



BETA This is a new service - your [feedback](#) will help us improve it.

Interested party comments

Site address 1 Battersea Bridge Road, London, SW11 3BZ

Appeal reference 6002127

LPA London Borough of Wandsworth

Published

Interested party 1

Interested party Christine Skinns

Date received 27 January 2026, 22:51

Comment I appealed against this over-development when it was originally proposed and feel exactly the same as I did then. I imagine you already have my comments from that time, but please do get in touch if that is not the case.

I really believe that the residents and their council (Wandsworth) have already made clear their rejection of this development and that the Secretary of State should honour that decision.

Yours,
Christine (Chrissy) Skinns

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 2

Interested party Marie Ann Gallagher

Date received 27 January 2026, 22:46

Comment I wish to strongly object to the Rockwell Tower development adjacent to Battersea Bridge (Reference Number 6002127)

for the following reasons:

Having lived in Battersea my entire life I have seen many changes which due to careful management of the riverside, particularly between Wandsworth and Chelsea bridges, have led to an improvement of the local environment, opening up this area with low rise blocks of housing and offices, the riverside walk for pedestrians and cyclists and the beautiful green space which is Battersea Park and includes two Grade II listed bridges especially the iconic Albert Bridge. Such careful management has contributed to a healthier environment and is better for our local wellbeing.

The damage to our Battersea heritage caused by this potential construction is unacceptable and will change forever the vista for anyone who travels across the river to Battersea into an eyesore – one ridiculously high solo tower compared to the existing buildings along the river front or is this just the beginning?

Most importantly, Battersea Bridge is our major artery crossing the river with buses, emergency vehicles and other transport. Look at the huge impact when the bridge was forced to close twice fairly recently due to two accidents/incidents. The traffic issues on both sides of the river were bad enough but for people who rely on public transport ie buses to cross the river twice daily it was a nightmare.

What would happen if this massive unreasonable construction development caused damage to the safety of the bridge resulting in a much longer major closure and what a disaster it would be for the river crossing serving this part of the Battersea community?

The new TFL traffic management scheme approaching the proposed site and Battersea Bridge often causes huge congestion. What will happen to all the extremely important five bus routes that service the communities on both sides of the river if this further construction goes ahead not to mention all the traffic on A3220?

We have only just recovered from all the disruption of the very recent TFL extension of the bus lane and gate. These works caused the whole area to grind to a halt at times affecting all streets feeding onto Battersea Bridge Road and the buses were often unable to complete their journeys due to the heavy congestion. Will we have to face this total disruption and heavy traffic in all our residential streets again often trapping us on this side of the river?

I do not understand how such an appalling and intrusive design of such a tower of such massive scale providing large numbers of yet more luxury flats would be allowed on a site already occupied by a low-rise building which complements the environment. This is a disruptive and destructive type of development for no good reason and with no benefit to the local area.

Will it provide the necessary social housing for the area?

Affordable housing is often promised by developers but, in reality, it is never delivered or of an appropriate size to live in a pleasant environment. Look at the Nine Elms development in terms of social or affordable housing.

However, that development is at least set back from the river maintaining its river walk and as a group of blocks of flats is not so intrusive both on this side of the river or from the other side. It also provides an enormous amount of luxury apartments but are they all lived in? How many of the Rockwell flats will be just empty as investment opportunities contributing nothing to the local community?

We believed that Wandsworth Council had listened to its residents and constituents and unanimously rejected this ludicrous project. We are not happy that Rockwell refused to accept the ruling and ignored the concerns of local people and this enquiry demanded by them means that our borough will have to expend and divert council tax-payer funds to fight this unnecessary challenge which no-one except Rockwell wants. This is not an appropriate site for such development and will irretrievably damage our river front and walk.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 3

Interested party	Mary Scott
-------------------------	------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 22:17
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I believe this building will be a disaster for the local area. It is far too big and out of proportion to other buildings in the area and far too close to Battersea bridge which may be damaged during the building.</p> <p>Transport is already very congested getting over the bridge and building works will cause severe delays with little alternative routes for people to get across the river.</p> <p>Affordable housing promises are nearly always broken and they are never truly affordable and I have no doubt the company will only look to making a profit for their shareholders. I strongly resent them taking this to court costing me, a Wandsworth tax payer, money that could be spent on more worthwhile things. No no no no no!</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 4

Interested party	Parvoleta Shtereva
Date received	27 January 2026, 19:23
Comment	<p>I do not support the appeal against the planning decision for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The height of the proposed building, even though revised, is still not consistent with the council's own planning policy for the area.2. The height of the building is completely out of proportion to existing structures and will forever damage the skyline of an area known for historical and protected bridges, churches and park.3. The loss of light and privacy for the residents of neighbouring buildings and significant light pollution that will extend across the river and beyond.4. Risk to the structural integrity of Battersea Bridge, the Thames River wall and neighbouring buildings.5. Significant adverse impact on the life and wellbeing of local residents, visitors and businesses through severe traffic congestion and pollution which will last for years.6. Lack of public transport and other services infrastructure to support such an increase in residents.7. The materials presented by the developer as part of the planning application do not demonstrate in-depth analysis and due consideration of the construction challenges and environmental impacts of this build. <p>4. and 5. and .7 are particularly acute as the construction will take place on a very small surface area which is not easily accessible apart from the main road. It is inevitable that the number of projected (and likely significantly underestimated) heavy truck movements required will cause massive congestion in the area and could endanger lives. The suggestion that a building of such scale on such a small footprint will be completed in two year period is completely unbelievable.</p> <p>This process has already caused significant anxiety to local residents who do not have the financial means to match a developer which is supported in this project by a very large US hedge fund.</p> <p>Please stand with local residents and our council and reject this appeal.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 5

Interested party	Johanna Hernon
Date received	27 January 2026, 19:04
Comment	<p>The proposed building is too high for an area where all other buildings are no more than 8 storeys high. It is also too large for the site. It will spoil the beautiful river views and block the light and views of other residential buildings in the area. It is completely out of character for the area and would spoil the riverside path. The area is already heavily congested and traffic moves very slowly so any construction work would make this even worse. The No 19 bus route from Battersea Bridge to the West End is due to be axed shortly so a development of this size will have a very bad effect on the existing transport infrastructure. Battersea Bridge is an extremely important river crossing and may be damaged by construction traffic. I am strongly opposed to this proposed development being given planning permission. It is not suitable for this site or the area.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 6

Interested party	Ajit Gill
Date received	27 January 2026, 18:32
Comment	<p>The Environment Agency wishes to provide additional written advice in support of our previous comments provided under the parent application (LPA ref: 2024/1322) as an interested party. I have attached a copy of our comments.</p>
Supporting documents	The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road Appeal (Ref 6002127) Environment Agency comments.pdf

Interested party 7

Interested party	Jamie Ross
Date received	27 January 2026, 17:14
Comment	<p>I wish to object to the proposal for the One Battersea Bridge development by Rockwell, and do not support the appeal against Wandsworth Council's planning decision.</p>

The proposal completely goes against the borough's Local Plan and London Plan, and against Wandsworth Council's unanimous decision to refuse planning permission for what I gather they called a 'grossly unacceptable' development.

It's far too tall for this riverside site and totally out of character with the area.

It would ruin the Thames Path walk experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.

Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing.

There would be extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on already congested narrow streets and along the Thames Path.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 8

Interested party	Vickesh Rathod (DPDS Consulting)
-------------------------	----------------------------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 15:55
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Please refer to enclosed detailed representation prepared by DPDS Consulting Group on behalf of Mr Stuart Gulliver (Albion Riverside) and Ms Amanda Henricks (Chairman of Thameswalk Residents Association).
----------------	--

This representation was also emailed to Alison Dyson (PINS Case Officer) on 23rd January 2026 by Les Durrant (DPDS Consulting Group) and is being uploaded here for completeness.

Supporting documents	6002127 Appeal Representation - Gulliver and Henricks_comp.pdf
-----------------------------	--

Interested party 9

Interested party	Claire Pilton
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 15:37
----------------------	------------------------

Comment

I do not support this Appeal 6002127 for the very reasons Wandsworth Council unanimously refused the revised application on 3rd June 2025. In addition, I would ask the Inspectorate:

1. Why the applicant did not originally provide a completed Section 106 planning obligation?
2. Would the latter be legally binding?
3. Increasing affordable housing is vital, but at what cost? MD Nicholas Mee told me on 3 June 25, "some 30% Glassmills' total sq footage would be affordable" - this together with the size of the affordable flats, minimal provision of bath/ shower rooms, lack of outlook/ privacy, negates the much publicised 50% claim. Similarly the offer of reception spaces, podium garden, play space, restaurant and 'public realm improvements' along the site's short Thames-side boundary are incommensurate with the pitfalls this proposed tower block would wreak; not only on the surrounding area - but on its own occupants; namely lack of privacy / overlooking, insufficient parking, lack of routine and, more worryingly, emergency vehicular access, wind tunnel effect at street level, inadequate outdoor communal space etc
4. There is no provision for additional local infrastructure to meet the needs of up to 110 additional households comprising (according to the plans) some 440 people; this with regard to schools, doctors, shops, public transport, on-line deliveries and parking. There are just 18 parking spaces for 110 apartments. The area is already short on residents' and pay&display spaces.
5. Despite a catalogue of reports, there is inadequate research / documentation regarding the environmental impact the proposed tower block would have on the locality; I can see no mention of the 'wind tunnel' effect it would have on the river and ultimately the river bed, especially near the bridge where, at low tide, many working and passenger craft already have to navigate with caution?
6. There are inadequate studies on the impact of vibration and possible damage (as a result of pile-driving and construction) to Grade II Battersea Bridge and Albert Bridge, nearby buildings and the Thames river wall and walk way
7. Disruption caused by construction may not be a planning issue per se, but there is insufficient documentation regarding the real impact construction traffic would have on Battersea Bridge; recent closures of Albert Bridge resulted in serious congestion locally and back into Chelsea /Pimlico/ West End. Where is there provision for emergency access for fire-engines / ambulances etc?
8. The way Rockwell secured letters of support is dubious. In April 25 I was stopped in Battersea Park by a chap with a clipboard and asked if I supported social housing and, if so, would I sign a petition? This took the form of a letter to the LBW's Planning Dept saying I supported the Glassmills

proposal because ... the letter said I could write 'one sentence on local issues, one on housing issues and /or one on your ideas'. Such underhand activity would explain why all but a handful of emails supporting the application followed the same format. I took photos of the comments form; it was prepared by Your Shout who were employed by Rockwell to approach people and knock on doors in the neighbourhood. Is the Inspectorate prepared to allow this appeal to abuse what Planning upholds as a democratic process?

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 10

Interested party

Zena Bellow

Date received

27 January 2026, 14:59

Comment

The Glassmill 1 Battersea Bridge Road SW11 3BZ
Appeal reference 6002127

Valiant House Management Co are writing to register their objections to this planning application on behalf of the 200+ residents dwelling at VH in 104 flats.

We believe that your committee should respect Wandsworth Council's decision to reject this application. The groundswell of rejection by local communities was overwhelming and the objections continue.

The Thames Waterfront was significantly altered after John Prescott, Deputy PM under Tony Blair, overturned the planning inspector's advice in 2006, and gave permission for two towers (821 apartments) in Lots Road to be built. This caused a lot of anger locally by allowing such significant, tall and dense development. Today the whole area is more or less a wasteland with very few of the apartments being inhabited.

The same scenario should not be allowed to happen at the Glassmill site.

The area around Battersea from Lombard Road, Vicarage Crescent, past Battersea Square along Battersea Church Road to Battersea Bridge is not a backwater to be ignored as evidenced by the recent immense upheaval and inconvenience caused by TFL's recent abysmal efforts changing traffic lights and phasing on Battersea Bridge.

Attempts to solve these congestion problems are still ongoing.

It should be noted that the nearest underground/overground stations are an average of 1.6 m away. Battersea Bridge is therefore a vital arterial link, and ensuring that the bus services run without hindrance is essential. This would be severely threatened by construction works which would presumably last for years.

The tow path is one of Wandsworth's most popular amenities and is widely enjoyed by both locals and tourists. At weekends it is often very busy. All existing developments between Battersea and Albert Bridges greatly enhance the amenity value of the path. A building of this scale and design on the other hand would be ugly and intrusive and would greatly detract from what is currently a very attractive walkway.

Please reject this application. The only people who would benefit are the developers and investors looking for a piece of real estate. Ordinary working people, as this Government likes to call us, would certainly not.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 11

Interested party	Rob McGibbon
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 13:51
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Sirs,
----------------	-------

There are multiple reasons that this appeal should be rejected. In fact, the development scheme put forward by Rockwell Property falls short in virtually EVERY aspect. I outline the key reasons for my objection here:

- It is too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
- It would irrevocably harm the Thames Path experience and

important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.

- Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.

- Extra pressure would be put on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.

- Claims of “50% affordable homes” are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell states that it will get a £470,000 GLA grant PER UNIT for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on these units? And what is the risk of these units not being built - yet supported with GLA money? We should be told.

- The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.

- What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?

- This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan and will set a precedent for the future height of blocks in Battersea. To give this persuasion could unleash a swathe of other developments that would change this area for the worse forever.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 12

Interested party	Loudivina Gaoat
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 13:37
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	We against of high rise building.
----------------	-----------------------------------

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 13

Interested party	Barbara Dwek
-------------------------	--------------

Date received

27 January 2026, 12:47

Comment

I object to the proposal, and my principal objection aligns with the conclusions already reached by Wandsworth Council's Planning Office.

By reason of its height, scale, and massing, the proposed development would be incongruous within an area characterised by predominantly low-rise development and designated as a low-rise policy zone. The proposal would result in an unacceptable change to the established spatial character of the area, causing significant harm that is not outweighed by material considerations.

The proposal therefore conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy D9 (Tall Buildings) of the London Plan (2021), and Policies PM9 (Riverside) and LP4 (Tall and Mid-Rise Buildings) of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023).

The proposal fails to adequately address a number of material planning considerations, including the following:

Previously identified site constraints

The application and subsequent appeal disregard significant constraints identified in the original 2018 application by the same applicant (Application Ref: 2018/1311).

These unresolved constraints include the site's location within Flood Zones 2 and 3a, the Wandsworth Thames Policy Area, the Ransomes Dock Archaeological Priority Area, and the requirement for heliport consultation for developments exceeding 30 metres in height.

Neighbouring amenity and rights to light

Insufficient regard has been given to impacts on neighbouring amenity, including established rights to light affecting properties at 6 and 8 Hester Road.

In particular, Albion Riverside, 8 Hester Road, completed in 2003 by Foster + Partners, has benefited from uninterrupted access to light for over 20 years, such that rights have accrued under the Prescription Act 1832 (Section 1.3).

Riverside ecology and biodiversity

The application is deficient in its assessment of environmental impacts due to the absence of a full Environmental Statement.

This results in an inadequate assessment of impacts on the Thames riverside ecosystem, protected species, and a known starling population near Battersea Bridge, contrary to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Insufficient regard is also given to relevant biodiversity assessments, including Section 14.36 of the Northern Line Extension Biodiversity Plan.

Transport, parking, and highway impacts

The proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that adequate public transport capacity exists to support the development and provides insufficient private parking for the number of proposed residents.

The parking garage scheme is ill-considered, and the application lacks robust traffic modelling and adequate consultation with Transport for London, particularly in relation to Battersea Bridge access. The parking garage access itself via lift seems particularly inconvenient if not to mention dangerous for those exiting and entering via car, creating further hazards to cyclists and pedestrians which are plentiful on Hester Road.

Hester Road lacks capacity for residents of a further 110 residential units, as pedestrians, cyclists, or drivers. It is already a very dense, narrow street that serves the Royal College of Art, 6, Hester Road, 8 Hester Road, many cyclists using it as access to the River Path, and this must really be considered fully as it impacts residents' safety.

These omissions are of particular concern given that Elcho Street functions as a major bus route and bus standing area.

Construction impacts and management

The proposal lacks a credible construction management and logistics plan.

Insufficient information has been provided regarding construction vehicle routing, site ingress and egress via Hester Road, and traffic impacts during demolition and construction, demonstrating a disregard for impacts on immediate neighbours and residents reliant on Battersea Bridge.

Townscape, heritage, and visual impact

I support and align with the objections raised by the Battersea Society in relation to townscape, built heritage, and visual impact. (<https://www.batterseasociety.org.uk/planning-1/the-glassmill-1-battersea-bridge-road-sw11-3bz-20241322-1>)

Of particular concern are effects on the setting, views, and vantage points associated with nearby designated heritage assets, including Battersea Bridge (Grade II), Albert Bridge (Grade II), Battersea Park, and the Embankment.

Air quality impacts

The site lies within an Air Quality Management Area, yet the proposal fails to provide adequate assessment or mitigation of construction-related dust, site emissions, and operational traffic impacts on NO₂ and PM₁₀.

This omission is especially serious given the presence of nearby high-sensitivity receptors, including residential dwellings with prolonged occupancy and vulnerable individuals.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 14

Interested party	P Lanigan-O'Keeffe
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 12:03
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I submitted an objection to this proposal as part of the original planning application process in 2024 and wish the inspector to be aware that I stand by my original objections. The idea that the developers should be able to raise an inquiry into this totally unsuitable project which flies in the face of the numerous opinions submitted by both professional bodies, by Wandsworth Council's refusal and the views of thousands of local residents makes a mockery of any involvement that the public have in the planning process. The costs and time that will now have to be devoted to fighting this by Wandsworth Council will divert funds and resources away from the urgent needs of borough residents at a time when all boroughs are desperately short of funds.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 15

Interested party	David Zambra
-------------------------	--------------

Date received 27 January 2026, 11:41

Comment This appeal should be dismissed. The height of the building is against what the council have planned for that area. It will be completely out of character with buildings nearby. It will cause traffic problems for buses and cars using the bridge during and after the works. It will overhang buildings nearby and destroy their light and outlook.
The promise to have affordable housing should be examined closely.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 16

Interested party Tim Childs

Date received 27 January 2026, 10:59

Comment The proposed building is far too large, incongruous in the setting and will block southern/western light to The Albion Riverside building to a very large extent. Also, if allowed to proceed, it will set a new height precedent for the location which will encourage other developers to try their luck along that stretch of the river. Congestion on Battersea Bridge is already very high and, notwithstanding the limit car spaces applied for, will inevitably result in dramatically increased vehicular activity in the locality.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 17

Interested party George Bridges

Date received 27 January 2026, 10:51

Comment This development would be an eyesore, its construction would cause massive disruption and is not supported by the local community. No one doubts the need for more affordable housing: but this development is not the way to deliver it.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 18

Interested party	Robert Godber
Date received	27 January 2026, 10:51
Comment	<p>Dear Sir/ Madam,</p> <p>I wish to raise 3 points that have not been addressed by the developer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Promontoria Battersea application to build on the Glassmill site conflicts with Wandsworth Local Plan Policy LP4 and London Policy D9. Promontoria were offered a different site in Wandsworth on which a large tower block could be safely built that was in line with London and Local policy. Promontoria failed to take up this offer. If they really do wish to build homes for London and the UK why did they not take up the offer from Wandsworth Council. They could have already started building.2. The River Wall and Battersea Bridge. Promontoria has indicated that deep excavation for the 29 stories would require approx 1,200 lorries delivering concrete for the piling to the site. Promontoria has failed to address concerns on the structural integrity of both Battersea Bridge and and River Wall from the deep piling required for such a tall building. The risk is that Battersea Bridge or the River Wall becomes unstable.3. Light. A 29 story building would conflict with Local Plan Policies LP2, LP15 and LP27. These issues have hardly been covered in the Promontoria application. Residents from 6 Hester Road, Thames Walk Appartments and Albion Riverside would be severely affect by such a tall building. Promontoria should have considered the Supreme Court judgement in Fearn v Tate Gallery. <p>These 3 factors point to a poorly put together application by Promontoria. If they really do wish to build new homes they should join the many tall buildings in the Nine Elms area where there is much less conflict with Local and London planning laws and no risk to the structural integrity of Battersea Bridge and the River Wall.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 19

Interested party	George Staple
Date received	27 January 2026, 10:22
Comment	<p>With some modifications, I would like to reiterate the comments I made in respect of the planning application, which was refused by Wandsworth Council.</p> <p>The changes that have recently been made to the road layout at each end of Battersea Bridge, while very welcome in terms of pedestrian and vehicle safety, appear already to have increased traffic congestion in the approaches to the bridge.</p> <p>The proposed development, sited so close to the southern end of the bridge, is not appropriate. The large number of new residents will inevitably further increase pedestrian and traffic congestion on, and approaching, the bridge. The very limited access to Albert Bridge would not provide an adequate alternative for cars, bicycles and pedestrians. The transport needed to take residents into central London north of Battersea Bridge, through the heavy commercial traffic already using the bridge, will have to increase commensurately.</p> <p>The proposed building will be more than twice the height of anything else in the locality, and will be visually entirely out of place in the low level skyline, particularly of Battersea Park, along the south bank of the river between Battersea Power Station and Wandsworth.</p> <p>The Glassmill Building is also likelier to take light from the buildings between Battersea Bridge and Albert Bridge.</p> <p>Shopping facilities are very limited in the immediate locality, as are GP practices and schools.</p> <p>For these reasons, therefore, the appeal should be refused.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 20

Interested party	Tonya Hoffman
Date received	27 January 2026, 09:47
Comment	The proposed building offers too much density that cannot not be reasonably sustained by the surrounding area.

Nor does it offers sufficient benefits for the broader community.

Additionally, the site sits right next to a heritage bridge and it does not reflect nor value the heritage of the community.

Finally, it utilises the entire footprint and does not provide any green space for residents or the community.

I object to this building proposal.

6002127.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 21

Interested party	Victoria Chadwick
-------------------------	-------------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 09:39
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>This building is completely unacceptable. Does not fit the area . Too tall too ugly. We already have a traffic problem crossing the bridges ,cars queuing for hours . Public transport is struggling already we cannot cope with more high rise flats and their residents.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 22

Interested party	Gerhard Reinecke
-------------------------	------------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 09:29
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The planned building is not planned in a zone where heights of buildings are restricted. The planned building exceeds this restriction by a massive lot. I think, the law and the council building plans should be respected by everyone. It conflicts not only with local plan but also with London Plan.2. It would bring way too much traffic as Battersea bridge can handle. It's on the brink already.3. It's totally unecological to build concrete vaults for the money of a few investors who will buy flats without ever living in them. Promised affordable housing in this building will never happen, as the building costs are too high. Roc well is now
----------------	--

splashing out millions again to fight the council's decision and planning laws. This will not make construction cheaper, so even less affordable housing!

4, 5 and others: It's too big for the area and will destroy the community, it will put extra pressure on buses and other traffic during construction, it is doubtful whether a safe construction on this site is even possible, the design is not up to the standard for such a prominent site, it's just another boring money making machine tower.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 23

Interested party	Gabrielle Folliard
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 09:21
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Dear Sir/Madam,
----------------	-----------------

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the planning appeal relating to the proposed redevelopment of 1 Battersea Bridge Road ("Glassmill"), reference number 6002127.

I am the owner and resident of Flat 28G, Thorney Crescent, within the Morgan's Walk estate. My home would be directly and materially affected by the proposed development.

I object to the appeal on the following grounds:

Excessive Height and Scale

The proposal for a 29-storey tower is wholly out of character with the existing low-rise riverside environment. It conflicts with Wandsworth's adopted Local Plan tall building policy, which requires tall buildings to be proportionate to their context and not to create an overbearing impact. The Glassmill site lies within the 'mid-rise' zone where building heights should not exceed six storeys or 18 metres. The proposed tower represents a clear and substantial breach of this policy framework.

Loss of Amenity, Privacy and Daylight

The development would result in significant overlooking of homes within Morgan's Walk, including my own flat, leading to loss of privacy and residential amenity. It would also reduce daylight and sunlight to surrounding properties and alter the micro-climate of this low-rise riverside neighbourhood.

Impact on Heritage and Townscape

The proposal would harm the setting of Battersea Bridge, a Grade II listed structure, and disrupt the established riverside townscape. The scale of the building is visually intrusive and fails to respect the character of this part of the Thames riverfront.

Transport and Infrastructure Impacts

Battersea Bridge and surrounding road networks are already under strain. Construction and operational impacts from a development of this scale would exacerbate congestion, increase safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists, and create difficulties for emergency service access, as has already been highlighted by local stakeholders.

The original planning committee unanimously rejected this proposal, and I believe that decision was correct. The appeal scheme remains contrary to adopted planning policy and would cause substantial harm to the amenity of existing residents, including myself.

I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate dismiss this appeal and uphold Wandsworth Council's original refusal.

Yours faithfully,

Gabrielle Folliard
Owner, Flat 28G Thorney Crescent
London SW11 3TT
Email: gabrielle.folliard@gmail.com
+44 7970 050663

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 24

Interested party	Shireen Nathoo
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 09:15
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Re: 6002127 I am writing to object to the appeal against Wandsworth Council's refusal of planning permission for the proposed redevelopment of The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road.
----------------	---

The Council was correct to refuse the application, and the appeal does not overcome the fundamental planning harms identified.

1. Height, Scale and Policy ConflictThe proposed part 10-

storey, part 28-storey building is wholly inappropriate for this location. The site lies within a mid-rise area where the Local Plan anticipates significantly lower building heights. The scale and massing would result in an over-dominant and incongruous development that conflicts with adopted local and London Plan policies on tall buildings and contextual design.

2. Harm to Townscape and Heritage Given the site's prominent riverside location, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character of the Thames frontage and the setting of nearby heritage assets, including Battersea Bridge. This harm was clearly identified by the Council and has not been adequately addressed in the appeal submission.

3. Adverse Impact on Residential Amenity The development would lead to loss of daylight and sunlight, an overbearing impact, and increased overlooking for neighbouring residents. These are material harms that weigh heavily against the scheme.

4. Public Benefits Do Not Outweigh the Harm While the provision of housing and affordable units is acknowledged, the Council correctly concluded that these benefits do not outweigh the significant and demonstrable harm arising from the proposal's excessive scale and inappropriate location.

Conclusion For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Inspector dismiss the appeal and uphold Wandsworth Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 25

Interested party	Samuel Burls
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	27 January 2026, 09:00
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Reference number: 6002127
----------------	---------------------------

I am hugely disappointed that Rockwell Property has appealed to the government to overturn the unanimous decision that refused it's disgusting development on Battersea bridge.

The decision to refuse them initially was the right one, this tower will ruin our local area and community and bring only negative impact (ie congestion from construction, more empty flats and ruin the skyline on the river.)

The local community will be destroyed if this tower is built. I urge my government to respect the unanimous decision of the local council which Rockwell Property do not care about – they are showing a complete disregard for our law and legal processes.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 26

Interested party natasha locke

Date received 27 January 2026, 08:51

Comment 6002127

I am absolutely appalled that Rockwell Property has appealed against Wandsworth Council's unanimous decision to refuse its planning application to build a grotesque tower on Battersea Bridge.

This development will ruin the community entirely – it is completely unnecessary and brings no benefit. The construction alone will cause huge problems to an area that is already so congested.

The fact they are appealing the decision shows how unjust this entire process has become. It is a disgrace that this has even been entertained AGAIN.

Rockwell clearly have a complete disregard for the views of the council, planning experts and the thousands of residents that have prevented this tower before.

If this tower goes ahead the community will be ruined – both in spirit and physically – there is no need for anything like this on the battersea shoreline.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 27

Interested party Nisha Mor

Date received 27 January 2026, 08:01

Comment The building is out of keeping with the landscape.
Too tall and will spoil an iconic area
Access to light
Overcrowding on riverfront
Traffic congestion
Affordable housing will not be afforded by most
There is good reason why the original claim was rejected

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 28

Interested party Jane Hemstritch

Date received 27 January 2026, 04:11

Comment I object to this appeal and submit that it should be dismissed for the following reasons:

1. Clear and substantial conflict with Wandsworth Local Plan 2023-2028.
Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires decisions to be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. No such considerations exist in this case.
The proposal for a 33-storey tower directly conflicts with the Wandsworth Local Plan 2023–2028, which limits development within:
 - Mid-rise zone MB-B2-02 to 6 storeys, and
 - High-rise zone TB-B2-04 to 12 storeys.The proposed height—almost three times the maximum permitted—represents a fundamental and unjustified departure from adopted policy. This is not a marginal exceedance but a material breach that undermines the planned system.
2. Unacceptable harm to residential amenity
The proposal would cause significant, demonstrable harm to existing residents through loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy.
Due to its excessive height and proximity, the development would block winter sunlight and cast extensive shadow over 6 Hester Road, a Peabody-managed affordable housing block, and Albion Riverside. These impacts would materially diminish living conditions and amount to an effective loss of the right to light.
In addition, all east-facing apartments in the proposed tower would directly overlook the bedrooms, bathrooms and living

rooms of these neighbouring properties, resulting in a serious and permanent loss of privacy. These impacts cannot be adequately mitigated and weigh heavily against the scheme.

3. Construction impacts that cannot be realistically mitigated

The construction impacts of a development of this scale on such a constrained site have not been convincingly addressed.

Battersea Bridge Road and Battersea Bridge are already subject to chronic congestion. Introducing sustained HGV movements would significantly worsen traffic conditions, impede bus services, and raise serious concerns regarding the continued effectiveness of emergency access, particularly for older and vulnerable residents.

Public transport in this location is heavily bus-dependent.

Construction disruption would therefore have a disproportionate impact on residents' ability to access employment, education and essential services.

4. Risk to heritage and neighbouring buildings

Battersea Bridge is a Grade II listed structure, and the proposed development would require deep pile foundations. This presents a credible risk of structural damage both to the bridge and to nearby residential buildings, including Albion Riverside.

The application fails to demonstrate that these risks can be adequately avoided. In such circumstances, reliance on post-event remediation is insufficient. The absence of firm, enforceable guarantees—such as bank or parent-company guarantees with unlimited liability—further underscores the uncertainty and risk inherent in the proposal.

5. Deliverability concerns

The appeal site is severely constrained. There is no credible strategy for accommodating cranes, machinery or materials storage on site.

The reliance on “just-in-time” deliveries is unrealistic given that:

- Battersea Bridge Road is frequently gridlocked during daytime hours; and
- Hester Road is too narrow to accommodate HGV movements or temporary closures.

Traffic marshals cannot overcome these physical and network constraints. The proposal therefore raises serious doubts about whether it is deliverable without unacceptable harm to the surrounding area.

Conclusion

The proposal conflicts materially with Wandsworth Local Plan 2023–2028, causes significant harm to residential amenity, poses unacceptable construction and heritage risks, and lacks a credible delivery strategy. These harms are not outweighed by any material considerations.

Interested party 29

Interested party	Amanda Henricks
Date received	27 January 2026
Comment	Added as a document
Supporting documents	Thames Walk Residents Association.msg

Interested party 30

Interested party	Connie Williams-Thomas
Date received	26 January 2026, 21:18
Comment	I don't want high rise new builds to take over
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 31

Interested party	Koen Van Eynde
Date received	26 January 2026, 21:01
Comment	<p>The same comments apply as I wrote before, this development is too high with complete disregard to the surrounding area or the needs of our community and indeed London for real affordable housing. It is an eyesore, with the sole purpose of maximising profit over architectural beauty, profit and foreign investor savings accounts over real housing, with no benefit to the area, the council, or the city. A development that focuses on bringing housing, services, businesses, and improving rather than hindering already terrible traffic and public transport connections, is something we could all support. Not another glass status symbol.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 32

Interested party	Toby Rigby
Date received	26 January 2026, 20:07
Comment	<p>I do not support this appeal. I am a former resident of Morgan's Walk, living in Paveley Drive. I still have family and friends living in the development. This tower if built, would be devastating for the local area. My main point is the impact on the light at Morgan's Walk, this tower would ruin the light available for the many flats facing it. The traffic around is bad enough, it would get exponentially worse, especially on and around Battersea Bridge. The tower would be out of keeping with other buildings in the area - and ruin what is a charming pocket of London. I fail to believe any affordable houses would come to fruition.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 33

Interested party	Alice Bullock
Date received	26 January 2026, 20:05
Comment	<p>I am a former resident of Morgan's Walk and have family and friends in the building. I knew when living there how much light the flat would get in the morning which was only possible due to the height of the building currently. If it had been taller all our light would have been blocked. There's also too many people and too much traffic around that area already, the area does not need any more new flats. I object to the planning and do not think their greed should be allowed to ruin the river skyline</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 34

Interested party	Nathalie Hayes
Date received	26 January 2026, 19:06
Comment	<p>Hello, I love living in Battersea, it is a place that has been blooming over the years and I welcome regeneration. The new Elcho</p>

Street and Vivianne Westwood developments have been welcomed by the community so this objection isn't just NIMBY-ism.

Rockwell proposal will ruin the area. The height of it is excessive and will be a blot on the surrounding area and conflicts with Wandsworth council's policy on height. The surrounding area will lose light and resident's will be overlooked (including directly into my bathroom!).

The impact on Battersea bridge is also unknown if it is damaged it will cause chaos for years and will affect emergency services reaching people.

Please, please don't let these greedy off-shore developers ruin an area I love and cherish.

Thank you for reading this,

Nathalie

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 35

Interested party	Kristin Frija
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 17:51
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The biggest problem in Battersea is the traffic and we cannot see that there are room for many more vehicles. To cross the bridge is already a nightmare. We are also far from any tube station and therefore most people use their cars. Visually one should not build anything taller than existing buildings, especially that close to the bridge.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 36

Interested party	Emma Basden
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 16:57
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I object to this proposal. reference number 6002127 I grew up in Battersea and would like to preserve it for generations to
----------------	---

come. This development is too large and too tall for the space suggested and the surrounding buildings are not allowed to be higher than 9 levels so neither should this.

Ignore other empty promises of social housing etc...foreign backed developers should not be dictating what happens to our historic London. It has been rejected locally and should not be allowed to take up valuable time and money which could have gone into other more pressing projects.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 37

Interested party Rachael Hudson

Date received 26 January 2026, 16:52

Comment

I am writing as a local resident to vehemently object to the appeal lodged by the developer regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Glassmill site. I urge the Planning Inspectorate to uphold Wandsworth Council's unanimous decision to refuse this scheme.

This proposal for a tower with so many flaws is fundamentally flawed and represents a gross overdevelopment that ignores local democracy, planning policy, and the specific constraints of this historic riverside location. My objection is based on the following material planning grounds:

1. Direct Breach of the Adopted Local Plan (2023) The proposed height (29 storeys) is a flagrant breach of the recently adopted Wandsworth Local Plan (2023-2038). The site is designated as a "mid-rise" zone, where the maximum appropriate height is identified as 6 storeys (or 18 metres). A 29-storey tower is not a "landmark", it is an alien anomaly that disregards the democratically established spatial strategy for the borough. Allowing this appeal would render the Local Plan meaningless and set a dangerous precedent for the entire south bank of the Thames.

2. Severe Harm to Heritage Assets & Protected Views The site is situated at the foot of Battersea Bridge (Grade II Listed) and is highly visible from the Chelsea Embankment Conservation Area and Cheyne Walk.

Dominance: The tower would visually overpower the delicate structure of Battersea Bridge, destroying the established skyline which is characterized by low-to-mid-rise buildings.

Historic England's Position: I note that Historic England has previously objected, describing the scheme as "visually intrusive" and "harmful." The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the setting, violating the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3. Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity As a nearby resident, I am deeply concerned about the "overshadowing" and "sense of enclosure" this tower will create. The scale of the building will lead to a significant loss of daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties (specifically the affordable housing at Hester Road). The sheer bulk of the tower is oppressive and unneighbourly, degrading the quality of life for existing residents.

4. Traffic Safety and Infrastructure Strain The junction at Battersea Bridge Road and Prince of Wales Drive is already one of the most congested and dangerous in the borough, even with recent changes.

Construction Danger: The logistics of constructing a tower of this magnitude on such a constrained "island" site presents unacceptable risks to pedestrian and cycle safety.

Cumulative Impact: The local infrastructure cannot support the density proposed. The addition of hundreds of new residents and the associated service vehicles will exacerbate gridlock on a critical Red Route.

5. Conclusion Wandsworth Council's Planning Committee rejected this scheme unanimously because it is the wrong building for the wrong place. The minor amendments made by the developer do not mitigate the fundamental harm caused by its excessive mass and height.

This development offers no public benefit that outweighs the irreversible damage it would cause to the historic riverside character and the lives of local people. I respectfully request that this appeal be dismissed.

Yours faithfully,

Rachael Hudson 25 Henty Close, London, SW11 4AH,
26/01/26

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 38

Interested partyRachael Hudson

Date received26 January 2026, 16:52

Comment

I am writing as a local resident to vehemently object to the appeal lodged by the developer regarding the proposed redevelopment of the Glassmill site. I urge the Planning Inspectorate to uphold Wandsworth Council's unanimous decision to refuse this scheme.

This proposal for a tower with so many flaws is fundamentally flawed and represents a gross overdevelopment that ignores local democracy, planning policy, and the specific constraints of this historic riverside location. My objection is based on the following material planning grounds:

1. Direct Breach of the Adopted Local Plan (2023) The proposed height (29 storeys) is a flagrant breach of the recently adopted Wandsworth Local Plan (2023-2038). The site is designated as a "mid-rise" zone, where the maximum appropriate height is identified as 6 storeys (or 18 metres). A 29-storey tower is not a "landmark", it is an alien anomaly that disregards the democratically established spatial strategy for the borough. Allowing this appeal would render the Local Plan meaningless and set a dangerous precedent for the entire south bank of the Thames.

2. Severe Harm to Heritage Assets & Protected Views The site is situated at the foot of Battersea Bridge (Grade II Listed) and is highly visible from the Chelsea Embankment Conservation Area and Cheyne Walk.

Dominance: The tower would visually overpower the delicate structure of Battersea Bridge, destroying the established skyline which is characterized by low-to-mid-rise buildings.

Historic England's Position: I note that Historic England has previously objected, describing the scheme as "visually intrusive" and "harmful." The proposal fails to preserve or enhance the character of the setting, violating the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

3. Unacceptable Impact on Residential Amenity As a nearby resident, I am deeply concerned about the "overshadowing" and "sense of enclosure" this tower will create. The scale of the building will lead to a significant loss of daylight and sunlight for neighbouring properties (specifically the affordable housing at Hester Road). The sheer bulk of the tower is oppressive and unneighbourly, degrading the quality of life for existing residents.

4. Traffic Safety and Infrastructure Strain The junction at Battersea Bridge Road and Prince of Wales Drive is already one of the most congested and dangerous in the borough, even with recent changes.

Construction Danger: The logistics of constructing a tower of this magnitude on such a constrained "island" site presents unacceptable risks to pedestrian and cycle safety.

Cumulative Impact: The local infrastructure cannot support the density proposed. The addition of hundreds of new residents and the associated service vehicles will exacerbate gridlock on a critical Red Route.

5. Conclusion Wandsworth Council's Planning Committee rejected this scheme unanimously because it is the wrong building for the wrong place. The minor amendments made by the developer do not mitigate the fundamental harm caused by its excessive mass and height.

This development offers no public benefit that outweighs the irreversible damage it would cause to the historic riverside character and the lives of local people. I respectfully request that this appeal be dismissed.

Yours faithfully,

Rachael Hudson 25 Henty Close, London, SW11 4AH,
26/01/26

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 39

Interested party	Alice Basden
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 16:21
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I object to the height of this proposed building. I am a young person who would like to keep Battersea low rise with well designed buildings. The rules in our area only allow up to 9 levels and so this building should be made to obey the rules and keep London special for future generations . Thank you</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 40

Interested party Amanda Stewart

Date received 26 January 2026, 15:58

Comment I object to this planning proposal for many reasons but principally:

1. The proposed height of the building exceeds Wandsworth Borough rules and is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings.
2. Battersea Bridge is a treasured icon of London and critical for access to the North Bank. A development of this magnitude so close to the bridge will compromise the long term stability of the bridge

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 41

Interested party Vivienne Johns

Date received 26 January 2026, 15:44

Comment I am amazed that Rockwell are spending over £1million to appeal. Wandsworth council will now have to spend a vast amount to match the appeal meetings . So much for Rockwell's social housing programme to gain large grants. The £1million spent and spending being forced from the council could go some way to providing social housing. I objected originally as this building is totally alien to all the cultural and architectural policies of the area. Please don't allow it.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 42

Interested party Dianne Nelmes

Date received 26 January 2026, 15:35

Comment Wandsworth Planning Authority has set out in full its reasons to reject this proposed development which is fulsome. My lay person's view is that this development is totally out of

character. At a public consultation the developer s team simply misled me on vital facts and truths . I am cynical about the social

Housing: just look at the so called social housing attached to Albion Riverside

Why not simply redevelop the existing building which could be adapted to a lovely collection of apartments

Dianne Nelmes

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 43

Interested party	Barbara Siddle
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 15:04
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I do not support this appeal. The tower will be a blot on the landscape and Wandsworth council did right to turn down the planning application. It is totally out of keeping with the area.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 44

Interested party	Ian McBride
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 15:01
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>The developers' artful tactic of volunteering 50 per cent affordable housing and council control shortly before WBC committed to a similar policy in an amendment to its Local Plan should be viewed with caution and even cynicism.</p> <p>The developers/ investors will have given intense scrutiny to the economics and profitability of the various iterations of these proposals. To be able to make such a gesture surely suggests one of only two possibilities - (i) only by the gross over-development of the small site with 29 storeys does the proposition become profitable; (ii) the developers are showing their greed, rather than displaying civic responsibility. It should be borne in mind that developers have been known to negotiate serious dilution of such obligations once the project is underway, citing economic viability: given that the social housing units would attract significant grant aid legally binding</p>
----------------	---

commitments must surely be required.

In any event, to allow a developer to subvert a key council policy (Local Plan 2023 - 2038 stipulating building heights of 7 to 12 storeys) by seizing a revision of policy (requirement for 50 per cent of affordable housing), as allowing a 'public good' exemption surely can not be permitted. This would set the precedent for any developer to ride roughshod over planning policy - double the height of the block and offer 50 per cent to the council. Carefully developed, bespoke planning rules, framed to protect and enhance the environment for all of us, would become near worthless overnight. The strain on local services and infrastructure caused by such over-development would become intolerable.

If this crude over-development were allowed on such a significant riverscape site imagine developers' future expectations in more prosaic, less commanding locations.

Finally, no convincing evidence seems to have been adduced to support the assertion that re-purposing of the Glassmills building is not viable. Considering embodied carbon alone, surely a thorough independent analysis should be published before any redevelopment is entertained.

In summary, this application proposes a gross over-development of a tiny but important site - important because it sits at a principal gateway to the borough which should not be dominated by this enormous structure - and risks harming nearby heritage settings.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 45

Interested party	Patricia Bannerman
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 14:43
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The proposed tower is unjustifiable on many counts.
----------------	---

Firstly, it would run roughshod over the July 2023 Wandsworth Local Plan wherein a building on the Glassmills site should not exceed 6 storeys as it would be in mid-rise zone MB-B2-02. A building of the height proposed (29 storeys) far exceeds even the limit in the adjacent high -rise zone TB-B2-04.

Such a tall building would require very deep foundations and its construction would be a serious risk to surrounding

structures such as other already occupied residential buildings, to the Thames Path and also to Battersea Bridge itself, which is not only Grade 2 listed, but is also a major through road between Chelsea and South London. This through route which is extremely busy would be seriously disrupted during the lengthy period that would be required for demolition of the current building and construction of the tower.

Emergency vehicles would be hampered in moving between north and south, particularly as nearby Albert Bridge does not allow for wide or very heavy vehicles.

There is nowhere for lorries, cranes etc to enter, exit, park on the very restricted site. Vehicular access would continue to be a problem were the building to be completed as delivery vehicles and tradesmen's vans would have nowhere to stop without hampering the traffic flow on Battersea Bridge Road and/or vehicular access for residents of Hester road.

The provision of more affordable housing in Wandsworth would not be greatly improved by this proposed scheme, even if that part of the scheme were eventually to be fulfilled as currently stated and it has frequently been shown to be the case that the full complement of affordable units is often whittled down further along the line in many a development. At the same time the disruption with noise and air pollution to the lives of residents currently living immediately next to the site would be horrendous and the ensuing loss of natural light to their homes would be permanent.

Apart from all of these practical considerations a building of such height would be a visual aberration within the setting of the river frontage and its buildings of modest height.

How seriously has the option of refurbishment of the current building been considered as this would be less disruptive, less damaging and if tackled sympathetically more in keeping with the area ?

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 46

Interested party	Laura Jane Holden
-------------------------	-------------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 14:39
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I do not support this appeal and object to Rockwell Property's plans as the building will be too big for this riverside site and
----------------	--

out of character with the area. It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook. Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path. Claims of “50% affordable homes” are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing crisis" endeavour?! We should be told. The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme. What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction? This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 47

Interested party	Jenny Westin
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 13:28
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Dear Sir/Madam,
----------------	-----------------

I would like to lodge my strongest possible objection to the appeal made in respect of the Glassmill development at 1 Battersea Bridge Road. It was unanimously rejected by Wandsworth council's Planning Applications Committee for good reason. Allowing a 29 storey tower to be built in this location completely ignores Wandsworth's newly adopted Local Plan and risks undermining it in the future.

The tower would be seen from far away and would harm the setting of many heritage assets, eg Grade II listed Battersea Bridge, nearby conservation areas and many parks and gardens. The height would need to be substantially reduced to avoid this, according to Historic England.

Glassmill would cause significant overlooking and loss of privacy for the neighbouring properties at 6 Hester Road and Albion Riverside, the same goes for the elevated playground on the social housing part of the building. Considering a similar case was tried in *Fearn v Tate Gallery* it is clear the playground can never be used by anyone. The permanent loss of daylight to 6 Hester Road would also be significant.

The deep excavations and pilings required pose a significant and very serious risk to the neighbouring structures in

Thameswalk apartments, 6 Hester Road, Albion Riverside's car park, and Battersea Bridge. Nothing has been provided on how the risk of damage would be mitigated or that the full funds are available to cover the cost of repair. Damage to Battersea Bridge would be devastating to most parts of Chelsea and Battersea and cause severe traffic problems for years in an area which is already badly congested most of the day. The Hammersmith Bridge disaster must not be repeated. There is no credible construction traffic management plan. It currently takes 5-10 minutes to cross the bridge by car or bus from the junction with Hester Road to Chelsea Embankment, a distance of ca 300m. For traffic coming from further down Battersea Bridge Road or from the connecting roads, the situation is even worse. Adding heavy construction traffic would not improve that situation in either direction. Flood risk has not been adequately assessed, nor the risk to the flood defence structures. The local microclimate impact has been ignored or brushed over. The developer's own studies show it would be very uncomfortable for pedestrians at some places around Glassmill and some balconies would be too windy to be used. The impact studies submitted seem to look only at effects on Glassmill itself, but neighbouring properties would of course also be affected. This must not be ignored, but investigated fully. Last but not least, the public money spent on the appeal and on subsidising the social housing element (£400,000+ per unit) should the developer win the appeal, is much better spent elsewhere. The social housing apartments would in this case be single aspect, which is bad practice as it risks overheating. Providing just one bathroom in the larger units risk causing damp and mould, as they would be used all the time. It is simply not good value for taxpayer money! This is just a brief list of my reasons for objecting. I second the more detailed objection submitted by Albion Riverside Residents' Association. Please dismiss the appeal.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 48

Interested party

Bedria Bedri

Date received

26 January 2026, 13:23

Comment	This is a ridiculous development proposal right by Battersea Bridge in an already over populated area with gridlock traffic issues, sub infrastructure and amenities and a high rise that is out of kilter blocking light access to neighbours.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 49

Interested party	Caroline Oliver
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 12:36
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	This tower is unacceptable, what is wrong with what is already there?
----------------	---

It is too tall for starters, overshadowing all surrounding buildings, not to mention ruining the views to the river and from the river on the south side.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 50

Interested party	Patricia Wilkinson
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 11:39
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	This area of Battersea is already completely congested and the already creaking local transport and services will not be able to cope with the additional pressure. It already can take up to 30 minutes to cross the river from Battersea park Road.
----------------	---

It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area and would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.

Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.

Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent.

The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.

What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction? Per above the area is already at breaking point.

This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 51

Interested party	Nikki Coventry
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 11:36
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I do not believe this project is in keeping with the nature of this community and do not believe the appeal should be granted.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 52

Interested party	Ciara Mason
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	26 January 2026, 11:29
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I do not support this appeal.</p> <p>Given that the original application was unanimously rejected by the council, it represents a wanton disregard for Wandsworth Council's finances and resources.</p> <p>Among many other points, the proposal is completely at odds with the Local Plan and London Plan. It is far too big for the proposed site, totally out of character with the area and would block daylight to all surrounding neighbours and the riverside walk.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 53

Interested party	Clara Smith
Date received	26 January 2026, 11:15
Comment	I am against a high rise where locals have specified low developments
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 54

Interested party	Susan Sinclair
Date received	26 January 2026, 10:35
Comment	<p>This proposal is truly horrendous. This would overwhelm the local skyline dwarf surrounding homes and permanently change the area's character. It would pile extra pressure on already stretched transport and services.</p> <p>Plus the wind tunnelling , shadowing, etc wd impact on everyday life. Everytime builders want to do this they exaggerated the social benefits of affordable housing but few rarely get built. It's just a marketing strategy and we know marketing is lies.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 55

Interested party	Varangkana Singhakowinta
Date received	26 January 2026, 10:28
Comment	<p>I request that the appeal be dismissed and that the Wandsworth Council's Planning Applications Committee decision upheld.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Inappropriate tower of 29 storeys is out of scale with its surroundings, where prevailing building heights range from two to nine storeys2. Loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring properties, including Thames Walk Apartments, Albion Riverside and housing on 6 Hester Road3. Construction impact, vibration and structural risk to surrounding area for several years, especially deep

excavation. Battersea Bridge is a Grade II listed structure
4. The development would generate substantial construction and operational traffic in an area already subject to congestion and physical constraints, including weight limits on Battersea Bridge
5. Environmental impact. Huge carbon emission.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 56

Interested party	Wendy Watson
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 23:03
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.</p> <p>It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.</p> <p>Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.</p> <p>Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing crisis" endeavour?! We should be told.</p> <p>The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.</p> <p>What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?</p> <p>This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 57

Interested party	Neil Thomas
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 22:19
----------------------	------------------------

Comment

I object to this planning application in the strongest terms.

The proposed development is located within a predominantly low-rise riverside area and sits in close proximity to existing residential buildings. As a nearby resident, I would be directly affected by the scale and impacts of the scheme.

Objection: excessive height

The proposed height of the building conflicts with adopted planning policy. The Wandsworth Local Plan, adopted on 19 July 2023 following three years of consultation, establishes clear parameters for tall buildings. Policy LP4 requires that the massing of tall buildings be proportionate to their surroundings and that they do not create an overbearing impact when considered in context. The Plan further limits tall and mid-rise riverside development to defined zones. While buildings of up to 11 storeys exist within designated 'tall' zones, the Glassmill site is located within a 'mid' zone, where development should not exceed 6 storeys or 18 metres. Any proposal exceeding these limits is inconsistent with the Local Plan.

Objection: loss of residential amenity

A development of this scale would cause harm extending well beyond its own footprint. Nearby homes, balconies, gardens, streets and communal areas would be subject to permanent and direct overlooking, resulting in a significant loss of privacy. The height and bulk of the building would also adversely affect daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties. In addition, introducing an extremely tall structure into an otherwise low-rise environment would have unknown and potentially harmful effects on the local microclimate, including wind and shading impacts.

Objection: impact on Battersea Bridge, transport and infrastructure

The proposal raises serious concerns regarding the setting and operation of Battersea Bridge, a Grade II listed structure, as well as other designated and non-designated heritage assets in the surrounding area. The construction phase would inevitably worsen traffic and transport conditions in an area that is already operating at or beyond capacity. Thames crossings in south-west London are critically overstretched, as demonstrated during the extended closure of Wandsworth Bridge last year. Even occasional closures or restrictions on Battersea or Albert Bridge routinely cause severe congestion and delays. Additional disruption associated with this development risks bringing bus services to a standstill and increasing danger to vulnerable road users, particularly

cyclists and pedestrians.

These pressures have been intensified by recent major changes to the road layout, making any construction-related disruption both more severe and more prolonged. The Fire Brigade has already stated that the new layout makes it harder for emergency vehicles to cross the bridge quickly, an issue that is also evident for larger ambulances. Further strain arising from the construction of a very tall building would exacerbate these risks.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 58

Interested party	Edward Wihardja
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 22:08
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Aesthetically insane to have such a massive development right at the corner of a historical bridge. With such development the bridge and the surrounding areas will be ambushed by this massive development.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 59

Interested party	Anne Bickerton
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 21:44
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The proposed building is far too tall for the site. I worry about the emergency services as Battersea Bridge is the one they have to use and it is already very congested. Where are the extra doctor's surgeries, schools and transport? There is no parking in Hester Road and they are not building an underground carpark so where are people meant to park especially as there is meant to be a restaurant. The social housing element in the building is not as many units as they claim. All in all a disaster.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 60

Interested party Andrew Joscelyne

Date received 25 January 2026, 19:49

Comment

The proposed building is completely out of scale with all other buildings within this immediate area.

Such a building has no place among the historical low rise buildings which now exist in the area of Battersea Park.

The view of the River Thames from both North and South of the river will be violated.

There is insufficient parking space within the surrounding streets to accept the number of vehicles associated with the inhabitants of a building of this size.

Battersea Bridge and Battersea Bridge Road form a key crossing of the River Thames at this point. The increased traffic associated with such a building is likely to cause significant congestion.

Heavy vehicle traffic associated with the lengthy construction phase is likely to cause chaos with busses and work traffic crossing Battersea Bridge.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 61

Interested party Harry S

Date received 25 January 2026, 17:45

Comment

This is not a building for our community. This design doesn't belong here and we don't want it.

You are causing more harm than good and this area of Battersea is already at maximum capacity with regards to Battersea Bridge and the traffic in the surrounding area.

Pedestrians have died on Battersea Bridge! We don't not need another building with apartment's and more people in the area. We are already at maximum capacity.

Take your tall building elsewhere. I don't want to see it!

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 62

Interested party	Sarah H
Date received	25 January 2026, 17:38
Comment	<p>This development at Battersea bridge is a horrid idea and will cause many more negative effects on the community.</p> <p>The building isn't a good idea at all. It is way too high and goes against a policy already in place limiting how high buildings can be. People want their privacy, not to always be looked upon and that height is not appropriate under any circumstances.</p> <p>The height will cause the winds and weather to change in the area and make things worse, not better.</p> <p>The traffic on the bridge and main road is already bad enough and clogged up 70% of the day. With the current population that already lives here; we don't need another big tall building to make the traffic worse.</p> <p>There are many more reasons on why this is a bad idea. Ultimately Battersea is not Canary Wharf and we don't ever want to be anything like that place.</p> <p>Take your tall bulky and ugly tower and go back to Canary Wharf.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 63

Interested party	Samuel Goldschmidt
Date received	25 January 2026, 17:09
Comment	<p>It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.</p> <p>It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.</p> <p>Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along</p>

the Thames Path.

Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing crisis" endeavour?! We should be told.

The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.

What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?

This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 64

Interested party	Sarah Basden
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 17:01
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I do not support this appeal
----------------	------------------------------

- The buildings in this part of London are 2-9 level building restriction and this should be upheld. The developers knew this rule when they bought the site and the local council and the Mayor have made this clear. Local neighbourhood plans LP2 and D9 should be upheld and international developers should not go above our rule of law.
 - The height and size of the building is inappropriate and would set a precedent across the UK where US/foreign owned/local developers set the agenda rather than locals
 - Loss of Daylight into our neighbouring apartment and Loss of Privacy. The developer has not considered the implications of the Supreme Court Judgement in Fearn v Tate Gallery which is relevant here.
 - Flood zone - the development is within a flood zone and the Environmental Agency objected due to the proximity to the flood defence structures. This should be upheld
 - Environmental and Climate degradation
- Albion Riverside has commissioned independent specialist advice on demonstrating that the existing building of Glassmills can be retrofitted which would reduce carbon emissions involved in building a new building
- Heritage, townscape and strategic views
- Battersea Bridge is in a conservation area and this development would considerably harm this bridge. It would also visually impair Albert Bridge which is iconic to London's

heritage.

Historic London has advised that the building height would need to be significantly reduced to avoid harm to Battersea Bridge. The scheme therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP3, London Plan Policies D9 and HC1 and the statutory duty to preserve heritage settings.

- Construction Impacts

The scheme has not outlined how it will overcome the various challenges involved in building such a tall building next to the bridge, near other buildings next door, on a flood plain etc.

- Wind Microclimate and other environmental impacts have not been addressed and even at first glance a novice can see that a tower of this size, without setbacks and in such a constrained space will cause multiple issues even without it being next to London's historic river, bridge etc.

- Local network, traffic, emergency services are already under strain and a building of this size would make things worse.

In conclusion, this scheme should not have been allowed to get past a first submission at local council level. It has wasted local time and resources at a time when the UK should be focussing on improving what we already have, preserving historic London, encouraging local employment and housing for locals. Developments should focus on a better and cleaner environment and a wonderful place to live for future generations. This scheme does nothing to help stewardship for future generations and should be dismissed.

Thank you and regards
Sarah Basden

-

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 65

Interested party	James Whiteside
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 15:46
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	6002127
----------------	---------

I am against this development. Public services and transport in the area are already straining and the disruption would be unimaginable.

The skyline would also be severely negatively affected.

No to the tower block.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 66

Interested party Vanessa Colomar

Date received 25 January 2026, 14:24

Comment Sir/Madam,

I would like to lodge my concerns regarding the construction of a tower block on the south side of Battersea Bridge.

As a long-term resident of the area, I believe it is too big for the site, and out of character with the area. We regularly walk, or drive, along the Thames Path, and the view would be spoilt, particularly of the Chelsea Embankment, Allen Hall, Chelsea Old Church, etc.

Those in the immediate vicinity will lose light and outlook, and a worrying precedent for the area would be created.

I am particularly concerned about extra traffic along an already congested Thames Crossing route, especially during construction, when presumably large vehicles and cranes will be used.

This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

It is my understanding that planning permission was, rightly, rejected, and consider it egregious that a wealthy developer should be allowed to contest that rejection. If Rockwell were acting in good faith and with true community spirit, they would review their plans and develop with more sensitivity to the area and respect for their neighbours.

Thank you.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 67

Interested party Meredith MacArdle

Date received 25 January 2026, 13:48

Comment I object to this appeal against Wandsworth Council's unanimous decision to turn down Rockwell Property's wish to build a tower next to Battersea Bridge. I use that area frequently for leisure and also travel through it frequently, so I know that Rockwell's proposal will adversely affect the area. The Council has decided that the proposal is not suitable for the area and would deprive existing buildings of light, and would put impossible pressure on traffic and amenities in the small streets around the area. The proposal has already been rejected by residents and the council, which should not be required to spend money opposing this appeal. Rockwell cannot even confirm that they will provide 'affordable housing' although they appear to want several hundred thousand pounds of grants for each unit they 'suggest' will be affordable. This appeal should not have been submitted and should be rejected. Thank you,

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 68

Interested party Sarah Tooley

Date received 25 January 2026, 13:14

Comment The proposed building is too tall for the site and would cause untold damage to local views and heritage sites, as well as conflicting with the Local Plan and London Plan. There is likely to be considerable loss of privacy and light for neighbours and the disruption to traffic during construction, as well as the possibility of damage to the bridge and/or embankment, could be costly and with long-lasting effects. The appeal appears to be based at least partly on the promise of affordable housing but without real detail being provided; this application was rejected unanimously when made originally - PLEASE REJECT THIS APPEAL TO FOR THE SAKE OF ALL WHO LOVE BATTERSEA, THE SURROUNDING AREA AND THE THAMES.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 69

Interested party	Caroline de La Soujeole
Date received	25 January 2026, 11:50
Comment	<p>To the attention of the Planning Inspector</p> <p>There has been unprecedented public opposition to the Glassmill scheme which you will be well aware of. Over 2,000 people submitted objections on the planning website, over 5,000 signed a petition organised by a local resident and at the latest count over 600 people signed the petition organised by the local Conservatives ward team.</p> <p>Height, scale and massing are clearly big issues with this project but it goes beyond that.</p> <p>Battersea's local heritage is at risk. The tower would dominate the skyline. The GLA noted that the proposal would result in harm to heritage assets including Albert Bridge, Battersea bridge, Battersea Park, and a number of nearby conservation areas both in Battersea and on the north bank of the river in Chelsea. There are also concerns about potential structural damage to Battersea Bridge, a grade 2 listed asset, as a result of the construction process.</p> <p>Residents have also expressed significant concerns over loss of daylight and sunlight on neighbouring properties as well as overshadowing and privacy concerns.</p> <p>There are insufficient public realm improvements - The improvements to the Thames Path are minimal and lack ambition. Partly this is a reflection that this is a very constrained site and the building fills up most of the available footprint. We request that the Planning Inspector makes a site visit to see how tight the site is and how it would impact on the amenities of neighbours near and far.</p> <p>Given this is a small site with significant and unresolved access constraints, there is likely to be significant disruption to the local community during building works from construction traffic in an area which is already heavily congested and where there have been fatal road accidents in recent years. The planning application is significantly lacking in its construction management plan with few details on how the building works will be managed on this constrained site.</p> <p>The housing proposed for social rent is stated to be "subject to viability". There is no guarantee that the level of affordable housing will actually be provided, and no indication that a registered provider has been identified to purchase it. Residents have also raised concerns about the financial viability of the scheme - as taxpayers this is something we</p>

should all care about. We can't have been the only ones left scratching our head when it was announced that the initial scheme would be reduced by 5 storeys whilst the affordable housing share was increased from 35% to 50%. Some residents have done the maths and come to the conclusion that the scheme could only be viable if there are significant Mayor of London grants believed to be £170k per affordable unit after 20% are paid for. Also of note is that drawings indicate that half of the units for social rent will be single aspect (i.e: having windows on only one side), because of the admitted constraints of the site.

The Glassmill is quite simply the wrong building for the wrong site.

We hope you will support the Council's decision to refuse planning permission.

Kind Regards

Councillor Caroline de La Soujeole, Tom Horrobin, Zarah Wiles – St Mary's ward Conservative Action Team

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 70

Interested party	Richard Shuttleworth
-------------------------	----------------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 11:13
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>This proposal is for a tower block completely out of scale for this part of the historic Chelsea/Battersea riverside. It is overwhelmingly unpopular if one discounts the mostly dishonestly obtained 'For' comments. It would be seen from most parts of North Battersea. I do not believe that it will provide affordable housing, and I am told it is being funded by huge off shore financial interests with unlimited money to fight planning refusals.</p> <p>There are more than enough high - rises close to the river and approval of this project will open the way to many more.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 71

Interested party	David Hobden
Date received	25 January 2026, 10:05
Comment	<p>This proposal to build such a tall building on this riverside site is totally out of character. It would harm the Thames Path experience and local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy. There would be extra pressure on buses, trains and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.</p> <p>The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high profile river edge scheme. This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 72

Interested party	Judith Hobden
Date received	25 January 2026, 09:51
Comment	<p>This building would look very out of place on this riverside site, it is so tall it would look totally wrong. It would take daylight and privacy from near by residents and future residents would loose light and it would ruin the character of the area. There would be extra pressure on busses, trains and parking plus disruption and safety concerns on the narrow streets and along the Thames path.</p> <p>Claims of 50% affordable homes are not credible.</p> <p>What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction.</p> <p>This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 73

Interested party	Alexandra Roch
Date received	25 January 2026, 09:48

Comment

I am against building such a large tower block practically on Battersea Bridge. There is no demand for expensive accommodation in this area, we need more social housing so it is a waste of Wandsworth Tax Payers money. There is already an enormous traffic problem by the Bridge which would be made worse. It would be bad for the environment, bus routes and transport would be impacted, not enough schools in the area, Medical facilities are already overstretched, and parking would be a disaster as the proposed building has negligible parking facilities. I am a local resident of Morgan's Walk and would be overshadowed by this huge tower block, affecting light, air quality and general well being. I am against Rockwell building on this site.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 74

Interested party

Catherine Peterson Moorhouse

Date received

25 January 2026, 09:06

Comment

The same objections as when the first application was lodged remain - over development, congestion at the bridge, traffic jams, prevention of residents easy movement around the area, plans not in keeping with the neighbourhood style...I could go on. The application was roundly rejected by Wandsworth Council the last time. What is so difficult to understand?

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 75

Interested party

Shirin Elling

Date received

25 January 2026, 06:54

Comment	This building is completely out of character for this area. I do not believe that it will be of any value in the social housing department. It will block light to countless residents and quite frankly why does it have to be so high? There are countless buildings already around Battersea which are less than half full. Surely this is just going to be another blight that does nothing for locals and just another white elephant for foreign investors and developers who do not live in the area to interfere with our quality of life.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 76

Interested party	Ron Manners AO
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	25 January 2026, 06:38
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The Rules state "12 story buildings only". Developers should uphold local resident's rulings. If not, this is anarchy!
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 77

Interested party	Pervaiz Naseem
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 19:56
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area. It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook. Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path. Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing
----------------	--

crisis" endeavour?! We should be told.
The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.
What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?
This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 78

Interested party Peter Rigby

Date received 24 January 2026, 18:42

Comment

I am opposing this development which has already been unanimously turned down for extremely valid reasons. I am a near neighbour and for us, and many hundreds of people nearby, this development would be seriously detrimental. I echo a number of points made by others including:
Traffic is already appalling both ways on Battersea Bridge, this would make it worse both during construction and for evermore.
It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.
Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.
Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.
Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing crisis" endeavour?! We should be told.
The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.
What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?
This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 79

Interested party Alexandrina Rigby

Date received 24 January 2026, 18:40

Comment

It's way too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.
My families home will lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing and be totally overlooked .
Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.

The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.
What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?
This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 80

Interested party Belinda Wright

Date received 24 January 2026, 18:40

Comment

This development will make the traffic congestion over Battersea Bridge much worse and it's terrible now. The amount of stationary queueing traffic on the bridge now Heavy buses and trucks will cause the bridge to fail

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 81

Interested party Virginia Collyer

Date received 24 January 2026, 18:25

Comment	I object to the building of this tower block! Firstly it completely conflicts with the Local Plan and the London plan. It will completely overshadow the properties in Morgans Walk and take light from the flats. It will ruin the Thames path walk and will be a blight on the landscape. It will cause massive disruption by Battersea Bridge. It should not be built!
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 82

Interested party	Elfreda Pownall
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 18:16
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	This tower would be completely out of keeping with its surroundings, with local planning laws, the views of local residents and especially the decision of the council. Having lots of money does make the firm immune from these constraints and it is disgraceful of them to attempt to circumvent these realities by outspending the council.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 83

Interested party	Cathy Madoc Jones
-------------------------	-------------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 17:34
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The proposed tower is wholly inappropriate for this riverside site: it is excessively tall, out of character with the surrounding area, and would cause harm to the Thames Path experience, important local views, and the setting of nearby heritage assets. The scheme would lead to significant loss of daylight and privacy for neighbouring properties, increased overshadowing, and poor light and outlook for future residents. It would place further strain on already congested buses, trains, and limited parking, while construction and servicing on narrow streets and along the Thames Path would be disruptive and raise safety concerns. The headline claim of "50% affordable housing" is not credible without transparent viability evidence and binding Section 106 obligations, particularly for genuinely affordable social rent; given that the developer is to receive a reported £470,000 GLA grant per social rented unit, it is entirely reasonable to ask what the net
----------------	--

private contribution actually is. The design quality and sustainability measures fall short of what is expected for a prominent river-edge development, there is no clear assurance as to what protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction, and overall the proposal is in clear conflict with both the Local Plan and the London Plan.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 84

Interested party Christian Dewar Durie

Date received 24 January 2026, 17:18

Comment This proposal is totally inappropriate for the site. Vastly over sized.; far too high. It will detrimentally affect so many people, local and visiting. Traffic over Battersea Bridge (and overflow to Albert Bridge) would become intolerable. More expensive high rise residential accomodation is not required. So much is empty - walk round Chelsea and Kensington at night and see how few houses are occupied. Housing is needed but not top end of the market; there are many (often government owned) empty buildings, old offices etc that could and should be adapted to 'affordable' properties. This proposed scheme is a travesty and will ruin our river and landscape - even more than already spoilt. Please pay attention to the very strong local views and refuse this application.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 85

Interested party Eleanor Gawne

Date received 24 January 2026, 16:16

Comment I do not support this appeal against the local authority's planning decision (case 6002127). These are my reasons why:

1. The scheme is too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
2. It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings.
3. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more

overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.

4. There will be extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.
5. Claims of “50% affordable homes” are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent.
6. The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.
7. What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?
8. This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 86

Interested party	Jack Hodsoil
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 14:04
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I object to this application as it conflicts with adopted local and environmental planning policies. The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site and would place unacceptable pressure on existing local infrastructure. It fails to demonstrate compliance with the Local Plan and relevant environmental protection and sustainable development policies and should therefore be refused.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 87

Interested party	Diane Hewett
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 13:17
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Totally out of character for the area and site. Harm the heritage setting and river path experience Conflict with Local Plan and London Plan Impact on neighbour privacy and daylight Impact on Battersea Bridge and potential damage not addressed Affordable housing not transparent, solve ‘housing crisis’
----------------	---

cynical manipulation of rules to build out of character
monstrosity
Pressure on local transport and parking
And finally again totally out of character with local area and
heritage

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 88

Interested party Susan Johnson

Date received 24 January 2026, 13:12

Comment The building is totally incompatible with the other buildings between Battersea Bridge and Albert Bridge. The location is already congested and construction there would only increase the volume of traffic both during and after completion. It would totally dominate what is a reasonably view across the river.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 89

Interested party Emily Thornton

Date received 24 January 2026, 13:07

Comment I grew up in Chelsea. The idea that the skyline around Battersea Bridge should be dominated by a building of this height and design is horrifying and no doubt would set a precedent for other high rise buildings to start being built along that stretch of river. The developers would do better to put their funds towards a total redesign of their idea and re-submitting it, rather than putting a strain on council resources that would be much better spent elsewhere. It's possible to envision development that takes into account community, innovation, and return on investment without being aesthetically offensive, insensitive and negatively impacting the character of an area.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 90

Interested party Christopher Boyce

Date received 24 January 2026, 13:05

Comment This planning applications has been correctly rejected already. It us way too tall for thus historic site by the bridge. It destroys views from both sides if the river. It is inappropriate to such a sensitive site in relationship to the historic views of Chelsea and Battersea.
I lived in Battersea fir nearly 30 years. I know and value this area greatly
NO. NO. NO.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 91

Interested party James Neilson

Date received 24 January 2026, 13:04

Comment It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
It would harm the Thames Path experience and important local views, and risk harm to nearby heritage settings. Neighbours would lose daylight and privacy and face more overshadowing; future residents may have poor light and outlook.
Extra pressure on buses, trains, and parking, plus disruptive and unsafe servicing/construction on narrow streets and along the Thames Path.
Claims of "50% affordable homes" are not credible without transparent viability and binding Section 106 obligations, especially for social rent. Rockwell will get a £470,000 GLA grant per unit for the flats for social rent. So, how much will they actually spend NET on their altruistic "solve the housing crisis" endeavour?! We should be told.
The design and sustainability measures are not good enough for a high-profile river-edge scheme.
What protections are in place should Battersea Bridge be damaged during construction?
This proposal completely conflicts with the Local Plan and London Plan.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 92

Interested party Derek Young

Date received 24 January 2026, 12:47

Comment The whole riverside area is being turned into massive housing blocks and it's not for everyone to be blighted by these hideous huge skyscrapers at every conceivable bit of land that becomes available and here's a massive one. Simply too big for the area and people live in these areas as I was born here in 1959 and these huge buildings are destroying the landscape and heartbreaking for people that don't want to constantly look at these huge buildings which only suit the developer.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 93

Interested party Robin Thomas

Date received 24 January 2026, 12:42

Comment It will not be in keeping with the neighbourhood and will cause massive traffic problems on Battersea and Albert Bridges.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 94

Interested party Louise Ireland

Date received 24 January 2026, 12:41

Comment This tall building is totally out of keeping with its surroundings and planning consent will pave the way for others with nearby brownfield sites to build equally unwelcome towers, defacing the area and going absolutely against the expressed opinions of locals. The traffic created during the building work will mean emergency vehicles cannot get to locals as quickly as needed and other traffic across the Thames will be severely affected for the years the building work will take.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 95

Interested party	Valerie Wilson-Peters
-------------------------	-----------------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 12:39
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	It's too big for this riverside site and out of character with the area.
----------------	--

The developer's Appeal conflicts with majority opinion expressed clearly already by people opposed to the development. It does not meet the criteria of the local Council or The London plan

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 96

Interested party	Stephen Hill
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	24 January 2026, 09:46
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I'm against the height of the building, not the redevelopment of the site. The fact is the 28 storey's will reduce the available natural light to residents, be an imposing and overbearing. A height of 8 to 10 storey's would be commensurate with the area.
----------------	--

To build such a high block risks undermining the foundation of adjacent dwellings.

The resident aspect will not be sold to local people but to investors who leave them empty the majority of the time.

Which we have witnessed in many other large blocks in Battersea. Many flats in the area are having difficulty selling due to the high cost of maintenance fees.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 97

Interested party	Richard Jenkins
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received 23 January 2026, 16:47

Comment The proposed tower block is brutally oversized and misplaced. It has no particular architectural merit. No demand for such a building in that location has been demonstrated and it would be a local eyesore, in particular from the very open view from across the river. It will further overload local infrastructure and facilities and add to pollution along the already congested Battersea Bridge Road. Construction and usage thereafter will cause further chaos. The upper floors will encroach on the privacy of the Morgans Walk estate.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 98

Interested party Godfrey Davis

Date received 23 January 2026, 15:05

Comment Formal Objection to Appeal: The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road
To: The Planning Inspectorate
Re: Appeal against refusal of planning permission for The Glassmill (Ref: 2024/1322)
Dear Sir or Madam,
I write on behalf of Albion Riverside Residents Association (ARRA) to object to the appeal lodged in respect of the Glassmill development at 1 Battersea Bridge Road. This appeal follows a unanimous decision by Wandsworth Council's Planning Applications Committee to refuse planning permission, in line with officers' recommendations. That decision reflected both the scale of local opposition and the seriousness of the planning harms identified. Albion Riverside (some 182 apartments) occupies a uniquely affected position, within Hester Road which runs off Battersea Bridge Road at the site of The Glassmill. The Glassmill site would therefore have direct and unavoidable implications for our building and its residents. Our objection is grounded in planning policy and evidence.
1. Scale, Height and Massing: A Fundamentally Inappropriate Tower
The proposed development is unambiguously a tall building. At 29 storeys it is wholly out of scale with its surroundings, where prevailing building heights range from two to nine storeys. This represents a clear and serious conflict with

Wandsworth Local Plan Policy LP4 and London Plan Policy D9.

The excessive height and bulk would dominate the local skyline, cause significant townscape harm and fundamentally alter the character of this stretch of the Thames. Allowing a tower of this scale would also set a damaging precedent, undermining the integrity of Wandsworth's recently adopted Local Plan.

2. Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing and Privacy

The scale of the building would result in permanent and severe losses of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, including Thames Walk Apartments, Albion Riverside and the assisted housing at 6 Hester Road. In some cases, losses exceed accepted standards by a substantial margin, with irreversible impacts on living conditions.

The proposal would also cause significant overlooking and loss of privacy, including from elevated terraces. These impacts conflict with Local Plan Policies LP2, LP15 and LP27 and have not been properly addressed in the application or the officer's report. The failure to consider the implications of the Supreme Court judgment in *Fearn v Tate Gallery* is particularly notable.

3. Construction Impacts, Vibration and Structural Risk

Demolition, deep excavation, extensive piling and prolonged construction activity would generate significant noise and vibration over several years.

Given the site's constraints and proximity to sensitive structures, these works pose serious risks to the foundations and structural integrity of Thames Walk Apartments, the river wall, Albion Riverside's underground car park, 6 Hester Road, Battersea Bridge Road and Battersea Bridge itself. No credible construction methodology has been provided to demonstrate how these risks would be managed or mitigated. In addition, the tightly drawn red line boundary has had the effect of excluding essential construction activities from full assessment. Earlier representations set out why a properly defined application site would be likely to trigger Environmental Impact Assessment under the 2017 Regulations. These cumulative construction impacts have never been comprehensively examined.

4. Traffic, Access and Network Impacts

The development would generate substantial construction and operational traffic in an area already subject to congestion and physical constraints, including weight limits on Battersea Bridge.

There is no credible construction traffic management plan, and unresolved questions remain about access via private roads alongside including Hester Road. The cumulative impact of demolition traffic, servicing, refuse collection, deliveries, cycling provision and general residential traffic would be severe, contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan transport policies.

5. Heritage, Townscape and Strategic Views

The proposal would cause material harm to the setting of heritage assets, most notably the Grade II listed Battersea Bridge, as well as conservation areas and registered parks and gardens on both banks of the Thames.

Historic England has advised that the building height would need to be significantly reduced to avoid harm. That advice has not been meaningfully addressed. The scheme therefore conflicts with Local Plan Policy LP3, London Plan Policies D9 and HC1, and the statutory duty to preserve heritage settings.

6. Environmental and Climate Considerations

Albion Riverside has commissioned independent specialist advice demonstrating that the existing Glassmill building could be retained and retrofitted (see Appendix). The applicant has not properly examined this option and has relied on superficial and incomplete carbon analysis to justify demolition.

Demolition and rebuild would result in substantially higher embodied carbon emissions than refurbishment, conflicting with Local Plan Policy LP10 and London Plan policies on whole life carbon and circular economy principles.

7. Flood Risk and Riverside Constraints

The site lies within Flood Zone 3 and in close proximity to the Thames flood defences. The Environment Agency has objected due to inadequate assessment of flood risk and impacts on the flood defence structure.

These issues have been deferred to conditions rather than resolved at application stage, contrary to the precautionary approach required by national and local policy.

8. Wind Microclimate, Infrastructure and Employment Impacts

The wind microclimate effects of a tower of this height on a constrained riverside site have not been adequately assessed. The applicant's own studies identify uncomfortable conditions at pedestrian level, with no convincing mitigation. Potential implications for Battersea Heliport flight paths remain unexamined.

The applicant has also failed to demonstrate that utilities infrastructure, including water, electricity and wastewater capacity, can support the full development. This raises further doubts about deliverability.

Finally, the proposal would result in a net loss of employment floorspace within Wandsworth's Riverside area, contrary to Local Plan Policies PM9 and LP33.

Conclusion

Taken together, the proposal represents a clear case of overdevelopment on a constrained riverside site. The harms identified are substantial, wide-ranging and cumulative. They were properly recognised by Wandsworth Council in its unanimous decision to refuse planning permission.

For these reasons, Albion Riverside Resident's Association respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed and the Council's decision upheld.

Yours faithfully,

Godfrey Davis
Chairman
On behalf of Albion Riverside Resident's Association

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 99

Interested party Fred Mather

Date received 23 January 2026, 12:11

Comment I object to this planning appeal as a resident of Montevetro Building, Battersea Church Road, which lies in close proximity to the appeal site and would be directly affected by the proposed development.

Excessive height and conflict with adopted planning policy
The proposed building is excessive in height and massing and is fundamentally out of keeping with the surrounding low- to mid-rise riverside context. It conflicts directly with the Wandsworth Local Plan (adopted July 2023), which was subject to extensive public consultation. The Tall Buildings Policy (LP4) requires development to be proportionate to its surroundings and to avoid creating an overbearing impact. The appeal site lies within a designated mid-rise riverside zone, where building heights should not exceed 6 storeys / 18 metres. A taller structure would be contrary to this clear policy framework and would undermine the purpose of the zoning strategy.

Loss of residential amenity
A development of this scale would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of nearby residents, including those in Montevetro. The proposal would result in increased overlooking, leading to a loss of privacy, and would adversely affect daylight and sunlight levels. The introduction of a tall building into an established low-rise environment also raises concerns regarding wind and micro-climatic effects, which would negatively impact the quality of the surrounding public and private spaces.

Impact on Battersea Bridge, transport and local infrastructure
The proposal raises serious concerns regarding its impact on Battersea Bridge, a Grade II listed structure, and the surrounding transport network. The bridge and adjoining road network are already heavily constrained, with frequent

congestion and sensitivity to even minor disruption. Construction traffic and potential road closures would exacerbate these issues significantly. Recent changes to the road layout have further reduced resilience, and there are well-documented concerns from emergency services about delays in crossing the bridge, posing risks to public safety.

Conclusion

The appeal proposal represents overdevelopment of the site and would cause demonstrable harm to residential amenity, heritage assets and the functioning of the local transport network. It is contrary to the adopted Local Plan and should therefore be dismissed.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 100

Interested party	Louise Irvine
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	23 January 2026, 09:24
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Stop the vast over development of our capital city
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 101

Interested party	Stuart Gulliver
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	23 January 2026
----------------------	-----------------

Comment	Added as a document
----------------	---------------------

Supporting documents	interested party representation by DPDS for Mr Gulliver (Albion Riverside).msg
-----------------------------	--

Interested party 102

Interested party	Amanda Henricks
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	23 January 2026
----------------------	-----------------

Comment Added as a document

Supporting documents interested party representation by DPDS for Ms Amanda Henricks (Chairman of Thames walk residents association).msg

Interested party 103

Interested party Michael Williamson

Date received 22 January 2026, 20:18

Comment This new development will ruin a beautiful low rise waterfront on Battersea Bridge.
The travel and noise pollution from the construction is extremely harmful to the environment and to the population who live in the area.
The Battersea Power Station development offers a far better development and has not been taken fully up by buyers so there can be no justification for this development.
The river between Battersea Bridge and Chelsea Bridge offers a classic riverside design which should be retained.
Any new development must not exceed current heights. I strongly oppose this proposed development. I hope sense will be seen.
Regards,
Michael Williamson

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 104

Interested party Penny Davis

Date received 22 January 2026, 20:04

Comment This is already a very congested traffic area and the recent work to alleviate this has failed completely, resulting in all day traffic jams, not just at rush hour, at exactly this spot by the bridge, which I use daily, This results in severe congestion as far as the Kings rd in one direction and the Latchmere in the other. The addition of a high rise building could only add to this already bad situation which is already causing great inconvenience to local residents
Strenuous efforts have been made over the years by local residents to keep buildings at a low level to preserve the

residential character in this area, close to the open space of the park and the river frontage between the two listed bridges. The increased height of the proposed building if approved, would be an unwelcome addition, completely out of character and set a dangerous precedent for the height of new building in the area, leading to what I call the 'ghetto' effect and towering over an area used for leisure activities and low rise housing.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 105

Interested party	Rashid Al Dahhan
-------------------------	------------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 18:14
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The planned building adds to an already congested area.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 106

Interested party	Hugo Buitendag
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 17:13
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I am writing to formally object to the proposed redevelopment at The Glassmill (Ref: 2024/1322). This 28-storey tower is entirely out of scale with the Battersea riverside, creating a jarring vertical protrusion that undermines the local character and heritage of the Thames path.</p>
----------------	---

My primary concern is the severe impact on local infrastructure. Battersea Bridge is a critical bottleneck; adding a high-density, mixed-use development here will result in unacceptable traffic congestion. Specifically, this threatens the reliability of five vital bus routes. As there are no Underground stations near the west side of Battersea Park, these buses are the sole lifeline for thousands of residents commuting into central London. Any further disruption to this corridor is untenable.

Furthermore, the scale of this development will significantly degrade the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. The "public realm" works cannot compensate for the increased

pressure on the river walk, nor for the overshadowing and wind-tunnel effects created by a tower of this magnitude.

For a site of this sensitivity, the massing and density are excessive. I urge the Planning Inspectorate and the Secretary of State to prioritise the functionality of our transport network and the integrity of the riverside by dismissing this appeal.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 107

Interested party	Stephen Gunnion
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 17:07
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I wish to object to planning application 2024/1322 (appeal reference: 6002127) at The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road, on the grounds of traffic impact, scale, and harm to the riverside environment.</p>
----------------	--

Battersea Bridge is already a severe traffic pinch point. The proposed demolition and construction of a part 28-storey building would significantly disrupt traffic flows on a bridge that carries five vital bus routes. These bus services are essential to local residents, particularly as there are no Underground stations anywhere near the west side of Battersea Park.

Thousands of people rely on these buses daily to commute into central London, access employment, and reach essential services. Any prolonged disruption or long-term congestion would have a serious and disproportionate impact on the community.

The proposed building is also wholly out of kilter with the existing character of the Battersea riverside. A tower of this height would dominate the skyline, overwhelm neighbouring buildings, and undermine the established scale and visual coherence of the area.

In addition, the development would adversely affect users of the Thames river walk. Increased congestion, construction activity, and changes to the public realm would negatively impact pedestrians and cyclists who rely on this route for safe and enjoyable movement along the river.

For these reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 108

Interested party	Camilla Symington
-------------------------	-------------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 16:04
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>This is a complete waste of tax payers money and everyone's time - it has been rejected quite rightly & an appeal is in no one's interest.</p>
----------------	---

I am a chartered surveyor and understand housing need and residential development but this is completely at odds with the surrounding area and local planning policy. It is simply not the right site location for the scope and scale of this proposed development. I hope that the Planning Inspectorate upholds the decision that has already been made.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 109

Interested party	David Bannerman
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 15:33
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>According to the July 2023 Wandsworth Local Plan a building on the Glassmill site should not exceed 6 storeys as it would be in mid-rise zone MB-B2-02. Even in the adjacent high-rise zone TB-B2-04 the height should not exceed 12 storeys.</p>
----------------	--

In this application the tower (30 storeys including the double-height ground floor) would be around 3 times as tall as the local building limit. It would be completely contrary to the 2023 Plan.

A tower of that height would loom over the entire neighbourhood. It would clash with the local character and intrude visually into an extended river frontage of buildings of modest height. It would overlook neighbouring buildings and reduce their access to natural light.

The tower would contain many more flats than parking spaces. Realistically, many residents would require a car given the distance to the nearest railway and tube stations.

Battersea Bridge and Battersea Bridge Road form a key traffic corridor between Chelsea and South London, especially as the only other nearby bridge (Albert Bridge) has width restrictions that exclude large vehicles. This traffic corridor is already overloaded. If this new tower were built, traffic congestion would be exacerbated. Vehicles visiting the tower, such as tradesman's vans and the ubiquitous delivery vans from online retailers, would have nowhere to stop on the tightly-constrained site itself.

Demolition of the existing building followed by construction of the tower would take at least 3 years and involve over 1,000 lorry movements, greatly adding to the traffic on Battersea Bridge Road. As for loading and unloading, limited-access Hester Road would be unavailable owing to the need to keep access free for local businesses and residents.

It is agreed that more affordable housing is required in Wandsworth, but the proposed scheme would provide only a maximum of 54 affordable units. Maximum because originally-agreed numbers tend later to be negotiated down by developers.

Quite apart from the restrictions imposed by the Local Plan, and aesthetic issues, all of which are important, insurmountable practical objections arise from the size of the proposed tower relative to its small and cramped footprint, with no free space around it. This would lead to problems of accessibility both during demolition and construction and permanently afterwards.

For these and other reasons this application should be refused.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 110

Interested party	Montevetro Management Compay LTD
-------------------------	----------------------------------

Date received	22 January 2026, 14:05
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>Montevetro is a residential building of 103 dwellings completed in 1999. We wish to object to the current proposals for a high-rise development on Battersea Bridge Road on the following planning policy grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Tall Building Policy – Wandsworth Local Plan <p>The Wandsworth Local Plan 2023–2038 includes a detailed</p>
----------------	--

Tall and Mid-Rise Building policy which identifies where tall buildings may be appropriate and sets out the scale at which buildings are likely to be acceptable. Outside designated “tall building zones,” the plan expects development to remain in the mid-rise range, generally up to around six storeys (18m) in height in areas such as this, and tall buildings should be justified against established criteria.

The proposal for a significantly taller structure in this low-rise residential context is incongruous with these policies and the character of the surrounding area. The height and massing proposed would have an overwhelming visual impact and would materially change the existing built form in a location that the Local Plan does not identify as appropriate for tall buildings.

2. London Plan – Policy on Tall and Large Buildings

Under the London Plan Policy 7.7, tall and large buildings should only be permitted where they are part of a plan-led approach that identifies them as appropriate in the local context, and where they do not have an unacceptably harmful impact on their surroundings. Developers must demonstrate that the scale, massing, and design would not adversely affect the character of the area or the amenity of nearby residents. The proposal does not demonstrate that it is an appropriate response to the existing local character or that it would avoid undue harm to residential amenity, public views, or townscape quality.

3. Amenity, Infrastructure and Environmental Impact

Policy DMS1 (General Development Principles) and supporting policies in the Local Plan require that development proposals protect the amenity of neighbouring uses, including through consideration of daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy, and local environmental conditions.

The proposed development would result in significant construction disruption, increased traffic, noise, pollution and pressures on local services and infrastructure. This is particularly acute given the recent installation of traffic signals nearby, which have already materially impacted local traffic movement and access. These cumulative impacts have not been satisfactorily mitigated in the current proposals.

4. Character and Context

The Local Plan and London Plan place emphasis on development that fits positively with the existing urban grain, scale and character of its context.

The siting of a significantly tall building immediately adjacent to established low- to mid-rise residential neighbourhoods fails to respect the prevailing scale, and would create an overbearing and dominant structure that detracts from the character and quality of the local environment.

Conclusion:

In light of the above planning policy considerations, including the Local Plan’s requirements on location, scale and design of tall buildings, as well as the London Plan’s criteria for

appropriate tall building development and protection of residential amenity, we strongly object to the proposed development. We respectfully request that the planning authority refuses this application unless the scheme is substantially redesigned to align with policy expectations.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 111

Interested party Emilio Voli

Date received 22 January 2026, 11:56

Comment The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan.

It will destroy the charming character of the area

There is already huge traffic congestion along Battersea Bridge Road and in particular at its crossing with the Chelsea Embankment/Cheyne Walk, especially with the changes to that crossing to improve pedestrian safety. This will become unmanageable with the proposed development.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 112

Interested party Peter Clayton

Date received 21 January 2026, 17:03

Comment Tony FYI exMorgans Walk On behalf of the Board of Morgan's Walk Management Ltd., representing the residents of the Morgan's Walk estate, we object in the strongest terms to this planning application.

Morgan's Walk

1.Objections on ground of excessive height:

Directly conflicts with Wandsworth Local Plan (LP) policy,

adopted on 19 July 2023 after three years of consultation. The Tall Building Policy (LP4, p. 294) states that: "The massing of any proposed tall buildings should be proportionate to the local environment [...] and should be designed so as not to create an overbearing impact having regard to its context." The Plan further states that development proposals for tall or mid-rise buildings on the riverside will only be supported in specific zones. Within the 'tall' zone, the highest existing building is 11 storeys. By contrast the Glassmill site is located in the 'mid' zone, therefore no building on it should exceed 6 storeys or 18 meters.

2. Objection on grounds of impact on Battersea Bridge, transport

Battersea Bridge is itself Grade 2 listed

The construction phase itself would inevitably cause a negative impact on transport/traffic. The Thames bridges connecting south-west London are already critically stretched, as was seen

during the extended closure of Wandsworth Bridge last year.

Even the occasional closures of Battersea or Albert Bridges cause massive tailbacks and delays. These works could slow or bring to a standstill the buses on which we all rely and put at even greater risk vulnerable bridge users, specifically, cyclists and pedestrians.

These issues have been exacerbated by the recent major changes to the road layout, making disruption as a result of erecting a very tall building even more severe/extended.

Furthermore, the Fire Brigade has stated that under the new layout they already have greater difficulty crossing the bridge in a hurry (and the same is already noticeable for larger ambulances).

3. Objection of no architectural merit

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 113

Interested party

Barbara Vavalidis

Date received

21 January 2026, 16:39

Comment

I object to the plan to construct The Glassmill as proposed on three separate grounds. 1. The building height is excessive

given the building's location in the riverside mid zone. It is certainly out of keeping with building heights in any adjacent area. 2. Loss of amenity and the building's impact on areas beyond its own footprint. 3. Impact on an already stretched Battersea Bridge transport situation will be severe and result in major disruption to an important crossing point. Lack of underground in this district means that residents in a broad geography are dependent on buses and cars which must use Battersea Bridge. The addition of so many additional residents will stretch transport capacity to a breaking point.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 114

Interested party	Romily McAlpine
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	21 January 2026, 14:38
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The building will have a major factor on the traffic and congestion in the area which is already unbearable. This will also add further pollution and a further burden on public transport and infrastructure. Additionally the building aesthetics are questionable and will have a detrimental affect on local views.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 115

Interested party	Romily McAlpine
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	21 January 2026, 14:38
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The building will have a major factor on the traffic and congestion in the area which is already unbearable. This will also add further pollution and a further burden on public transport and infrastructure. Additionally the building aesthetics are questionable and will have a detrimental affect on local views.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 116

Interested party	Abi Holroyd
Date received	21 January 2026, 12:32
Comment	<p>This is extreme. Overdevelopment and over dense which contravenes the local plan</p> <p>This development would destroy the relationship with the grade 2 listed bridge adjacent to the site</p> <p>It would set a very dangerous precedent and is very unneighbourly what's the development next door being Morgan's walk</p> <p>Please refuse as strongly object</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 117

Interested party	Ellen Ann Hopkins
Date received	21 January 2026, 09:44
Comment	<p>I have lived at 5, Petyt Place, SW3 5DJ since 1982. I have seen many adverse developments to the riverscape here. This development will have a disastrous effect on the beauty of the river and the amenity of homes and the enjoyment of the river for those who live here and those who enjoy the river and bridges here. The scale of this development is too large and will dominate the low lying skyline. This will impact adversely on the Conservation Area opposite and historic buildings on the Chelsea side opposite this development. There is already a huge amount of traffic here which causes disruption to traffic flow and ease of movement along the river. This development will cause a huge increase in these problems. There will be an increase in noise and light pollution. The valued appearance of this river area will be affected and ruined. This is an area beloved by residents and tourists alike. Residents won't be able to move with any ease through the works which will go on for years.</p> <p>I appeal to the council to reject this project which has nothing to recommend it and will cause significant damage to the look and enjoyment of this historic riverside area where Henry VIII's palace once stood. This area should be protected from overdevelopment.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 118

Interested party	Ed Butcher
Date received	20 January 2026, 20:59
Comment	I would like to object to the planning appeal of the GlassMills Battersea bridge project. A building of this size should not be built.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 119

Interested party	Harry Richards
Date received	20 January 2026, 19:55
Comment	<p>I wish to object to the appeal against the refusal of planning permission by Wandsworth Council for the proposed high-rise development at 1 Battersea Bridge Road.</p> <p>Traffic congestion and highway impact Battersea Bridge is already a severely constrained crossing with frequent congestion throughout the day. The proposed development would introduce additional residential traffic, servicing, deliveries, and drop-off activity in an area that demonstrably lacks highway capacity. This would exacerbate existing congestion around the bridge and adjoining junctions, with negative implications for bus reliability, pedestrian safety, and emergency vehicle access.</p> <p>Air quality and public health The increase in traffic associated with the proposal would inevitably worsen local air quality in an area already subject to high pollution levels. This conflicts with both local and London-wide planning objectives to reduce vehicle emissions and protect public health, particularly in locations where traffic congestion is already acute.</p> <p>Height, scale and townscape impact The proposed height and massing are excessive in this sensitive riverside location and would appear visually dominant when viewed from Battersea Bridge and surrounding streets. The design fails to respond appropriately to the established scale and character of the area, resulting in harm to the local townscape and an incongruous addition to the skyline.</p>

For these reasons, the proposal represents unsustainable development that would cause demonstrable harm, and the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 120

Interested party Henrietta Caledon

Date received 20 January 2026, 13:24

Comment

The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan. It will block out light and cause reflection from the sun. It is hard to believe that it is being seriously considered.

Battersea Bridge Road is a main road feeding Chelsea, Westminster and further afield, it will result in traffic gridlock (which there is most days anyway) which will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge. The delays are terrible as it is.

It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local quality of life. It will take years to complete which will result in years of a gridlocked main thoroughfare and will negatively impact views from historic sights.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 121

Interested party Simon Marquis

Date received 20 January 2026, 11:46

Comment

This proposed development is out of keeping with this site and will spoil significant river views.

Crucially will make worse the already terrible traffic situation at Battersea Bridge.

Please do not permit this development as proposed go ahead.

S and N Marquis

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 122

Interested party	Christopher Price
-------------------------	-------------------

Date received	20 January 2026, 10:53
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I do not object to a development on this site, but I think the recent traffic congestion entering BATTERSEA BRIDGE has proved that a building of such height as suggested would cause absolute chaos for any traffic getting over the bridge. The idea of so much carbon monoxide being pumped into the area with the additional traffic being halted around the vicinity surely must cause a severe problem to anyone compromised with breathing and also children. I would urge you to seriously consider any height restriction for a development on this site. I live in Monte Vetro on BATTERSEA Church Road and it is sometimes impossible to get to the end of the road onto BATTERSEA Bridge Road and with this extra influx of so many vehicles and so many flats I think it would then become impossible to live in BATTERSEA, which we all love very much. thank you.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 123

Interested party	Andreas Liesche
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	20 January 2026, 10:48
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>On behalf of the Board of Morgan's Walk Management Ltd., representing the residents of the Morgan's Walk estate, we object in the strongest terms to this planning application.</p> <p>Morgan's Walk is an estate of 222 properties with a mix of low-rise flats, maisonettes and houses, bounded by Battersea Bridge Road, Battersea Church Road and the river front. The estate is situated adjacent to the proposed development.</p> <p>Objections on grounds of excessive height:</p> <p>To erect a tall building in this area would directly conflict with Wandsworth Local Plan (LP) policy, adopted on 19 July 2023 after three years of consultation. The Tall Building Policy (LP4,</p>
----------------	---

p. 294) states that: “The massing of any proposed tall buildings should be proportionate to the local environment [...] and should be designed so as not to create an overbearing impact having regard to its context.” The Plan further states that development proposals for tall or mid-rise buildings on the riverside will only be supported in specific zones. Within the ‘tall’ zone, the highest existing building is 11 storeys. By contrast the Glassmill site is located in the ‘mid’ zone, therefore no building on it should exceed 6 storeys or 18 meters.

Objections on grounds of loss of amenity:

Any such major development would have negative environmental impact on areas far beyond its own footprint. All of the estate’s balconies, gardens, streets and other areas, would be permanently and directly overlooked, impacting the privacy of residents. There would be a negative impact on the estate’s daylight/sunlight, as well as an unknown impact on the micro-climate due to an extremely tall building being introduced to a low-rise environment.

Objection on grounds of impact on Battersea Bridge, transport and social infrastructure:

We are concerned about the impact on Battersea Bridge, a Grade 2 Listed structure, and other designated and non-designated heritage assets in the immediate area. The construction phase itself would inevitably cause a negative impact on transport/traffic. The Thames bridges connecting south-west London are already critically stretched, as was seen during the extended closure of Wandsworth Bridge last year. Even the occasional closures of Battersea or Albert Bridges cause massive tailbacks and delays. These works could slow or bring to a standstill the buses on which we all rely and put at even greater risk vulnerable bridge users, specifically, cyclists and pedestrians.

These issues have been exacerbated by the recent major changes to the road layout, making disruption as a result of erecting a very tall building even more severe/extended. Furthermore, the Fire Brigade has stated that under the new layout they already have greater difficulty crossing the bridge in a hurry (and the same is already noticeable for larger ambulances).

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 124

Interested party	Alexandra Kirk
Date received	20 January 2026, 10:48
Comment	I would like to object to the glass mill building - I believe it goes entirely against the other buildings on the river at the height it is. That amount of work on a site as close to Battersea bridge as that would also be devastating for the community
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 125

Interested party	ALEXANDER BARISON
Date received	20 January 2026, 09:24
Comment	I do NOT support this appeal as the proposed development is still unsuitable for the site - it remains as a high-rise structure with no respect for the immediate surrounding area or the pressure it will put on adjacent services - critically the narrow road connections at the Battersea Bridge foot. The potential congestion this would cause is unthinkable, as there is no scope for expanding this section of highway to meet increased traffic without a complete rebuilding of Battersea Bridge itself. The effect on neighbouring residents would also be negative, as they are overshadowed by this towering development, let alone the harm this would do to the vista. It is vital to preserve areas of the river from excessive developments such as this - it is not a sustainable plan for the future.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 126

Interested party	Kenneth Hawes
Date received	20 January 2026
Comment	Added as a document
Supporting documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none">interested party representation.docxinterested party representation.docx

Interested party 127

Interested party	Andrew Marshall
Date received	19 January 2026, 17:59
Comment	it's too big and unneighbourly , contradicts the local area plan.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 128

Interested party	Nicola Marquis
Date received	19 January 2026, 16:30
Comment	This appeal should be denied on planning grounds that the height and density of the proposal is wholly inappropriate for the surroundings. Furthermore the congestion and pollution around this site would be horrendous during construction and after occupation. The planning application was not successful for good reasons.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 129

Interested party	Marion Larsen
Date received	19 January 2026, 16:21
Comment	I would like to protest strongly against proposed development of The Glassmill. It would be a disaster for the immediate area, creating immense problems with the closure of Battersea Bridge, adding to the existing congestion; the arrival and parking of construction vehicles, the noise and rubble created by the demolition of the existing building. It would have a devastating effect on residents and businesses in the area, also on the peace and quiet of Battersea Park, and would spoil the view. I can see no benefit at all in the proposed development, only destruction, upheaval, ruin of lives and businesses
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 130

Interested party Allan Sanderson

Date received 19 January 2026, 15:44

Comment I wish to support the decision of the London Borough Wandsworth to refuse this application and I would request that this appeal be dismissed. The proposed development of a part 10 storey and part 28 storey building is on any basis seriously excessive in height. Further, as Wandsworth have made clear, it is contrary to established local policies with regard to Tall and Mid-Rise Buildings. The proposed building is wholly inappropriate for a site adjacent to the River Thames, Battersea Bridge and the Albert Bridge. It would seriously detract from the balance, harmony and beauty of this historic part of London.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 131

Interested party Nicholas Campbell

Date received 19 January 2026, 14:13

Comment My wife has already left her comments and I agree with everything she said. This plan to build a further building on the proposed site will cause overwhelming problems - the traffic and pollution are indeed at a tipping point - and I too can see no benefit.

If the project was to be all low cost housing that would make young people able to afford somewhere to live in London, maybe an exception can be made - but this is to produce more high end living spaces that already exist throughout this area and elsewhere - in fact, there are too many available for sale already so you can't even argue that there is a need for this kind of development.

It would add to London's pollution, make the traffic around Battersea Church Road much worse and it is already terrible. It would be a true disaster ...and for no good reason.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 132

Interested party Nicole Campbell

Date received 19 January 2026, 14:09

Comment It is simple, this plan to build a further building on the proposed site will cause overwhelming problems - the traffic and pollution are at a tipping point - and I can see no benefit.

If the project was to be all low cost housing that would make young people able to afford somewhere to live in London, specially nurses and police etc... maybe an exception can be made - but this is to produce more high end living spaces that already exist throughout this area and elsewhere - in fact, there are too many available for sale already so you can't even argue that there is a need for this kind of development.

It would add to London's pollution, make the traffic around Battersea Church Road much worse and it is already terrible. It would be a true disaster ...and for no good reason.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 133

Interested party john-paul pape

Date received 19 January 2026, 13:17

Comment Nothing has changed since the first planning application so why should it be allowed on appeal?
The building will be significantly taller than all around it. Meaning it is an eyesore.
It will add immensely to already high traffic levels crossing Battersea bridge where traffic light timings need to be monitored daily to keep reasonable movement and flow.
It will add significantly to pollution levels given the number of homes being proposed.
Build residential homes but build a reasonable number and make half of them affordable to ordinary people.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 134

Interested partyIvor French

Date received19 January 2026, 11:25

Comment

I'm objecting to this development on several grounds. My main objection is that the scale and density of the development is completely inappropriate to the size, location, and prominence of the site, which I know well as I pass it most days.

I am a chartered surveyor by training and have spent most of my career in the commercial property sector, so I am aware of the various factors involved. I strongly believe that the developers have submitted this application in the knowledge that it would be refused so that they can offer to reduce its scale as part of the negotiation. It would still be massive overdevelopment in a very sensitive and visible location, unless they offer to reduce the height to approximately the same as now or maybe slightly higher. It would also adversely impact on views of and from Albert Bridge.

The scale will also produce even more congestion and pollution. I live on Battersea Church Road, and it is almost always impossible to leave the block of flats in which I live by car because of stationary traffic/congestion. Traffic is frequently stationary from Battersea Bridge Road to Battersea Square and causes immense pollution. The smell of exhaust fumes is overpowering particularly on the warmer days we are all now more frequently experiencing.

This developer has very deep pockets as it is funded by Cerberus Capital Management, an American private equity fund. So, it will no doubt pursue this massive overdevelopment indefinitely. However, I know from speaking to many of my neighbours and shopkeepers and restaurant tours in the area that we all feel very strongly that the scheme is currently design should not go ahead and I hope that they have all made their voices heard to you. Thank you

Supporting documentsNo documents

Interested party 135**Interested party**Simon Briscoe

Date received19 January 2026, 03:39

Comment	In my view the scale of this development is not in keeping with its location, in particular in terms of mass, height and density . The impact it would have on both the visual amenity of the area and the local infrastructure (including in particular transport links across Battersea Bridge) is disproportionate to the benefits it would bring.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 136

Interested party	George Boyes
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	19 January 2026, 03:13
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	Battersea Bridge Road is already a major traffic congestion problem. The One Battersea Bridge project during construction will cause severe problems and interruption to traffic. This will cause problems to local residents as well as commuters using the Bridge. In addition the height of the building is an unacceptable for the area.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 137

Interested party	Tessa Solomon
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	18 January 2026, 20:01
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>The buildings on this stretch of the Thames have SO FAR remained at a certain height, making the area less intrusive on our skyline. This proposed building will create a precedent and feel out sync with the surrounding area.</p> <p>The demolition & build will cause untold traffic congestion in an area already suffering.</p> <p>Costly road works have just been completed at this junction with Battersea Bridge. Without a doubt demolition & re build would effect these new works.</p> <p>Also the impact of so many new residents & cats would have a huge impact on an already busy area.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 138

Interested party Shona Stopford Sackville

Date received 18 January 2026, 19:17

Comment The proposed scale is huge and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan. Why is this necessary at all? It will be an eyesore - block light and change the riverside ambience and the local quality of life.
Battersea Bridge Road leads into Chelsea, Fulham and Westminster. The traffic is already appalling and this will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge which don't have leeway for more traffic either. It will take years to complete, negatively impacting everyone in the area.
It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local residents and businesses.
It must not go ahead

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 139

Interested party Lucy Holmes

Date received 18 January 2026, 18:52

Comment My objects are:

The height of the proposed building will dwarf other surrounding architecture and impact on our views in the surrounding area. This is not a built up area along the river and will knock out some of the historical beauty.

During the demolition and build the impact on our roads, Battersea Bridge, our fantastic buses and traffic generally will be dramatic on our neighbourhood.

The end result will bring a huge amount of new congestion in an already heavily congested part of Battersea. The addition of so many new residents and cars will add to the gridlock very noticeably.

Please don't let this high rise building ruin our beautiful Battersea.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 140

Interested party	Christine Brown
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	18 January 2026, 18:15
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>The proposal for the development of Glass Mills does not make sense in terms of scale and the necessary logistics to efficiently provide services such as parking / deliveries / waste disposal / schooling / healthcare / social care which are already severely challenged in this borough and ward.</p>
----------------	---

I do not believe this proposed development can be adequately supported, nor sustained and should be scaled back considerably (by 50%) in line with the existing building.

I would welcome a response from Rockwell on these points.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 141

Interested party	Andy Davison
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	18 January 2026, 17:50
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>Battersea bridge is already highly congested and polluted and local public transport is poor (relying entirely on buses on congested roads).</p>
----------------	---

The proposed scheme will make all of those factors worse.

London's riverside is an attractive social space for recreation - the proposed scheme detracts from an area that has benefitted from more attractive and human-scale developments. The proposed scheme will sharply contrast with this, being inconsistent on height and style with other properties.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 142

Interested party	Natalia Damian
Date received	18 January 2026, 17:17
Comment	The building of this residential tower will affect the local residents more than benefiting us. It will be at least 4 years of having a construction site in an already heavily transited road where at least 2 people have already lost their lives. The construction of this building will not solve any immediate housing concerns and on top of that it will be just another luxurious set of flats inaccessible for local buyers. I object to this development and I request local authorities to hear our appeal.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 143

Interested party	Valerie Martin
Date received	18 January 2026, 16:08
Comment	The proposed redevelopment plans are still totally out of keeping with the area, both north and south of the river. The building proposed is still FAR TOO HIGH. It will totally overwhelm its immediate surroundings which are largely residential , and does nothing to improve the area. Part “28 storey building” is duplicitous, as “plus ground floor” means it will be at least 29 storeys high. What other descriptions are not what they seem? In my view this proposed development should NOT BE GRANTED PLANNING PERMISSION in its present form.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 144

Interested party	Matt Mitten
Date received	18 January 2026, 15:20
Comment	This building is too big for the surrounding area. Not to mention the chaos that the building works would do in the area

with all of the lorry's that would come and go.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 145

Interested party Simon Drakeford

Date received 18 January 2026, 15:17

Comment It will ruin a lovely waterfront vista. It will block out light from the surrounding areas. The amount of residence will add to already huge traffic issues on that particular road and area. It will also block out the view from many residents that live around there. I agree we need more housing, but we don't need unnecessary, ugly out of context edifices that are all about shareholder return rather than sensible town planning. There must be better solutions and I implore the Wandsworth Council to make the right decision here.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 146

Interested party Thomas Holroyd

Date received 18 January 2026, 15:06

Comment This is over development , over bearing and extremely unneighbourly
The development contradicts the local plan and significantly impinges on the nearby conservation areas
Allowing this would set a dangerous precedent for the immediate surrounding area and cause great harm.
I object strongly

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 147

Interested party Hermione Weguelin

Date received 18 January 2026, 13:08

Comment	For all the reasons given in my earlier appeal, I write to reiterate all I said most strongly that the Glassmill project would have a hugely detrimental effect on the whole local neighbourhood.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 148

Interested party	Anthony Martin
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	18 January 2026, 10:52
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The proposed building is still too high and totally out of keeping with its surroundings, both north and south of the Thames. I do NOT support this application.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 149

Interested party	Sarah Ashby
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	18 January 2026, 09:25
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>Wandsworth Council has refused the application for The Glassmill, a 28-storey tower proposed by the developer, Rockwell, on the south side of the Thames by Battersea Bridge. This vote was unanimous. If this goes ahead it would contravene planning guidelines that Rockwell clearly believes are irrelevant and not applicable to them. They are now appealing that decision. The consequence is that Wandsworth CC will be forced to defend this appeal, a process that will cost taxpayers significant sums, money that should be spent on public services to benefit local residents. Rockwell clearly has no social conscience and will use the best legal team to win a battle that benefits no-one but themselves, all provided by an American hedge fund who do not give a damn about the damage this development will do to a community that fought to prevent it.</p> <p>It is appalling that Rockwell is prepared to show total disregard for the democratic process that produced an unambiguous refusal for a development for which there is absolutely no support. We totally support the Council in its fight to defeat this appeal and show Rockwell that money</p>
----------------	---

alone should not be allowed to abuse the will of the public.
This development will completely ruin the beauty of the area.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 150

Interested party Tania Kerouach

Date received 17 January 2026, 14:28

Comment This tower is far too tall and would ruin the neighbourhood's character
Because of all the added residents, traffic on the bridge and around the area would become a lot worse, especially at rush hours.
Huge construction disruption
This development doesn't reflect the local community's needs, priorities, and character, it would impose a disproportionate development driven by financial speculation and unsound commercial decisions.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 151

Interested party Sophia Galitzine

Date received 17 January 2026, 10:15

Comment Battersea Bridge is already badly congested with traffic, this building will add to the congestion. We do not need more luxury flats, which this development is proposing. It will also be an eye sore on the river bank. Redevelopment of the existing ugly building would better serve the local area/community.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 152

Interested party Jonas Frantz

Date received 17 January 2026, 08:07

Comment

I am very much in favour of this development. It will bring much needed affordable housing to the area for teachers, nurses etc. in a design that's suitable for the nice neighbourhood. The previously built council housing is an eye sore on the area (the tall towers on Battersea Church Road are one example). It's about time someone built more well designed buildings that serve the population.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 153

Interested party

Dawn Williams

Date received

16 January 2026, 18:36

Comment

It is outrageous that this development which has failed to achieve planning consent, for good reason, and there is now an audacious appeal to the planning inspectorate to overturn the earlier correct decision.

Local residents have objected to this application - The scale of the building is wholly wrong for the site and the local area can not absorb the extra traffic and congestion that this will bring. Residents have had months of disruption to our roads as a result of the new road layout and traffic management. The whole area is creaking and can not take any further building or traffic footfall. It will also compromise the local neighbourhood feeling which is a rare thing and something that needs protecting. If you want people to live and provide a workforce for our city you need to look after the residents and the neighbours that are already here. In the strongest terms this appeal must be turned down, respecting the earlier decisions that the application is not appropriate and local people do NOT want it. Please do the right thing and reject this once and for all.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 154

Interested party

Simon Burgess

Date received

16 January 2026, 18:17

Comment

This is an inappropriate building of these proportions on this site. Its height is excessive; it will be obstructive to its

neighbours and will add yet further footfall and congestion to an already overcrowded area. Further cars and carparking will add to the confusion.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 155

Interested party	ISABELLE GRANGER-COHET
-------------------------	------------------------

Date received	16 January 2026, 17:25
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I live in Battersea Church Road and already experience extreme congestion in the area. Stationary cars are often backed up well beyond the entrance to my home near Battersea Square producing enormous amounts of pollution. It often takes 20 minutes + to travel the 400 m to Battersea Bridge. This development will undoubtedly cause even more congestion and pollution because of its size.</p> <p>The proposed development is also entirely inappropriate to the size of the site and represents massive overdevelopment. I have no objection to some development around the same height as the adjoining buildings and agree that the current office building is no longer viable. But the proposed development is completely out of scale with the surroundings and would dominate the local street scene to a completely unacceptable degree.</p> <p>I understand the political pressure that the offer of affordable housing puts on the Mayor, but affordable housing shouldn't be the reason for the construction of such an eyesore producing extreme congestion and pollution in what is already a very congested and polluted area.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 156

Interested party	Valerie Allam
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	16 January 2026, 17:25
----------------------	------------------------

Comment

The height of the tower is aesthetically out of synch with the Bridge, the neighbouring blocks of flats and the skyline towards Battersea Power Station.

The traffic and congestion in the bridge area is already acute and during construction of such a tall building it will be made worse for years to come. The noise and pollution will be horrendous due to the immense scale of the project.

Inappropriate scale of the project within quite a small footprint is my main objection.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 157

Interested party

Raj Dhandsa

Date received

16 January 2026, 17:19

Comment

I feel this proposed development is totally inappropriate for this site. Whilst I understand the value of the site the scope of the building is excessive. The stress the size of the development would be extremely detrimental to the area.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 158

Interested party

Christopher Kerr

Date received

16 January 2026, 17:17

Comment

A building so high is totally unacceptable in this area and the effect of this number of apartments on local infrastructure would be disastrous.

A very inappropriate and ill conceived development in this historically and culturally significant area of London

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 159

Interested party

John Jarvis

Date received 16 January 2026, 17:05

Comment

1. I repeat my previous objections which were submitted on the original application
2. The proposed building is far too large and high for this site. It will be a carbuncle.
3. Traffic is already diabolically bad around this site and this proposed Development would be a disaster from a traffic point of view.
4. There is no need for more properties of this kind along this stretch of the river. It is already over developed.
5. Much more sensitive Development is required on this site.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 160

Interested party Antonia De Gier

Date received 16 January 2026, 17:04

Comment

I do not support the appeal, traffic is already horrendous in the area and will only get so much worse. It will also impact hugely on the currents residents next door, please do not overturn the decision!

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 161

Interested party Anne Tickler

Date received 16 January 2026, 14:56

Comment

I utterly oppose the building of a tower of such height and in such a ludicrous position too. It will blight one of our strategic bridges (Battersea Bridge) and bring enormous problems in terms of traffic and no doubt will be another more than half empty building like the one on the opposite side which straddles the iconic Lots Road Power Station almost completely obliterating it from view on the south side of the river.

Please, PLEASE take note of what local residents think

otherwise hundreds of flats in the surrounding area will flood the market.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 162

Interested party Anthony Williams

Date received 16 January 2026, 14:51

Comment We are extremely concerned about the proposal for this new block. Not only is it out of place and will be incongruous, much more importantly the additional burden placed on the local infrastructure and traffic will be intolerable. That will not end with the conclusion of building works which will themselves add immeasurably to the congestion that is already a problem specifically in this area. Additional living space here will add to the pressure on traffic and utilities. The appeal must be rejected.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 163

Interested party Philip Boon

Date received 16 January 2026, 14:30

Comment My major objection is related to traffic congestion; which is already bad over Battersea Bridge Road. This development will make it even worse / unbearable and potentially unsafe over a relatively long period of time during its' construction. The site is not ideally situated for space or aesthetic appeal.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 164

Interested party Fiona Stewart

Date received 16 January 2026, 14:21

Comment

. Over height restriction for area
No architectural merit whatsoever
The area is full of high quality buidings ec RCA, Foster Building, Albion, Montevetro
The road network will collapse with the extra traffic
Make the developer refurbish

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 165

Interested party

Victoria Conran

Date received

16 January 2026, 14:02

Comment

I'm concerned about the impact this development will have on the already overburdened bridge traffic. Has there been any consultation with TfL who have already announced the possibility of changing the bus routes? I would like to be confident that traffic and transport will be better for this development.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 166

Interested party

Sue Farr

Date received

16 January 2026, 13:44

Comment

I object in the strongest possible terms to this unnecessary building because;
It will cause massive disruption over many years, due to the extremely restricted access to the site.
The pressure on Battersea Bridge, Battersea Church Rd and the immediate vicinity will be enormous, The roads are already hugely congested, even more so since the introduction of several sets of traffic lights nearby. The area will come to a complete standstill, causing pollution, and unbearable delays and distress to residents and commuters.
Secondly, the scale of the proposed building is completely at odds with its surroundings and will be an absolute eyesore.
The scale must be driven purely by the greed of the American developers who care not one jot for the lives of Battersea residents.

And finally, there have been so many developments in Battersea and Wandsworth in the last few years, creating thousands more homes, but with absolutely no provision of additional infra structure, causing enormous strain on our roads, schools, care provision and so on. Why would we support yet more development when the local infrastructure is already desperately inadequate. This development will be of benefit to only one party, the huge American corporation behind it. Please put the needs of Londoners in the local community first.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 167

Interested party	guy morrison
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	16 January 2026, 11:35
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	I oppose this development on the grounds that is it totally out of keeping with the surrounding area, and far too big. The routes into central London over Albert and Chelsea Bridges will become even more gridlocked than they already are.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 168

Interested party	George Munton
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	15 January 2026, 20:21
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	15th January 2026
----------------	-------------------

Dear Sirs,

I do not believe this application is appropriate to the local area; both from an architectural standpoint and also a transport infrastructure aspect. Battersea retains a village feel due to its wealth of low-rise buildings and it is well know for this amongst people from all over London and the UK. The local transport services do not support such a development and currently Battersea and Albert Bridges do nor adeuqately support the traffic that crosses these bridges each morning and evening. I am a commuter who sits patiently in this traffic every day as I cross the river. The construction of a multi story high rise

development would have an extremely negative aspect on the local environment.

I would ask the men and women responsible for making the planning decisions to reject this application.

Your Faithfully,

George Munton

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 169

Interested party Angel West

Date received 15 January 2026, 17:47

Comment I do not support this appeal. I fully support Wandsworth refusing planning permission for this proposed development. The proposed development is entirely out of keeping with the neighbourhood. I have been a Battersea resident for 23 years and highly value the area around Battersea bridge. This proposed development would set an awful precedent, destroying the much-valued ambience and skyline.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 170

Interested party Anthony OCarroll

Date received 15 January 2026, 17:14

Comment Dear Sir / madam,

This proposal is frankly crazy. While there are large towers in Chelsea harbour, the access to them is completely different.

These towers will impose on Battersea Park, ruining the conservation area.

The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant, ruining the skyline and exceeding the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the

London plan.

Battersea Bridge Road is a main road feeding Chelsea, Westminster and further afield, it will result in traffic gridlock (which there is most days anyway) which will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge. The delays are terrible as it is.

It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local quality of life. It will take years to complete which will result in years of a gridlocked main thoroughfare and will negatively impact views from historic sights.

Yours sincerely

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 171

Interested party	Jackie Spetzler
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	15 January 2026, 12:50
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>The proposed redevelopment is on a busy corner of Battersea Bridge which serves as a gateway between the two sides of the river. With Albert Bridge closed to larger vehicles, and Hammersmith bridge closed indefinitely, there are not many options to get across the River.</p> <p>Battersea Bridge is already incredibly busy and frustratingly congested. This development will cause chaos for years; both during construction, but the huge scale will also significantly increase the congestion in future. Particularly for public transport, but also for bicycles and cars.</p> <p>This development is also hugely imposing and so extreme that it dwarf's the neighbours all around and is therefore visually unappealing. Not in keeping with the neighbourhood at all.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 172

Interested party	Javier Ruskin
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	15 January 2026, 12:46
----------------------	------------------------

Comment

I am a local resident and I wholeheartedly support the proposals

Why

- building up is essential and more homes (particular affordable homes which this has plenty) should sit at a higher priority than how (often very wealthy) people feel about a view or traffic
- planned public realm, restaurant and offices look great.
- current building is an eye sore
- this shouldn't sit there doing nothing for any longer

I do wish the local authorities would get some backbone and push back on the substantially older and wealthy resistance to this. Crack on

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 173

Interested party

Antonia Marshall

Date received

15 January 2026, 12:37

Comment

This is going to cause absolute chaos in an area which is already choc-a-bloc. Battersea is being ruined. There is no care for the local residents. It will take years to complete a building which will also ruin the aesthetics of the area. This should absolutely not be allowed.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 174

Interested party

John Deer

Date received

15 January 2026, 12:34

Comment

This is an example of a council that needs to take notice of the wishes of residents. This will make a life in Battersea Wandsworth and Chelsea an absolute hell and must not go ahead.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 175

Interested party Anouk van den Ing

Date received 15 January 2026, 11:44

Comment The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan.

Battersea Bridge Road is a main road feeding Chelsea, Westminster and further afield, it will result in traffic gridlock (which there is most days anyway) which will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge. The delays are terrible as it is, and I often because of this get delayed into the office, even if leaving early hours.

It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local quality of life. It will take years to complete which will result in years of a gridlocked main thoroughfare and will negatively impact views from historic sights

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 176

Interested party Sarah Keeling

Date received 15 January 2026, 11:29

Comment I have a number of objections.

1. The plan for such a high building is inappropriate for skyline;
2. Traffic is already very heavy on Battersea Bridge rd. we only have buses, no tubes so that a further increase in traffic would make life difficult for us locals;
3. there are many large buildings with flats towards wandsworth bridge, but to build a tall glass building next to the Bridge would dominate the skyline, be out of keeping with the mainly victorian housing, low build apartment buildings, and the very attractive largely brick Chelsea School of art buildings whose architecture sympathetically blends into the largely bricked buildings in the area.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 177

Interested party	Chris Orr
Date received	15 January 2026, 10:16
Comment	I continue to object to this development as it is very inappropriate for the area. It will certainly increase the traffic problems on Battersea Bridge Road. I have been resident here for 26 years and public and private transport problems have got worse and worse. There was extremely strong local opposition to this particular scheme.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 178

Interested party	Kate Terris
Date received	15 January 2026, 10:10
Comment	The original application was rightly turned down by Wandsworth Borough Council. There was a lot of local opposition. A 28 storey building is inappropriate in this location. We need a more sympathetic building. I object again.
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 179

Interested party	Elaine Michel
Date received	14 January 2026, 14:05
Comment	<p>I would like to reiterate that this proposal will destroy the historical landscape and bring chaos for years to come during construction as well as increased pressures on local services from doctors, to dentists and schools as well as further afield in Kensington and Chelsea where the nearest A&E is located.</p> <p>Local amenities such as Battersea Park are already struggling with the huge influx from local developments including Battersea Power Station and along Nine Elms Lane to the American Embassy. The scale and density is not appropriate for this site.</p>

As a local resident for nearly 40 years, I have seen the impact of redevelopments in the area. Nine Elms Lane continues to be coned off in one direction or another for months at a time, the area around Ransome's Dock is currently a building site, the RCA building is not finished and now Meadbank Nursing Home has put in an application the area will just be one big building site with all the chaos that brings. In addition, the impact on our already poor air quality will affect it even further. Many of the local side roads are not suitable for heavy vehicles, Albert Bridge certainly would not be able to take any heavy traffic so it would all come along Battersea Bridge Road which is very congested during peak times.

The height of the development will affect access to blue space not just for me but for thousands of neighbouring properties. There are already several developments visible from my flat without even having to stand up to look out of the window, which have encroached on to the view. I don't want to be hemmed in by a horizon of tall buildings. Those in close proximity will be even more affected. I know for a fact that many of those in the Worlds End Estate lost their views when Lots Road and the surrounding area were redeveloped and they now have reduced sunlight or are in shadow due to Terry Farrell's 'Dancers' development on the north side of the river.

Directly across the river we have beautiful historical architecture. The Glassmill proposal has no connection to anything nearby, north or south, east or west of its location. If it was an enhancement to the area, the inconveniences would be almost bearable but this proposal has no regard for the landscape and heritage of the local area and presents itself as a cynical profit making project by a conglomerate of self interested developers. To quote Cllr Govindia who said at the April 2025 planning committee, "the applicant, having paid an enormous sum of money for the site, is then recovering that investment by jacking up the building and I think it's right that the applicant should get the message that it is not for us and the local community to bear the negative side of their bad economic decisions." And Leader of the Council Simon Hogg "such a large building would cause more harm than good." I urge the Inspectorate to reject this appeal.

Supporting documentsNo documents

Interested party 180**Interested party**Richard à Brassard

Date received	14 January 2026, 10:21
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I strongly object to the proposed multi-storey tower. The Wandsworth Local Plan (adopted July 2023), following rigorous examination by an independent Inspector, designates this site as suitable for buildings of 5–6 storeys. Even under Policy LP4’s flexibility, heights of 7–12 storeys might be arguable—but a multi-storey tower of this size is wholly incompatible with the Local Plan’s spirit, purpose, and detail. The site lies between Grade II* Albert Bridge and Grade II Battersea Bridge, with multiple Grade I and II* heritage assets nearby, including Battersea Park. Existing riverside buildings, including those by Lord Foster, respect their context at 7–12 storeys. The Design Review Panel (6 March 2024) confirmed this proposal is a “significant departure” from the Local Plan and constitutes overdevelopment.</p> <p>The application also raises serious concerns: unresolved fire strategy, inadequate play space, single-aspect affordable homes contrary to London Plan standards, and insufficient public realm benefits. Traffic impacts on Battersea Bridge Road (a Red Route) and unrealistic construction timelines further compound the harm.</p> <p>Approving this scheme would set a dangerous precedent, undermine heritage, and disregard planning policy. It should be refused.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 181

Interested party	Paul Ekins
-------------------------	------------

Date received	14 January 2026, 09:43
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I wish to state that I am still objecting to this development proposal. Here is a copy of my original submission Comments Type of comment: Object to the proposal Comment: This application should be refused. It is completely out of kilter with the local area and with Wandsworth Council's plan for the area. Both the construction and subsequent occupation of the flats will cause huge traffic congestion on Battersea Bridge, which is already subject to long queues at many times of the day. The demolition of a perfectly reusable building and the reconstruction of a new one of this size will create a large quantity of carbon dioxide emissions that are the main cause of climate change, and goes against the Council's stated preference for refurbishment rather than demolition. In short, the proposed building will be an eyesore,</p>
----------------	--

damage the local quality of life, and contribute to climate change. Please, Wandsworth Council, do not permit it.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 182

Interested party Freddie A'Brassard

Date received 14 January 2026, 08:46

Comment I do not support this development. I have lived in the area my entire life. The traffic in the area during rush hour is already at peak capacity. The disruption from the building works will be immense and the building will be a total eye sore for the area where there are no high rise towers. There is a new development over the river in the Chelsea Power Plant and all the flats appear empty when I have passed by. There is no demand for this type of property in the area. It needs to be stopped.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 183

Interested party TREFOR DAVIES

Date received 13 January 2026, 21:06

Comment I do not support the appeal no 6002127 to the rejection of planning application no 2024/1322. My original objections to the planning application were posted on or just before 21/06/2024 and they still stand. In essence they were that the proposed 34 storey tower block (admittedly subsequently reduced in height slightly) would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and literally stick out like a sore thumb. The so called Affordable Housing proposed would still be out of reach to normal local people, and would most likely only be affordable by Overseas Investors who would have little interest in the Local Community. The construction works would cause massive disruption to residents in the area, over an extended period of time, and cause traffic disruption on both sides of the river. This increased congestion would no doubt continue after building completion, and the surrounding roads and bridges are

already overcrowded.

Whilst I am not objecting to re-development of Glassmill , 1 Battersea Bridge Rd per se, it has to be suitable and in keeping with the existing buildings in the surrounding. I believe that one of the main reasons that the original application was rejected by Wandsworth was that it was totally out of line with local development guidelines regarding height and these restrictions should be strictly applied to any planning application.

Thank you.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 184

Interested party	Jan Cumming
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	13 January 2026, 18:59
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>Comment: I have already made an objection to the current proposal, mainly due to the height. Visually it would not be in keeping with the riverside architecture. Not only that, the higher the building the more units there would be, and a bigger increase in population, with an increase demand on local services, like hospitals, GPs, dentists, shops, leisure services. Also, apart from noise, it is likely to cause significant disruption to travel for a substantial amount of time, and we have only just emerged from the finish of the safety improvements. I know that the local population are weary of negotiating around existing local building works, theoretically and physically; surrounding area works are still ongoing on one, and another has just restarted. So, to add a third, which doesn't have the appeal of the existing ones doesn't make sense.</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 185

Interested party	Daisy Dodd-Noble
-------------------------	------------------

Date received	13 January 2026, 18:08
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>In the last 5 years I have watched the traffic on Battersea bridge road decline so immensely that it takes a considerable chunk out of my work week to make this journey (my work requires road transport). This road is now always stationary,</p>
----------------	--

making basic tasks difficult for residents of Battersea, such as taking my mother to the doctor across the river. The park has become overwhelmed with people, and hazardous to older residents taking a stroll, with e bikes and chaos everywhere. The tescos on Battersea bridge road already has a bouncer for crowd control, because of the many boisterous young shoppers. The area is at its limit of traffic and people.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 186

Interested party Max Noble

Date received 13 January 2026, 17:33

Comment I wish to formally object to the above planning application.

The proposed development is wholly inappropriate for this site and is not in keeping with the established character of the surrounding area. The scale, massing, and design of the proposal are significantly at odds with neighbouring properties and the prevailing streetscape, resulting in a development that would appear intrusive and visually incongruous.

The area is characterised by low rise buildings, whereas the proposed scheme represents an overdevelopment of the site that fails to respect local context. As such, the proposal conflicts with the council's own design and character policies, which require new development to preserve or enhance the appearance and character of the local area.

Furthermore, the development would have an adverse impact on residential amenity. These impacts have not been adequately mitigated and would materially harm the quality of life of neighbouring residents.

Taken together, the proposal represents a poor and unsympathetic form of development that would cause lasting harm to the character of the area and should therefore be refused.

I respectfully request that the council gives due weight to these objections when determining the application.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 187

Interested party	Susie Beart
Date received	13 January 2026, 16:25
Comment	<p>I vehemently object to your planning proposal. This hideous tower will be a blight on the landscape for miles in each direct on our historic river. It is totally out of keeping with the historic buildings around it, particularly the ancient and beautiful building of Thomas Moore opposite. Battersea Bridge Road is a main road feeding Chelsea, Westminster and further afield, it will result in traffic gridlock (which there is most days anyway) which will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge. The delays are terrible as it is.</p> <p>The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan. Hard to believe it's being seriously considered. It will not provide the much needed affordable housing, but simply supply top end expensive properties for foreigners who won't live here to invest in.</p> <p>It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local quality of life. It will take years to complete which will result in years of a gridlocked main thoroughfare and will negatively impact views from historic sights.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 188

Interested party	Elaine Smith Dunlap
Date received	13 January 2026, 10:13
Comment	<p>I am resubmitting my original comment, I am still objecting to the planning application. See below Name: Mrs. Elaine Smith Dunlap Address: 30 ETHELBURGA STREET LONDON SW11 4AQ Comments Type of comment: Object to the proposal Comment: I am writing to express my vehement opposition to the proposed Glassmill Tower. Not only is it a totally incongruous structure for our architectural community, but also it would be a safety hazard. With the Heliport so close to us and the memory of the Vauxhall tragedy of Jan 2013 fresh in my mind, I truly fear for the vulnerability of our Community if this structure is completed. It is clear that the</p>

current Glassmill needs replacing, but please do not give permission for such an inappropriate building for our Community. We do not need more potentially empty luxury high rise flats that are appealing only to the very rich and foreign investors. Build something more modest and affordable... That's what Battersea needs and it's Community wants. This proposal is only for greedy profit, not for the people of Battersea, who love our unique and special past, and don't wish to destroy it's visual integrity. You wouldn't find this in Mayfair and we don't want it here either. Do the right thing and deny this proposal, unless it is significantly and affordably modified. Thanking you in advance. Sincerely, Elaine Smith Dunlap, 30 Ethelburga Street SW11 4AQ. esmithdunlap@gmail.com

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 189

Interested party	Daisy Raven
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	13 January 2026, 09:50
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	This skyscraper will completely take over the Battersea skyline in a bad way. Not only that, the traffic is already the worst in the whole of London, trying to get over Battersea Bridge. It takes approximately 20 mins at the very least to get over that bridge on any given day, normally far more - I have spent about 1H30 at one time trying to get over the bridge in a car. The skyscraper will add to the already heavy footfall in the area, and be completely abysmal. Do not do it - it will create absolute havoc. Strongly objecting to this build.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 190

Interested party	Lucas Bond
-------------------------	------------

Date received	13 January 2026, 09:33
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The following comments represent the formal position of Transport for London (TfL) Spatial Planning regarding the potential impacts of the proposal on the transport network and the delivery of the Mayor's Transport Strategy.
----------------	--

Transport issues highlighted at consultation stage included a contribution towards Battersea Bridge Road improvements, the removal of all general parking proposed, amendments to the cycle stores and servicing arrangement proposed, and structures technical approval for Battersea Bridge Road was requested. The need for travel plans, a car park management plan, delivery and servicing plan, and construction logistics plan to be secured by condition or legal agreement was also requested.

A further reduction in car parking due to the sites location and access to public transport is considered appropriate.

Concerns over cycle parking and servicing have been satisfactorily addressed since consultation stage. Structures approval was to be secured as a pre-commencement condition had the application been recommended for approval.

A contribution of £436,812.00 was to be secured in the Section 106 Agreement towards Battersea Bridge Road improvements adjacent to the site had the application been recommended for approval.

A Car Parking Design and Management Plan, a Delivery and Servicing Plan and Construction Logistics Plan were to be secured by condition. A Travel Plan and residents exclusion from parking permits were all to be secured through the Section 106 agreement had the application been recommended for approval.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 191

Interested party	James Basden
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	12 January 2026, 22:02
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	The proposed development is entirely out of keeping with the Neighbourhood Plan which - after much local consultation - agreed that 12 storeys was the maximum height. It is disproportionate to the location next to a historic bridge, adversely changing the river scape on both North and South sides.
----------------	--

We have already objected to the plan and, with the full support of Wandsworth Council planning, had the previous plan unanimously rejected. This altered plan still has the

deficiencies of the previous proposal and lacks local support. It will block sunlight for our neighbours, create demand that exceeds the capacity of local services and lead to years of disruption during construction. I object to its development in the strongest terms.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 192

Interested party Valerie Cumming

Date received 12 January 2026, 16:50

Comment This appeal has no merit and has ignored the informed and detailed objections made when the first application was made. The over-development of this site ignoring the local plan shows a type of contempt for local knowledge that is an unfortunate aspect of many unsuitable and large-scale developments throughout the UK. As a longstanding resident of Battersea [over fifty years], I like many others am aware of how important Battersea Bridge Road and Battersea Bridge are to businesses and individuals who use these areas on a daily basis. We recently suffered a year-long TfL project to upgrade cycle lanes and install far too many traffic lights that wholly ignored local concerns about access and movement. This development would have a far longer and far greater impact on the area, more or less reducing access to pedestrians, side roads and the one bridge that can take heavy traffic - Chelsea Bridge. And, the impact on the nearby residents including the block of flats next to this site would be destructive of all aspects of wellbeing; this is a community wrecking proposal not one that cares for Battersea and its many residents. It should be dismissed as a waste of government, local authority and residents' time.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 193

Interested party Helen Burrows

Date received 12 January 2026, 12:41

Comment The developers are pushing for this to be agreed, however details are vague and not fully obvious, especially in relation to

the amount of social housing. The promises of better lighting and safer for pedestrians is inaccurate- Battersea Bridge Road is well lit and safe to walk along.

Instead, this development will cause chaos and increase car numbers on the road which is already at breaking point. The current support letters are also from areas that are not local to this development, there is no consideration for those who will be impacted by this.

Even with the reduction from 39 to 34 storeys, it will not alleviate the increase of traffic on an already packed road as well as the infrastructure in the local area. There has been no consideration on the impact to Battersea and to have resubmitted it with such a small reduction in height shows that the company are not taking into consideration the local population at all. It still goes against the local restrictions on building height so how has this been allowed to be submitted?

This development does not fit with the area and with the additional traffic and impact on resources, it will be incredibly detrimental to Battersea as a whole. Emergency vehicles use this bridge and the impact on them will be extensive – it's already too busy, with queues of traffic daily taking up the whole road down to the Latchmere – adding additional traffic will only make things inaccessible.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 194

Interested party	Susan Lofthouse
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	12 January 2026, 12:18
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>The building is too high. It contravenes the planning rules for this area. It cuts out light to neighbouring buildings. I note there is a restaurant. Please note - in that part of the road, and in Parkgate, there are already 9 restaurants and other eating places.</p>
----------------	--

The developers have been submitting names as being in support when a glance at the Wadsworth Planning site shows quite clearly that people have been objecting to this.

Some years ago there was a very nasty accident at Vauxhall when a helicopter smashed into a tall tower – not even 33 floors. Wandsworth helicopter station is nearby.

It destroys part of the riverside view.

Allowing this skyscraper will open the way for other similar applications, which will exacerbate this situation.

Whilst accepting that the site be redeveloped, such excessive reconstruction will increase the size of any building works, especially with the need for tall cranes. This will impact on traffic flow, putting heavy pressure on Albert Bridge, which is sometimes closed. Example: Albert Bridge is closed for 5 days from 28th May. It would make great difficulties for emergency vehicles.

Heavy building works, such as pile driving, could cause problems with the bridge structure

This developer should stop wasting tax payers' money on appeal after appeal.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 195

Interested party	Marion Roberts
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	10 January 2026, 17:47
----------------------	------------------------

Comment	<p>I do not support the appeal. It goes against the obligations of the local plan 2023. It is a significant over development on a small site and no justification for it. It negatively impacts its immediate surroundings and across the river, not only visually but for environmental reasons. The mass of the tower perches on a very small footprint. The landscaping and public amenities are not generous enough to mitigate the building size. The overhang on the river side creates more width and mass by taking land, space and light belonging to the Thames Walk which is there for public enjoyment. I agree with the other objections expressed in the notes of this appeal.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 196

Interested party	Godfrey Davis
Date received	10 January 2026, 13:37
Comment	<p>I object to the building of a 28 floor tower on this location as it is two and a half times higher than the height limit in the local area plan and massively higher than the surrounding buildings. This stretch of the river bank is extremely sensitive opposite Cheyne Walk with two architecturally important bridges. The proposed building will ruin one of London's important vistas.</p> <p>I have additional concerns about the adequacy of the social rent units and the community space. The impact on this rare pedestrianised section of riverbank that links with Battersea Park and the adjacent Power station complex is of great concern.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 197

Interested party	Walter Ross
Date received	9 January 2026, 11:30
Comment	<p>The main objection is to an increase in the traffic on both the Battersea Bridge and the Albert Bridge both of which are already congested and unable to cope with the volume and weight of existing traffic - on the bridges and the junctions at either end.</p> <p>Also a concern about the construction of foundations of the building on the foundations of the bridge. A severe problem of a similar nature occurred with the pile driving for the Ransome Docks Development.</p> <p>The proposed height of the building pays no respect to the existing skyline of the surrounds (that had been respected in other developments in the area including Morgan's Walk.)</p> <p>The application would seem to be based on maximising a commercial return without respect for neighbours and the existing characteristics and architecture of the area and neighbourhood.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 198

Interested party	John Hussey
Date received	9 January 2026, 10:36
Comment	<p>I am deeply concerned, as a local resident, about this appeal. The current commercial building on the site is of adequate size and is not overly imposing in terms of height. A twenty-eight storey building would be another blight on this lovely stretch of the Thames. Has any consideration been given to the impact that the digging of foundations could have on a beautiful Victorian bridge , designed by Bazalgette? The traffic and noise caused by such a redevelopment would be terrible, especially for an area that already suffers from traffic congestion and noise , partly caused by an ill- conceived new TFL traffic scheme that has made traffic and noise much worse. Has any consideration been made to the direct neighbours who live in the adjoining flats of the occupants of Albion Wharf and Norman Foster's practice? I would suggest that only a redevelopment of a similar height and footprint should be permitted. Thought should also be given to the fact that the nearby Albert and Chelsea Bridges are in a poor state of repair and condition. Any closing of these bridges would cause chaos , while any redevelopment is being done at this site. Please do not allow this appeal.</p>
Supporting documents	No documents

Interested party 199

Interested party	Fiona MacNeill
Date received	8 January 2026, 17:58
Comment	<p>Dear Team</p> <p>The proposed Glassmills re-development will be my very near neighbour. My objections to the original planning application remain and in summary were based on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The disproportionate and dominant tower height (28 floors above ground). Other buildings in the locale are a maximum of 12 floors.2. Inappropriate height for the iconic riverside and bridge location. Will harm the spatial character of such a historic riverside setting.3. The height contravenes the local neighbourhood plan for mid-rise developments.4. The developers used questionable methods to canvas support for the original application = astroturfing https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Astroturfing.

5. This and other actions by the developer (submitting my emailed question at the original neighbourhood consultation as indicating support) have undermined my trust, especially in relation to delivering any of the more positive (but still woefully inadequate in my opinion) aspects of the re-development (Section 160).

6. Does Wandsworth council have the resources to hold the developers to account in delivering the section 160 commitments if the appeal is granted.

7. How will the local infrastructure (doctors, roads/deliveries/traffics, parking, community space etc) meet the needs of up to 110 additional households comprising some 440 people

Many thanks
Fiona MacNeill

4. It is difficult to see how this development will meet the local community needs

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 200

Interested party	Julia Dodd-Noble
-------------------------	------------------

Date received	8 January 2026, 13:09
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	<p>The proposed scale is excessive and too dominant ruining the skyline and exceeds the low-to-mid-rise character of the area, violating both Wandsworth Council's local plan and the London plan. Hard to believe its being seriously considered. Battersea Bridge Road is a main road feeding Chelsea, Westminster and further afield, it will result in traffic gridlock (which there is most days anyway) which will put pressure on Albert Bridge and Chelsea Bridge. The delays are terrible as it is.</p> <p>It is a planning disaster and prioritizes developer profit with no consideration for local quality of life. It will take years to complete which will result in years of a gridlocked main thoroughfare and will negatively impact views from historic sights.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 201

Interested party	Patrick Dodd-Noble
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received 8 January 2026, 12:01

Comment We strongly object to this high rise building. Although some redevelopment of the building is accepted the density and more importantly this 28 story building is totally out of keeping. It also breaks existing planning guide lines and will change the skyline of that part of the South bank. It should be rejected completely

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 202

Interested party Nese Ogun

Date received 8 January 2026, 10:46

Comment Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing as a resident of Chelsea, directly across the river from the proposed Glassmill Tower development, to formally object to this planning appeal.

While I do not live immediately beside the site, this proposal would have a significant and lasting visual impact on the wider Thames riverscape and the historic setting of both Battersea and Chelsea. The proposed tower, at over 28 storeys, is entirely out of scale with its surroundings and would introduce an overly dominant and discordant feature into what is currently a relatively coherent and low-rise skyline.

One of the most valued aspects of this stretch of the Thames is its openness, human-scale architecture, and layered historic character. A building of this height and bulk would interrupt long-established views, loom over the river, and permanently alter the visual balance of the area. Rather than enhancing the skyline, it would stick out in a stark and intrusive way, becoming an eyesore rather than a landmark.

The development also risks setting a troubling precedent. If a tower of this scale is allowed here, it opens the door for similar proposals along this part of the river, gradually transforming a historically sensitive and visually harmonious stretch of London into one dominated by isolated high-rise buildings with no meaningful relationship to their surroundings.

I am also concerned about the environmental and microclimate impacts of a building of this size, including wind

tunnelling along the riverfront and the long-term sustainability of such a tall structure.

This proposal feels driven by maximum density rather than by good urban design or respect for the established character of the area. Developments along the Thames should enhance its beauty and heritage, not overwhelm it.

For these reasons, I strongly urge that this appeal be refused and that any future proposals for this site be far more sensitive to the visual, historical, and environmental context of the river and its surroundings.

Yours faithfully,
Nese Ongun

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 203

Interested party	Yavuz Uzay
-------------------------	------------

Date received	8 January 2026, 10:43
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	<p>I am writing to object to this planning appeal as a local resident who will be directly affected by this development.</p> <p>Scale, massing, and visual impact: The proposed tower is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area. At over 28 storeys, it would dominate the local skyline and be highly visible from many parts of Battersea. Rather than blending in, it would stand out in an intrusive and overbearing way, harming the character of the neighbourhood. I am also concerned about its potential impact on local wildlife, including bird migration.</p> <p>Overshadowing and loss of light: This development would cause a significant loss of daylight and sunlight to nearby homes and public spaces. The size and bulk of the building would create a strong sense of enclosure, making the area feel darker, more cramped, and less pleasant to live in.</p> <p>Traffic and congestion: Battersea Bridge is already extremely congested, particularly at peak times. A development of this size would inevitably increase traffic, deliveries, and servicing vehicles, making an already bad situation worse. This raises serious concerns about access for emergency vehicles, as well as the safety of</p>
----------------	---

pedestrians and cyclists.

Pressure on local infrastructure:

Local services are already under strain. Public transport, GP surgeries, schools, and other essential services do not have the capacity to support a development of this scale without significant negative impacts on existing residents.

Construction disruption:

The construction period will be long and highly disruptive, bringing increased noise, dust, heavy vehicles, and possible road closures. This will seriously affect the quality of life of those living and working nearby.

Precedent:

Allowing a building of this height and scale in this location would set a worrying precedent for future overdevelopment, gradually changing Battersea into a high-rise area that no longer reflects its established character.

Climate and sustainability:

There are also concerns about the environmental impact of such a tall building, including wind tunnelling at street level and the overall carbon footprint of the development.

For all of these reasons, I strongly believe this proposal is inappropriate for this location and should be refused.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 204

Interested party	Melis Ongun
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	8 January 2026, 10:40
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	Hello , We are objecting to this planning appeal due to the following causes:
----------------	---

1) Scale, massing & visual impact: Out of character with the surrounding area and harmful to the Battersea skyline (bird migration) and overbearing and visually intrusive as well as fails to respect local context and heritage.

2) Overshadowing & loss of light: Impact on neighbouring homes and public spaces and loss of daylight/sunlight and sense of enclosure

3) Traffic & congestion: There will be Increased vehicle

movements as well as pressure on already congested Battersea Bridge as well as Impact on emergency access as well as pedestrian and cyclist safety

4) Infrastructure strain: Public transport capacity and GP surgeries, schools, local services

5) Construction disruption including noise, dust, road closures and Length of construction period

6) Precedent: Sets a dangerous precedent for future overdevelopment

7) Climate & sustainability: Wind tunnelling and Carbon footprint issues

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 205

Interested party	JOHN PARKER
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	8 January 2026, 10:03
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. clear breach of Local Plan regarding tall buildings2. would damage the local surrounding area and far beyond by its dominance3. massive damage to views of the river4. massive damage to the Conservation Area. an obvious breach.5. the chaos and disruption during the construction period would be huge and extend over months- we are already missing one Thames bridge.
----------------	---

Please ensure that the project does not go ahead. This is a nationally important, iconic part of London

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 206

Interested party	Paul Scott
-------------------------	------------

Date received	6 January 2026, 19:10
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment

The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road, London, SW11 3BZ.

I maintain all of my previous objections to this high density tower block scheme for various social, environmental, heritage, public health and fire safety planning reasons.

Creating these two blocks here would also cause a much greater strain upon Wandsworth's already over stretched local infrastructure as well.

These flats are also not going to be genuinely affordable council rented housing which means that they would not reduce the waiting list for council homes within this borough either.

Constructing this development would involve more air and noise pollution which is going to have an adverse effect upon the overall quality of life for local residents too.

For these above stated reasons I believe that the Planning Inspectorate therefore ought to uphold Wandsworth Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the appeal reference: 6002127 as shown on your website.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 207

Interested party

William Heal

Date received

6 January 2026, 16:28

Comment

I do not support this appeal and agree that the application was rejected. The planned building is completely inappropriate for the area, and would cause unacceptable disruption and congestion, both during development and afterwards. It would be an eyesore.

Supporting documents

No documents

Interested party 208

Interested party

Peter Cadbury

Date received

6 January 2026, 15:15

Comment	<p>My objections to this development were strongly expressed before the Planning Meeting was held, at which I attended. If anything these have been re-enforced by hearing the Officials and councillors unanimous recommendations that this ghastly hugely overlarge and wholly out of place tower block should not be allowed to take place. Nothing I have heard has changed this view and I urge the Council and the Secretary of State to reject this appeal in its entirety.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 209

Interested party	Simon Vince
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	6 January 2026, 09:50
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Please note that, as a statutory consultee, Heathrow Airport has not been consulted on this planning application. Our review of the submitted documents indicates a proposed building height of 123m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). A structure of this scale at the stated location—along with the likely use of cranes exceeding this height—poses a significant risk to the safe operation of Heathrow’s runways. Consequently, Heathrow will be required to object to the proposals unless the conditions outlined below are secured as part of any future planning permission.</p>
----------------	--

H10 Radar Mitigation Condition

No construction shall commence on site until a Radar impact assessment has been completed by Heathrow's Air Navigation Service Provider (ANSP) NATS and any subsequent mitigations have been agreed with the Operator and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of aircraft safety and the operations of Heathrow airport.

Instrument Flight Procedures Condition

Heathrow’s Instrument Flight Procedures (IFPs) would also need to be protected. An initial assessment shows that any buildings or structures including cranes that exceed 123m AOD would have an impact on the IFP’s associated to Heathrow Airport. However, once the design has sufficiently matured, Heathrow’s advice would be to undertake a pre-planning assessment with an Approved Procedural Design

Organisation (APDO) so that any IFP concerns can be formally assessed at the cost of the applicant.

Reason: In the interests of aircraft safety and the operations of Heathrow airport.

Submission of a Construction Management Strategy
Development shall not commence until a construction management strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority covering the application site and any adjoining land which will be used during the construction period. Such a strategy shall include the following matters:

- details of cranes and other tall construction equipment (including

the details of obstacle lighting) – Such schemes shall comply with Advice Note 4 ‘Cranes’ (available at <http://www.aoa.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Advice-Note-4-Cranes-2016.pdf>). The approved strategy (or any variation approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be implemented for the duration of the construction period.

Reason: To ensure that construction work and construction equipment on the site do not breach the Instrument Flight Procedural surfaces associated to Heathrow Airport and endanger aircraft movements and the safe operation of the aerodrome.

We would also like to bring the following to your attention:

CAA Building Notification

If any part of the development exceeds 91.4m AGL, upon grant of permission, Wandsworth Council is required to notify the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) as required under Annex 2 paras 30 – 32 of DfT/ODPM Circular 01/2003 ‘Safeguarding of Aerodromes & Military Explosives Storage Areas’.

CAA Crane Notification

Where a crane is 100m or higher, crane operators are advised to notify the CAA (arops@caa.co.uk) and Defence Geographic Centre (dvof@mod.gov.uk). Crane notification | Civil Aviation Authority (caa.co.uk)

The following details should be provided before the crane is erected:

- the crane's precise location
- an accurate maximum height
- start and completion dates

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 210

Interested party	evan llewellyn
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	6 January 2026, 08:36
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	28 stories is totally inappropriate for this area and spoils the view for 1 mile in 4 directions. 14 stories should be the maximum for this area and even 14 is too much in Battersea Reach, as 90% of residents agree.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 211

Interested party	Rosie Wellesley Wesley
-------------------------	------------------------

Date received	5 January 2026, 15:11
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	A building of this size will cause endless disruption not only to build but to the area. Wandsworth is fast becoming a wall of high rise buildings and some areas must be protected ie close to the park and the river. The local area is already becoming too built up and so busy. The traffic situation has become the stuff of nightmares for local residents with endless complaints, traffic jams beginning at 6am and literally lasting all day every day of the week. You can not add to this by building more high rise flats.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 212

Interested party	James Roberts
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	2 January 2026, 15:25
----------------------	-----------------------

Comment	I have reviewed the application, but I find the proposed building is far too high still, and the scale/massing not suitable
----------------	---

for the area

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 213

Interested party William Roberts

Date received 2 January 2026, 15:16

Comment The proposal's excessive height and scale, harmful effect on the local area and failure to meet NPFF 2024, Policy D9, the London Plan 2021, Local Plan 2023 or Policies PM9 and LP4 say enough about why this appeal should be rejected. The mitigation requirements and financial penalties are insignificant in comparison to the harm that would be done by allowing this development in its current form over the longer term.

The right investment for the site is welcome. Wandsworth tall building guidelines are 21m or around 7 stories. A proposal around this height or no taller than Albion Riverside, Hester Road (near by, around 9 stories) would be more suitable. Also this building does not seem to offer much architecturally and could be improved from an aesthetic point of view.

Supporting documents No documents

Interested party 214

Interested party Lucinda Curtis

Date received 1 January 2026, 11:17

Comment Good morning
I am a Battersea resident and am concerned about the disregard for Wandsworth's Local plan by this developer. They are proposing a 28 storey building when the local plan specifically states that a 7-12 storey building is appropriate for the area.
I suggest that developers consult the local plan before putting in planning applications.
I would also recommend that marketing material has to show the entire elevation of a building, rather than just a cropped picture. It is disingenuous to hoodwink people in this way.
Many thanks

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 215

Interested party	Pauline Morrison
-------------------------	------------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 21:05
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	The proposed building is out of scale with the surrounding Buildings and will dominate the skyline. At 28 stories it is way taller than any buildings in the vicinity and its design will not enhance the area - in fact it will detract from the riverside environment. It's another case of developers trying to squeeze every penny out of a most unsuitable development. If it is approved it will open the door to further high rise unsuitable and unattractive buildings built not for the community but for huge profits.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 216

Interested party	Claire Gooch
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 16:42
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	I do not support this appeal. The proposed building is totally out of keeping with the area. The traffic on Battersea Bridge Road is consistently gridlocked thanks to some recent very bad road planning by TFL. This would only be made worse by construction traffic and then yet more cars brought in by owners/tenants. I cannot believe anyone in their right mind would approve this appeal - it would be an eyesore to the banks of the River Thames.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 217

Interested party	Robin Roads
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 16:35
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	The part of the building that is 28 stories is too high as it is not compatible with the surrounding area.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 218

Interested party	Andrew Hamilton
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 12:51
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	<p>I have previously objected to this application- as have many hundreds of others, and would just like to add three further comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. In spite of reducing the height of the proposed tower block, this edifice will be very visible from both sides of the river, and will therefore blight the historic Chelsea Reach- immortalized by Whistler, Turner and other artists for centuries. The height is totally contrary to Wandsworth's own development guidelines- which appear to be wilfully ignored by the applicant.2. Part of the justification for this breach appears to be a calculated guile on the part of the developer to increase the percentage of affordable housing, by way of subsidy from the public purse. In no way can this justify despoiling the skyline for the next generation, or compensate the developer for over-paying for the site.3. I recall the late architect for this scheme, Sir Terry Farrell, admitting that lower rise mansion blocks were preferable to high- rise residential towers- somewhat hypocritically in my view since he was also the architect of the lamentable tower at Lot's Road on the north side of the River. He made one strategic error, and he should not be allowed another posthumously. <p>Andrew Hamilton MVO, FRICS</p>
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 219

Interested party	Tanji Kaler
-------------------------	-------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 12:15
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>With all the documentation it is difficult to know whether there is a change to the design. If the building is still to be 28 stories;</p>
----------------	---

this may or may not include the underground parts, my objection still stands.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 220

Interested party	Linda Sutton
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	30 December 2025, 01:48
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	The proposed height of the proposed building on the site of 1 Battersea Bridge Road remains far too high.
----------------	---

The building should be in keeping with the surrounding buildings. In particular, The Royal College of Art building which is the perfect height for the road and area.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 221

Interested party	Gerard Connolly
-------------------------	-----------------

Date received	30 December 2025
----------------------	------------------

Comment	Added as a document
----------------	---------------------

Supporting documents	Interested party representation Mr Connolly.msg
-----------------------------	---

Interested party 222

Interested party	Thomas Kelly
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	29 December 2025, 21:58
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	Planning Appeal Comment – The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road
----------------	--

Application Reference: 2024/1322
Site Address: The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road,
London SW11 3BZ

I object to the current planning application for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and the erection of a part 10-storey, part 28/29-storey building for the following planning reasons.

1. Conflict with the Adopted Wandsworth Local Plan (2023–2038)

The site lies outside designated tall-building locations identified in the Local Plan and within an area where mid-rise development is expected. The proposed height and massing significantly exceed the scale envisaged for this location and therefore conflict with Local Plan policies on building height, townscape, and spatial strategy.

2. Daylight and Sunlight Impacts

The proposed scale and bulk raise significant concerns regarding loss of daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential properties and public spaces. Nationally accepted BRE Guidelines (“Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight”) require new development to minimise adverse impacts on surrounding occupiers. Given the proposed height and proximity to existing buildings, there is a high risk that the scheme would result in unacceptable reductions in daylight, sunlight, and overshadowing, contrary to Local Plan amenity policies.

3. Impact on Heritage Assets

The site is located within the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets along the Thames riverside. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that development preserves or enhances the setting of heritage assets and avoids causing harm to their significance. The excessive height and visual prominence of the proposal would adversely affect key views and the historic riverside townscape, resulting in harm that is not outweighed by public benefits

4. National Conservation and Design Policy

The NPPF requires development to be sympathetic to local character, including landscape setting, and to establish a strong sense of place. The proposal’s scale and massing are inconsistent with these objectives and would fail to conserve the character of the Thames riverside environment. The scheme therefore conflicts with national policy on high-quality design and conservation.

5. Traffic and Transport Impacts (TfL and Local Network)

The scale of the development would generate increased pedestrian, cycle, servicing, and vehicular movements in an area already constrained by Battersea Bridge Road and the surrounding highway network. TfL policies require development to demonstrate that it will not result in unacceptable impacts on transport capacity, safety, or operation. Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the local and strategic transport network can safely accommodate the additional demand arising from a development of this scale.

6. Planning Committee Decision

Wandsworth Council's Planning Applications Committee previously refused this application on the basis that the proposal's height, scale, and massing conflicted with the Local Plan and would result in unacceptable harm to the character of the area.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal conflicts with the adopted Wandsworth Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework, and established guidance on amenity, heritage, conservation, and transport impacts. I respectfully request that this appeal be dismissed.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 223

Interested party	James Bennett
-------------------------	---------------

Date received	29 December 2025, 21:48
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	This building is so high that it will loom over Battersea Park, terribly upsetting the skyline beside a green oasis tucked within central London. There are plenty of high rise blocks up in Vauxhall, we do not need one at this location. It will sour the riverside and is not needed.
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 224

Interested party	N Mor
-------------------------	-------

Date received	29 December 2025, 21:18
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	I do not support the appeal as there were overwhelming reasons why the proposed building was rejected and these should be respected.
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 225

Interested party	Zac Evans
-------------------------	-----------

Date received	29 December 2025, 21:16
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	<p>This tower should be approved for planning and should never have not been approved in the first place. This is a brownfield site with unused office space occupying it. I know this as I walk past it twice a day.</p>
----------------	---

Furthermore the tower should be taller. We are in a housing affordability crisis and yet we have local Labour councils preventing flats being built on brownfield sites. It is madness this wasn't approved and now millions of pounds will be wasted on consultations and building work delayed by years.

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 226

Interested party	marcello silvestri
-------------------------	--------------------

Date received	29 December 2025, 20:44
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	<p>It is conservation area! The council block 2 meter extension in warriner garden and now allow a tower to be built on battersea bridge? .. madness..</p>
----------------	--

It would also be a real pity for the scenery of battersea aera. Increase traffic to an already overcrowded areas across the area making impossible to cross battersea, albert or even chelsea bridge.

It is not the place to build such a a tower. We already have the power station residential estates that has brought yes business but an immense traffic. Unless you are planning to double the pavement, road and train platform capacity it is madness to bring additional 110 flats!

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 227

Interested party	Robin Gollance
-------------------------	----------------

Date received	29 December 2025, 20:43
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	Concerned on the traffic this will cause on Battersea bridge road, the impact on the view of the river and the impact to number 2 Hester Road
----------------	---

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------

Interested party 228

Interested party	Judith Young
-------------------------	--------------

Date received	29 December 2025, 16:31
----------------------	-------------------------

Comment	<p>Not sure how they can appeal again. But here goes. The location is totally unsuitable for this proposal Since new traffic lights have been installed in Battersea Bridge Road, the traffic jams have been horrific. Any building works there will only add to the misery already suffered by travellers. I see no reason at all why the present building cannot be reconfigured to contain all the apartments, offices etc. It is still too high.</p>
----------------	--

Supporting documents	No documents
-----------------------------	--------------
