



Chief Executive
Andrew Travers

Wandsworth Borough Council
Chief Executive's Group
The Town Hall Wandsworth High Street
London SW18 2PU

Date: 24th April 2025

For further information on this agenda, or to find out how you can have your say on the issues being discussed, please contact the Democratic Services Officer: Callum Wernham on Email: callum.wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk or Tel: 020 8871 8347.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

**THURSDAY, 24TH APRIL, 2025 AT 7.30 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBER - THE TOWN HALL, WANDSWORTH
HIGH STREET, LONDON, SW18 2PU**

Members of the Committee:

Councillor Belton (Chair); Councillor Ayres (Deputy Chair); Councillors Apps, S. Boswell, Colclough, Govindia, Humphries, Justin, Owens and White.

LATE ITEMS OF CORRESPONDENCE

- 3. Applications (Paper No. 25-137) (Pages 3 - 10)**
- Late items of correspondence. **(Attached)**

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE – 24th April 2025

LATE ITEMS OF CORRESPONDENCE

As of midday 24th April, the cut off for late submissions.

TO VIEW ON THE ONLINE APPLICATION FILE.

The link to this can be found on the 'Index of Applications' sheet of Paper

25/137

Item 1 Page 5

The Glassmill, 1 Battersea Bridge Road SW11 3BZ (2024/1322)

St Mary's Ward Councillor's Representation

The following has been received from adjoining ward Cllrs Jamie Colclough and Jessie Lee:

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee,

I want to make sure the concerns of people in St Mary's Ward are clearly heard – particularly those raised by the Friends of Battersea Riverside, as well as the Battersea Society, residents of Morgan's Walk, and many others from across our community in St Mary's and Battersea Park wards.

I fully back the residents' view and the officers' recommendation to refuse this planning application. But beyond simply turning down this proposal, our residents think it's important to send a loud and clear message to developers: schemes like this, that ignore the local character and put profit ahead of improvements to the local area and people's wellbeing, just aren't welcome here in Battersea.

This is very different to the Gasholders application that was recently approved by Committee. The Gasholders application was in an abandoned, decontaminated site and had no nearby residential properties, so had no amenity impact on residents. For this application, the officers are right about the building being far too tall and out of scale under Policy D9 of the London Plan. The truth is, a massive 29-storey tower here would cause real harm – not just locally but also to the historic views from Battersea Park, the Thames Embankment, and the Battersea Square Conservation Area. That clearly breaches Local Plan policy LP3, which is there to protect our neighbourhood's character and heritage.

Losing up to 70% daylight for nearby residents isn't just a minor inconvenience – it's devastating for people's quality of life and health. This clearly breaches our Local Plan policies LP2, LP15, and LP27. Our community deserves homes they can live comfortably in, not spaces shadowed by towering developments.

Residents have also made clear their concerns about flooding and climate impacts that the Environment Agency have also raised when it comes to managing flood risks, which is another potential breach of the National Planning Policy Framework and Wandsworth's own Local Plan Policy LP12 as well as London Plan Policy SI12.

Finally, it has been noted that many of the 'letters of support' that have recently appeared on the planning portal, that, don't seem to reflect what I've heard from residents in St Mary's Ward. Many responses look heavily guided or scripted, repeating phrases like "active frontage" or "building net zero" that most residents just wouldn't naturally use. Other comments are also off-topic or unrealistic. I'd strongly urge the committee to approach these letters of support with a healthy dose of scepticism and caution.

We urge you tonight to refuse this application decisively. We will always support Social Housing, but our residents are going to be the ones that live through the impact of this development, and its construction. For this to be worth it, the overall good from the application needs to justify the harm and, in this case, it falls well short.

Additional Representations

A further 593 representations have been received supporting the proposal. The grounds of support relate to the provision of:

- Affordable housing
- Affordable workspace and active frontages
- Low cost community facility
- Sustainable building

A further 216 representations have been received objecting to the proposal. The grounds of objection are as follows:

- Excessively tall and inappropriate building
- Loss of daylight/sunlight and overshadowing
- Privacy and overlooking
- Wind microclimate
- Flood risk and defences
- Structural impact on Grade II listed Battersea Bridge
- Impact on surrounding heritage assets
- Traffic impact (construction phase and when completed)
- Insufficient space to enable the construction phase within the site boundary
- Rights of way and Party Wall issues
- The legitimacy of methods used by the applicant to gain public support for the proposal has been questioned

Officer comments

The above grounds of objection are discussed in the order as above.

- The impacts of the excessively tall building have been assessed and identified within Section 20 of the PAC report. The conclusion of the harm caused has been discussed in Section 20. This assessment is detailed and comprehensive and no further Officer comment is considered necessary in this regard.
- The impacts on daylight/sunlight loss and overshadowing have been assessed within Section 4 of the PAC report. This assessment is detailed and comprehensive and no further Officer comment is considered necessary in this regard.
- Privacy and overlooking impacts have been assessed within Section 5 of the PAC report. This assessment is detailed and comprehensive and no further Officer comment is considered necessary in this regard.
- Wind and microclimate impacts have been assessed within Section 15 of the PAC report. Officers consider the intention to secure the mitigation as outlined within para 15.17 of the PAC report (porous baffles and screens) through the imposition of a planning condition (had the proposal been found to be acceptable) to be a lawful approach. No further assessment is considered necessary in this regard.
- The flood risk and river defences has been assessed within Section 12 of the PAC report. The approach recommended by Officers (had the proposal been found to be acceptable) as described within paras 12.23 to 12.26 is considered reasonable. The imposition of a negative condition along with a S.106 'best endeavours' clause to deal with the condition survey and raising of the river wall would, in Officers' opinion, achieve the objectives of Policy LP12.
- In terms of potential structural impacts to Battersea Bridge, it has been asserted that construction traffic could damage its integrity. As part of the Stage 1 referral to the GLA, Transport for London (TfL) that own and manage the bridge have not raised this as a potential issue that requires mitigation. As such, no further conditions, or S106 clauses, are considered necessary in this regard. An additional condition is recommended to be imposed (had the proposal been found to be acceptable) for details of protection of the banister to Battersea Bridge where it would have been closest to the application site, along with a condition requiring an impact assessment to ensure the basement excavations do not harm the bridge abutment (as advised in Para 81 of the GLAs Stage 1 response (July 2024).
- The impacts on the setting of surrounding heritage assets (listed buildings and conservation areas), have been assessed within Section 20 of the PAC report. This assessment is detailed and comprehensive and no further Officer comment is considered necessary in this regard.
- The impact on local traffic conditions during any construction phase and during the operational life of the building have been assessed within Section 10 of the PAC report. The recommended conditions and S106 clauses would have provided the necessary degree of control during both these phases; had the proposal been found to be acceptable. This assessment is detailed and

comprehensive and no further Officer comment is considered necessary in this regard.

- It has been asserted that the red line site curtilage is insufficient for depositing materials, storage of materials, plant and equipment required for the construction phase. Officers have witnessed, on several occasions, planning permissions on constrained development sites being delivered through detailed construction planning using techniques that facilitate the delivery of buildings in inner urban areas. The same degree of detailed planning would be expected to have been achieved for this site; had the proposal been found to be acceptable.
- In terms of rights of way and party wall matters, Officers are aware that solicitors have been instructed, by objectors and the developer, and are in dialogue over these issues. These are important matters, yet they cannot be regarded as material planning considerations that can affect the outcome of a planning application.
- In terms of the methods used by the applicant to gain public support, the applicant has employed the services of a communications company, Your Shout, to engage with the community. Officers have made investigations into the methods used by the applicant's communications consultant and requested an explanation on these methods to elicit support. The following is the methodology used by Your Shout that Officers have obtained by way of explanation and comprises the following:
 - *Trained Fieldworkers are fully briefed on the project by senior members of the project team.*
 - *Fieldworkers carry identification at all times.*
 - *The Metropolitan Police are informed in advance of any fieldwork that is to take place. An Identification Number is provided by the police.*
 - *Fieldworkers visit residents on their doorsteps (they do not enter any homes) or speak in public places.*
 - *They introduce the proposals by means of a written document ("Flashcard"). This Flashcard is attached.*
 - *If the member of the public is supportive of the application, they are asked to complete a letter of support. They are given a document that allows them to complete their name and address. The member of the public is given a card with our contact details, how to withdraw their comments and full information on the process that will be followed in terms of submitting the letter to LB Wandsworth.*
 - *If the member of the public states that they want to oppose the application, they are given the letter to complete and the information card.*
 - *At the conclusion of the process, the letter is signed by the member of the public.*
 - *All letters, whether in support or opposition, are submitted to LB Wandsworth.*
 - *The most recent work took place in February, March and April this year.*
 - *If any resident wishes to withdraw their comment, they can contact us and we will ask LB Wandsworth to remove their comments.*

Officers have been made aware that some members of the public approached by Your Shout may have not have been advised as to the scope and nature of the proposal, with particular regard to the 29 storey height. The Council has made investigations, to the best of its ability, to seek answers on how Your Shout has elicited the degree of support that has been recorded above. The Council is, however, unable to investigate or verify each individual letter of support or objection to an application. This is with particular regard to the sheer volume of representations received on this application. Members are reminded that it is the substance of representations and the material planning considerations referred to therein which are important to the determination of the application and not the number of representations for or against an application.

Clarification

The PAC report has indicated Historic England as objecting to the proposal (page 27 of PAC report). Historic England stated that (19 June 2024)...‘Therefore, we are unable to support these plans, and strongly recommend that the tall building is lowered significantly in height to reduce or remove entirely the harm to historic environment on both sides of the Thames.’ They concluded in their consultation response to the amended scheme (6 November 2024) that they have concerns regarding the application on heritage grounds with justification and public benefits that would need to be extremely strong [to outweigh identified harm].

Item 3 Page 153

166 Upper Richmond Road SW15 (2024/3185)

Update on CIL Estimate

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) estimate	
Mayoral CIL	£41,460.22
Borough CIL	£68,359.74

The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all relevant details are approved and any relief claimed.

Amendment to Officers Report

DELETE Paragraph 20.4 on page 176 ‘Employment and Skills Contribution (amount TBC)’. It has been confirmed by the Economic Development Officer (EDO) that the proposed development does not trigger a financial contribution as part of the legal obligation.

Item 5 Page 195**40 Skeena Hill SW18 (2025/0047)**

Further representation received from a neighbour and circulated to all PAC Members raising the following points:

- The report has failed to address the Inspector's grounds for dismissing the appeal against the previously refused planning application 2024/1894 with particular reference to the side extension and the harm caused, contrary to policy LP2 (diagrams of the 'proposed' and 'refused' side elevations were included to illustrate this point)
- The proposal remains large scale and harmful to neighbouring amenity.
- Request to 'defer' the application as it is not in line with the Local Plan, Planning Committee Protocol, Local Government Act 1972 or the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, section 5.11.
- Notification of the planning committee meeting dates omitted from the portal.
- Works have already started on site without due approval.

Officer Comment

The Officers' report makes reference to the dismissed appeal application throughout and comparisons set out on pages 197 and 198. The merit of the proposal relative to local plan policy, including LP2 and taking into consideration the proposal that was dismissed, has been fully addressed in the officers' report. The rear extension proposed under this application is of the same depth as that previously approved under application 2024/3304, and has been reduced in depth by 0.5m from that previously refused under application 2024/1894, it is considered that the reduction in depth overcomes the previous concerns regarding loss of outlook and amenity to adjoining properties.

There are no planning grounds to justify a deferral of the application. The application is valid and has been fully consulted upon in line with statutory requirement and with the Council's SCI. The proposal, as reduced and amended in its scale and form from that which was previously dismissed, has been assessed by officers as being acceptable for the reasons set out in the report. Furthermore, the proposal follows other similar examples within the street. There is no further information officers would require to further assess the application or that could be presented to the PAC that would change the recommendation.

It has been noted that the system had not updated to reflect the recommendation to PAC to approve the application which has now been addressed.

There are two extant planning permissions for works to the property at 40 Skeena Hill as referenced under the planning history section of the officers' report. Any works being undertaken at the site currently may be in relation to either of those

permissions. Residents are advised to report any suspected breaches of planning control matters through the correct procedure on the Council's website.

This page is intentionally left blank