



Chief Executive  
Andrew Travers

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

Date: 19th December 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](mailto:callum.wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk) or Tel: 020 8871 8347**

## **CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**THURSDAY, 8TH JANUARY, 2026 AT 7.00 P.M.  
ROOM 123 - THE TOWN HALL,  
WANDSWORTH HIGH STREET, WANDSWORTH SW18 2PU**

### **Members of the Committee:**

Councillors Ayres, Belton and Owens, and the following representatives:

Balham Society	Mr Mark Dodgson
Battersea Society	Mr Michael Jubb (Chair)
Clapham Society	Mr Roger Armstrong
Friends of Battersea Park	Ms Frances Radcliffe
Putney Society	Mr Andrew Catto
Royal Institute of British Architects	Mr Edward Potter
Royal Town Planning Institute	<i>To be confirmed</i>
Tooting History Group	Ms Libby Lawson
Wandsworth Historical Society	Dr Pamela Greenwood
Wandsworth Society	Mr Peter Farrow (Deputy Chair)

## AGENDA

### 1. **Declarations of Interest**

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests, other registerable interests and any non-registerable interests relevant to any matters to be considered at the meeting.

### 2. **Minutes - 4th November 2025**

**(Pages 3 - 8)**

To confirm and sign as a correct record the minutes of the previous meeting of the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee held on 4th November 2025. **(Attached)**

### 3. **Applications (Paper No. 26-01)**

**(Pages 9 - 12)**

To consider a report by the Head of Development Management (Wandsworth) certain applications which have been received for permission to carry out developments in or adjoining conservation areas or upon buildings which are listed as being of special architectural or historic interest. **(Attached)**

### 4. **Decisions (Paper No. 26-02)**

**(Pages 13 - 24)**

Report by the Chief Executive on recent decisions on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee. **(Attached)**

### 5. **Future Meeting Dates**

To note that the next meeting of the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee has been scheduled for the following date:

- 10th March 2026

\*Note\* A reminder that the meeting scheduled for 12th May 2026 has been cancelled due to its proximity to the Borough elections.

**Minutes of a meeting of the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee  
held at the Town Hall, Wandsworth, SW18 2PU on Tuesday, 4th November,  
2025 at 7.00 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

Michael Jubb (Chair), Battersea Society  
Councillor Ayres  
Councillor Owens  
Mark Dodgson, Balham Society  
Roger Armstrong, Clapham Society  
Andrew Catto, Putney Society  
Edward Potter, Royal Institute of British Architects  
Libby Lawson, Tooting History Group  
Pamela Greenwood, Wandsworth Historical Society  
Peter Farrow, Wandsworth Society

**In attendance:**

Lauren Way, Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer  
David Andrews, Conservation and Urban Design Officer  
Stephen O’Fegan, Senior Conservation and Urban Design Officer (Via MS Teams)  
Callum Wernham, Democratic Services Officer

**Apologies:**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Belton, Frances Radcliffe and Edward Potter.

**1. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**2. Minutes - 8th September 2025**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8th September 2025 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

Matters Arising

The Committee sought a further update with regards to the Furzedown Lodge site. Officers stated that the pre-application meeting had been completed, whilst further progress was awaited from other Council departments regarding best use of the site as it was situated on Council owned land. The Chair felt that this was a disappointing situation given that progress towards renewing the site had been ongoing for a significant period of time. The Chair asked that Conservation Officers liaise with other departments of the Council to expedite this process wherever possible.

In relation to Waterfall House, the Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer stated that the appeal for the five freestanding advertising banners had been dismissed. Officers noted that a further application, which the Committee had

considered at a previous meeting, was progressing akin to comments raised previously by the Committee.

### **3. Applications (Paper No. 25-376)**

#### **2025/2256 - Land rear of 2 - 28 Bickley Street, SW17 9NF**

Proposal: Erection of 3 x two-storey dwellings with associated bin stores, cycle parking and landscaping.

#### **The Committee provided comment on the application.**

Members of the Committee queried whether the application site was located within an archaeological priority area. Officers stated that they were unsure whether this was the case, and noted that this work was carried out externally by the Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS).

The Committee heard that there appeared to be some confusion regarding the historic boundary walls as detailed within the application. One such wall, whilst likely being a historic boundary, was not a historic wall as that wall had been demolished in 2017. In addition, some concern was raised regarding the proposed fascia boards at the single and upper level, which might be better served by a simple brick design with no fascia boards.

The Committee commented that should the development proceed, and the Granada reopen, their firm expectation was that proximity of the residential development would not hinder any such performance within the building.

Members of the Committee felt that the application did not appear to be detrimental to the Grade I listed building, as the view down the alleyway was unlikely to be made worse as a result of the proposed development.

The Committee commented on the application, emphasising that the archaeological value of the site required further investigation prior to any development.

#### **2025/2348 - Chivalry Hall 29A - 29B Chivalry Road, SW11 1HT**

Proposal: Alterations including installation of replacement windows and doors, roof covering with rooflights, solar panels and air source heat pump in connection with amalgamation of two dwelling houses into single 2-3 storey 6-bedroom dwelling house with associated landscaping and refuse storage. Ground floor side extension to create garden room and replacement of existing first floor projecting balconies.

#### **The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

The Committee queried whether the openings which housed the windows were original to the building. The Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer stated that it was understood that the central opening may have been previously altered, however there was no indication that the others had been altered. It was added that the proposal also included two of the window openings to be shortened to make each opening the same size.

It was commented that there had been no pre-application advice for this application.

The Committee raised concerns that the proposed balconies would be very large and imposing, whilst being visible from the street. It was commented that both proposed dwellings would have access to a garden area, which should negate the need for such large balconies.

Members of the Committee raised significant concerns as to the inclusion of proposed glazing bars on the windows, in addition to the proposed alteration of the size of the windows.

The Committee unanimously objected to the application on the grounds that the changes to the fenestration, particularly the Chivalry Row frontage, were unacceptable. The removal of the lancet windows on the side elevation and the changing of the size of the windows and addition of glazing bars would reduce the understanding of the original use of the hall. In addition, the Committee raised strong reservations to fenestration of the garden facing wall, and particularly to the depth of the proposed balconies.

#### **2025/3241 - Chivalry Hall 29A - 29B Chivalry Road, SW11 1HT**

Proposal: Alterations including installation of replacement windows and doors, roof covering with rooflights, solar panels and air source heat pump, associated landscaping and refuse storage. Alterations including erection of single storey side extension and installation of balconies in connection with reconfiguration of existing dwellings.

#### **The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

It was noted that this proposal was predominantly the same as the previously considered application 2025/3241, with the primary changes being the retention of one unit within the building to be split vertically down the centre. In addition, it was proposed for the gateway parking and crossover to be enlarged and one set of lancet windows to the side elevation to be retained.

Taking into consideration the above differences, the Committee resolved to issue the same comments as for application 2025/3241, given that the substance of their objections remained unresolved.

The Committee unanimously objected to the application on the grounds that the changes to the fenestration, particularly the Chivalry Row frontage, were unacceptable. The removal of the lancet windows on the side elevation and the changing of the size of the windows and addition of glazing bars would reduce the understanding of the original use of the hall. In addition, the Committee raised strong reservations to fenestration of the garden facing wall, and particularly to the depth of the proposed balconies.

#### **2025/3192 - Land South of Tudor Lodge Health Centre, 8c Victoria Drive SW19**

Proposal: Erection of a 2-bedroom single storey plus basement level house with associated lightwells, hard and soft landscaping including new entrance gates, bin and bike store.

**The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

The Committee queried whether there was any precedent for the proposal to be a thatched roof. Officers stated that in relation to the previous application which had been rejected at appeal, the Inspector had made comments regarding the overly modern style of the proposal. As such, it appeared that the applicant had pivoted to a more traditional design.

The Committee raised concern regarding the proposal to thatch the property, especially given the drawings indicated that some of the walls were proposed to be thatched.

Concern was raised as to whether it was acceptable to build anything on this land. The Committee referred to the applicant's design and access statement, which indicated the need to retain the space and open land. In addition, Members of the Committee raised objection to the loss of trees that would occur as a result of the proposed development.

The Committee unanimously objected to the proposal, raising strong reservations regarding the principle of development of the site, whilst adding that a building of this size and scale was completely inappropriate and out of character for its setting. The Committee added their endorsement to the objection raised by the Wandsworth Tree Wardens.

**2025/1986 - Putney Methodist Church Upper Richmond Road, SW15 6SN**

Proposal: Planning permission for installation of a new accessible entrance ramp and steps; replacement of existing entrance doors with power-assisted doors; creation of an internal glazed lobby; relocation of a brick pier; insertion of a new opening in the perimeter wall and railings; installation of a new noticeboard; construction of a new shared bin store screened by timber fencing; installation of raised solar panels on the south-facing roof slope and installation of an air source heat pump within the church tower.

**The Committee unanimously supported the proposal.**

It was noted that there had been no objections and 4 letters of support regarding this application, whilst the Putney Society were fully supportive of the proposal. In addition, it was commented that the addition of the proposed photovoltaic panels would generate enough electricity to remove the existing gas boiler.

A comment was raised regarding the need for the base of the proposed photovoltaic panels to be screened to dissuade colonisation by birds.

A Member of the Committee raised a query regarding the possibility of having a less distinctive ramp approach from the entrance to the car park to integrate it with the general entrance. It was noted that the applicant had met with community groups and the Putney Society, and had gone over their plans in considerable detail.

The Committee unanimously supported the application, and asked that the applicant allow for some further consideration regarding the design of the ramp.

**2025/3306 - 110-112 Putney High Street, SW15 1RG**

Proposal: Alteration including erection of rear extensions and front mansard roof extension to; existing ground floor commercial space, and in connection with change of use at upper floors to residential to create 2 x studio flats, 3 x 1-bedroom units and 3 x 2 bedroom units with associated amenity and service space.

**The Committee unanimously supported the application.**

It was noted that, in essence, the proposal would retain the front façade of the property whilst allowing for the redevelopment of the rest of the building.

The Committee considered that the Putney Society had considered this application, and they felt that allowing for a mansard roof was a positive addition as it gave each building its own mansard when viewed from the street.

Concern was raised as to how the floorplates would manage and support the double height window.

The Committee unanimously supported the application, whilst asking that the applicant further consider how floor would be supported in the middle of the large window and other associated matters regarding the proposed flat above.

**4. Decisions (Paper No. 25-377)**

The Committee considered each of the decisions reported for information.

The Chair noted, with approval, that each of the applications previously recommended for refusal by the Committee had been determined as such.

**5. Future Meeting Dates**

The Committee were advised that their meeting scheduled for 12th May 2026 was proposed to be cancelled, due to its proximity to the Borough elections. It was noted that the May 2026 meeting of the Planning Applications Committee had also been cancelled for similar reasons.

Subject to the above, the Committee noted their schedule of meetings for the remainder of the municipal year.

The meeting ended at 8.40 p.m.

This page is intentionally left blank

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL

CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 8TH JANUARY 2026

Report by the Head of Development Management (Wandsworth) on current development proposals likely to affect the character or appearance of conservation areas, listed buildings and registered parks and gardens.

SUMMARY

This report outlines current proposals which, in the opinion of the Council, would be likely to affect the character or appearance of conservation areas and listed buildings within the Borough. The applications are presented to the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee for comment. Any comments given will be reported to the relevant Case Officer and/or the Planning Applications Committee as appropriate.

The details of the applications are contained in this report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee is asked to comment on development proposals that would be likely to affect the character or appearance of conservation areas and listed buildings; the applications for development proposals are set out within this report.
2. The following planning applications are for consideration:

**APPLICATIONS**

3. **2025/4170 - Land at Lennox Estate Arabella Drive SW15**

Construction of 81 new affordable units (Use Class C3) across two buildings ranging from 6 to 14 storeys, incorporating ground floor community floorspace (Use Class E(d) and F2). Demolition of existing buildings, MUGA and structures and stopping up of part of Arabella Drive, provision of new and replacement open space and play space, landscape and public realm improvements including reorganisation of car parking and carriageway on

**Wandsworth Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

Ludovick Walk. Removal and replacement of existing pedestrian and stepped access to existing homes at 11-15 Ludovick Walk and other associated works.

**4. 2025/3651- Meadbank Nursing Home 12 Parkgate Road SW11 4NN**

Demolition of existing buildings and site redevelopment to provide replacement care accommodation (Use Class C2), within a part 4, 5 and 7 storey building plus basement level, providing up to 139 care beds and suites, with associated communal, wellness and ancillary facilities, hard and soft landscaping and associated car parking, and servicing, cycle parking, substation and plant equipment.

**5. 2025/2161 -Riversdale Primary School, 302 A Merton Road SW18 5JP**

**6. 2025/2288 - Riversdale Primary School, 302 A Merton Road SW18 5JP**

Alterations including erection of a two-storey building to accommodate 4 classrooms and ancillary spaces, removal of existing single storey modular classroom building and replacement with artificial grass surface play area.

**7. 2025/4253 - 2 Altenburg Gardens SW11 1JJ**

Demolition of existing office building (Class E) and erection of two storey (plus roof accommodation) residential building (Class C3) to provide 1 x 4-bedroom house with associated with associated amenity space, landscaping, boundary treatment, cycle and refuse storage.

**8. 2025/4124 - 89 Thurleigh Road SW12 8TY**

Alterations including erection of single storey front extension at first floor level, installation of windows to side elevation, replacement of garage door with glazing and louvers, erection of single storey rear extension and excavation to extend basement with rear lightwell. Landscaping including works to trees.

The Town Hall  
Wandsworth  
SW18 2PU

Mr Nick Calder  
Head of Development Management  
(Wandsworth)

19th December 2025

**Background papers:**

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

**(Paper No. 26-01)**

All reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committees, regulatory and other committees, the Executive and the full Council can be viewed on the Council's website (<https://democracy.wandsworth.gov.uk>) unless the report was published before May 2001, in which case the Democratic Services Officer (Callum Wernham – 020 8871 8347 or [Callum.Wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk](mailto:Callum.Wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk)) can supply it if required.

This page is intentionally left blank

WANDSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCILCONSERVATION AND HERITAGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE – 8TH JANUARY 2026

Report by the Chief Executive on recent decisions by the Planning Applications Committee and Head of Development Management (Wandsworth) on planning applications previously considered by the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee.

SUMMARY

In the period since the last meeting of the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee (CHAC), there have been 2 applications previously considered by CHAC that have determined by the Planning Applications Committee, and 4 applications previously considered by CHAC that have been determined by delegated authority. One further application has been withdrawn by the applicant, whilst one appeal has been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.

The details of these applications are contained in this report.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee is asked to receive the report as information.

**APPLICATION DETERMINED**

The following applications, previously considered by the Conservation and Heritage Advisory Committee, have been determined:

- 1. 2025/0225: Moira Court, Balham High Road, SW17 7AH 2025/2348 - Chivalry Hall 29A - 29B Chivalry Road, SW11 1HT**

Proposal: Alterations including installation of replacement windows and doors, roof covering with rooflights, solar panels and air source heat pump in connection with amalgamation of two dwelling houses into single 2-3 storey 6-bedroom dwelling house with associated landscaping and refuse storage. Ground floor side extension to create garden room and replacement of existing first floor projecting balconies.

**The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

The Committee queried whether the openings which housed the windows were original to the building. The Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer stated

**Decisions**

that it was understood that the central opening may have been previously altered, however there was no indication that the others had been altered. It was added that the proposal also included two of the window openings to be shortened to make each opening the same size.

It was commented that there had been no pre-application advice for this application.

The Committee raised concerns that the proposed balconies would be very large and imposing, whilst being visible from the street. It was commented that both proposed dwellings would have access to a garden area, which should negate the need for such large balconies.

Members of the Committee raised significant concerns as to the inclusion of proposed glazing bars on the windows, in addition to the proposed alteration of the size of the windows.

The Committee unanimously objected to the application on the grounds that the changes to the fenestration, particularly the Chivalry Row frontage, were unacceptable. The removal of the lancet windows on the side elevation and the changing of the size of the windows and addition of glazing bars would reduce the understanding of the original use of the hall. In addition, the Committee raised strong reservations to fenestration of the garden facing wall, and particularly to the depth of the proposed balconies.

**Decision:** Application withdrawn by the applicant.

**2. 2025/3192 - Land South of Tudor Lodge Health Centre, 8c Victoria Drive SW19**

Proposal: Erection of a 2-bedroom single storey plus basement level house with associated lightwells, hard and soft landscaping including new entrance gates, bin and bike store.

**The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

The Committee queried whether there was any precedent for the proposal to be a thatched roof. Officers stated that in relation to the previous application which had been rejected at appeal, the Inspector had made comments regarding the overly modern style of the proposal. As such, it appeared that the applicant had pivoted to a more traditional design.

The Committee raised concern regarding the proposal to thatch the property, especially given the drawings indicated that some of the walls were proposed to be thatched.

Concern was raised as to whether it was acceptable to build anything on this land. The Committee referred to the applicant's design and access statement, which indicated the need to retain the space and open land. In addition, Members of the

Committee raised objection to the loss of trees that would occur as a result of the proposed development.

The Committee unanimously objected to the proposal, raising strong reservations regarding the principle of development of the site, whilst adding that a building of this size and scale was completely inappropriate and out of character for its setting. The Committee added their endorsement to the objection raised by the Wandsworth Tree Wardens.

**Decision:** Planning permission refused by delegated authority for the following reasons:

- a) The proposed development would result in the loss of an existing area of open space, with no complementary provision to be made, contrary to Policy LP53 of the Local Plan (2023) and paragraph 104 of the NPPF (2024). The site is considered to contribute towards the open spacious character of the area. As such, the proposed loss of open space is considered to be unacceptable.
- b) By reason of the design, scale and siting of the proposed development, on land designated as a locally listed park, the development would constitute an incongruous addition to the locally listed park, causing harm to the character and appearance of the non-designated heritage asset, contrary to the purpose of including the site on the Local List. The public benefits put forward are not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. It is therefore considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the non-designated heritage asset contrary to paragraph 216 of the NPPF, London Plan Policy HC1, policies LP1 and LP3 of the Local Plan (2023) and the Historic Environment SPD (2016).
- c) A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) has not been submitted as part of this application and therefore the Council is unable to assess whether any additional information or details would need to be provided, if any further reports or surveys would be required to be carried out, therefore in the absence of this it is unable to determine if the proposal would be acceptable with regards to ecology and biodiversity considerations, contrary to policy LP55 of the Local Plan (2023).
- d) No Air Quality Impact Assessment or Air Quality Neutral Statement has been submitted as part of this application and therefore the Council is unable to assess whether any additional information or details would need to be provided or if any further reports or surveys would be required to be carried out, therefore in the absence of this it is unable to determine if the proposal would be acceptable with regards to air quality considerations, contrary to policy LP14 of the Local Plan (2023) and policy SI 1 of the London Plan (2021).
- e) In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and the Council has, as far as practicable,

**Decisions**

sought solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in the Local Plan consisting of the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies Document, Supplementary Planning documents and where appropriate the Site Specific Allocations Document as well as offering a full pre application advice service. However, we have been unable to seek solutions to problems as the principle of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

**3. 2025/3306 - 110-112 Putney High Street, SW15 1RG**

Proposal: Alteration including erection of rear extensions and front mansard roof extension to; existing ground floor commercial space, and in connection with change of use at upper floors to residential to create 2 x studio flats, 3 x 1-bedroom units and 3 x 2 bedroom units with associated amenity and service space.

**The Committee unanimously supported the application.**

It was noted that, in essence, the proposal would retain the front façade of the property whilst allowing for the redevelopment of the rest of the building.

The Committee considered that the Putney Society had considered this application, and they felt that allowing for a mansard roof was a positive addition as it gave each building its own mansard when viewed from the street.

Concern was raised as to how the floorplates would manage and support the double height window.

The Committee unanimously supported the application, whilst asking that the applicant further consider how floor would be supported in the middle of the large window and other associated matters regarding the proposed flat above.

**Decision:** Planning permission refused by delegated authority for the following reasons:

- a) The proposal by reason of its scale, design and massing would be an inappropriate addition that would be out of keeping with the existing building and approvals within this terrace failing to meet policies LP1 and LP3 of the Wandsworth Local Plan.
- b) The proposal due to its excessive bulk in terms of massing, height and depth would result in harm to the amenity of adjoining properties in terms of overbearing impact, loss of light, outlook and privacy failing to meet policy LP2 of the Wandsworth Local Plan.
- c) The proposals have not illustrated that the proposed units would achieve suitable levels of light and units on lower levels to the rear would have

restricted levels of outlook failing to meet policy LP27 of the Wandsworth Local Plan.

- d) Given the amount of plant and its location there is no noise impact assessment that confirms that there would be no harm to the windows or terraces of the host building or that of the adjoining properties in terms of noise disturbance, failing to meet policy LP14 of the Wandsworth Local Plan.
- e) The increased number of units would also put a strain on the existing waste collection point within the alleyway alongside the pub failing to meet policy LP2 of the Wandsworth Local Plan and the Reuse, Recycling and Waste SPD.
- f) In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive manner and the Council has, as far as practicable, sought solutions to problems arising in relation to dealing with the planning application. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in the Local Plan consisting of the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies Document, Supplementary Planning documents and where appropriate the Site Specific Allocations Document as well as offering a full pre application advice service, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably. In addition further guidance was offered to the applicant by the case officer during the processing of the application to identify amendments to address those elements of the scheme considered unacceptable. However, the necessary amendments to make the application acceptable are substantial and would materially change the development proposal. They would require further consultations to be undertaken prior to determination, which could not take place within the statutory determination period specified by the Department of Communities and Local Government. You are therefore encouraged to consider submission of a fresh application incorporating the material amendments set out below which are necessary to make the scheme acceptable. Required amendments: To the rear, the proposal would need to be significantly reduced in terms of massing to reduce harm to adjoining properties and the proposed extension would need to be altered to appear more in keeping with the terrace. To the front, the terrace should be removed, the large front dormer should be altered to three smaller dormers and the roof access should be removed. Additional information would need to be provided in terms of light, noise, cycle parking, biodiversity improvements and a reduction in flats is required to deal with waste concerns.

\*Note\* The applicant has lodged an appeal regarding this application. An update will be provided in a future Decisions Paper report once the outcome of the appeal has been determined.

#### **4. 2025/2531: Waterfall House, 223 Tooting High Street, SW17 0TD**

**Proposal:** Display of non-illuminated wall mounted fascia and boundary fronted fascia signs.

**Decisions****The Committee unanimously objected to the application.**

Officers noted that, to date, there was no decision regarding the appeal against the decision to refuse permission for a previously submitted scheme on the application site. Officers were hopeful that a decision would be forthcoming by the next meeting of the Committee.

A member of the Committee commented that the sign affixed to the boundary wall may be acceptable if it were to be mounted level and not follow the angle of the wall as currently shown. It was felt that this style of sign would not intrude on views of the listed building.

The Committee unanimously objected to the application, on the grounds that the proposed erection of a large sign in the proposed location would obscure the view of a very distinguished building in a prominent position at the entrance to the Borough and Tooting. Whilst the Committee had sympathy for the need for commercial use to be able to advertise, the proposal was deemed to be simply inappropriate for a Listed building.

**Decision:** Planning permission granted by delegated authority, in accordance with the plans submitted and subject to the conditions set out therein.

**5. 2025/1931: Rayne House Sudbrooke Road, SW12 8TP**

**Proposal:** Alterations including erection of additional floor of accommodation with balconies and excavation to enlarge basement including the formation of a front lightwell in connection with creation of 3 x1 bedroom flats.

**The Committee provided comment on the application.**

The Chair noted that the proposal was for a mid-rise building in a predominantly two-storey area, which could conflict with Local Plan Policy LP4. The Chair added that it was unfortunate that no visualisation was provided in relation to the impact of the proposal on local and statutorily listed buildings within Nightingale Lane and the Nightingale Lane Conservation Area.

Members of the Committee felt that the erection of an additional storey would have a detrimental impact to nearby conservation areas and Listed buildings. It was added that the approval of such a proposal could set a precedent for other sites being redeveloped in a similar manner, which would further impact the character of the area.

The Committee provided comment on the application. Whilst members of the Committee were not against the principle of adding another storey to a relatively modern block of flats, doing so to this building would result in a mid-rise building which would be contrary to Local Plan policy LP4. The Committee were unable to reach a view regarding the impact on the adjacent conservation area due to a lack of submitted information and visualisations. On the basis of what had been submitted,

the Committee were of the view that the application would be likely to have an adverse impact on the adjacent conservation area as the new height of the proposal would be overly dominant and out of keeping with its surroundings.

**Decision:** Planning permission refused by delegated authority for the following reasons:

- a) The proposed roof extension to form an additional storey, by reason of its siting, scale, height and design, would constitute an unsympathetic and incongruous form of development that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and streetscene. The proposed five-storey building would be located in an area outside of the identified mid-rise building zone and would represent an unacceptable and discordant transformative change within the location that would significantly harm local spatial character. In addition, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting, and therefore the significance, of the Nightingale Lane Conservation Area, Grade II listed 74 Nightingale Lane and the locally listed buildings nos. 68-70 Nightingale Lane, whilst failing to provide public benefit to outweigh the harm. As such, the proposal is contrary to the NPPF (2024), policy D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and policies LP1, LP3, LP4 and LP5 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023).
- b) By reason of design, location and internal arrangement, the development would fail to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers. Proposed Flats 1 and 2 would not be provided with a minimum of 2.5 metres floor to ceiling height across 75% of the Gross Internal Floorpace and Flat 3 would be located entirely at basement level with the lightwell providing restricted outlook, a harmful sense of enclosure and poor levels of privacy. These deficiencies would result in substandard and unsatisfactory living conditions contrary to Policy LP27 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023) and policy D6(8) of the London Plan (2021).
- c) In the absence of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would avoid harm to existing trees. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy LP56 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (2023).
- d) In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to make available detailed advice in the form of our statutory policies in the Local Plan as well as offering a full pre application advice service. However, we have been unable to seek solutions to problems as the principle of the proposal is clearly contrary to our statutory policies and negotiation could not overcome the reasons for refusal.

## **6. 2024/4463: Salvation Army Citadel 9 Ram Street SW18 1TJ**

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of a new six-storey building to provide flexible community/commercial use (Class F.2/E) on part of the ground floor with the remainder of the ground floor and the upper floors providing a 50-bedroom

## **Decisions**

hotel use (Class C1) with associated entrance/lobby, plant, refuse storage, cycle storage and landscaping.

### **The Committee unanimously supported the proposal.**

Members of the Committee heard that the previous building which had occupied the site included a number of interesting stone plaques. Unfortunately, the application to demolish and replace the building with the existing structure was never considered by the Committee.

The Committee unanimously supported the application, on the grounds that it was neatly designed on a small and landlocked site, which would feature as the corner property for the possible redevelopment of the wider area. The Committee noted that the applicant had worked with both the Council and Transport for London regarding parking and servicing space. The Committee commented that perhaps a slight increase to the height of the proposed pitched roof would create a more interesting design and screen elements of the plant which would be situated on the roof space.

**Decision:** Planning permission granted by the Planning Applications Committee, in accordance with the plans submitted and subject to the conditions set out therein, subject to legal agreement.

## **7. 2024/0307: Land at Whitnell Way, Ashburton, Chartfield Estate, SW15 6DG**

**Proposal:** Full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures (including garages, pramsheds, an existing substation and refuse store), site preparation works and the construction of 3 No. buildings (4/5 storeys in height) to provide 32 residential homes (Use Class C3), along with community use floorspace (Use Class F2) at ground floor of block facing Chartfield Avenue, vehicular access alterations, cycle and vehicle parking, alterations and enlargement/upgrade of childrens playground and associated landscaping, including works to trees.

### **The Committee unanimously supported the proposal.**

The Chair noted that this proposal was a good example of a problem that could arise when applications were received from within the Council. Whilst it was hoped that there was good communication between different Council departments and the Planning Authority, preferential treatment could not be given to the applicant purely because they were from within the Council.

The Committee discussed that there had been three public consultations in addition to a pre-application submission regarding this application. Members of the Committee were advised that the view from the Putney Society was that this type of application was what was to be expected to make use of 'spare' or underutilised space. It was noted that the Putney Society were not opposed to this application, whilst adding that five similar applications were under preparation and anticipated for submission.

In response to a query regarding the property mix on the north side of Chartfield Avenue, the Principal Urban Design Officer stated that there was a mixture of property types, including one large Victorian property, and more recent infills from the 1950's and 1960's. It was added that the proposed block was one storey lower than the block that would be adjacent.

The Committee noted that there had been a significant number of resident objections, primarily on the grounds of a loss of open space.

**Decision:** Planning permission granted by the Planning Applications Committee, in accordance with the plans submitted and subject to the conditions set out therein, subject to legal agreement (CIL liable).

#### **8. 2025/0648: 7 Vicarage Mansions Queenstown Road SW8 3RZ**

Proposal: Alterations including erection of mansard roof extension to create additional floor of accommodation

**The Committee unanimously objected to the proposals.**

The Chair noted that this particular application site had a long planning history.

In response to a question regarding installation of a lift, the Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer stated that there were no proposals to install a lift, whilst a staircase up to the proposed mansard was included within the application. Members of the Committee commented that it was likely that the applicant would be required to install a masonry staircase in place of the existing timber staircase to comply with building regulations.

The Committee queried the reasoning behind the proposed removal of the prominent rear chimney stack. The Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer stated that there was no obvious reason as to why the chimney was proposed to be removed.

The Committee discussed that the building had suffered as a result of development over time. The property had lost its string course, and was the subject of a number of drainpipes which serviced the individual flats, detracting from the character of the building. Concern was raised that approval of this application would threaten the important consistent composition of the square. The building was a prominent corner property, and the approval of this application could lead to applications for other properties seeking a fifth storey which would detract from the conservation area.

It was noted that the Battersea Society had raised significant concerns that this application would adversely alter the composition of St Philip's Square, which was the central square of the Park-Town Estate and conservation area. It was considered imperative to preserve and enhance the quality of the built environment in this historic area. Comments regarding the drainage clutter were echoed, as it detracted from the appearance of the building, particularly when viewed from the north frontage.

The Principal Conservation and Urban Design Officer noted that rationalisation of the pipework could form part of the planning balance as a minor heritage benefit. Such a proposal would likely require an amended application seeking wholesale redevelopment, which would only be sought if this was considered a sufficient heritage benefit to outweigh the harm.

**Decisions**

The Committee unanimously objected to the proposals on the grounds that the addition of a mansard roof would detract from the overall consistent built environment of St Philip's Square, the centrepiece of the Park-Town Estate. Should the application be approved, the Committee urged that a review and rationalisation of the pipework at the frontage of the property be included as part of the application.

**Decision:** Appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (planning permission refused).

**9. 2025/1986 - Putney Methodist Church Upper Richmond Road, SW15 6SN**

Proposal: Planning permission for installation of a new accessible entrance ramp and steps; replacement of existing entrance doors with power-assisted doors; creation of an internal glazed lobby; relocation of a brick pier; insertion of a new opening in the perimeter wall and railings; installation of a new noticeboard; construction of a new shared bin store screened by timber fencing; installation of raised solar panels on the south-facing roof slope and installation of an air source heat pump within the church tower.

**The Committee unanimously supported the proposal.**

It was noted that there had been no objections and 4 letters of support regarding this application, whilst the Putney Society were fully supportive of the proposal. In addition, it was commented that the addition of the proposed photovoltaic panels would generate enough electricity to remove the existing gas boiler.

A comment was raised regarding the need for the base of the proposed photovoltaic panels to be screened to dissuade colonisation by birds.

A Member of the Committee raised a query regarding the possibility of having a less distinctive ramp approach from the entrance to the car park to integrate it with the general entrance. It was noted that the applicant had met with community groups and the Putney Society, and had gone over their plans in considerable detail.

The Committee unanimously supported the application, and asked that the applicant allow for some further consideration regarding the design of the ramp.

**Decision:** Planning permission granted by delegated authority, in accordance with the plans submitted and subject to the conditions set out therein.

---

The Town Hall  
Wandsworth  
SW18 2PU

Andrew Travers  
Chief Executive

19th December 2025

**Background papers**

No background papers were used in the preparation of this report.

All reports to Overview and Scrutiny Committees, regulatory and other committees, the Executive and the full Council can be viewed on the Council's website (<https://democracy.wandsworth.gov.uk/ieDocHome.aspx>) unless the report was published before May 2001, in which case the Democratic Services Officer, Callum Wernham - 020 8871 8347 or [callum.wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk](mailto:callum.wernham@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk)) can supply it if required.

This page is intentionally left blank