

**London Borough of Wandsworth
CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS – RESPONSES ANALYSIS**

April 2023

Conservation Area

A public consultation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) for **Conservation Area** received **20** responses: **##** from members of the public and **##** from **local society etc.** **##** responses were in favour, **##** responses were neutral, and **##** responses disagreed with the draft CAA.

Respondent	Address within CA?	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
1	Yes	Neutral	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree 2. On behalf of the Directors of Valiant House Management Ltd and as a resident in Valiant House. Valiant House is a 1970s block of flats which sits within the Battersea Square Conservation Area. The block is situated on the riverfront and is referred to several times within the appraisal – albeit not in the most flattering terms. The block was the first post war residential development to be built on the London riverfront. It is situated in direct sightline of three Grade II listed properties (Devonshire House and the Old Vicarage, both in Vicarage Crescent and the Raven Public House in Battersea Church Road) and the Grade I listed St Mary’s Church. The residents of the 104 apartments care very much about their local neighbourhood and are keen to ensure its special character is protected and enhanced. We welcome the Appraisal and what is being proposed in the Management Strategy, including the extension of the area to incorporate the St John’s Estate. That said, we are surprised the Management Strategy stops short of providing the detailed guidance on future development which 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The Management Strategy is not exhaustive, and exclusion does not indicate proposals would be viewed as more acceptable / would not have to go through the same planning process. Many of the examples highlighted are covered under applicable planning policies and would be flagged to Conservation team. The categories that are included in the Management Strategy are considered to be the most relevant to this CA. Flats do not benefit from Permitted Development Rights and this is stated in the document. 3. Noted 5. Noted 6. Noted 	

			<p>has been included in the strategy for the neighbouring Battersea Park area. The sharp difference between the two documents might suggest the Council has decided to adopt a relatively light touch approach to development in and around the Square when compare the Management Strategy to the parallel sections of the Management Strategy for Battersea Park. The reasons for the disparity are far from obvious and there is a risk we are sending a signal to developers that the Council will offer greater latitude when considering development proposals for Battersea Square area compared to neighbouring areas. I will set out some specific examples of the omissions I am referring to although in practice we are calling for the two strategies to be more closely aligned.</p> <p>Satellite dishes In the Battersea Park Management Strategy it says: 2.10 Satellite dishes should not be erected on elevations or parts of roofs that are publicly visible from the surrounding streets. Instead they may be located on rear elevations (subject to planning permission in the case of flats) or on garden buildings that are out of sight In the Battersea Square Management Strategy, there is reference to solar panels, but it makes no mention on satellite dishes (or aerials or other transmitting devices). We believe this is a serious omission and needs to be addressed in the final document.</p> <p>Advertisement hoardings In the Battersea Park Management Strategy it says:</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>2.12 Advertising often requires consent from the Planning Service under the Advertisement Regulations. Shops may erect various signs without consent subject to certain restrictions, however illuminated signs always need consent in a conservation area. Hoardings usually require consent. Further information can be found on www.planningportal.gov.uk</p> <p>In Battersea Square there is no reference to advertising hoardings, again a serious omission.</p> <p>New buildings</p> <p>In the Battersea Park Management strategy it offers clear guidance on new development:</p> <p>2.41 It is Council policy to protect the buildings that make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area and these are shown on the townscape maps in the conservation area appraisal.</p> <p>2.42 Where there are sites that would not involve the loss of a positive building or a space that is of value to the character and appearance of the conservation area, a new building may be acceptable. Any new building should respect the scale, mass, height, quality, and visual interest of the positive buildings around it so that the positive aspects of the street scene can be maintained or repaired. Wandsworth Conservation & Design Group 97 Battersea Park Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy</p> <p>2.43 Only buildings of the highest quality that will enhance the character of the conservation area will be recommended for approval and all proposals for new buildings should benefit from discussions with the</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>Conservation and Urban Design Group before submission</p> <p>We believe it is important any new development within the area should conform to this guidance, particularly the reference to any new development respecting "...the scale, mass, height, quality and visual interest of the positive buildings around it".</p> <p>Blocks of Flats</p> <p>Again we quote from Battersea Park: Works to maisonettes, flat blocks and houses converted to flats: 3.2 These buildings do not benefit from permitted development rights and therefore most external alterations will require planning permission, including: Changing windows and front doors Reroofing and altering chimneys Cladding or rendering external walls Laying out a hard surface in the front garden Altering boundary treatments</p> <p>This applies equally to blocks in Battersea Square, as we in Valiant House are only too aware. As such, it should be made explicit in the Battersea Square Strategy</p> <p>3. Agree 5. Agree 6. Neutral</p>		
2.	Unsure	Neutral	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree 2. I noted with great concern that double glazing will not be supported - this position is entirely outdated given the impact of buildings' GHG emissions on climate change. 3. Disagree 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. Noted, and not the intention of this guidance – the wording will be reviewed to make the guidance on windows clearer about appropriate interventions 3. Noted 	

			<p>4. I do not see how BVL/ St. Johns Estate have anywhere near the same history or historical value as Battersea Square, hence don't see the benefit of adding these newer developments to a conservation area. I would object to this.</p> <p>5. Disagree</p> <p>6. Neutral</p> <p>7. Form only worked upon reloading</p>	<p>4. Noted regarding objection to boundary change to include the estate. The estate is a high quality, well maintained, and attractive complex which has influenced the development of the wider area and contributes to the history of the Area</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Noted</p>	
3.	Unsure	Agree	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. I agree overall but believe that Valiant House, although a brutalist form of architecture dating from around 1969/70, should be included in the new extended conservation area. It is an iconic development which has remained unchanged since it was built.</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Valiant House is already within the Conservation Area</p>	
4.	Unsure	Neutral	<p>1. The Battersea High Street Estate, Clancy Court, Morgan Court, Coles Court, (bordering Shuttleworth Rd; Trott Street and Battersea High Street) should be included in the conservation area. This estate was born to improve the specification of housing in this area and designed sympathetically with the area.. The flats and maisonettes have higher ceilings and larger windows than the old demolished premises. The whole estate is arranged so each block has light and not overlooked. There is a childrens area, block green space, parking etc. Built in 1970 this is now a classic architectural style. The whole Battersea High Street estate deserves conservation status, with clancy, morgan , coles courts being a priority.</p>	<p>1. Noted that it is felt Battersea High Street Estate should be included. Although the estate is well managed and of a good quality, it is not considered to have a strong enough link to the history and development of the identified conservation area. As flats, the estate also lacks permitted development rights, so further development / change is viewed as being sufficiently controlled under this scope. The inclusion may be reconsidered in future Appraisals</p>	
5.	Unsure		<p>1. Agree</p>	<p>1. Noted</p>	

			<p>2. A greater effort needs to be done to protect area from over development particularly developments above the standard 3-4 storey heights which also diminish the village feel and views. A greater effort should also be made to plant and protects existing trees and greenery.</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. It would also benefit from further expansion. Would it make sense to connect this area with Chelsea lot road area by extending a walking bridge / adjacent to existing bridge?</p>	<p>2. Noted</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. This area is not within Wandsworth and therefore cannot be included in the Conservation Area – it is in Hammersmith and Fulham</p>	
6.	Unsure	Agree	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. No more high-rise buildings... it obscures all the beautiful historical buildings</p> <p>3. Agree</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. Most positive</p>	<p>The supportive comments are noted.</p> <p>The comments regarding the high-rise building within the CA are noted and will be considered.</p>	
7.	Unsure	Neutral	<p>1. Disagree</p> <p>2. particularly found the desire for the retention of single glazed windows when repairing or replacing windows a concern. With Energy Proficiency Certificate (EPC) surveys now a factor in both the sale and rental of properties, single glazed windows make achieving a C rating standard or better impossible. Energy efficiency very much a key component in keeping heating costs down and being eco-friendly. Windows are a significant factor in reducing building heat loss. Double or triple glazed windows are the most practical solution. Though requiring like-for-like appearance of original style windows to maintain the look of the facade should be the norm. Overall, I found the appraisal</p>	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. There are means of installation that can achieve a good energy rating and preserve the characteristics of the area. The text will be reviewed and amended as necessary to clarify.</p> <p>3. Noted</p> <p>4. Noted</p> <p>5. Noted</p> <p>6. Noted</p> <p>7. Objection of inclusion of estate noted – the estate is well maintained, and the intention of inclusion is to recognise the quality of the estate as well as its role in the wider development of Battersea Square, occupying a significant portion of the area. As flats, the estate does not have permitted development</p>	

			<p>interesting, but tired of the downbeat assessment of so many of the buildings within the existing Conservation Area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Partially agree. 4. As a social meeting place the business fronts in the Square are important in keeping welcoming and relaxing visual environment 5. Disagree 6. Neutral 7. Wandsworth Council has invited the St Johns Estates (known as Battersea Village by the residents) to be included in the Battersea Square Conservation Area and each time the residents, the Residents Association, and the lessee owned Freeholder management company have politely declined. The main thrust of this appraisal appears to be a determination to force inclusion of the St Johns Estate into the Conservation Area. As a long-term resident of the St Johns Estate I am very content with how our Estate has been managed and maintained over four decades. Respect for the appearance of the buildings and grounds is a key component of the management strategy whilst also enabling sympathetic improvements to ensure the 1930's residential Houses are fit to handle climate changes, energy efficiency, and the digital services demanded. In previous visits to the St John Estate the Wandsworth Council representatives praised the management and maintenance of both the Estate buildings and the grounds and the determination to continue that standard. This appraisal has also been complimentary of the Estate. Nothing in the 	<p>rights, and all works require planning permission. This would remain the same should the estate become part of the Conservation Area. There would be no additional controls introduced as a result of designation.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>appraisal convinces me our Estate would benefit from incorporation into the Conservation Area. Instead, the opposite is my interpretation of the appraisal.</p>		
8.	Unsure	Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I agree that it is important to retain the character of the area and to avoid incongruity, but at the same time we need to avoid perpetuating the current situation that UK's older housing stock is some of the worst in Europe in terms of energy efficiency, humidity control and comfort of occupants. 2. Retaining and reconditioning original sash windows is seldom particularly effective at reducing draughts, avoiding rattles, and facilitating easy and noise-free opening and closing. Secondary glazing is unsightly, and mould builds up between the outer and inner glazing. Double glazing that replicates original windows but also has argon between the panels is the most effective in terms of energy efficiency, comfort, and reduction of outside noise. Trickle vents are also necessary to aid internal ventilation. Whilst all due regard should be given to the appearance and character of buildings, conservation areas should not be regarded as living museums - they are for living people and needs and conditions change over the decades. Traffic: it is indeed true that much of the character Battersea Village has been lost due to busy and fast-moving Vicarage Crescent. Any attempt to change this for the better, with traffic calming or even re-routing much of what uses it as a rat-run between 	<p>All supportive comments are noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Noted regarding windows – the text will be reviewed and amended as necessary to clarify the guidance. Noted regarding traffic 3. Noted 4. Noted 5. Objection of inclusion of estate noted – the estate is well maintained, and the intention of inclusion is to recognise the quality of the estate as well as its role in the wider development of Battersea Square, occupying a significant portion of the area. As flats, the estate does not have permitted development rights, and all works require planning permission. This would remain the same should the estate become part of the Conservation Area. There would be no additional controls introduced as a result of designation. 	

			<p>Battersea Park Road and Battersea Bridge, would be welcome.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. It is accessible and user-friendly. 4. Don't know 5. My chosen Conservation Area is the St. John's Estate (Eaton, Haythorn, Archer etc. Houses) and I disagree that this area should form part of the Conservation Area. We have a Board and Managing Agents who are very diligent in ensuring that any alterations carried out to flats in the development are done so with all required permissions, planning consent where applicable, and adherence to guidelines for all exterior appearance - windows, doors, etc 6. Positive 		
9.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disagree 2. The St John's Estate is currently well-managed, as indicated in the appraisal but as individually owned flats, owners have included or may wish to include solid wood double-glazing to save heating. This is an essential requirement in improving the Electrical Performance Certificate, changes being brought in during 2023. The need to save energy is sadly ignored in the Conservation Appraisal where the need to keep single-glazed windows is emphasised, which seems an amazingly retrograde step. The change would mean that planning permission would be needed for simple things such as tree pruning for safety measures, an unnecessary extra burden on the already overworked Planning Department. 3. Whilst generally well laid out there are some material errors in respect of the St John's Estate; 	<p>All comments are noted</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.The concern regarding the windows is noted however, there are other methods of insulation to help save energy that can be sympathetic to the unique features of the area. Applying for Planning application would help the LPA monitor and agree to the changes of the CA. The guidance on windows will be reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to provide further clarity. 3.It have been noted there is some confusion with the named buildings in the area this will be addressed. 4. It is noted the respondent does not agree with the proposed changes to the CA. 5. As flats, there is no permitted development, and planning permission is already required – 	

			<p>the picture describes one building as "Archer House" when it clearly relates to White House. The St John's Estate has not existed since 1981 and is currently known as Battersea Village. Few residents would know what St John's Estate meant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Disagree 5. Huge concern over the restrictions which would prevent the Directors of Battersea Village running the estate in line with the lease and their responsibilities to leaseholders if the need for planning applications were required for every activity. 6. Disagree 7. Mostly positive 8. Nicely laid out and an interesting read although it is now out of date as both The Woodman and the Quecumber Bar are closed, as is the Gordon Ramsey restaurant on Vicarage Crescent. Some of the pictures are wrongly captioned. 	<p>inclusion of the estate within the Conservation Area would not change this, nor would it introduce any further controls.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Noted 7. Noted 8. The captions of photos will be reviewed and amended as necessary 	
10.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree 2. I am pleased the anomaly regarding the properties opposite the KLS building, starting from 4 Orville Rd to the corner opposite Fred Wells Gardens, will be resolved. To have continued to have one half of the development in the conservation area and the other half outside it, when all the facades are identical, would have been unfair and infuriating for the residents. Either have all the development within the conservation area or set out side it. I am glad that a decision has been made either way. As it happens the development will sit outside the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The supportive comment is noted. 2. Noted 3+4. The positive comments are noted 5. Noted as above 6. 6. Noted 	

			<p>Battersea Square conservation area and I think that is right given the age of the development.</p> <p>3. Easy to use and convenient.</p> <p>4. Agree</p> <p>5. I am pleased the anomaly regarding the properties opposite the KLS building, starting from 4 Orville Rd to the corner opposite Fred Wells Gardens, will be resolved. To have continued to have one half of the development in the conservation area and the other half outside it, when all the facades are identical, would have been unfair and infuriating for the residents. Either have all the development within the conservation area or set out side it. I am glad that a decision has been made either way. As it happens the development will sit outside the Battersea Square conservation area and I think that is right given the age of the development.</p> <p>6. Positive</p>		
11.	Unsure	Agree	1. Agree	The supportive comment is noted	
12.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	<p>1. Agree</p> <p>2. I think overall it is very strong and a good assessment of the Square and surrounding areas. I have a few points to add:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The solar panels on lampposts are visually unappealing and detract from the look of the square. They arrived when they put up the Christmas lights and so far haven't been taken down - this likely means they serve no purpose all year round, only for the Christmas lights, so should be taken down for the rest of the year. - Shop fronts in the square: Since the photographs were taken, the turquoise shopfront has now been painted black and has a "make shift" banner 	<p>1.The supportive comments are noted.</p> <p>2. The supportive comment have been noted.</p> <p>The further comments regarding the other unsympathetic alterations within the CA that have been observed. The CA will aim to conserve and enhance the characteristic identified. Unfortunately, it is outside of the realms of the conservation to advise what shops open within certain building. It is outside the remit of the Appraisal to address the footbridge – comments will be passed to relevant departments. Comments are most impactful if passed to your local councillor.</p>	

			<p>hanging off it with 'Battersea Rickshaw' written on it. This looks shabby (can you insist the restaurant get a more permanent sign?) and the black is far too dark and gloomy for the square, the old blue colour was much nicer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Candyland signage is very tacky and shabby and does not reflect the character of the square at all. This coupled with the bars on the windows makes it a very unsightly view at a prominent point of the square. - The bright yellow and blue painted houses (which were picked up in the assessment) should be painted a more sympathetic colour asap. - There have been a number of hospitality closures in the area recently. Thankfully the Woodman has now reopened, but the local residents are concerned about who and what will take over at London House. This is arguably the most prime development on the Square and the new tenant should be one that is in keeping with the village character. Do we get a say in what can open there as locals? - Just Eat signs should be removed and not be allowed to be displayed on the square as they are bright orange and garish. - This may not be the forum for this request, but I would like to extend a plea to consider the footbridge over to Imperial Wharf station be reconsidered. This would provide such a boost to the area (given the 170 is buckling under pressure these days) and we are so far from a station. Either that, or a pier on this side of the river to 	<p>6. Unfortunately supporting local businesses is beyond the scope of the conservation appraisal.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>connect us better with the new Power Station would be amazing.</p> <p>3. Don't Know 4. Don't know 5. Mostly positive 6. Local, independent businesses are the lifeblood of the character of the square and they are really struggling. If anything can be done to help them out, this would be really appreciated I'm sure. Thank you!</p>		
13.	Unsure	Agree	<p>1. Agree 2. I do not think it is appropriate to criticise residential buildings which are actually people's homes in this way. These are matters of opinion and not fact."The ground floor treatment is flat and unattractive, lacking any detail or visual relief. The glazed sections are irregular, and given the use as private office space, the blinds are permanently drawn, creating an inactive street frontage. The west end is rendered which is unpleasant and uncharacteristic of the area, and the turning of the corner, while intended to mitigate the mass of the building, invites the eye to the car park beyond and unsightly Valiant House, and is not a view that needs to be emphasised. 3. Agree 4. Disagree 5. Positive</p>	<p>1.The supportive comment is noted 2. The comments regarding the regarding the residential buildings are noted. The aim of the CA appraisal to help protect the remaining character and to encourage the enhancement of the identified characteristics of the area. The inactive frontage has been identified as detracting from the more active nature of the Square. 3.The supportive comment is noted 4. It noted that the respondent does not agree with the proposed boundary change. 5. The positive comment is noted</p>	
14.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	<p>1. Agree</p>	<p>The supportive comment has been noted.</p>	

15.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	1. Agree	The supportive comment has been noted.	
16.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	1. Agree 2. Agree 3. Agree	The supportive comments have been noted.	
17.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	1. Agree 2. Agree 3. Agree 4. Positive	All comments have been noted.	
18.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	1. Agree 2. The continuing increase in the volume of polluting traffic is detrimental to the whole concept of `preservation` 3. Don't Know 4. Disagree 5. Mostly Positive	1.The supportive comment is noted 2. The comment is noted regarding the volume of traffic however, this is beyond the realms of conservation area appraisal. Comments passed to relevant departments 3. Noted 4.It is noted the respondent does not agree with the new proposed boundary change. 5. Noted	
19.	Yes/ No/ Unsure		1. Agree 2. The appraisal makes an important point about the volume of through traffic affecting the area significantly. Reducing this through traffic should be a future management priority for the Council. This could at the same time enable improving the through-cycling provision to move significant commuter cycling from river path to, for example, segregated bike paths in Battersea Church Road and Westbridge Road. 3. Agree 4. Agree 5. Mostly Positive	All the supportive comments have been noted.	

20.	Yes/ No/ Unsure	Agree	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree 2. Agree 3. Agree 4. Mostly Positive 	All comments have been noted.	
21.			<p>You have included St John's Estate in the current Conservation Area Appraisal despite the fact this makes it harder to manage and maintain the properties, including changes to windows and solar panels - against both sustainability values and goals, as well as creating additional costs for residents in the long term. Considering the other developments that surround the estate whom have already ignored this, it seems unreasonable to extend this conservation area with no recourse for local residents nor support from the Council in terms of Grants to help with the associated costs you will force on the area.</p>	<p>Objection of inclusion of estate noted – the estate is well maintained, and the intention of inclusion is to recognise the quality of the estate as well as its role in the wider development of Battersea Square, occupying a significant portion of the area. As flats, the estate does not have permitted development rights, and all works require planning permission. This would remain the same should the estate become part of the Conservation Area. There would be no additional controls introduced as a result of designation.</p>	
			<p>It's great to see so much of the history of the area brought to life in the proposal but as I've mentioned previously our estate, which is 200 Abodes and one of the beating hearts of the high street seems to have so far been airbrushed out of that story. The only reference to it is as follows.</p> <p><i>Otherwise, the east side has largely been redeveloped with local authority housing of the 1960's that contrasts with the established pattern of development, and while not forming part of the Conservation Area, largely forms its setting.</i></p> <p>I think this is factually wrong. I'm pretty sure Lindsay Court was built pre 1960s, There used to be a lovely plaque commemorating its opening but it got stolen/removed and was never replaced. If memory serves me right it was</p>	<p>It is noted that it is felt the estate is not properly addressed. While the estate is well managed and of a good quality, it is not considered to have a strong enough link to the history and development of the identified conservation area to merit inclusion. As flats, the estate also lacks permitted development rights, so further development / change is already well controlled within this scope. The inclusion within the Conservation Area would not change this, nor introduce further controls. The inclusion may be reconsidered in future Appraisals.</p> <p>Noted regarding potentially incorrect dates – these will be reviewed and amended accordingly</p>	

		<p>built 1957, pre Powrie House or at the same time as it. (I'm not sure about the other blocks but as you will see they all form part of a whole architectural plan)</p> <p>Aside from whether of not the estate should form part of the conservation area I'd just love to encourage some more effort to be spent on uncovering the history of the estate. It was quite well thought out at the time, with each block having green spaces and amenities, playgrounds etc. I notice the conservation area includes one of the estate's gardens by the church. It feels a bit weird to cherry-pick the resident's community garden while leaving out the rest of the estate from the conservation area? I'm not entirely sure about the ramifications of being included in the conservation area but going off the intro:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the historic and architectural character and appearance of the area which will assist applicants in making successful planning applications and decision makers in assessing planning applications; • Raise public interest and awareness of the special character of their area; • Identify the positive features which should be conserved, as well as negative features which indicate scope for future enhancements. <p>It would seem it could help protect the area from future negative planning applications should the estate ever get redeveloped. I note that the new building next to Morgan court is part of the conservation yet marked as negative. Something all the residents raised at the time of the planning application (it used to be a wonderful old pub called 'The Castle') yet still it was granted to be built? One</p>	<p>Noted it is felt the garden is 'cherry picked' from the estate – the garden is included as it is adjacent to the listed church and forms part of the churches setting – it was felt omitting the garden but including the church would be less clear.</p> <p>Noted it is felt inclusion would offer more protection – as flats, works already require planning permission as there are no permitted development rights to flats. The good condition of the estate indicates that good planning decisions are already being made Views of newer building to Morgan Court noted – permission was granted as it was determined by planning that the benefits of the building outweighed any identified harm.</p> <p>This does not mean the building makes a positive contribution to the identified character. The building remains within the boundary as the boundary is historic Examples of newer development within the boundary of the Conservation Area noted – these are all developments of earlier sites which were within the Conservation Area when it was designated. The boundary is not amended to include or omit individual buildings unless there is a clear and robust justification for doing so.</p> <p>The pride of residents in the estate is noted – exclusion from the conservation area is not intended to negatively reflect on the estate – it is simply reflective of a different character and</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>learning for the council might be to understand how this state of affairs came to be and why it was granted so relatively recently?)</p> <p>So, in order to fulfil the stated objectives of the appraisal, we do not feel it is complete until more research is done in telling the story of the Battersea High Street Estate, one of the most diverse and eclectic areas of the Square & High street. We also don't understand why it has not been included when there are at least 4 examples of newer or similar buildings within the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No. 1 Battersea Square 2. The redevelopment at The Castle Pub 3. The New development south of the Former Library, just north of the train bridge over the high street 4. Powrie House <p>I thought it might also be interesting to send you Master plans for the estate drawn up but our own residents' circle 2016, as well as plans for public art mosaic projects to give a flavour of the expertise and care that our residents show for the area. Being a Council owned estate I just would have thought the Council would want to shine a light on its own buildings and show a similar level of care and attention (as well as support) to our community.</p>	<p>appearance than that which has been identified in the Appraisal</p>	
		<p>I wish to object strongly to the Battersea Square Conservation Area Appraisal No.9.</p> <p>In particular, I see no valid reason to include the St. Johns Estate, comprising Eaton house, Haythorn House, Archer House, Wite House and Winfield House.</p>	<p>Objection of inclusion of estate noted – the estate is well maintained, and the intention of inclusion is to recognise the quality of the estate as well as its role in the wider development of Battersea Square, occupying a significant portion of the area. As flats, the estate does not have permitted development</p>	

		<p>My experience if this estate is from visiting it to meet friends for 20 years and subsequently purchasing an apartment on the estate in 2019.</p> <p>St Johns Estate is self-contained private estate and many parts are not externally visible.</p> <p>The St. Johns Estate is well maintained without changing the appearance. Examples are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Painting of the wood on the buildings is carried out on a regular basis to maintain the look & feel. • Gardeners visit on a regular basis to maintain grass, shrubs and hedges. Trees are also assessed for work (e.g. trimming) on a regular basis by qualified tree companies. • Replacement Double Glazing has to be of wood, replacement sash and exactly match the dimensions of the current windows. • There are full time 'porters' to ensure the cleanliness of the estate, plus other duties. <p>Archer House has central heating and hot water supplied by a single source. All other Houses were built to use electricity. Apparently, providing gas to the other Houses is not feasible (and would alter the exterior of the properties). Therefore, with the difference in process for Gas and Electricity, many leaseholders are being significantly financially impacted by the high costs to provide heating and hot water. All external walls are solid (and in excess of 1 inches thick), external insulation is not permitted and therefore the options to improve insulation are significantly limited – prohibiting replacement double glazing (see above) would likely see many leaseholders with an EPC rating below 'C' (i.e. expensive to heat ... and</p>	<p>rights, and all works require planning permission. This would remain the same should the estate become part of the Conservation Area. There would be no additional controls introduced as a result of designation.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

		<p>Secondary Glazing is never as effective as Double Glazing, particularly for sash windows).</p> <p>All costs are provided (on an 'equal' basis) by all leaseholders.</p> <p>Overall, the St Johns Estate is significantly well maintained while adhering to the same overall style over many years. Adding it to the Conservation area will necessarily add additional time and money for both the Borough and the Estate. I believe that deferring a Consultation for decision for 3-5 years would benefit all concerned.</p> <p>Therefore, as stated earlier I object to the St Johns Estate being included within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Further to my e-mail below, please note that it is not necessary for double glazed sash windows to have an exterior (unsightly) trickle bar vent.</p> <p>Mine have trickle vents but they cannot be seen from the exterior – it depends on the supplier.</p>		
		<p>Introduction</p> <p>The appraisal is incomplete as it lacks guidance for those wishing to alter their property, concentrates too much on the Square and its buildings and does not set out details of current issues and how the Council plans to manage these. The appraisal states that: <i>This Appraisal has summarised the strengths and weaknesses of the area and this management plan will set out a strategy to consolidate and enhance these strengths and prevent further erosion of the area's special historic and architectural character and appearance.</i></p> <p>We can find no text setting out this strategy.</p> <p>Guidance</p> <p>A key principle for conservation areas is to repair and maintain rather than replace with the further aim of reinstating missing features where possible. While the</p>	<p>The intention of Part Three: Management Strategy is to serve as guidance about the most appropriate ways to alter properties. The guidance is applicable to the entire Area, but proposals are considered on a case-by-case basis and contextual to the application site.</p> <p>Part 3 is the strategy</p> <p>Guidance – many of these same elements (windows, doors) are included within the Management Strategy. The elements included are not exhaustive but reflect those most relevant to development pressures identified in the Area. All applications are considered contextually to the application site. The</p>	

		<p>historic information is valuable a key reason for appraisals is to set out both the Council’s strategy for conserving and maintaining the area and how those wishing to make changes to their property can support this. A useful example can be found on pages 90-111 of the Battersea Park Conservation Area Appraisal. This clearly sets out important principles and gives detailed commentary on how a resident might apply these principles while undertaking necessary repairs and alterations.</p> <p>Battersea Square: The strategy appears to be restricted to the Square itself rather than the wider area and is not sufficiently clear about the different types of buildings, the variety of flats, houses and retail and commercial premises.</p> <p><i>Design and Access Statements:</i> We are aware that these are not mandatory but guidance should clearly identify these as essential elements of a thoughtful planning application.</p> <p><i>Statutorily and locally listed buildings:</i> There is a lack of guidance relating to these.</p> <p><i>Changes needing planning consent.</i> A list of these should be included.</p> <p>Issues</p> <p>While not all these are solely related to planning we are taking advantage of the draft appraisal to raise these issues.</p> <p><i>Change from retail to residential:</i> The strategy should include a clear indication that the Council will resist this. They might also suggest that grants could be available for upgrading retail fronts such as that shown for Candy Land and reinstating original window designs and other original features (if this is still the case).</p>	<p>relevant text will be reviewed and amended as necessary to clarify this</p> <p><i>Design and Access Statements:</i> outside the remit of the Appraisal</p> <p><i>Statutorily and locally listed buildings:</i> These are policy considerations which fall under the remit of the Planning Act as well as the Local Plan</p> <p><i>Changes needing planning consent –</i> It would not be practical to include an exhaustive list and this information can be found online via the planning portal etc. Applicants are encouraged to contact the planning department should they have specific queries or seek pre-application advice.</p> <p><i>Issues - Change from retail to residential –</i> From 1 August 2021 the government introduced permitted development rights for this change of use and therefore this can be carried out without the need for planning permission. Grants are unfortunately no longer available due to costs.</p> <p><i>Closure of business at 7-9 Battersea Square and the deterioration of that building -</i> Noted</p> <p><i>Lack of public access to the Square:</i> Comments noted but outside the remit of the Appraisal – will be passed to relevant department</p> <p><i>Traffic:</i> Outside the remit of the Appraisal but comments passed to relevant department</p> <p><i>St. Mary’s Churchyard and Slipway:</i> Outside the remit of the Appraisal but comments passed to relevant department</p>	
--	--	---	---	--

		<p><i>Closure of business at 7-9 Battersea Square and the deterioration of that building.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of public access to the Square:</i> So much of the seating space is now taken over by restaurants that it has become inhospitable to other than a paying public. There are only three public benches and sometimes tables are pushed right up close to them, making them uninviting to anyone not in the Square for a meal. Battersea Square should remain a public space with some restaurant use rather than restricted to those who can afford to eat and drink there.</p> <p><i>Traffic:</i> The appraisal mentions this in passing but there is no mention of how this might be managed. The extension to Thomas's School will exacerbate this.</p> <p><i>St. Mary's Churchyard and Slipway:</i> The slipway is an important part of the history and the life of the area but there has been a failure of the Council to deal with the perpetual drug, alcohol and noise issues. As a result it is often not welcoming to those who would like to simply, and quietly, enjoy the space.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The Planning Committee of the Battersea Society looks forward to contributing further to the development of this and other Conservation Area Appraisals.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--