

## London Borough of Wandsworth

### CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS – RESPONSES ANALYSIS

April 2023

#### Magdalen Park

A public consultation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) for Magdalen Park Conservation Area received 65 responses, 64 from members of the public, and one from Historic England. 11 responses agreed with the proposals, 47 disagreed, and 7 were neutral.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
1	Disagree	Forcing a historic aesthetic on what are current dwellings doesn't seem right to me - old designs and methods may be distinctive but they also often mean poorly lit, small, insecure and energy inefficient residential properties. Most of the changes shown in the consulting document that home owners have made to their properties have improved those properties and are a sign of a vibrant, healthy suburban community. Those residents not motivated to upkeep and improve their property will be fine to leave things, whereas those who want to improve will likely be forced in higher payments to conform with a restrictive set of rules. I also think article 4 directions will lower community spirit - new regulations will lead to small numbers of curtain-twitchers imposing themselves as the judge and policeman of the neighbourhood - reporting old changes as new and creating stress, friction and conflict. It's unnecessary made-work for the council and resources could be better employed elsewhere - for instance if the council cares about how the estate looks, why can't we have proper bins rather than having to dump our binbags outside the house every week.	Comments noted.  Issues with bins are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Waste Services.	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
2	Disagree	<p>Deeming our area a conservation area has always seemed like a silly a joke ! I have lived in this estate for 30+ years owning x2 different properties- despite strict planning rules imposed at the planning stage in any application , the council does NOT and never has enforced any conservation planning rules set out in the conservation plan on the ground - most of the original front gardens / fences / windows / front doors/ render have all been altered with cheap &amp; somethings ugly plastic versions without any planning and the aesthetic of the original estate in no more ! It is too late for this unless you are going to go around enforcing all the rules and making every property owner restore to the original it's a pointless exercise - your 40 years too late.</p> <p>The original architecture you trying to preserve is already lost due to very poor / non existent enforcement to protect it for years.</p> <p>Please either retrospectively enforce the conservation aesthetician or don't bother</p>	<p>The Magdalen Park Conservation Area was designated in May 1989 for its special architectural and historic interest, as set out in the 'Summary of Special Character' section of the Appraisal which identifies the special character and significance of the Area. As part of the appraisal process, a review of the condition of the Area was carried out. The conclusion was that despite piecemeal erosion, all areas of the Conservation Area are still worthy of inclusion.</p> <p>Some alterations (such as to fences, window, doors, and front gardens) were (prior to the Article 4 Direction) Permitted Development. The Council cannot undertake enforcement action on changes which have been in place for more than four years. The Council does not have the ability to make owners restore original features if no planning application has been submitted. The Appraisal instead seeks to provide Design Guidance and examples of original features to enable residents to make alterations to their properties which preserve the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original features, the original architecture and form of the Conservation Area is still very much present, albeit at risk from further erosion due to changes being carried out under permitted development rights.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
3	Agree (except for solar panel design guidance)	Solar panels on south-facing roofs are not detrimental to the character of the estate and they should not be limited to only non-principal or non-street facing roof pitches. This flies in the face of all common sense, of Wandsworth's environmental policies, and the local plan. It is, frankly, ridiculous design guidance.	Comments noted. National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	No
4	Agree	I'm in favour of keeping everything preserved the way it was intended but you are literally 30 years too late. It's almost pointless now, everything has already changed.  Again it's a nice idea but way too late. There's very little consistency left to protect, short of forcing people to put wooden fences back in etc.	Comments noted.  The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. The Council is now seeking to prevent further erosion through the updated Appraisal and Article 4 Direction. The Design Guidance provides advice to enable residents to make alterations to their properties which preserve the character and appearance of the area. Examples of surviving original features which can be restored/reinstated are also provided in the Appraisal.	No
5	Disagree	I very much disagree with removing permitted development rights in this area. It is already totally wrong that we cannot smooth render our houses to get rid of the pebble dash.	Comments noted.  Traditional roughcast render is a distinctive original feature of the houses within the Magdalen Park Conservation Area and contributes to its character and appearance. Smooth render is discouraged and	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
			would not normally gain planning permission. The change from pebbledash to render is already not permitted under PD rights as part of Conservation Area designation.	
6	Disagree	The restrictions already in place in this conservation area, on what you can do with your own property, are already enough. It is ridiculous that I would need planning permission for something like repainting the front of my house to keep it looking smart and tidy.	Comments noted.	No
7	Disagree	I think it is already restrictive enough and the works people want to do to the houses are to improve them. It is the houses that remain in council ownership that are in poor condition and the council should invest in them to improve the lives of the tenants and the aesthetics of the area. I also think the council tightly controlled the materials used for the finish of our rear extension. This was costly and time consuming and this is a part of the house not seen from the road so the council do not need to have such control.  The original doors and windows are insecure and modern equivalents should be permitted.	Comments noted. We cannot comment on individual planning applications as part of this consultation.  Guidance on suitable replacement doors and windows can be found in the Management Plan. Good quality examples of doors and windows are also identified throughout the Appraisal.	No
8	Disagree	I strongly disagree with the proposals. They are unnecessarily onerous on homeowners and will delay and prevent necessary improvements to properties. If for example a front door gets damaged due to a break in, planning permission must be sought before a replacement can be installed? Ridiculous and unnecessary extra expense and delay. Many homeowners agree that updating, modernising and making the area more aesthetically pleasing is important. We like the modern villa look. Whilst we appreciate and respect	Comments noted. Alterations which are sympathetic would likely achieve planning permission. The document is intended as guidance for best practice so that alterations are in keeping with the identified character and appearance of the Area.  In this instance of a damaged door, a matching door could be replaced without permission. A sympathetic	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>the history of the area, we are also keen to sympathetically and tastefully improve our own properties. These proposals are wholly disproportionate and unwelcome by myself and many other residents</p>	<p>door could be inserted, and retrospective permission sought to ensure the style and design is appropriate.</p>	
9	Disagree	<p>I strongly disagree with the existing restrictions and the proposal to introduce further restrictions. These make the Magdalen conservation area not only look dated, and therefore affect the house prices / value in the area, but also impacts the efficiency and performance of the properties. I do respect the history of the area, however, we should live in the present, not the past. The Council should use their resources and people’s money to improve the area, rather than restricting people to do so.</p> <p>No two properties in the area look the same. So I am struggling to understand what the Council is trying to preserve.</p> <p>There are also wild inconsistencies in what has been deemed permissible within the Fieldview Estate. It is ridiculous what some properties have been allowed to do while others within close proximity and full view of ‘public highways’ have faced restrictions / enforcements.</p> <p>How can the Council consider restricting the usage of solar panels!? This contradicts the Government and Council’s environmental objectives.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Council is seeking to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in accordance with our statutory duty set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. These traditional and original features make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Area.</p> <p>Each planning application is considered on its own merits. What may be deemed appropriate for one building may not be for another. Buildings with greater visibility from public vantage points are less suitable for alteration or extension, as the changes would be more visible from within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
			appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.	
10	Agree	<p>I think it is a good idea to have homes think about maintaining the character of the area, however the council needs to be mindful of improvements that can/should be made to a) help tackle the climate crisis (i.e. solar panels, more trees) and b) make houses more energy efficient (i.e. better doors, glazed windows).</p> <p>The list of proposed changes should be at the top of the page, so that the 'what you need to know' is clear. Then the rest of the information could have been better presented.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Double or even triple glazed windows are acceptable, as long as the overall design of the windows match the original. Secondary glazing is also an effective option. Similarly with doors, new doors should match the original, or existing doors can be draught proofed. Examples of original windows and good quality doors can be found in the Appraisal. Text to be reviewed and made clearer if necessary</p> <p>Comments noted. The layout of the Appraisal can be reviewed to include a section setting out the proposed changes.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
11	Agree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Support noted	No
12	Disagree	<p>Having lived in the area for over 25 years, my view is that the overall look and feel of the houses has improved over time. The works that have been carried out have improved the properties and I don't see any need to add additional restrictions to the works property owners can currently carry out. Most major changes that would materially alter the look of a property would require planning permission in any event.</p> <p>What has significantly changed over the years is the volume of litter on and around Magdalen Road. Taking action on the litter issue in the area is, in my opinion, far more important and impactful to the look of the area and general wellbeing of local residents than the proposed Plan</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The issue of litter is beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Waste Services.</p>	No
13	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted	No
14	Disagree	<p>A complete waste of time and will only add more unnecessary red tape for straightforward property maintenance confusing , deterring and ultimately preventing residents from improving their residences.</p> <p>Adding this buildings to the local list will only serve to delay any necessary maintenance works on them going forward.</p> <p>What could have been a simple document has been very poorly laid out and made un-necessarily complicated. Making it a laborious task to review and comment upon, potentially this is done purposefully to deter meaningful engagement with the document from the public.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to guide future changes and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area.</p> <p>Adding a building to the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the maintenance of the buildings.</p> <p>Comments noted. The updated Appraisal is intended to be clear and easily accessible, avoiding the use of large PDF files which present accessibility issues.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		A wholly overcomplicated and un-necessarily waste of effort from Wandsworth to only provide more red tape where it is not required diverting actual planning resource from meaningful work.		
15	Disagree	<p>Whilst I respect the need to preserve the area this goes against the current pressures that families are facing (ranging from cost of childcare to unaffordable housing). Being able to do simple home improvements to our existing properties without the burden of this extra burocracy is paramount. New proposals will add extra cost to improvements (needing specialist doors, fences, windows), make it harder to extend living areas (such as rules on back facing roof extensions) and put off potential newcomers to the area who are already concerned by current restrictions the conservation area places.</p> <p>I disagree with the addition of Earlsfield Primary as it will make harder for the school to adapt to more modern schooling practices and needs, such as by building extra additions or improving the current structures</p> <p>Tech side is ok however the jargon used makes it hard to actually understand what new rules will be compared with what we have currently. Need a simple (currently its X and after this it will be Y).</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Earlsfield Primary School is already a Locally Listed building. Inclusion on the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the maintenance of the building.</p> <p>Comments noted. The layout of the Appraisal can be reviewed to include a section setting out the proposed changes.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments
16	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted.	No
17	Disagree	Whilst I am sympathetic to the notion that some of the original character helps bring the whole estate together, it is ludicrous to enforce this upon home owners and require planning permission for things like windows and doors. The	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The issues of crime, dog mess and litter are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments</p>	No



Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		reality is this will just put people off investing their money into the housing stock, some of which is in an absolutely woeful condition. I get the sentiment, but the execution is a blunt tool to a nuanced issue. It will just mean further decay of the houses within the estate that haven't been refurbished and a lot of ill feeling from homeowners. Why don't you spend money tackling the crime, dog mess and mountains of litter on the estate instead?	on dog mess and litter on to our colleagues in Waste Services	
18	Disagree	Implementing additional rules will not attain the desired effect, properties have already been changed and so this is very much after the horse has bolted. Making further restrictions now is nonsensical.	Comments noted. The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. The Council is now seeking to prevent further erosion through the updated Appraisal and Article 4 Direction. This is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area.	No
19	Agree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Support Noted	No
20	Disagree	I disagree with the changes outlined in the Article 4 directions for the area and think these highly restrictive rules will only lead to a further decline in the aesthetic of the estate. Having lived in Earlsfield for a number of years I have seen the Openview Estate slowly improve as people invest money in their homes and the quality of the area. What was previously a quit shabby looking area is now slowly starting to look like those who live there take pride in the area in which they live.	Comments noted.  The maintenance of the pavements and roads are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Roads and Transport. The condition of the council-owned houses is beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Housing.	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>If people are unable to even do simple things like paint their property or improve their front garden, without applying for and receiving planning permission, then the area is going to start going backwards again. Living costs are high as it is, and most people will choose to forego the cost and bureaucracy leading to further degradation of the housing stock in the area.</p> <p>While I can just about understand the desire to maintain the pebbledash on properties, to require planning to paint and weather-proof that which may be in disrepair is a draconian measure from an overbearing council.</p> <p>Rather than further restricting the rights of those who choose to make the Estate their home, why not invest in re-paving the footpaths, re-surfacing the roads, fixing the front gardens and fences of the council owned properties, i.e. investing as a Council to work alongside those who are doing what they can to make the area better.</p> <p>I also think it is reprehensible that the Council has also put the Direction in place with immediate effect.</p> <p>Adding further buildings, such as the school, will simply add to the already heavy burden of bureaucracy they need to wade through daily.</p> <p>Many of those who live across the area may not be comfortable engaging via this web-based approach and will therefore choose not to.</p>	<p>This consultation period formed the opportunity for residents to give their views on the proposed changes. The Article 4 Direction will be subject to review by the Council's Executive before it can be confirmed.</p> <p>Adding a building to the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the buildings.</p> <p>Comments noted. Letters were sent to all residents, physical copies of the Appraisal were available from the Town Hall and the borough's libraries, and residents had the opportunity to respond by post.</p>	
21	"Mostly but not entirely"	I find it remarkably onerous to have to file planning permission for doing simple things which involve maintaining the house and/or upgrading it when that maintenance or upgrade fits within the standard applied.	Comments noted. General upkeep is no restricted by the Article 4 Direction.	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		Please do not make it overly onerous for people who live in the area to follow the rules.		
22	Neutral	It adds to London architectural heritage	Comment noted.	No
23	Agree	I am saddened by some of the ways some households have made changes to the Openview estate. More encouragement should be given to encourage the restoration of some features such as the fencing to give a more uniform view along the roads. Help should be much more forthcoming from the Council about sources of suitable doors, window and fencing contractors who can make the restoration changes easier for householders	Comments noted. The purpose of the Design Guidance is to provide residents with more information and guidance on how they can restore lost features, and the appropriate designs, materials and styles.  The Council cannot recommend individual contractors, but the Design Guidance provides advice on the design of suitable doors and windows, and the Appraisal includes examples of original and sympathetic doors and windows. The Building Conservation Directory is a valuable resource to source further information including materials and businesses <a href="https://www.buildingconservation.com/">https://www.buildingconservation.com/</a>	No
24	Agree	I feel the assessment and management plan for the Magdalen Park conservation area should go further and encompass poorly installed satellite dishes and their associated cabling. The standard of workmanship displayed by contractors installing these systems is generally very poor causing unnecessary damage to properties as well as demonstrating little or no regard towards retaining the character of the buildings in the estate. I am also interested to note the appraisal also considers the entrance gates to the playing fields from Fieldview to be “an outstanding boundary feature” and goes as far to criticise the “insensitively located paraphernalia associated with an	The installation, alteration or replacement of satellite antennae is covered by the Article 4 Direction.  Comments noted.  Development is considered in balance with other benefits and though harm may be identified from a heritage standpoint, other benefits may outweigh this when all aspects are considered	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		adjacent telecommunications mast” as spoiling the historic feature. Between 2005 and 2007 the residents of Fieldview rallied together and opposed the construction of this mast on multiple occasions, but were eventually overruled by Wandsworth Council who sited “no objections” in the listed planning report - which was clearly untrue.		
25	Disagree	I feel that it’s an over-reach of governmental powers and I feel that we should be unwinding these conservation areas and restrictions in order to attract great investment to improving the properties.	Comments noted.	No
26	Disagree	<p>Area shouldn’t be a conservation area in the first place. Cost for council to install fences and wooden windows for the vast amount of council properties when they need to be replaced. Including the upkeep of the highly difficult wooden windows. PLUS the council are trying to be more eco conscious - using highly expensive, low availability of wood and wooden windows aren’t as good as keeping in the heat. Properties are already vastly different with pebble dash / render / smooth render and they have paid for planning permission so shouldn’t be penalised if this needs correcting rather than potential future removal.</p> <p>Many houses have off road parking which theoretically they don’t have.</p> <p>You’re penalising new people to the area who have not made changes to their properties due to current costs rather than the look of effectively council houses!</p> <p>You’re trying to put in a conservation area - have you even seen the state of the roads and potholes?</p>	<p>Magdalen Park was designated as a Conservation Area in May 1986 as it was identified as being an area of special architectural or historic interest. This is set out in the ‘Summary of Special Character’ section in the Appraisal.</p> <p>Timber windows from a sustainable source helps to reduce the use of single-use plastics, often found in other windows, and have many other benefits, such as a much longer life expectancy. Timber can also be double and triple-glazed with as good as an energy efficient performance as plastic. Whilst uPVC windows may have a cheaper initial cost, their rates of failure may cause them to have a greater whole life-cycle cost than their timber equivalents.</p> <p>Works which have been undertaken with planning permission are lawful and would not be subject to enforcement proceedings. The Article 4 Direction cannot be enforced retrospectively.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>Many older people in this area don't have access or know how to navigate.</p> <p>Ill thoughtout. Money grabbing exercise</p>	<p>The maintenance of the pavements and roads are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Roads and Transport.</p> <p>Letters were sent to all residents, physical copies of the Appraisal were available from the Town Hall and the borough's libraries, and residents had the opportunity to respond by post.</p>	
27		<p>The link above returns a 404 error so I am unable to read the assessment</p> <p>Telling me that there is something I must read about the area I live in and then not providing it for me to read is most distressing</p>	<p>Comments noted. We apologise for any technical issues the respondent experienced. We are aware the web page was inaccessible for a short period during the consultation period, but this was due to circumstances beyond our control. Physical copies remained available during this brief period and we sought to ensure the matter was resolved as soon as possible.</p>	No
28	Mostly Agree	<p>Having chosen to live in the conservation area I certainly agree with the sentiment that important aspects of the estates should be preserved. However, it is important to allow people to do what they want with their own houses to the most extent possible while still preserving the most important aspects of the estate. I have no concerns with preserving porches or fences. These are some of the most important and interesting aspects of the estate.</p> <p>However, it seems to me that the council should be very careful when dictating painting over pebble dash, changing hardstanding or changing front doors. These aspects have changed a great deal already and there is very little value to</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Traditional roughcast render and pebbledash is a distinctive original feature of the houses within the Magdalen Park Conservation Area and contributes to its character and appearance. The external walls of houses should only be painted if the material itself has already been painted. Exposed brick and other decorative architectural details are important parts of the character of the Conservation Area and should always be left unpainted.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>the estate in protecting them. In particular, the pebble dash is not an attractive feature, and while it's one thing to say people should keep it, it's a very hard message to say they can't paint it. And honestly, is unlikely people will follow that request.</p> <p>It is important to preserve some areas of London, and insisting on planning permission is the best way to do this. However, you have to make it very clear to people that they need planning permission to make changes people may be used to making elsewhere. It is not acceptable to wait until people make changes they expect to be ok, and then tell them that they should have had permission. I knew about some of these restrictions when I moved in, but there was no proactive advice from the council to inform me of the specifics. In fact, precisely what permission is required in the estate is almost impossible to find out.</p> <p>Additionally, if you are going to insist that homeowners file planning permission for even small changes, you should make it free of charge to do this. It is unfair to put people out of pocket to navigate the restrictions the council has imposed.</p>	<p>Information on what works do and do not require permission can be found on our website and also on the Planning Portal, a national website providing information and advice for people seeking to make changes to their houses.</p> <p>The fees for planning applications are set nationally by the Government are beyond the control of the Council.</p>	
29	Disagree	<p>It is not clear what is actually preserved. This are was a mass housing project with the houses quality being a let down (first floor bricks are cracked/low quality hence the rendering to cover them). The plan claims beauty in the architecture. Besides the subjective aspect, I fail to see how this would be an inspiration to any architect these days compared to other movements.</p>	<p>The special architectural and historic character and the significance of the Conservation Area is set out in the 'Summary of Special Character' section of the Appraisal.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. The Appraisal identifies original features and</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>I do not understand how this would address situations where those houses have been altered such that now they would be in breach. I find the idea dubious and the intend dishonest and abusive.</p> <p>This would also impact the houses price, and that means you are influencing the market.</p> <p>Rather strange to see the website not working over the weekend. The detail page returned 404 (not found) to only be back on Monday. And the content has been altered. Why was some content removed?</p>	<p>architectural styles and gives evidence of surviving examples. The architecture of the estate is characteristic of the time and is a is a clear example of the break from previous housing design which is also well illustrated within the area.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction cannot be enforced retrospectively and so any works carried out prior to the making of the Article 4 direction under permitted development remain lawful.</p> <p>We apologise for any technical difficulties the respondent experienced. We are aware the web page was inaccessible for a short period during the consultation period, but this was due to circumstances beyond our control. No changes were made to the web based version of the Appraisal during the consultation period.</p>	
30	Disagree	<p>Firstly, I couldn't agree more with some very valid points raised above by other people disagreeing with this additional restrictions and limitations. Secondly, it appears necessary to remind everyone that these are people's private homes that we're discussing (in a modest Zone 3 area), not museums.</p> <p>Thirdly, I am afraid we are losing sight of the historical context when these house where built and how low was the priority for quality housing development at that time – hence hard to argue and appreciate the whole concept of “conservation” for this particular boundary.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Each application is considered on its own merits and what is suitable for one property may not be suitable for another. In determining planning applications the Council always seeks to maintain a consistent approach. Some works to the roof fall under Permitted Development rights.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to preserve the character and appearance of all Conservation Areas</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>Now, I also want to raise some concerns with the Conservation Plan itself and really bring to discussion and debate what is it that the Council is truly trying to preserve. Let's be practical and pragmatic here: if these houses were built to beautiful architectural design, features, and of good quality (like others around Wandsworth), every house owner would have happily done their best to preserve those without the Council even needing to intervene or impose any restrictions. I shall now bring to light some particular excerpts from the Magdalen Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council itself recognizes these particular buildings as "mass produced", "inter-war planned housing estates" – we all know and understand the historical context of these implications; funds had to be allocated to bringing the country's economy and infrastructure back on its feet; which, as even stated in this Draft report, implied using low-quality construction materials. The Openview Estate (bar the buildings built by the Holloway Brothers, pre WWI) is particularly of degrading quality given the low-cost construction (all properties within Openview Estate only have quality brickwork on the ground floor, which is why there is even rendering on the 1st floor – to hide the cracked and unappealing brickwork). At least the Fieldview Estate properties were built in the 30's and we can observe better quality construction (i.e. fully exposed quality brickwork, tiling feature between ground and 1st floor, etc.).</li> <li>- The Council seems to contradict itself in terms of roof extensions: in one report it stated that the "wide gaps between buildings give the streets a spacious feel and allow</li> </ul>	<p>and carries out this work to the same effect across all conservation areas in Wandsworth.</p> <p>The respondent quotes from the Draft Appraisal for Wandsworth Common Conservation Area Sub-Area A which was written in 2007. At the time this document was written, grant funding was available from the Council, however this is now no longer the case.</p> <p>The management of the amenities within the Conservation Area are not relevant to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the Appraisal. It is also beyond the scope of this report and in some cases beyond the control of the Council.</p> <p>68 Lyford Road is Grade II Listed and within the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area. It is therefore subject to the protection these designations afford.</p> <p>The updated Appraisal is intended to be clear and easily accessible, avoiding the use of large PDF files which present accessibility issues.</p> <p>We apologise for any technical difficulties the respondent experienced. We are aware the web page was inaccessible for a short period during the consultation period, but this was due to circumstances beyond our control.</p>	



Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>views through to rear elevations”, so technically a lot of roof extensions can be seen from public streets, yet the Council seems to be inconsistent in their approval of what is and isn’t allowed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Council claims that the front boundaries that were replaced from original designs are “intrusive and unattractive”. Personally, these are rather very strong and subjective views. The definition of what is attractive to one is different to someone else’s. Maybe some viewers like the fact that certain features of the houses are slightly different and showcase how the exact same house can look different by changing “accessories” and still be attractive in its own right.</li> <li>- The Council argues there is “too much variety with householders seeking to personalize the appearance of their homes” and considers this a negative aspect. This is another very subjective statement. For instance, I personally very much enjoy walking the streets of the Southfields Grid (i.e. Engadin, Elborough, etc.) and seeing technically the same houses, yet each with its own character (some are exposed brick, others of various rendering colour, others have different door colours, or front landscaping, etc.). Above all, this statement makes no sense since the original architecture itself is not even consistent through and through for the two estates.</li> <li>- Moreover, the Council is treating the various conservation areas differently. It’s interesting how these rather simplistic designs and cheap constructions require so much rigidness and restriction at the expense of the homeowners, yet it “has encouraged owners, THROUGH GRANT ASSISTANCE, to</li> </ul>		

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>enhance the appearance of properties in Wandsworth Common Area A (Lyford, Herondale, Frewin, etc.). So, the area where the houses have indeed some beautiful architecture, receive grant money to maintain them and are still not even enforced but rather “encouraged” to preserve the original built.</p> <p>- Furthermore, the amenities that were originally built to support these two estates (schools, sports fields, allotments) are not even prioritised for the residents of this conservation area. Nearly half of the conservation area is not even in the catchment area for The Earlsfield Primary School. The Beatrix Potter Allotments and the sports clubs give no priority on the waitlist for Magdalen Park Conservation Area residents. So, it appears all the original benefits and original vision on how this suburban area would function have been stripped out to some extent.</p> <p>- Finally, there are much better designed and built houses that represent the “arts and crafts” movement that can be preserved and showcased. One particular house that is within very close proximity is the property at 68 Lyford Road.</p> <p>I prefer a downloadable version. It's easier to use and read offline, especially given this last weekend the website seems to have not worked...</p>		
31	Disagree	<p>How does this tie into the councils Net Zero Plan. Lots of the houses have a split between brickwork and rendered walls. You should not stop people from re rendering the whole wall to improve the energy efficiency of their homes. This will impact visually, but only to a minor extent and is a major setback to anyone wanting to clad their home and reduce</p>	<p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area.</p>	<p>Yes – see Officer Comments</p>

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>carbon emissions and fuel bills. The conservation area status should not stand in the way of this.</p> <p>More guidance is needed on how people can improve energy efficiency whilst staying within Article 4 constraints.</p> <p>Please can the council help to provide traders who can provide acceptable doors and windows?</p> <p>Does the council know how many original doors/windows are still retained?</p>	<p>Traditional roughcast render and pebbledash is a distinctive original feature of the houses within the Magdalen Park Conservation Area and contributes to its character and appearance. Smooth render is discouraged and would not normally gain planning permission. The use of render as external wall insulation is not usually recommended and should form part of a 'whole building approach' where other energy saving measures have been implemented.</p> <p>The Appraisal can be reviewed to include further information on energy efficiency measures.</p> <p>The Council cannot recommend individual contractors, but the Design Guidance provides advice on the design of suitable doors and windows, and the Appraisal includes examples of original and sympathetic doors and windows. The Building Conservation Directory is a valuable resource to source further information including materials and businesses <a href="https://www.buildingconservation.com/">https://www.buildingconservation.com/</a></p>	
32	Disagree	<p>There have already been so many changes that have taken place that putting further restrictions in now, is rather like shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted.</p> <p>Furthermore its unfair to those who haven't yet made ammendments/alterations, but wish to do so in the future in keeping what renovated neighbouring houses have already done. In addition to this, council peeved houses have made</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original features, the original architecture and form of the Conservation Area is still very much present, albeit at risk from further erosion due to changes being carried out under permitted development rights.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>changes not in keeping with restrictions and this too is grossly unfair; do as we say, don't do as we do!</p> <p>Not user friendly or hugely accessible for most</p>	<p>The updated Appraisal is intended to be clear and easily accessible, avoiding the use of large PDF files which present accessibility issues. In addition, letters were sent to all residents, physical copies of the Appraisal were available from the Town Hall and the borough's libraries, and residents had the opportunity to respond by post.</p>	
33	Disagree	<p>Why are you now concerned . The council has constantly over the years granted planning permission for hideous buildings and totalt over pipulating the Earlsfield area. Why so concerned now. Bit late in my opinion.parking is farcical and huge rip off to the tenants. No wonder anyone who can fit a drive on their frontage has.</p>	<p>We have a statutory duty to review conservation areas to assess their condition and to produce updated Appraisals. In Wandsworth in 2020 the Council undertook a review of the 46 Conservation Areas in the borough, prioritising those which lack appraisals, have insufficient and/or outdated appraisals, or have been identified as being under development pressure. Magdalen Park was identified as being one of these areas. It is considered that there is a real and potentially immediate risk of permitted development rights being carried out in relation to the identified properties within this Conservation Area, thereby having a detrimental effect on its character and appearance.</p> <p>Parking issues are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Parking.</p>	No
34	Agree	<p>Provided that the council actually enforces it. Although I live in an alleged conservation area in Wandsworth, since 1986 all sorts of inappropriate alterations have been made to housing, and the front gardens turned into car parks. Most of</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Hendham Road is not in the Magdalen Park Conservation Area but the Wandsworth Common</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>the houses now have unsuitable windows and doors, removing all the rhythm and symmetry. Thus the Council has failed to protect the character of the area (Hendham Road) despite my protestations</p> <p>The council needs to walk the talk.</p>	<p>Conservation Area, and is of a different character to Magdalen Park.</p>	
35	Neutral	<p>The new Article 4 restrictions comment on keeping chimneys as they are to maintain the character of the area. Due to the shape of the roofs in some of the properties (where the ceiling is higher than the base of the rafters) this means that chimney breasts internally cannot be removed without a huge and unnecessary amount of structural work. The council should allow people to take down chimneys from the top and not require them to pay large amount of cost (and carbon) to meet conservation area restrictions.</p>	<p>Alterations to chimneys would fall under the category of 'alterations to the roof of a dwelling-house'. The removal of chimneys is discouraged as they are often prominent original features and form an important part of the roofscape of an area. The lowest carbon impact would be retention.</p>	No
36	Disagree	<p>Some material considerations appear to have been overlooked in setting the Article 4 direction.</p> <p>Forcibly preserving housing stock that was originally of varying quality is counterproductive (I've seen the brickwork hidden by the render - it's bad). The housing was built to be lived in, with function front of mind. Whilst the townscape is indeed pleasant, with no high rises, the current conservation area rules are more than adequate to maintain this.</p> <p>The direction will disincentivise residents looking to improve their homes. At best this will result in the current stock being frozen in time as of February 2023, but more likely risks decay as residents are forced to choose between the cost and uncertainty of seeking permission for improvements against allowing further deterioration, or moving out of the area.</p>	<p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area. It is considered that there is a real and potentially immediate risk of permitted development rights being carried out in relation to the identified properties within this Conservation Area, thereby having a detrimental effect on its character and appearance.</p> <p>The costs associated with the management of planning applications are beyond the scope of this report.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>The costs to the council of managing applications, enforcement, and reimbursing residents for cancelled plans appears to not have been considered at all. Taking resources away from valuable council services to handle the additional administration, especially given the current cost of living challenges, is simply perverse and irrational. (In the alternative, if the council is viewing this as an income opportunity, this is not only punitive to the residents but the legal costs of the inevitable challenges will quickly outstrip any financial benefits to the council.)</p> <p>There also seems to be little reference of the council's desperate need to invest in its own properties and the public realm (the proposal's initial assertion that the area is "well preserved" is a clear misrepresentation).</p> <p>The position on climate-sensitive improvements is totally fudged. South-facing houses will clearly have a serious challenge to install solar roof panels and all properties without an existing parking pad will have to rely on council resources for EV charging - again, further avoidable costs. I object to the proposals and am disappointed that the council has seen fit to implement them without prior consultation.</p> <p>By all means invest in the public realm and council properties, but creating more rules helps no one.</p> <p>The impact of the new rules, and the fact that they have been imposed with immediate effect, are both buried very deeply and not in consistent plain English (I'd never heard of an Article 4 direction, nor an assessment and management plan).</p>	<p>The maintenance of council-owned properties is beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Housing.</p> <p>National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>This consultation period has been the opportunity for residents to give their views on the proposed changes. The Article 4 Direction will be subject to review by the Council's Executive before it can be confirmed.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are explained in the Management Plan and there is further information available on our website.</p> <p>The layout of the Appraisal can be reviewed to include a section setting out the proposed changes.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		Readers need to know what's changing for them as first priority. The justifications can follow.		
37	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted.	No
38	Disagree	<p>Your assessment does not take into consideration the people who live in these types of houses. They were very cheaply built, as owners we are left to deal with issues like poor render, damp, leaking roofs. You put on restrictions which limits choice and therefore rises costs and at the same time not offer any monetary support to the residents.</p> <p>If by adding these building we make it more expensive for them to renovate then I am not in favour. If you provide financial aid to help restore the building then I would be less concerned.</p> <p>The web portals were good, but going from the consultation page to the have your say page was difficult, which felt deliberate, like you did not want people to have their say.</p> <p>I have never understood why conserving something means staying rooted to the past. At the time these buildings were erected there were real financial pressures that directly impacted how construction was carried out, which meant cutting corners, and using cheap materials. Now close to 100 years later we should be embracing new materials, renders that improve insulation and solar tiles amongst many other options. One specific point is around old roof tiles of the area a weathered and largely in poor condition, yet you want people to try to match them. They look awful, and its almost impossible to get anything even close, and limits the choice, thus increasing cost. You do not provide any financial</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Adding a building to the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the maintenance of the buildings.</p> <p>Comment noted. We are sorry you felt it was difficult to navigate.</p> <p>The concept of conservation (in the context of conservation areas) does not prevent change but seeks to manage change in a way that preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>New tiles should match the original tiles as closely as possible in terms of colour, but it is acknowledged there is variation between historic tiles and new tiles. Applications for new roof coverings will be considered on their own merits.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area. It does not block people from maintaining their houses.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>assistance yet you put blockers up to the people who live in these homes that just want to keep there homes well maintained. The restrictions on dormer on the grounds that they are unsightly is also laughable. Unsightly to who exactly?? I have not ever spoke to a resident that thought the larger dormers were unsightly, in fact they are looked upon as far nicer ascetically that the ones that are allowed. The question of unsightly is subjective, and one that the local residents should have a say on rather than a council department who does not have a good track record of engaging with the residents. Why don't we have a consultation on what the local residents this is aesthetically pleasing? This consultation feels like an academic work, when it should actually be a reflection of the area TODAY not how it was 100 years ago.</p>	<p>Applications for dormer windows are considered on their own merits. Guidance on dormers is set out in the Housing Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The Appraisal is an assessment and description of the area as it is at the time of writing, but does include reference to the history of the area and its original character and appearance.</p>	
39	Disagree	<p>I am concerned that the assessment and management plan treat Magdalen Park as something to be preserved in aspic, with no regard for the residents who live in the properties now. The houses were built with poor quality materials (for understandable reasons) which means that they need to be repaired/replaced. Making this more difficult and expensive is not going to help preserve the local area, discouraging those who cannot afford expensive works. This creates a less equitable situation for residents. It favours those who have the money to spend on expensive changes and/or those who have already made changes.</p> <p>I'm also concerned that the Council is spending money on this sort of consultation when basic elements such a safe pavements (as we have a number of older residents and young families) are not in place. The report sounds like a PHD</p>	<p>The concept of conservation (in the context of conservation areas) does not prevent change but seeks to manage change in a way that preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area. The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area.</p> <p>The maintenance of the pavements and roads are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Roads and Transport.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments



Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>paper written from an ivory tower - the comments about original wooden fences take no account of the practical and safety elements for those with young children for example.</p> <p>The library in particular is a beautiful building but I'm concerned that the lists make things more difficult to protect/restore.</p> <p>From a format perspective, this form is fine - my comments relate to communications more broadly - see below. Why was there so little communication about the consultation? Why is it so difficult to find this form via a search engine? Why are the proposed changes not more clearly outlined? This feels like the Council making it deliberately difficult to understand and comment on proposed changes in order to reduce the number of people who will respond.</p>	<p>Adding a building to the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the maintenance of the buildings.</p> <p>The Council wrote to every household within the Conservation Area informing them of the consultation. The details of the consultation were also published on our website. The consultation website was available through searching 'wandswoth conservation areas consultation' in internet search engines.</p> <p>The layout of the Appraisal can be reviewed to include a section setting out the proposed changes.</p>	
40	Disagree	<p>I don't agree with the Article 4 implementation. I also think the size of the conservation area should be reduced.</p> <p>There should also be a downloadable PDF version</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The updated Appraisal is intended to be clear and easily accessible, avoiding the use of large PDF files which present accessibility issues. Webpages can be downloaded directly from a user's browser and saved in various formats, including PDF</p>	No
41	Disagree	<p>Recently, the council granted planning permission for a whole new dwelling to be built near to Burntwood Lane which, looking at the proposed plans will definitely not fit within 'the look' of the area.</p> <p>Also, residents have over the years, already made changes to the outside of their properties. Will these have to be</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Article 4 direction cannot be enforced retrospectively and so changes made under permitted development prior to the making of the Article 4 Direction remain lawful.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>reversed? Or is it just the people who haven't but may be planning to, will now have to gain permission for possible minor alterations? Such as painting or rendering their properties, having satellite dishes put up....This seems slightly ridiculous as these home owners have bought their properties and surely have the right to improve them or create more living space.</p> <p>Don't misunderstand me, I am a fan of original features on properties and do not agree with unnecessary changes but having to make a planning application for simple jobs seems a little unreasonable.</p>		
42	Disagree	<p>Your assessment does not take into consideration the people who live in these types of houses. They were very cheaply built, as owners we are left to deal with issues like poor render, damp, leaking roofs. You put on restrictions which limits choice and therefore rises costs and at the same time not offer any monetary support to the residents. Also, this creates a sensible disparity of treatment with owners of neighbouring houses that, despite having a better architectural significance, are not within the boundaries of the conservation area (e.g. all the houses in the roads further up the hill).</p> <p>Adding these building would make their renovation more expensive and burdensome, hence I am not in favour. If you provide substantial financial aid to help restore the building then I would be less concerned.</p> <p>In addition, as already said, this creates a disparity of treatment with houses in neighbouring roads: this houses</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Adding a building to the Local List does not result in any additional planning restrictions which would affect the maintenance of the buildings.</p> <p>Comment noted. We are sorry you felt it was difficult to navigate.</p> <p>The concept of conservation (in the context of conservation areas) does not prevent change but seeks to manage change in a way that preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>New tiles should match the original tiles as closely as possible in terms of colour, but it is acknowledged there is variation between historic tiles and new tiles. Applications for new roof coverings will be considered on their own merits.</p>	No

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral</b>	<b>Respondent comments</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Changes required to draft CAA?</b>
		<p>have more architectural value but are not subject to any restrictions.</p> <p>Going from the consultation page to the "have your say page" was difficult, which felt deliberate, in order to discourage feedback.</p> <p>I have never understood why conserving something means staying rooted to the past. At the time these buildings were erected there were real financial pressures that directly impacted how construction was carried out, which meant cutting corners, and using cheap materials. Now close to 100 years later we should be embracing new materials, renders that improve insulation and solar tiles amongst many other options. One specific point is around old roof tiles of the area are weathered and largely in poor condition, yet you want people to try to match them. They look awful, and its almost impossible to get anything even close, and limits the choice, thus increasing cost. You do not provide any financial assistance yet you put blockers up to the people who live in these homes that just want to keep there homes well maintained. The restrictions on dormer on the grounds that they are unsightly is also laughable. Unsightly to who exactly?? I have not ever spoke to a resident that thought the larger dormers were unsightly, in fact they are looked upon as far nicer ascetically that the ones that are allowed (not mentioning the fact that they are hardly visible from the main road). The question of unsightly is subjective, and one that the local residents should have a say on rather than a council department who does not have a good track record</p>	<p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to bring change under control and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area. It does not block people from maintaining their houses.</p> <p>Applications for dormer windows are considered on their own merits. Guidance on dormers is set out in the Housing Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>The Appraisal is an assessment and description of the area as it is today, but does include reference to the history of the area and its original character and appearance.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		of engaging with the residents. Why don't we have a consultation on what the local residents think is aesthetically pleasing? This consultation feels like an academic work, when it should actually be a reflection of the area TODAY not how it was 100 years ago.		
43	Disagree	Restricting changes to homes in this way will devalue properties, make maintenance more expensive, reduce the ability of homes to accommodate additional people, reduce their functionality (e.g. porches) and increase bureaucracy. These changes do not have my support.	Comments noted	No
44	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted	No
45	Disagree	There has been huge change already so an article four will just serve to decrease house costs and increase costs to residents/home owners. There is too much variation to make it worthwhile and will be a huge administrative burden on small matters for little benefit. It is not enough significant value. This relates to the openview estate which doesn't even get to benefit from many of the listed benefits eg schools on the estate if on Dawnay road or far end of swaby road. Strongly oppose permitted development rights removal on this area.	Comments noted.  The 'Summary of Special Character' section of the Appraisal sets out the significance, character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	No
46	Disagree	I strongly oppose the proposed enactment of Article 4. 1. I believe that the improvements that people have made to their houses have only improved the look of the area and added value to the area. I do not see any benefit in maintaining the original features which were designed simply to be as cheap a construction as possible. Forcing residents to maintain the low quality pebble dash render, weathered fencing etc will reduce the value of properties in the area as	Original features make a substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and are part of the special architectural and historic interest of the area. These features should be retained in order to preserve this character and appearance.  Comments noted.	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>it will mean the area will stay shabby rather than being gradually smartened up as people make improvements.</p> <p>2. There is inequity between people who have already benefited from making improvements, and those who have not yet made improvements / new purchasers. This again will reduce the value of properties as purchasers will be put off by being forced to retain cheap, ugly features.</p> <p>3. Placing strict limits on loft conversions will mean families will be forced to move out of the area as they grow. This will reduce the value of properties in the area and also negatively impact schools which are already experiencing an exodus of children at older ages.</p> <p>4. Requiring planning permission to do things like paint and replace front doors will make it less likely that people will make these improvements, thereby meaning properties continue to look shabby rather than being smartened up on a regular basis.</p>		
47	Disagree	Does not consider the existing changes to homes under current planning permissions. It's too late to have a consistent appearance area. The planning department have already proved they unable to be consistent applying rules, noting the attempted enforcement regarding the smooth rendering in 2019.	The Article 4 Direction cannot be enforced retrospectively and so any works carried out prior to the making of the Article 4 direction under permitted development remain lawful.	No
48	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted	No
49	Disagree	I have lived on the estate for over 30 years and have seen many changes. I like the individuality that fresh people with new ideas bring to the area. Changes have to happen and as they have already started I think it is to late to now clamp down on folks.	Comments noted. The intention of the Appraisal is not to prevent change, but guide change to be suitable to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
50	Disagree	[The respondent made no further comments]	Disagreement noted	No
51	Disagree	<p>I object to the proposals and it is an overreach that the council has seen fit to implement the Article 4 without prior consultation.</p> <p>There seem to be some fairly important factors that have been overlooked in setting the Art 4 direction:</p> <p>The direction will disincentivise residents looking to simply maintain their homes (planning applications for painting and general maintenance. At best this will result in the current housing stock being frozen in time as of February 2023, subject to further decay as residents are forced to balance the friction of seeking permission for improvements against allowing further deterioration, or moving out of the area.</p> <p>Forcibly preserving housing stock that was originally of cheap quality for what can only be seen as subjective reasons of sameness being equated to attractiveness will lead to houses significantly deteriorating and becoming unliveable, thereby completely defeating the point of any restrictions. The housing was built to be lived in, with function front of mind. Whilst the townscape is pleasant, with no high rises, the conservation area rules that existed for the Magdalen Park estate prior to 2023 are more than adequate to retain this. Wooden fencing and pebble dash were cheap construction materials that were readily available at the time or, in the case of the latter; used to cover cheap brickwork. There are plenty of examples of brick or stone fencing being installed in the area in an attractive and sympathetic way, providing a more durable solution.</p> <p>The costs to the council of managing applications, enforcement, and reimbursing residents for cancelled plans</p>	<p>This consultation period has been the opportunity for residents to give their views on the proposed changes. The Article 4 Direction will be subject to review by the Council's Executive before it can be confirmed.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to guide change and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area.</p> <p>The costs associated with managing planning applications are beyond the scope of this report</p> <p>The condition of council housing stock is beyond the scope. We will pass your comments to our colleagues in Housing.</p> <p>The Article 4 does not restrict ability to make homes more eco friendly. Timber windows from a sustainable source helps to reduce the use of single-use plastics, often found in other windows, and have many other benefits, such as a much longer life expectancy. Timber can also be double and triple-glazed with as good an energy efficient performance as plastic. Whilst uPVC windows may have a cheaper initial cost, their rates of failure may cause them to have a greater whole life-cycle cost than their timber equivalents.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>appears to not have been considered at all. There is no evidence of thought to how long these new restrictions will delay simple maintenance to homes, which would then lead to deterioration of exactly those properties the council purports to want to preserve.</p> <p>There also seems to be little reference of the council's desperate need to invest in its own properties (the assertion that the area is "well preserved" conveniently overlooks this).</p> <p>Probably the most ill-conceived part of the new article 4 restrictions (of which there were many to choose from for this honour) are the restrictions that impact making homes and the area more sustainable and eco-friendly. Insisting on the use of wooden windows and doors that are energy inefficient, preventing the installation of solar panels on any roof that is street facing, and prohibiting the installation of parking pads (in an area where street parking is already ridiculously oversubscribed) that would allow homeowners to install EV points to switch to fully electric vehicles, all flies in the face of not only the council's own stance on environmental sustainability but that of pretty much all levels of government and certainly is shockingly out of touch in the face of a climate crisis.</p> <p>The article 4 directive and the associated proposals from the council are disproportionate to the stated objective and the council has not made the case that they are necessary to maintain a pleasant and liveable area that is also fit for the future. For all of these reasons I strongly object to and disagree with the council's proposals.</p>	<p>National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
52	Disagree	I feel the application of an Article 4 Direction for the Magdalen Park Conservation Area is too little too late especially with reference to the Openview estate and the variations that already exist. Applying this Direction now penalises and restricts those in the neighbourhood who have not already made changes to their properties and adds time, money and bureaucracy to those wishing to improve their properties; which improves the general area for all. I do not believe that the Openview Estate has such historical value that further corrective measures are warranted by the council and strongly believe homeowners should retain permitted development rights. It shows a lack of understanding of resident's wishes for the area.	<p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original features, the original architecture and form of the Conservation Area is still very much present, albeit at risk from further erosion due to changes being carried out under permitted development rights.</p> <p>The Openview estate is one of the two formally laid-out, well-preserved, suburban Council housing estates built around 1933 which form the central elements of the significance of the area. This is explained and referred to throughout the Appraisal.</p>	No
53	Disagree	There is no justification for it, it restricts residents of their basic right to renovate their homes, it is very draconian to require planning permission simply to paint the facade. The first comment expresses exactly how I feel about the proposed changes.	The justification for the Article 4 Direction has been reviewed by both Officers and Councillors. A review of the condition of the area has been carried out as part of the Appraisal process, and it is considered that there is a real and potentially immediate risk of permitted development rights being carried out in relation to the identified properties within this Conservation Area, thereby having a detrimental effect on its character and appearance.	No
54	Disagree	<p>Focussing on the Open View area, I think the plan aims to stick too closely to how the houses were built in the 1930s, and not with a view to current challenges/opportunities: the houses are cheaply built and energy inefficient and we need to be open to development in order to reduce our carbon impact.</p> <p>The cost to owners to maintain pebbledash versus a smoother render is greater, and less ecological options for</p>	Traditional roughcast render and pebbledash is a distinctive original feature of the houses within the Magdalen Park Conservation Area and contributes to its character and appearance. Smooth render is discouraged and would not normally gain planning permission. The use of render as external wall insulation is not usually recommended and should	No



Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>greater insulating ability exist (the 1930s houses are terribly insulated). I also find the discouragement of using solar panels alarming.</p> <p>I find some of the values put on the conservation area to be very subjective, and also contradictory (specifically for the Open View area) - in some cases variety is praised, in others it is discouraged. I do not believe 'naturally weathered' (tatty) fencing adds to the intrinsic appeal of the area, over varnished or nicely painted alternatives, for example.</p> <p>Similarly, I do not believe the smoothly rendered houses diminish the overall value of the building design - in fact I think it enhances the area.</p> <p>In general terms I agree with the desire to maintain the value of this unique area, however I think some of the proposals are too subjective, and too limiting on the owners in terms of cost, their ability to enhance the shabbiness of their aging properties, or their ability to be more carbon efficient.</p> <p>On this basis, I do not agree with the overall management plan proposed.</p>	<p>form part of a 'whole building approach' where other energy saving measures have been implemented.</p> <p>National guidance on solar panels in conservation areas states that they must not be fitted to a wall which fronts a highway. Principle elevations and roof slopes facing the public realm make the most substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. New technologies, such as PV panels disguised as slates and sitting flush with roof materials, may be suitable in the appropriate context, and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p>	
55	Disagree	<p>Re. proposal's for The Openview Estate, the Council explains that, 'the Direction is designed to ensure that the special character of the area is preserved and is not eroded by works which are unsympathetic to the appearance of the area...'</p> <p>The Openview Estate has already seen much change and so imposing such a direction seems futile, and will only disadvantage residents by making them apply and pay for planning permission on small amendments and restricting choice of materials, potentially increasing the price of works.</p> <p>With the current cost of living crisis this seems incredibly insensitive to the local community. It is possible that this</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present.</p> <p>The Council is now seeking to prevent further erosion through the updated Appraisal and Article 4 Direction.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		Direction could also impact on resale values of houses in the area – potential buyers could well be put off by the prospect of having to apply for planning permission for projects which in other areas are covered by permitted development.		
56	Disagree	It will be huge cost and administrative burden for houses that were cheaply made to provide affordable housing original. These are not listed houses and no special importance. Additionally if people need to replace roofs due to leaks etc will the council be responsible for quick turn around or the potential liability of all these houses. When times are costly putting more cost onto house owners and restricting them from allowing families to live within their houses due to restrictions on roof extensions (when others already have benefited) is not fair. There is already the variance and little to be achieved apart from more admin and cost. This specifically relates to openview estate.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The ‘Summary of Special Character’ section of the Appraisal sets out what is significant about the area and why it is desirable to preserve and enhance it.</p> <p>Upkeep of roofs to prevent leaks is not restricted. Replacement of roofs in Conservation Areas is not permitted development, and therefore there is no change to this under the Article 4</p> <p>The Council aims to make a decision on householder applications within eight weeks of the application being validated.</p>	No
57	Disagree	No restrictive legislation please!	Comment noted.	No
58	Disagree	Why are you suggesting these changes. Most house have already completed work. So none of the houses look identical ( thank goodness) is this just a left wing implementation of power?	We have a statutory duty to routinely review conservation areas to assess their condition and to produce updated Appraisals. In 2020 the previous administration undertook a review of the 46 Conservation Areas in the borough, prioritising those which lack appraisals, have insufficient and/or outdated appraisals, or have been identified as being under development pressure. Magdalen Park was identified as being one of these areas. It is considered	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
			that there is a real and potentially immediate risk of permitted development rights being carried out in relation to the identified properties within this Conservation Area, thereby having a detrimental effect on its character and appearance.	
59	Neutral	<p>[This response included photographs and has been attached as an appendix – see appendix 1]</p> <p>Following your circular letter about the Public Conservation I have read the Appraisal and Management Plan in detail.</p> <p>It is inaccurate on two points:</p> <p>there has not been a ‘corner shop’ at the junction of Tranmere Road and Burntwood Lane for nearly a decade. what there is, is a mess of unfinished building - photographs attached. this is an eyesore that we have to walk past every day.</p> <p>the houses on Burntwood Lane, Nos. 155 to 127 were erected in 1905, not 1911. I have the title deeds of my flat at 135 Burntwood Lane.</p> <p>The paving on Tranmere Road between Waldron Road and Littleton Street is degraded and actually dangerous particularly round the tree here (photo attached).</p> <p>you would do better to tackle things like this than to tell us what kind of doors and window frames to use.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Appraisal will be updated to correct this.</p> <p>The maintenance of the pavements and roads are beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Roads and Transport.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
60	Disagree	<p>While we are not intending to make further changes to our house, I would object in principle to any increased restrictions on residents making improvements to their homes. The houses on our street are already not consistent, with front walls painted different colours, different porches / front doors, different windows, and different loft conversions etc. It seems hard to understand why the council would seek to impose additional restrictions now, when the horse has already bolted in terms of consistency.</p> <p>In my view, and I strongly suspect in the view of the vast majority of residents, most changes to houses on the street have represented improvements from a drab and un-aesthetic original design. For example, petitions in the past have strongly supported residents who have replaced the ugly original render on the front walls with a smooth alternative.</p> <p>I recognise the need to protect housing that is attractive or historic, but would challenge members of the council to visit our street and conclude that it meets those criteria. We have an amazing community here, and this is a great place to live, but not because the original housing looks nice.</p>	<p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. These traditional and original features make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Area. The Council is now seeking to prevent further erosion through the updated Appraisal and Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>Traditional roughcast render and pebbledash is a distinctive original feature of the houses within the Magdalen Park Conservation Area and contributes to its character and appearance. Smooth render is discouraged and would not normally gain planning permission.</p>	No
61	Neutral	<p>Just wanted to clarify something that doesn't seem clear on this appraisal, and may need updating on the website: It says "Burntwood Lane Nos 157-177, 179-22, 227 - 255 (odd)" at the base of the appraisal online. Should it say "179-225"? rather than "179-22"?</p>	Comments noted. The Appraisal will be updated to correct this.	Yes – see Officer comments

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
62	Neutral	<p>Firstly, the appraisal is very thorough with interesting historical information, maps and photos. However a report of this length (76 equivalent pages) needs page breaks and numbered paragraphs to help with finding and referencing information.</p> <p>It is good to live in this conservation area which provides a pleasant environment and to know that unplanned buildings and changes cannot just go ahead without regard to the surroundings. However it is a matter of degree and what is practical when it comes to the level of control that the Council requires and what people will tolerate.</p> <p>It makes sense that general aspects of the area, such as new buildings, significant alterations to fronts of houses and road and pathway changes are regulated by planning applications. Apart from this high level control, it is really a question of where to draw the line. Anything below a certain level can be counter productive as it is difficult to enforce and may be seen by some people as bureaucratic and interfering.</p> <p>It is also clear, as the appraisal acknowledges, that already there are many examples where a lack of enforcement in the past has resulted in regulations not being observed. Not only does this go against the general look of the area, but it makes future enforcement difficult, as people will immediately point to the broken examples.</p> <p>Surprisingly the appraisal does not show any costs for operating and maintaining the conservation area. Costs are another reality which affects the level of regulation and</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The costs associated with a Conservation Area are beyond the scope of this report.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Design Guidance can be reviewed to ensure this is clear.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Appraisal can be reviewed to include reference to trees. The Council must be informed of any intention to carry out works to trees in a Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Yes – see Officer comments</p>

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral</b>	<b>Respondent comments</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Changes required to draft CAA?</b>
		<p>enforcement, most notably staffing costs. To carry out a high level of enforcement is surely not possible, particularly at this time of high demand on Council funds, including the promise to maintain a low Council Tax in Wandsworth.</p> <p>I have met people who are not aware they are living in a conservation area. Perhaps there is a need for more regular publicity, other than waiting for appraisals. With more awareness, at least some people will feel they understand more the need for the Council's regulations and perhaps even look for guidance about how best to maintain their properties. Residents might come to appreciate the benefit of living somewhere special, particularly if this results in the the area being more sought after and property prices increasing.</p> <p>It is helpful to have clear and sensible reference as set out in the Design Guidance and Article 4(1) restrictions. However at times there is a certain vagueness with phrases like 'It is encouraged that ...' or 'Applications are discouraged... ' etc. A user friendly approach is good but the information needs to make clear what is 'desirable' and what is legally enforceable by the Council.</p> <p>There is no significant reference in the appraisal to trees. I understand that there is something called a Section 211 notice that specifically relates to trees in conservation areas. If this is so, it should be mentioned, particularly if it includes trees in back gardens.</p>		

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p>The proposals to extend the Conservation Area, as well as the proposed additions to the local list of buildings of architectural or historical interest, seem sensible and logical.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to give my comments</p>		
63	Neutral	<p>I appreciate your effort to conserve this special area and the need for some changes. However, can I ask that you send a redlined version of the Appraisal that clearly shows where it was updated? Otherwise I would like to submit my rejection of the proposals as it's not very clear what exactly has been changed.</p> <p>Re the article 4 direction i understand that no changes are made to Tilehurst Road properties so this won't affect me. Is that correct?</p> <p>Last but not least, can I suggest that the council themselves are actually doing a better job in maintaining the special character of this development. I know this is a different department but you should heed your own guidances, especially where the freehold is with the council and for your council flats. E.g. a lot of the prized hooped metal fences are rusting away and are not properly maintained. Wooden fences of council flats, eg no 90 have not been repaired since the storm last summer, street signs are in dire disrepair (eg on Tilehurst Road opposite Godley garden on the corner of no 92).</p> <p>If you want to maintain the special character of this area, you should start by maintaining it properly and enforcing this within your own organisation.</p>	<p>This appraisal document is a new document which has drawn on the previous Appraisal, but is expanded and updated. The Appraisal document does not include 'proposals' beyond the Article 4 Directions as this is beyond the scope of an Appraisal document. It is a document which is intended to expand on the history, development, and character of the area, as well as provided more detailed guidance on best practice approaches to future development.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction does not cover Tilehurst Road.</p> <p>Comments noted. The condition of council owned property is beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Housing. The condition of street signs is beyond the scope of this report. We will pass your comments on to our colleagues in Roads and Transport.</p>	No

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
64	Disagree	[This response has been attached as an annex – see Annex 2]	<p>The special architectural and historic character and the significance of the Conservation Area is set out in the 'Summary of Special Character' section of the Appraisal. It is this that we are seeking to preserve, in line with our statutory duty as set out in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Original features make a substantial contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and are part of the special architectural and historic interest of the area. These features should be retained in order to preserve this character and appearance.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much present. These traditional and original features make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Area. The Council is now seeking to prevent further erosion through the updated Appraisal and Article 4 Direction.</p> <p>The management of the amenities within the Conservation Area are not relevant to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the Appraisal. It is also beyond the scope of this report and in some cases beyond the control of the Council.</p> <p>The conclusion of the Appraisal is that despite some erosion of original architectural features, the original architecture and form of the area is still very much</p>	No



Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
			<p>present. These traditional and original features make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the Area.</p> <p>Each application is considered on its own merits and what is suitable for one property may not be suitable for another. In determining planning applications the Council always seeks to maintain a consistent approach.</p> <p>The Article 4 Direction is not intended to prevent change but instead to guide future change and to allow consideration of how works to one property might impact on the character of the whole area. The Design Guidance is intended to provide guidance and advice to residents to enable them to make changes which are sympathetic to the character of the area.</p> <p>This consultation period has been the opportunity for residents to give their views on the proposed changes. The Article 4 Direction will be subject to review by the Council's Executive before it can be confirmed.</p>	
65 (Historic England)		The proposed appraisals would benefit from inclusion on a section on archaeology and other relevant planning policy designations where appropriate (see comments in respect of Old Devonshire Road below). Further advice in including archaeology in plan making is set out in the following publication.	<p>The Appraisal will be updated to include a section on the archaeology of the area. Reference is already made to other planning policy designations.</p> <p>The Appraisal will be updated in line with the comments submitted: to define 'parlour houses' and revise the use of the phrase 'blocks of flats'.</p>	Yes – see Officer comments

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to draft CAA?
		<p><a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/greater-london-archaeological-priority-area-guidelines/heag098-glaas-archaeological-priority-areas/">https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/greater-london-archaeological-priority-area-guidelines/heag098-glaas-archaeological-priority-areas/</a></p> <p>We would also encourage the Council to make the proposed appraisals available to download if formally adopted.</p> <p>The area comprises of predominantly residential suburban housing which reflects a strong garden suburb influence. Laid out during Edwardian and Inter-war period, Magdalen Park displays a variety of architectural styles reflecting the influence of the individual builders who developed the plots, using a variety of materials, decorative embellishments, and roof forms. Parts of the area display an interesting planned layout and include garden allotments and recreational facilities. The proposed small extension to the CA boundary, in our view, encompasses buildings which conform to the prevailing character. We therefore consider the proposal to be consistent with NPPF Policy 186.</p> <p>We have a number of minor recommendations in respect of the proposed draft conservation area appraisal, set out below.</p> <p>The section on Openview refers to 89% of properties as Parlour Houses. This description would benefit from definition as this is not a common term.</p> <p>The Design Guide refers to many of the buildings being “blocks of flats”. This is perhaps misleading given the</p>		

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral</b>	<b>Respondent comments</b>	<b>Officer comments</b>	<b>Changes required to draft CAA?</b>
		relatively small, domestic nature of many of the dwellings which appear to be two-storey flats (in the manner of Warner Houses or Artisan General Labourers Dwellings Company). The low-rise nature of the area allows long views along streets and as such it may be beneficial to refer to low-rise flats arranged in terraces and semi-detached buildings.		