



Planning Applications  
The Town Hall  
Wandsworth High Street  
London SW18 2PU

154 Putney High Street  
London SW15 1RS

14 October 2013

Dear Sirs

Planning Application 2013/4462  
111 Upper Richmond Road SW15

The Putney Society wishes to OBJECT to this application which would exacerbate the continuing loss of office space from Putney in direct contravention of Core Strategy policy PL14, and DMPD policy DMTS13. Recent losses are already harming local shops.

Last week the PAC refused the application to redevelop 85-91 Upper Richmond Road. The attached extracts from the officers report are equally applicable here, if not more so. This application would provide no additional public realm, no break in the 'canyon' wall, in fact no public benefit at all, and would further harm the vitality of the town centre through more loss of daytime custom.

The applicants claim that the building is past its useful life. This is not the case. This is the newest of the large buildings on the Upper Richmond Road, with air conditioning and sufficient storey height for modern services, and until recently was fully occupied. Some of the plant may need renewal, but that does not make the building unfit. If any offices here can be saved, this is the best.

Wandsworth recently applied, unsuccessfully, for exemption from the new permitted development right to convert offices to residential. If you meant that, then you must refuse this application.

Yours Sincerely

*Andrew Catto*

Andrew Catto AADipl RIBA ACArch  
Buildings Panel Convenor  
For and on behalf of the Putney Society.

copy: Stephan Wallace.

**The Putney Society**

The amenity society for Putney and Roehampton. Registered Charity No. 263242  
[www.putneysociety.org.uk](http://www.putneysociety.org.uk)

**Extracts from case officer's report to PAC  
2013/0456 Carlton House. Refused 8th October 2013.**

**2 Loss of Employment Space**

2.1 Whilst it is accepted that any new mixed use development would involve a net loss of some employment floorspace, in particular, office floorspace. There is serious concern that the proposed re-provision of employment floorspace falls well short of the policy objectives set out in Core Strategy Policy PL14. As a result of all the recently approved developments in Upper Richmond Road and the recent changes to permitted development rights to allow offices to change to residential, there is a significant loss in office space in Putney. This needs to be carefully considered when looking at this application. Other recently approved developments in this part of the town centre have provided the following percentage of replacement office floorspace (not including the additional commercial floorspace):

2011 Langham Square 12%

2011 Tileman House 52%

2012 113 Upper Richmond Road 41%

2.2 All applications were approved prior to the new permitted development rights being passed. Protecting the level of office floorspace in Putney is now even more important when approving new developments. This development would provide only 825 sq m, which equates to only 21% re-provision. This level is considered to be too low.

3.8 It is considered that the tall building in the proposed scheme would fail to satisfy a number of the criteria in Policy DMS4 (b) as follows:

i) Contribution to social inclusion, environmental health and economic vitality: the scheme does not comply with Core Strategy policy objectives with regard to the quantity of replacement office floorspace and would not meet the design principles set out in the Area Spatial Strategy and SSAD.

iv) Acceptable visual impact on the surrounding area: the photomontages show that the tall building would make little positive contribution to the quality of the local townscape.

vi) Land use mix and its support to surrounding land use pattern: there is considered to be a shortfall in the re-provision of office floor space and the viability of the proposed retail unit is questionable. The contribution to the vitality of the town centre is not likely to be significant.

**Extracts from case officer' report to PAC  
2013/0456 Carlton House. Refused 8<sup>th</sup> October 2013.**

**2 Loss of Employment Space**

2.1 Whilst it is accepted that any new mixed use development would involve a net loss of some employment floorspace, in particular, office floorspace. There is serious concern that the proposed re-provision of employment floorspace falls well short of the policy objectives set out in Core Strategy Policy PL14. As a result of all the recently approved developments in Upper Richmond Road and the recent changes to permitted development rights to allow offices to change to residential, there is a significant loss in office space in Putney. This needs to be carefully considered when looking at this application. Other recently approved developments in this part of the town centre have provided the following percentage of replacement office floorspace (not including the additional commercial floorspace):

- 2011 Langham Square 12%
- 2011 Tileman House 52%
- 2012 113 Upper Richmond Road 41%

2.2 All applications were approved prior to the new permitted development rights being passed. Protecting the level of office floorspace in Putney is now even more important when approving new developments. This development would provide only 825 sq m, which equates to only 21% re-provision. This level is considered to be too low.

3.8 It is considered that the tall building in the proposed scheme would fail to satisfy a number of the criteria in Policy DMS4 (b) as follows:

- i) Contribution to social inclusion, environmental health and economic vitality: the scheme does not comply with Core Strategy policy objectives with regard to the quantity of replacement office floorspace and would not meet the design principles set out in the Area Spatial Strategy and SSAD.
- iv) Acceptable visual impact on the surrounding area: the photomontages show that the tall building would make little positive contribution to the quality of the local townscape.
- vi) Land use mix and its support to surrounding land use pattern: there is considered to be a shortfall in the re-provision of office floor space and the viability of the proposed retail unit is questionable. The contribution to the vitality of the town centre is not likely to be significant.