



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

154 Putney High Street
London SW15 1RS

25 February 2013

Dear Sirs

Planning Application 2012/5286
Ram Brewery, Wandsworth.

The Putney Society as the amenity society for Putney and Roehampton, representing nearly 1000 local households, wishes to OBJECT strongly to this application, both for the effect the proposed 34 storey tower will have on local views deep into Putney and because to consent this whole proposal would clearly show that CIL income now outweighs the Local Plan.

The location of the proposed tower means that it stands in line with View 1 from Tibbett's corner in map 1, and will dominate the background of Views 2 & 3 from Putney's bridges and behind the Bridge in the view from all along the Putney Embankment, all listed as important in the Council's new Local Views SPD. Consent so soon after its issue would demonstrate that this document had no purpose.

By aligning with these the tower will badly impact on Putney Bridge Road next to (and many views within) Wandsworth Park, Disraeli Road (Oxford Road CA), St Johns Avenue (W Putney CA) and others, and should therefore be rejected for the failing to preserve or enhance these Conservation Areas (not to mention what it will do to Church Row). Anyone who thinks this doesn't matter should visit Wadham Road, now blighted by the much smaller tower rising next to East Putney station.

This whole application is based on a false premise – see page 5 of the 'non technical summary' etc. - that the density *needs* to be this high. Only Minerva's bankers need this. What this the part of central of Wandsworth needs is set out clearly in the considered, evidence based, consulted and recently adopted new Local Plan, specifically on pages 76 and 77 of the Site Specific Allocations Document, which covers both high buildings and the impact on views. Please read this. The justification for a planning process is for the Council to represent the interests of local residents by encouraging enough development but *refusing* excess and *protecting* what is of value. The previous inspector understood this and rejected the last scheme. The council should do the same with this essentially similar one. Squeezing two towers in to one does not make it work, and is an admission that nowhere on this site is right for tall buildings.

Yours Sincerely

Andrew Catto

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

The Putney Society

The amenity society for Putney and Roehampton
Registered Charity No. 263242