



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2017

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10th January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/17/3181007

Holy Trinity Church, Trinity Road, London SW17 7RH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by CTIL against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
 - The application Ref 2107/2415, dated 27 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 8 antennae located behind replacement Glass Reinforced Plastic (GRP) louvres, the installation of equipment cabinets to be located internally within the clock chamber, and ancillary development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effects of the development on the significance of the listed building and conservation area. The Council's submitted documents indicate that their concern relates to the effects of the proposed replacement of the louvres.

Reasons

3. The appeal building dates from the mid-19th Century and is constructed of Kentish ragstone with Bath stone dressing. The church stands prominently at an angle to the road, with its bell tower close to the road. The church is Grade II listed and sits within the Wandsworth Common Conservation Area.
4. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that in deciding whether to grant listed building consent or planning permission for works or development to a listed building or which affects its setting, special regard should be given to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. In addition, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Furthermore, the Framework states that when determining applications local planning authorities should require applicants to describe the significance of heritage assets in order to understand the potential impact of the proposal on its significance.

5. The appellant intends to remove the existing timber louvres which are in place on all 4 sides of the bell tower. These would be replaced by GRP replicas. The appellant has supplied some literature and photographs of other louvres fabricated from GRP. However, from what I can see, the appellant has not submitted a detailed heritage assessment which would help to understand the significance of the church and any features that it possesses. There is no indication of the state of the louvres and the contribution that they may make to the significance of the building. In addition, no physical samples of the proposed replacement louvres have been submitted.
6. The existing louvres are prominent, within a prominent part of the building. In my judgement, the loss of the (presumably) original feature made from traditional material would involve some harm and loss of significance to the listed building. Without a proper assessment of the effects of the proposal on the significance of the building including samples of the proposed louvres, I find that I have to take a precautionary approach and the presumption lies in favour of the assets' conservation. Therefore, without any alternative information before me, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the significance of the listed building and would reduce its positive contribution to the conservation area.
7. I have noted the appellant's comments relating to the use of GRP louvres in other listed buildings. However, I have no way of knowing what assessments were submitted with these applications and what merits were weighed in the balance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. There are no considerations which outweigh the harm that I have identified. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR