

SPD comments - WBC

Section B: Consultation portal comments

The following comments refer to those which have been uploaded to the consultation portal. Please note that the hyperlinks did not feature in the pdf produced summarising my comments from the portal hence the need to share this document.

Section 1 – Introduction and background

| Section | Comments |
|---------|--|
| 1.1 | Background |
| 1.1 | <p>Interesting, Roehampton features as the focus of the SPD. The sentence "<i>The Council is committed to delivering a new future for Roehampton to create a high quality living environment for residents</i>" highlights this. However, this regeneration has focused on the Alton Estate, originating with the focus on the West before moving to the East, and there seems to be a lack of focus on the wider Roehampton area in terms of regenerative qualities.</p> <p>To highlight this Alton Estate focus, especially the Alton West, please find below the following examples from the Roehampton Partnership constitution, the Wandsworth Council Committee documents, and an article by the Alton Regeneration Watch.</p> <p>1. Roehampton Partnership</p> <p><i>"The Roehampton Partnership (called 'the Partnership' in the paragraphs which follow) is a formally constituted partnership comprising members of the private, public, voluntary and community sector. The Partnership is established and supported by Wandsworth Borough Council. The Partnership has been established with the aim of working together with all sectors of the community on a range of key inter-related issues to improve the Roehampton area making it a better place to live and work.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically the Partnership's objectives are to:-</i></p> <p><i>(a) Provide a forum for consultation to support and enable the long-term regeneration of Roehampton, utilising the collective skills and experience of its membership and by reflecting local needs and priorities</i></p> <p><i>(b) Act in an advisory capacity to the development of the Master Plan for Alton West and any subsequent delivery programme, and as a sounding board for issues arising from the master planning / development process</i></p> <p><i>(c) Act in an advisory capacity to the range of other regeneration activities which support the social and economic regeneration of the area.</i></p> <p><i>(d) Support consultation and engagement activity in the area and act as a forum for discussion for issues emerging from consultations and local resident and stakeholder engagement".</i></p> <p>[Source: Page 2 of the Roehampton Partnership's Term of Reference].</p> <p>Whilst there is a mention of Roehampton, the focus has been very clearly on the Alton regeneration, which was supposedly based on the "<i>Alton West</i>", though arguably as the Danebury Avenue Town Centre is located in the centre it is neither West nor East.</p> <p>2. Regeneration documents produced by Wandsworth Council</p> <p>If this is truly about the "<i>regeneration of Roehampton</i>" then why has the focus been on the "<i>Alton</i>". Even as recently as the Council Committee meetings of the Housing and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee (21st January 2015) and the Executive (26th January 2015) Paper No. 15-7 referred to the regeneration as "<i>the Alton area regeneration programme</i>".</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p>It was only when the same area was referred to in the Council Committee meetings of <u>Community Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee (10th February 2015)</u> and <u>Executive (23rd February 2015)</u> did the same area that is being regenerated start to be referred to as something else, in this instance the "<u>Roehampton Supplementary Planning Document</u>" in Paper No.15-68.</p> <p>3. The disappearance of the Alton</p> <p>Referring to this name change, from Alton to Roehampton, the Alton Regeneration Watch has produced a detailed article which highlights this erroneous use of names. In the article, "<u>We no longer exist</u>", it highlights that the Alton Estate has been sidelined to little more than a side note. This article is included as a reference to this contortion of naming the Alton as Roehampton.</p> <p>Unrelated to the above points is that this is the start of some duplication of section references which are scattered throughout this SPD which at times makes it difficult to follow. For instance, there are two sections with 1.1 before other sections have the same references though on different pages or drop down sections if referring to the online consultation. Perhaps the sectioning would be better if the second 1.1 was 1.1.1?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD59 Response Date: 17/05/15 09:43</p> |
| 1.2 | <p>With regards to the comment – "<i>The recommended masterplan reflects the aspirations of the Council as landowner</i>" – this is not correct as there are other landowners within this SPD area. This point was made to the Chair of the Roehampton Partnership in the email of Sunday 29th March 2015 13:43 (which copied in various community stakeholders such as MP Justine Greening, Roehampton Voice and the Chair of the Roehampton Forum) with regards to Team Roehampton's oversight of this point at the Roehampton Partnership meeting of 25th March 2015. The point is highlighted below;</p> <p>"5. Council as the landowner</p> <p><i>Team Roehampton also mentioned that the choice of SPD was because the Council as 'landowner' has 'more say'. Whilst Kingsclere Close was mentioned during the Roehampton Partnership, though for different purposes, how many at the Partnership would have picked up that there are freehold properties being demolished that are not owned by the Council. No Partnership member corrected this, and it is doubtful that many around table are aware of the freehold situation at all. Of the 28 properties, 23 are sold freeholds. This represents circa 7% of the properties that are to be demolished, which is not insignificant".</i></p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD60 Response Date: 17/05/15 10:04</p> <p>The full sentence of "<i>The recommended masterplan reflects the aspirations of the Council as landowner and planning authority following consultation with residents and stakeholder groups</i>" is debatable for the following reasons;</p> <p>Point 1 – Residents feel the need to meet with MP Greening</p> <p>If so, why have Alton Estate residents have had two meetings with MP Greening as they have felt that current community leaders and the Council are not supporting their views? One such example is highlighted on MP Greening's website - http://www.justinegreening.co.uk/campaigns/roehampton-regeneration .</p> <p>A further meeting was held on the 20th March 2015 at the DARA Focus Hall to which I was invited though unable to attend due to it being late notice and during working hours.</p> <p>Point 2 – Ward Councillors refuse to justify student housing in Danebury Avenue Town Centre</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

That the three Roehampton & Putney Heath Labour Councillors refuse to answer its electorate with regards to the following about student housing in the Town Centre. A series of questions were sent to all three Councillors, with Labour candidate MP Sheila Boswell and Wandsworth Labour Council leader Rex Osborne as copy parties. Email sent January 6th 2015 21:37. Yet the response was underwhelming and as one of the electorate this would seem to call into question what role "the elected members" had. Read the questions and answer in the document '[Challenge re student housing in DATC](#)'.

Point 3 – Roehampton Partnership ignores it's residents

In addition to the figures provided in point 2 the following figures were provided to the Roehampton Partnership at both the July 8th 2014 and re-submitted at the 9th September 2014 meetings. Both times ignored. These figures do not highlight that the Masterplan reflects the "*aspirations of the Councils as landowner and planning authority following consultation with residents and stakeholder groups*".

Refer to the Appendix on page 11 of the document '[Roehampton Partnership - Roehampton residents require more visibility v1.1](#)' as this provides feedback from residents with regards to the lack of support for student housing in Danebury Avenue Town Centre, the opening of either Danebury Avenue or Highcliffe Drive barriers, as well as the new access route through into Richmond Park.

Point 4 – Poor questionnaire response

The low turnout of questionnaire feedback represents another concern with regards to confirming support for this regeneration by residents. The Roehampton Partnership mentioned this though did not try to address the issue. The following are comments from the July 8th 2014 meeting.

"Mr. Horrocks sought clarification on why only 254 respondents had returned their questionnaire despite 3,800 questionnaires been sent out. In response, Mr. Moore said that people could not be made to return the questionnaires and this was part of the reason why there were various methods of engaging with the community during the consultation period. Ms Newton confirmed that the masterplanning team had spoken to 37 different community groups and that the team's contact details were widely publicised during the consultation period should residents have queries about the questionnaire. Mr. Horrocks said that he was one of the people who had not completed the questionnaire because he did not think it was good enough. He thought the questions were leading and designed to give the Council the answers it wanted".

"Councillor Ambache said that the poor response was probably due to people being sceptical about consultations".

Given the feedback from the ward's Councillors with regards to student housing in the Town Centre, as per point 3, as well as the Roehampton Partnership's non-response to the figures put in front of them in point 4, is it any wonder as to why there is a lack of feedback on the questionnaires.

Point 5 – Twentieth Century feedback not highlighted to residents

The two Consultation documents which were published for residents did not refer to the Twentieth Century Society, which is seems strange given that they are a statutory consultee in the planning process for post-1914 listed buildings under ODPM Circular 09/2005.

In the two summary consultation documents, neither time was the Twentieth Century mentioned.

- [Alton Area Masterplan Interim Consultation Report February 2014 \(Section 2\)](#)
- [Alton Area Masterplan – Preferred Option Consultation Report July 2014 \(Sections](#)

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p><u>2B, 2C, 2D)</u></p> <p>The first time, as far as I can tell, the Twentieth Century Society was mentioned was in the Council document <u>Wandsworth Borough Council paper 14-447</u> stated within point 22, right towards the end of the document and it was in favour of refurbishment rather than redevelopment.</p> <p>If the Roehampton Partnership refers to the Twentieth Century Society as an <i>"In response to a question, Mr. Moore confirmed that the 20th Century group, an amenity group in Wandsworth, were one of the agencies consulted"</i> (Minutes dated 3rd December 2014) then a question must be raised as to how well this consultation has been understood by this advisory group.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD62 Response Date: 17/05/15 17:26</p> |
| 1.3 | <p>The <u>"Alton Area Masterplan Baseline Report (August 2013)"</u> was published online on the 8th October 2014 as confirmed by Team Roehampton in an email dated January 8th 2015 12:03. This being published two days after the October Masterplan was confirmed by the Council Executive on 6th October 2014 as shown by the <u>leaflet</u> which was delivered to homes.</p> <p>The cover of the Baseline document is dated September 2013 and not August 2013.</p> <p>A question that needs to be raised is why was this document not shared with residents until after both the Options Consultation and the Preferred Options Consultation, and after the Masterplan being approved?</p> <p>Residents have not been given the opportunity to review this document and ask questions or challenge the assumptions that are contained within it during which could have had an impact on the outcome of the views and opinions expressed for the Options and Preferred Options consultations.</p> <p>For instance, on <u>page 15 of the Masterplan</u> it states the following - <i>"Currently 40% of the units in the Alton area are privately rented owned by buy to let landlords and primarily let to students. This lack of tenure diversity has resulted in a prevalence of short term tenancies with accompanying management problems as detailed above; an increase in resident leaseholders could address this imbalance"</i> was put to Team Roehampton as a query for the figure is closer to 20% not 40%.</p> <p>This is a gross exaggeration of the buy to let figures which has been used as part of the Council's basis for this regeneration, as Team Roehampton later commented that <i>"The 40% mentioned on page 15 of the masterplan should refer to the percentage of leaseholders in general, and not specifically non resident leaseholders"</i>.</p> <p>This leads to the following thoughts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Was this clarified with the Council members whom signed off the Masterplan?• Could this have lead to more discussion about whether this figure of 20% is sufficient justification for demolishing properties? <p>Additional comments from this Baseline sentence;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Could" is subjective and insufficient evidence for any demolition justification.• How will the Council ensure this "increase in resident leaseholders" and be able to stop, say, wealthy overseas residents from snapping up copious amounts of the leasehold properties? |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------------|--|
| | <p>Looking at the Baseline report, this 40% is taken from Table 3 on page 147, which includes the Ibsley neighbourhood and this will be commented upon further in section 1.4.</p> <p>Another example is the possible exaggeration of the health issues of the Alton, or at least the figures to support such issues are flawed. <u>Page 14 of the Masterplan states</u> ;</p> <p><i>"The area also performs relatively poorly on health indicators. 14% of the area's population have long-term health problems or disabilities which limit their day to day activity 'a little or a lot'. This is above the Wandsworth average of 11%. This higher incidence of health problems potentially limits the ability of people in the area to access jobs, or participate in exercise or social activity, or access services or amenities. This also puts significant pressure on health and other community services. Anecdotal evidence from health practitioners in the area suggests that there are particular problems of mental health and physical inactivity which further contribute to the areas problems regarding the health and wellbeing of its residents".</i></p> <p>If the Alton figures are that bad, then London's need improving too. The figure, <u>based on Table 16 on page 137 of the Baseline report</u>, for London is 14% too (Day-to-Day Activities Limited A Lot + Day-to-Day Activities Limited A Little), according to the figures in the Census report. Is it that the Alton performs "relatively poorly" (and so too London) or is it that Wandsworth's figures are very good? So, does the wrecking ball start on the rest of London based on these figures?</p> <p>These figures have been put to a member of Roehampton Partnership, and to date it has not been able possible defend the challenge of this use of data. This can be shared with the Planning Team to substantiate further if required.</p> <p>The further explanation to the challenge is located at – <u>"What health benefits will the Alton regeneration bring?"</u> on the roeregeneration website.</p> <p>In summary, all of the figures in the Baseline should be re-assessed for accuracy and whether they have used appropriately. These figures are being used for the basis of the regeneration and if the Baseline is flawed, then so too is the premise for continuing with the regeneration.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD63 Response Date: 17/05/15 17:36</p> |
| 1.2 | What is the role and purpose of the SPD? |
| 1.4 | <p>Referring to Section 1.1 this is a regeneration programme for the Alton Estate, and the SPD focuses predominately on the Alton West, not Roehampton.</p> <p>Figure 1.2 incorporates six blocks from the Alton East which has not been part of a consultation process as of yet. These six blocks being Hersham Close 73-95 odd, Hersham Close 1-39 odd, Bordon Walk 1-23 odd, Bordon Walk 2-24 even, Hersham Close 41-71 odd, and Holyborne Avenue 2-24 even. These six blocks were not mentioned in either the Options consultations or the Preferred Options consultation. If not in either of these stages why would members of the community have any reason to think these blocks would be included within the SPD?</p> <p>The first consultation The following documents were delivered to properties; > <u>Options booklet</u> – > <u>Questionnaire</u> -</p> <p>Can you find where these six blocks are within these documents?</p> <p>The second consultation The following documents were delivered to properties;</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

- > Preferred option booklet –
- > Options consultation questionnaire -

Can you find where these six blocks are within these documents?

The Council has stated that these blocks were in the Masterplan and that some of these are due for demolition. The following text from Martin Howell (Group Planner - Policy & Information, Planning and Development Division, Housing and Community Services Department, Wandsworth Council, The Town Hall, Wandsworth High Street, London SW18 2PU) indicates as much :

"The Council is currently consulting on the Roehampton Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), based on the principles set out in the Masterplan, which is a formal planning document which, once adopted, will be taken into account in assessing any future planning applications in the area.

Both the Masterplan and the Roehampton SPD set out proposals for Roehampton Local Centre – see "5.1 Sub-area 1 – Roehampton Local Centre" in the SPD. Whilst the boundaries shown in the diagrams in the SPD are indicative rather than definitive, Figure 5.2 Key Principles for Roehampton Local Centre, does indicate that the properties on the west side of Hersham Close (1-95 (odd)) are included in an area shown as "Mixed Use Development Opportunity". Properties on the east side of Hersham Close not indicated as being included in the area.

Details of the Roehampton SPD consultation can be found on the Council's website at: http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/info/1004/planning_policy/1225/supplementary_planning_documents_spds/5 "

However, this has later been retracted by the Council yet no explanation, as far as I aware, has been offered as to;

1. Why these six blocks have been included in the Masterplan, especially when they were not shown in the first two consultations referred to earlier.
2. Or what the implications are for the fate of these, and other, maisonettes on the Estate for if there are going to be maisonettes demolished as they are apparently not fit for purpose, then a question needs to be raised as to future of the remaining maisonettes.

If the Baseline had been shared with residents during the Options and Preferred Options consultation, then the challenge as to the inclusion of these blocks would be made been made earlier. Bearing in mind, the Baseline (dated September 2013) was uploaded onto the Council website after the Masterplan had been agreed by the Council Executive (October 2014).

The status of the future of the maisonettes have been highlighted by the likes of The Putney Society in its letter to the Council dated 9th April 2014. Also, these has been mentioned by Alton Regeneration Watch its article "[Spot the difference](#)", and roeregeneration's article "[Alton's maisonettes under threat?](#)".

In other words there is scepticism as to why these maisonettes are included in the SPD for there is no apparent reason for these being included, especially after they were not included in the first two consultations, they appear to have been slipped in after the resident consultations, even though they were within the Baseline which was apparently put together pre-resident consultations.

Comment ID: RSPD64
Response Date: 17/05/15 17:42

Figur Please remove the six blocks from the Ibsley neighbourhood for reasons highlighted in

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-------|--|
| e 1.2 | <p>section 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD65 Response Date: 17/05/15 17:45</p> |
| 1.5 | |
| 1.6 | <p>To date the Council has provided its own newsletters and leaflets with regards to the various stages of the consultation. On the 2nd April 2015 there was an email to those, assumed, to be on the Team Roehampton distribution list. As of the time of writing this there has been no Team Roehampton newsletter to explain this SPD process. Why has there been no materials distributed for this consultation like there was for the both the Options and Preferred Options consultations</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"Given that it has been subject to extensive community consultation"</i> – this is disputable. Team Roehampton has mentioned that both English Heritage and the 20th Century Society have been involved at every step of the process. I thought that the 20th Century was first contacted on 19th December 2013 which was after the first stage of the consultation that ran from September to November 2013. Additionally, the feedback from English Heritage seems to have had a more profound impact on the Preferred Options consultation, which appears as though another statutory body was contacted after the first consultation took place. Could the Council confirm this understanding?</p> <p>Also, section 1.2 refers to comments about the challenges made regarding this consultation.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD66 Response Date: 17/05/15 17:52</p> |
| 1.3 | Relationship to policies |
| 1.7 | |
| 1.8 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"The 2nd Proposed Submission Versions of the Local Plan documents (including the Core Strategy, Development Management Policies Document, Site Specific Allocations Document and Policies Map Changes Document) were subject to public consultation in October/November 2014"</i> leads to ask under what basis was this consultation communicated to Alton Estate residents?</p> <p>There does not appear to be any mention of this third consultation in any literature which was provided to the residents.</p> <p>Having attended the Roehampton Partnership meetings on 8th July 2014, 9th September 2014, 3rd December 2014 there was no mention of the October consultation rather that residents will have the opportunity to provide views at the February consultation, which was when the SPD was originally to be held. Also, at the Roehampton Forum, where I attended the meetings on 11th July 2015 and at the meeting of 7th November 2015 don't recall a mention of the October consultation, rather at the November meeting the following was stated (taken from the Minutes):</p> <p><i>"Jonny Moore reported that the Master Plan had been approved by the Council Executive on 6th October. It was now on line and in the library. The next stage would be to transfer this into planning policy. This would mean a consultation in February and March lasting six weeks. After that the Council would have to decide how to deliver regeneration"</i>.</p> <p>Note – Jonny Moore, at the time, worked for Team Roehampton and therefore for the Council.</p> <p>Even at the most recent Roehampton Forum meeting of 12th May 2015, it referred to three 'consultations'. These being the 'Baseline/Pre-consultation', 'Options Consultation' and the 'Preferred Options Consultation'. The presentation from Team Roehampton, did not seem to highlight the October/November 'consultation'?</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------|--|
| | <p>Comment ID: RSPD104 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:05</p> <p><i>"the meetings on 11th July 2015 and at the meeting of 7th November 2015" both need to be amended to 2014.</i></p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD265 Response Date: 24/05/15 16:13</p> |
| 1.9 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"The Core Strategy (Policy PL1) states that deprivation and inequalities will be tackled through regeneration initiatives and the focusing of mainstream services and resources on the highest priority areas, including Roehampton".</i> – how will the deprivation be tackled?</p> <p>There is no reference to how this regeneration will actually tackle such issues it is only recently that the concept of <i>"social regeneration"</i> is being discussed by the ward's Councillors and this is circa two years after this regeneration was initiated. Presently, this seems to be a buildings first worry about social aspects later.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD105 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:07</p> |
| 1.10 | <p>"Roehampton Masterplan" to be amended to "Alton Masterplan".</p> <p>"Roehampton residents" to be amended to "Alton Estate residents".</p> <p>What are these <i>"new transport linkages"</i>? MP Greening announced on the putneysw15 website [Dated 17 July 2014] that both Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive barriers will remain off the Masterplan. Or was this only a temporary reprieve?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD106 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:10</p> |
| 1.11 | |
| 1.12 | |
| 1.13 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"Mayoral CIL will however be charged and development will be required to mitigate its impacts as necessary and appropriate in accordance with the Section 106 tests".</i> – will this CIL make its way back into the Alton Estate?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD107 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:11</p> |
| 1.14 | |
| 1.4 | What is the SPD area? |
| | Location and context |
| 1.15 | <p>The removal of the following six maisonettes should be factored out of the hectare measurement - Hersham Close 73-95 odd, Hersham Close 1-39 odd, Bordon Walk 1-23 odd, Bordon Walk 2-24 even, Hersham Close 41-71 odd, and Holyborne Avenue 2-24 even – for the reasons mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Additionally much of the hectare space refers to areas that will not be built on such as Ibstock Place School, Alton Primary School, Bull's Green (i.e. Downshire Fields) which will not be built on, as well as the Whitelands College grounds of Roehampton University. This reference to "47 hectares" seems all encompassing. What is the area of where the works are to take place?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD108 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:16</p> |
| 1.16 | <p>To be amended to "The Alton Estate is located within Roehampton and is located in the west of the London Borough of Wandsworth between Putney Heath and Richmond Park. Roehampton sits in a rolling landscape located directly north of Richmond Park in south west London (see Figure 1.3). It is surrounded by the historic towns and villages of Roehampton,</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Richmond, Barnes and Mortlake”.</p> <p>Reading this comment makes one question what is supposed to be so wrong with the estate given it is situated on “rolling landscape” and “surrounded by..historic towns”.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD109 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:18</p> |
| 1.17 | <p>This section seems to counter the view that has been aired on multiple occasions that there is a need to open up the Alton Estate to make is more accessible as many local town centres are “<i>within easy access</i>”.</p> <p>Additionally, Sheen should be included as this is before Richmond via the 493 bus.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD110 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:20</p> |
| 1.18 | <p>This is not to comment on whether an institution is “<i>reputable</i>” or not, rather this list seems to disregard Roehampton University and the Priory Clinic.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD111 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:21</p> |
| Built form and heritage | |
| 1.19 | <p>Finally, “Alton Estate” receives a mention in its own right.</p> <p>The comment - “<i>This SPD focuses on Alton West, the area defined by Priory Lane to the west, Clarence Land to the north, Roehampton Lane and Holybourne Avenue to the east, and Richmond Park to the south</i>” - neglects The removal of the following six maisonettes should be factored in - Hersham Close 73-95 odd, Hersham Close 1-39 odd, Bordon Walk 1-23 odd, Bordon Walk 2-24 even, Hersham Close 41-71 odd, and Holyborne Avenue 2-24 even – as per the comments within section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD112 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:22</p> |
| 1.20 | |
| 1.21 | <p>Regarding Figure 1.4 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD113 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:24</p> |
| 1.22 | <p>Regarding the comment - “Numerous alterations have however taken place since the 1950s, including some insensitive later additions that have eroded the heritage value of assets and detract from their settings” – this is a subjective comment and requires an objective assessment. If it is proven to be true, then what did the Council do to prevent this from occurring?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD114 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:24</p> |
| 1.23 | |
| 1.24 | <p>Regarding Figure 1.5 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>The comment - “Higher scale development exists along Roehampton Lane both within and outside the SPD site boundary” – appears to be an ominous way to highlight that there is scope for tall buildings to built.</p> <p>Referring to Labour’s 2008 Stuart King’s Roehampton redevelopment Consultation Labour stated the following in support of keeping buildings to predominately 3 or 4 storeys – “The buildings the Tories want to build will be too high. While Allbrook House is 9 storeys, all the</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>surrounding buildings are of a human scale: 3 or 4 storeys along Danebury Avenue. Having all but a couple of buildings 5 or 6 storeys high will make Danebury Avenue darker, more like a canyon and could make the area bleak and windswept”.</p> <p>The result from the survey highlights, questions 19 and 20, that residents are not in favour of tall buildings.</p> <p>The accompanying text was –</p> <p>“The Alton Estate is an area containing many high-rise buildings, albeit spread across a large area and interspersed with open space and greenery. Although the Council’s plans demolish one such building - Allbrook House - all the other replacement buildings will be higher – up to six storeys high – than those there currently. In our survey, residents came out strongly against taller buildings: just 4% wanted buildings more than two storeys taller than those there now and 86% said they should remain the same or be smaller than the existing Danebury Avenue streetscape.</p> <p>What will be the consequence of generally taller buildings? We don’t know for sure because no wind tunnel modelling has been conducted by the Council or its contractors. What we do know, however, is that Roehampton is on the top of a hill, adjacent to a substantial amount of open space (Richmond Park, Putney Heath, Wimbledon Common) and is thus exposed to the elements. It is hardly unreasonable to believe that creating a canyon of buildings one third higher than those present now will increase the impact of wind through the area and allow less light down to street level. The buildings also “hem in” Danebury Avenue; an effect that will make the area feel smaller and more claustrophobic”.</p> <p>Having spent many hours recently standing in front of Cafe Joy, as a local resident, I can inform you it is already a wind tunnel.</p> <p>Regarding the comment “The Ibsley neighbourhood and area around Portswood Place (including Mount Clare) feature a prevailing scale of 1-2 storey built form, with the occasional 3-4 storey building” – the mention of Ibsley neighbourhood should be removed as this has not been consulted on as to its inclusion, refer to section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Regarding the comment “Higher scale development exists along Roehampton Lane both within and outside the SPD site boundary” – can this be listed please.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD115 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:28</p> |
| 1.25 | <p>To be revised to <i>“The public realm and public open space provides an important setting for the buildings and for the Conservation Areas”</i>. The word <i>“generous”</i> implies that something could be done to impact this to make it less <i>“generous”</i>.</p> <p>Also, the use of <i>“generous”</i> is another use of a subjective opinion expressed by the author of the document.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD116 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:29</p> |
| Figure 1.4 Existing Heritage Assets | <p>Regarding Figure 1.4 refer to comment about the need to remove the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD117 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:31</p> |
| Figure | <p>Regarding Figure 1.5 refer to comment about the need to remove the six Ibsley</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|--|--|
| e 1.5 Existi ng Buildi ng Heigh ts | <p>neighbourhood blocks mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD117 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:31</p> |
| Existing land uses | |
| 1.26 | <p>Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the need to remove the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Ibsley neighbourhood volume of properties referred to in Figure 1.6 is 84 not 222. The 84 refers to the six blocks in the SPD, this needs to be made clear.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD119 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:33</p> |
| 1.27 | <p>Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>"Roehampton Local Centre" to be renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre" as was the case in both the Options Consultation and the Preferred Options Consultation.</p> <p><u>Example 1: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan Options Consultation</u> "1 Danebury Avenue Town Centre New investment could create a cleaner, more attractive, more active and safer local centre which would be better used by local people. New shops could be provided and service areas could be better managed and secured".</p> <p><u>Example 2: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan: Preferred Option Consultation</u> "A REVITALISED TOWN CENTRE THE PREFERRED OPTION The preferred option aims to transform Danebury Avenue town centre, making it more attractive destination with new shops, better housing and potentially a new place for arts and community activities. There will be inviting public spaces, improved pavements and streets".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD120 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:34</p> |
| 1.28 | |
| 1.29 | <p>With regards to the list referred there seems to be omissions with regards to those businesses (such as Co-Op and Premier) and some other community infrastructure services such as Regenerate. Shouldn't all businesses and services be listed?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD121 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:35</p> |
| Access | |
| 1.30 | <p>Regarding Figure 1.7 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "<i>While the SPD area has a low to medium level of public transport accessibility (ranging from 1B to 3) it is within an approximately 20 minute walk of Barnes Station where South West trains provide direct connections to Clapham Junction, London Waterloo, Weybridge, Richmond and Kingston (see Figure 1.7)</i>" – this needs further explanation. This seems to have been written as to exaggerate the distance from the Alton Estate. From the Alton Estate the 72 (bus stop B) and the 265 (bus stop B) both take one to Barnes station. Also, the 493 (bus stop S) takes one very close to Barnes station. Barnes station should also be noted as a National Rail station and not a TfL underground station, whereas 1.31 highlights East Putney station as being an "underground station".</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| | <p>Additionally regarding this comment, there is a challenge that should be addressed as to whether residents would use Barnes station versus either Putney Bridge station (<u>accessible via the 265 bus, bus stop FE</u>) or Putney Station (<u>accessible via the 85 bus, bus stop B</u>). The reason for this challenge is that Barnes station is zone 3 and therefore a more expensive trip to a train station than either Putney station or Putney Bridge station, both of which are within zone 2. <u>Currently, zone 1-2 annual fare is £1,284 whilst zone 1-3 to is £1,508, which is £224 difference and the equivalent of £268.80 per annum to a lower rate tax payer or £313.60 for a higher rate tax payer.</u></p> <p>Regarding Figure 1.7 this is of a very poor quality and is difficult to read. <u>The page 6 map of the Queen Mary's Place brochure is of better quality.</u></p> <p>Regarding the comment – "Buses provide access to neighbouring centres (Putney, Wandsworth and Richmond) and into the wider public transport network, including links into Hammersmith and Victoria" – this ignores Sheen, Southfields, Clapham Junction, and Barnes.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD122 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:38</p> |
| 1.31 | <p>Using the TfL journey planner, the 265 bus from Roehampton Lane/Danebury Ave can take one to Putney Bridge station in 16 minutes. Therefore why would one take the "approximate 40 minute bus ride" to East Putney?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "The nearest underground station is East Putney which is an approximately 40 minute bus ride and is serviced by the District Line, with connections to Wimbledon, Hammersmith, Edgware Road, Westminster and Whitechapel" – this seems to direct the reader towards the Alton Estate being inaccessible. Using the TfL journey planner, the 265 bus from Roehampton Lane/Danebury Ave can take one to Putney Bridge station in 16 minutes. Using the TfL journey planner, from SW15 4LP to Hammersmith underground station this is 33 minutes. Therefore why would one take the "approximate 40 minute bus ride" to East Putney?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD123 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:40</p> <p>Even going to Southfields underground station would be quicker than going to East Putney underground. Leaving at 7am on Friday morning, for instance, would take 13 minutes with the 493 bus. - https://onedrive.live.com/redir?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!555&authkey=!A06lyrtsFK-y-5U&ithint=file%2cpdf</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD266 Response Date: 24/05/15 16:15</p> |
| 1.32 | <p>"Roehampton" to be replaced with "the Alton Estate".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD124 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:40</p> |
| Figure 1.6 Existing Land Uses | <p>Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD125 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:43</p> |
| Figure 1.7 Existing | <p>Regarding Figure 1.7 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD126 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:44</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| Site Access | |
|----------------|---|
| 1.5 | How was the SPD prepared? |
| 1.33 | <p>From a resident perspective the "Baseline" came after the "Masterplan completion" as commented in section 1.1 point 1.3.</p> <p>As mentioned in section 1.1 point 1.3 the Baseline contains flaws which needs to be revisited. If the Baseline is flawed it is fair to suggest that the following stages have been based on incorrect information.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD127 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:47</p> |
| 1.34 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"At each of the above stages consultation has influenced the masterplan evolution"</i> – again, this reinforces the suggestion that there is a need to review the Baseline, especially as it was released after the Masterplan and contains incorrect information.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"The final masterplan therefore represents a broad consensus on the approach required to bring about the necessary change in the Roehampton area"</i> – there has been no such agreement and this was highlighted by the examples in section 1.1 point 1.2 regarding the lack of support for student housing in Danebury Avenue Town Centre and section 1.2 point 1.4 regarding both the inclusion of the six Ibsley neighbourhood maisonettes.</p> <p>"Roehampton" needs to be amended to "Alton Estate".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD128 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:49</p> |
| 1.35 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"consensus of the opinion that resulted from the process"</i> – this is not the case as highlighted in section 1.2.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"a working group of Council Officers (as landowner and planning authority)"</i> – the Council is not the sole landowner and this needs to take into account the other "landowners".</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"It will be published for consultation for a period of 7 weeks"</i> – this was to take account of the fact that this was occurring during "purdah" and many residents were not fine with this approach. The Roehampton Forum, which rarely votes on any topic, voting against this and wrote to the Council to challenge this view.</p> <p>Additionally, there has been no formal distribution to residents of the Alton Estate regarding this SPD consultation, whereas in the past there have been newsletters distributed across the Alton Estate. To make up for this, the Alton Regeneration Watch, in their newsletter number 3, have delivered this communication to Alton Estate residents. To many on the Alton Estate this has represented a poor means of communication displayed by the Council.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD129 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:50</p> |
| 1.36 | |
| 1.6 | How to use the SPD |
| 1.37 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"The SPD provides supplementary planning guidance to the policies mentioned earlier in this section and is the product of an extensive masterplanning and community consultation exercise"</i> – this is disputable based on the lack of responsiveness from community leaders (as per section 1.1 point 1.2) and the Council (such as belated sharing of the Baseline report with residents) with regards to any views that challenge the support for the regeneration.</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

The local community leaders have various connections to the regeneration which raises some concerns about how transparent this process is.

Continuing the community leader comment, the ward's Councillors referred to this regeneration as a farce on no less than three occasions and this has been shared with the Roehampton Partnership. What has been done to disprove this consultation "farce"? Nothing, as far as I understand.

The three Putney Heath and Roehampton Labour Councillors campaigned for the 2014 local elections based on the consultation being a "farce" and this was mentioned at the Roehampton Partnership at the July 8th 2014 meeting. The three documents are outlined as follows.

Mention 1

"Roehampton Regeneration

By contacting and listening to Roehampton residents the Labour team is aware of local public opinion. The Tories regeneration 'consultation' was a farce. By declaring their preferred option before the consultation had finished they rode rough shod over local opinion. And the Roehampton Tory Councillors didn't say a thing! We are the only voice able to effectively monitor and, if necessary, oppose the Tories plans on the Council".

> Document -

<https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!133&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey=!AJazMeuwZ2vouxk>

Mention 2

"Alton Regeneration - A Warning!

Recently, the Tory Council leader described statutory planning procedures as 'guidelines'. They are NOT guidelines. 'Statutory' means they are a legal requirement. Now borough amenity societies and community groups have sent an 'open' letter to the Prime Minister calling for an urgent independent review into Wandsworth's planning processes.

All of this bodes ill for the Alton Regeneration. The recent consultation farce illustrates how Roehampton too is also being effected by this casual approach of the Tory Council to the interests of Roehampton residents. Publishing their 'preferred option' before the consultation had ended, is an amber alert to all those effected by the regeneration. Just what will we get as against what is proposed? So far not a peep from the 'do nothing' Tory Councillors in Roehampton. Jeremy, Peter and Sue would be much more vigilant. Local Tory Councillors will not fight the Tory Council but Labour will!"

> Document -

<https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!189&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey=!AH5FoZdb6tXX1q8>

Mention 3

"Danebury Avenue - Tories don't listen

The Tories are conducting a so-called consultation on the Alton Regeneration. This long overdue project is already turning into a farce. The Tories have already decided on the 'preferred option' - before the consultation closes! What have your Roehampton Tory councillors done about this? Nothing!

The Tories took no notice of the huge number of residents who did not want the Danebury barrier opened. They are now proposing to open the barrier almost 24/7 - watch out for the rat-runs to develop. What have your Roehampton Tories done about this? Nothing!"

> Document -

<https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!135&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey=!AH-YKSJz7DwIsgk>

Comment ID: RSPD130

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------|---|
| | Response Date: 18/05/15 21:53 |
| 1.38 | Not sure there is clear guidance. Include the confusion between the Council members with regards to the demolition of the six blocks in the Ibsley neighbourhood as mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD131 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:54 |
| 1.39 | Amend "Roehampton Local Centre" to "Danebury Avenue Town Centre". Comment ID: RSPD132 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:54 |
| 1.40 | |
| 1.41 | Amend "Roehampton" to "Alton Estate". Comment ID: RSPD133 Response Date: 18/05/15 21:55 |
| 1.7 | Structure of the SPD |
| 1.42 | |

Section 2 – Key issues and challenges

| Section | Comments |
|---------|--|
| 2.1 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"An examination of the SPD area reveals a number of physical, environmental, social and market issues affecting the quality of the life of the people who live there"</i> – each of these "issues" have not been proven. An example is regarding "social" whereby only now, some two years after the beginning of this regeneration work stream, has there been any discussion regarding the "social" component of the regeneration. At the Roehampton Partnership of 25th March 2015, the health representative, asked Jonny Moore, from Team Roehampton, how many times Team Roehampton had met with the NHS and the answer was once, which was commented by the health representative as not being good enough. It will be interesting to see if this is in the Minutes when they are finally released.</p> <p>Even at the 12th May 2015, Councillor Ambache mentioned, again, regarding the need for "social regeneration". I live here and don't see how this plan has progressed beyond the Roehampton Partnership Minutes of 3rd December 2014 which stated;</p> <p><i>"Councillor Ambache then spoke about the Masterplan which he said appeared to deal with only the physical aspect of the regeneration. As the Council is committed to building a stronger community it would have to engage with other partners such as health, schools, the voluntary sector etc. This will promote improved health outcomes and educational achievement, employment as well as partnership working with the police and improved arts and culture, All of these are just as important as physical improvements and, as such, there ought to be a strategic plan for community regeneration to cover the next five years. This will require an assessment of community needs and how to measure progress. Councillor Ambache said there ought to be a paper on this for discussion and how to move the matter forward. Councillor Carpenter agreed that there was health inequality within the borough and said that there was a need for the Council to engage with the NHS as stakeholders".</i></p> <p>Regarding the comment - "evidence suggests that the area is not working to its full potential" – this depends from whose perspective? If from the aspect of trying to cram as many people into such a confined area, something which Labour highlighted in their 2008 survey <i>"What Roehampton wants"</i> was that <i>"There is also a legitimate debate to be had as to whether the Alton estate – already the most densely populated part of the constituency – should be the focus of hundreds more homes. Love it or hate it, one of the things that cannot be denied about the Alton is that it was meticulously planned to provide green open space surrounding the blocks and avenues of council housing. The Council plans irreparably damage this plan by building on the green space and over-</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p><i>populating the estate</i>" then this plan seems to succeed!</p> <p>Cross referring this to figure 2.1 this does not highlight "key issues" rather it provides a vague high level overview of what the Council perceives as opportunities to maximise revenue opportunity. For instance, within Figure 2.1 it is stated "homes in need of improvement" though if the homes currently marked as such do indeed need improvement via demolition and replacement of new denser building growth, then that leads an open question that all other buildings on the Alton Estate could be in the same position?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD147 Response Date: 19/05/15 21:47</p> |
| 2.1 | Planning application history |
| 2.2 | <p>There seems to be some notable omissions from this list such as;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The current Ibstock school theatre (Application Number: 2013/0803) b) Whitelands college student accommodation (though mentioned in paragraph 2.17) c) Downshire House student accommodation (Application Number: 2013/1857) d) Digby Stuart and Southlands Colleges (Application Number: 2014/3330) e) Mosaic school (though mentioned in paragraph 2.17) f) Eglemont House apartments that have been advertised recently in the Wandsworth Guardian g) Emerald Square (though mentioned in paragraph 6.3) <p>Comment ID: RSPD148 Response Date: 19/05/15 21:49</p> |
| 2.2 | Quality of the environment and buildings |
| 2.3 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"With its proximity to Richmond Park and the Georgian landscape setting, parts of the area are attractive and the generosity of the public spaces and public realm contribute to a general sense of openness, particularly around Downshire Fields.."</i> - does "generosity" mean a target for developers?</p> <p>This "generosity" is based on whose thoughts? A subjective view which should be removed.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD149 Response Date: 19/05/15 21:50</p> |
| 2.4 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"Whilst the site benefits from the amount of open (and particularly green) space, there are issues with the quality, layout and functionality of the public realm and spaces that limit its usability, pedestrian accessibility and that detract from the quality of buildings"</i>.</p> <p>It should be highlighted that this "open space" is liked by residents of the Alton Estate. In the Putney Labour Survey of 2008 two questions supported this, these being questions 6 and 7.</p> <p>In 2010 there was the <u>Social Audit by the Roehampton Ecumenical Church</u> and again the open green spaces found favour with residents, as highlighted by the 74.8% as shown on page 20 of the report within Figure 6.</p> <p>Therefore two surveys with residents and two positive results for the green open space.</p> <p>It should be noted that these surveys and social audit were conducted by members of the Roehampton Partnership which is the main advisory body for the regeneration and it should be asked why these representatives are now countering the views as shown by the residents?</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

Regarding the comment - *"Poor quality entrances to blocks. Entries to stairwells or ground floor level units are not secured in every instance. This results in areas, which should be the sole realm of residents living in these blocks, being openly accessible and deemed to be insecure and unsafe"* – does this mean all buildings on the Alton Estate which do not have security doors are *"deemed to be insecure and unsafe"*? And therefore in need of demolition? Does this also extend to the 23 freehold properties of Kingsclere Close? Allbrook House and 117-211 odd Danebury Avenue in the demolition area have secure doors so is this really a problem?

Further, where there is any lack of security, the query needs to be raised as to why this is the case. Labour wrote about Kimpton House not having security doors, being the only one of six blocks in the Manresa neighbourhood which does not have security doors. The article, *'What price is security?'* [Saturday, 28 November 2009] commented on the prohibitive cost of installing such security doors.

In 2014, there was another attempt to ask the question for security doors, and the outcome was not in favour (16 yes, 18 no, 14 non-respondents) thought this may have something to do with the cost, which Labour has highlighted in the past.

The survey itself did not provide for any feedback should a resident choose not to take up the offer. Wouldn't it be better to have a meeting with the Council and the residents, including the ones whom wished for these secure doors to be installed? Maybe this could have influenced the numbers more favourably. Is it a surprise that those blocks which do not have secure doors do not take them up? Is there another way of managing the process? If not having secure doors is so dangerous, can the Council enforce this obligation?

In other words, it would seem that the freeholder (i.e. the Council) and the leaseholders need to work more closely to have security doors installed. There are reasons which can be worked through rather than used as means for demolition.

Regarding the comment – *"Poorly defined spaces that are frequently not overlooked and lack any positive active frontages"*. There are the following questions;

- What makes these spaces "poorly defined"?
- What is a "positive active frontage"?
- In whose subjective view are the above made?

Regarding the comment – *"In particular there are small spaces between buildings and smaller car parks which are not well supervised or visible to residents or visitors"* – the visibility could be improved via signposting? Whom is supposed to be doing the supervising?

Regarding the comment - *"Residential units frequently overlook refuse and service areas, external stairways and alleyways"* – this does not validate a need for demolition.

Regarding the comment - *".....and the presence of these concealed inactive areas provide opportunities for anti-social behaviour"* - This is a leading comment, either these *"concealed inactive areas"* lead to *"anti-social behaviour"* or they do not. If they do, the Council needs to provide evidence for this.

Regarding the comment - *"Many of the open spaces and parts of the public realm lack a clear role, function, definition and are underused"* – has been refuted on two earlier occasions within this section, via the 2008 Labour survey and the 2010 social audit.

Regarding the comment - *"Ramps, steps and bollards around the retail parade combine*

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p><i>with fences and walls around parking areas to crate fragmented spaces and a series of obstacles to pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement (see Photograph 3)"</i>- This picture is taken not far away from the Danebury Avenue and Roehampton Lane intersection and this intersection allows for access to <i>"pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement"</i>.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"A number of the open spaces (including Downshire Fields) lack facilities and amenities"</i> – whom is making the decision that <i>"facilities"</i> and <i>"amenities"</i> are required?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"detracts from the usability and historic openness of the spaces"</i> – again, refer to the Social Audit feedback mentioned earlier which supports the open spaces.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD150 Response Date: 19/05/15 21:53</p> |
| 2.5 | <p><i>"There are a number of good quality buildings within the SPD boundary which are attractive and make a positive contribution to the townscape, the conservation areas and their settings"</i>- this includes the five concrete slabs, that are listed and very similar in design to Allbrook House so how is this any different. If so poor quality why is the 20th Century keen to list it?</p> <p>This paragraph creates an unfair comparison of the "heritage assets" and other buildings on the Alton Estate. Let's not forget that Allbrook House and the library has featured a few times as being supported by various groups.</p> <p>Twentieth Century Society <i>"Among the buildings earmarked for removal are the Allbrook House slab block and the estate's library – both of which the Twentieth Century Society said it would seek to protect. Parts of the estate are already contained in the Alton Conservation Area, which includes grade I and grade II* listed 18th Century houses as well as 10 grade II-listed point blocks and five grade II* listed slab blocks.</i></p> <p><i>The Twentieth Century Society said it supported the general aim of regenerating the estate, but believed Wandsworth's approach was wrong. Case officer Clare Price said the majority of the estate's problems were due to neglect rather than its buildings: "We think that a sensitive refurbishment that carefully conserves the heritage of the buildings on site should be enough to achieve what Wandsworth wants."</i></p> <p>[Source: Listing bid on cards to stop Alton Estate demolition, Jim Dunton, 27 October 2014, Architects Journal]</p> <p>The Putney Society <i>"6. The Society played its part in the review, three years ago, of the Alton Estate conservation area. One conclusion of that review was that the boundary of the conservation area should be extended to take in Roehampton Library and Allbrook House above it, together with the green space and established trees between these buildings and Roehampton Lane. We believe that this view is shared by many in Roehampton. These buildings are, we consider, worthy of being added to the council's local list of buildings of architectural and historic interest: they are a distinctive composition enhancing the entrance to the Alton Estate at this point. If the five slab blocks adjoining Clarence Lane are worthy of being listed Grade II*, then the similarly detailed Allbrook House should be considered for listing by English Heritage. It is equally distinguished"</i></p> <p>[Source: The Putney Society response to the Council regarding the regeneration, 19 September 2012]</p> <p>The Labour Party</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----|---|
| | <p><i>"The whole council plan rests on the demolition of Allbrook House, the "landmark" block above Roehampton Library. This is the one question where there was no majority opposition to the council plan, but a clear plurality – 45% - don't want the block demolished. Barely a third – 34% - supported demolition and a sizeable number – 21% - didn't feel able to give a view. We had 21 surveys back from the parts of Danebury Avenue, including Allbrook House, under threat of demolition. Of these, 4 supported demolition and 14 opposed it.</i></p> <p><i>It's a great shame that the Council never even considered improving Allbrook House, which contains some large properties within it with spectacular views of Roehampton. Recladding or even more radical remodelling of Allbrook House could transform this block – the gateway to the Alton estate".</i></p> <p>[Source: Redeveloping Danebury Avenue: What Roehampton Wants, 2008 survey results]</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD151 Response Date: 19/05/15 21:56</p> <p>Further if the area is so unsafe and the buildings not fit for purpose, then why is that the Council even suggested that the area around Allbrook House could be redeveloped. This being in the Council Paper 12-463. Refer to roeregeneration article <u>"Allbrook House and the library – why demolish them?"</u> which highlights this, and other comments regarding support for keeping Allbrook House and the library.</p> <p>https://roeregeneration.wordpress.com/2015/05/10/allbrook-house-and-the-library-why-demolish-them/</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD267 Response Date: 24/05/15 16:17</p> |
| 2.6 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"A substantial number of residential and commercial buildings are however poorly sited and constructed, as well as falling considerably short of today's expectations and indeed the standards set in the London Housing Design Guide"</i> - whom is making the subjective decision that these buildings are "poorly sited and constructed"? Where is the evidence to support this? Does this therefore apply to other buildings that are not within the demolition zone thought within the SPD thus tempting the developers?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"The external and internal design has negative effects on residents and family living conditions"</i> – having lived in a 3 bed maisonette in the Ibsley neighbourhood for 10 years and a 2 bed apartment in a concrete slab for two years within the Manresa neighbourhood, I would like to have it explained to me how this comment rings true?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"Issues such as unattractive and deteriorating stairwells, external walkways exposing residents to the elements, worn exteriors, front doors facing away from the street do not only negatively impact the lives of the residents living in the area, but also shape the perception of those who visit the area."</i> – is farcical, as has been highlighted by a Senior Lecturer at a University as shown in the article <u>"Questionable demolition"</u>. This seems to be focused more for those that come into the estate and just because a building might be unusual for visitors, this does not constitute a reason for demolition.</p> <p>Further <i>"deteriorating stairwells"</i> and <i>"worn exteriors"</i> are maintenance issues, something which was highlighted by the Twentieth Century Society in paragraph 2.5 and also by The Putney Society – <i>"The "outdated" maisonette blocks in this area (proposed for demolition in the POP), are also found in other parts of Alton West and East. Are these other areas of similar blocks likely to be recommended for demolition by the</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----|--|
| | <p><i>council, in due course? With proper maintenance (which has so obviously been lacking for too long), these blocks could provide quite sound residential accommodation".</i> [Source: The Putney Society letter to Team Roehampton dated 9 April 2014].</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD152 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:01</p> |
| 2.7 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"Overall, a large number of existing homes within the site are at the end of their useful life and suitability to meet current and future housing needs"</i> - at this point this comment is subjective and there has been no validation of the need to demolish these buildings. What makes these buildings so ready for demolition compared to other buildings on the estate? Why are these buildings <i>"at the end of their useful life"</i>?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD153 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:02</p> |
| 2.8 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings are contributing to the area's problems"</i> - this is subjective and evidence is requested for the validation of this comment?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD154 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:02</p> |
| 2.3 | Community safety |
| 2.9 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"There is a particularly high rate of 'violence against the person' and 'criminal damage incidents' in the Roehampton ward, compared with Wandsworth Borough as a whole"</i> - makes the area seem worse that was portrayed in the Baseline report. The Baseline report stated that <i>"The Metropolitan Police Service produces annual ward based crime indices for their entire service area. The area is also lower than Wandsworth and London when comparing theft and handling. These statistics show that there is a higher rate of Violence Against the Person in the Roehampton ward as compared with Wandsworth as a whole, although rates are similar to London"</i> [Source: Alton Baseline Report September 2013, p137].</p> <p>Table 17 has the figures and it can be seen that the figures, other than the two targeted by the Council, seem to compare not too unfavourable with the Met Police Area figures.</p> <p>What is concerning is that these figures are a snapshot as at a certain point in time, in this case 2013, with no comparative data to understand in what direction the figures are going. For instance, is there a year on year increase in improvement of figures?</p> <p>According the Environment, Culture and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 19th February, 2014, the Alton Estate seemed to be making large improvements with regards to crime levels. This is even commented upon in Paper No. 14-147 which states <i>"The new Policing Model appears to be working well and delivering positive outcomes. There has been a significant reduction in reported crime within Roehampton when compared to the previous 12 months (January-December 2013). Additionally, detailed analysis of crime incidents on the Alton Estate (where the majority of crime has historically occurred) undertaken in August 2013 demonstrated that there had been a 30% reduction in crime (rolling year). These two sets of analysis indicate a continued downward trend in reported crime. Reports of anti-social behaviour have also decreased slightly"</i>.</p> <p>Source: Paper Number 14-147</p> <p>For the figures, refer to the Appendices 1 to 4 within Section 4 of the Environment, Culture and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee Wednesday, 19th</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p>February, 2014 7.30 p.m.</p> <p>Does this mean that the Alton Estate was on the right path and not in need of this demolition? Or if that bad, this must be sign of the Council's failure to look after the Estate?</p> <p>Further, Roehampton University has stated the safety of the area as being important to its students by stating;</p> <p><i>"The University of Roehampton is one of the safest in London. Despite its location in a densely populated area, Roehampton and its surroundings have been judged the safest in inner London by the independent Complete University Guide. In the Greater London as a whole, only one other institution had a lower crime rate in its local vicinity.</i></p> <p><i>The statistics for Roehampton show only 18.3 reported offences per thousand people in the vicinity of the university, including all types of victims, not just students. The worst universities had figures of 36.65 offences per thousand, twice that found at Roehampton.</i></p> <p><i>Dr Ghazwa Alwani-Starr, the University of Roehampton's Director of Estates, who has overall responsibility for security, said: "Students and parents will be very reassured to know that at Roehampton, their sons and daughters are studying at inner London's safest university."</i></p> <p><u>Source: 'Crime Written' – Alton Regeneration Watch</u></p> <p>The reduction in the head count of police is topical, so much so this was highlighted by the Labour Councillors in one of their leaflets, <u>Labour in Roehampton leaflet March 2014</u> section titled "<u>Bring back the bobbies petition update</u>". Has this reduction in police numbers contributed to crime figures?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD155 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:05</p> <p>Figures have been found which provide figures for a further two years. These figures highlight that there is a lack of consistency and further calls into question whether the figures in Table 17 are sufficient justification to be used. Refer to roeregeneration article "<u>SPD Paragraph 2.9 Community safety</u>" for a review of the figures.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD268 Response Date: 24/05/15 16:18</p> |
| 2.4 | Access to services |
| 2.10 | <p>Regarding the comment – "<i>Danebury Avenue (now known as Roehampton Local Centre)</i>" – when were Alton Estate residents going to be informed of this? There has not been formal notice of this to the Alton Estate. Who made this decision and on what basis?</p> <p>If the area "<i>contains limited community facilities</i>" that is due to the Council not continuing with existing facilities. Referring to the Labour survey of '<i>Stuart King's Roehampton redevelopment</i>' of 2008, <u>page 3</u> states "<i>And closing the Alton Club in Dilton Gardens is the exact opposite of what we should be doing: young people need more to do to get them off the streets, not less</i>". Can the Council provide a view as to what makes to current facilities "<i>limited</i>"?</p> <p>With regards to the comment that those community facilities "<i>which do exist are lacking in quality</i>", it is wondered what the likes of the DARA would make of this comment. This "<i>lacking in quality</i>" comment seems to be subjective rather than providing any qualitative assessment. Can the current community groups of the area, and the Council, please explain in what capacity the current community facilities are "<i>lacking in quality</i>"?</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p>Comment ID: RSPD156 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:08</p> |
| 2.11 | <p>So the area needs good connections to the "<i>Whitelands College beyond</i>"? Can this explained as to what benefit this will have to more "permanent year residents" (page 47 of the Masterplan)?</p> <p><i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> should be replaced by Danebury Avenue such as time as the residents of the Alton Estate are formally made aware of the scope to service all of Roehampton.</p> <p>Comments such as <i>"quality of the frontage and buildings are poor (presenting a tired and unattractive entrance to the estate) and the arrangement of buildings and level changes in this area are such that service areas, building backs, surface car parks, ramps and walls dominate and create unusable spaces with a lack of a public focal point. The area lacks well-defined and good quality public spaces and routes"</i> are subjective and not based on any substantive evidence.</p> <p>Regarding the comment <i>"the Sports and Fitness Centre and Youth Club are hidden away on the back streets with poor connections to Whitelands College beyond"</i> the Sports and Fitness Centre and Whitelands College were built in the knowledge of what the access routes there would be. The <i>"poor connections"</i> needs to be explained further as they are all located currently quite close the heart of the Danebury Avenue retail area.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD157 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:09</p> |
| 2.12 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"Extensive alterations, demolitions and reconfigurations have left Portwood Place suffering from a lack of focus"</i> – if this is true, then the Council has allowed this and has not been held accountable for this.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD158 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:10</p> |
| 2.13 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"There are shops and services within the area which benefit existing residents, however the quality of the offer fails to cater for the daily convenience needs of the catchment population"</i>. To the best of my knowledge Alton Estate residents have not been informed that the estate should be servicing the catchment area. Can the Council share with us any Options and Preferred Options consultation documents which highlighted that shops should cater to the <i>"catchment population"</i>?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"The lack of suitable modern premises affects the level of services available and both areas are set within a poor quality environment which detracts from their attractiveness and appeal to local residents as places to shop and visit"</i>. To date Alton Estate residents have not been informed as to what "services" should be provided at this point in time that is apparently lacking?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "Both areas suffer from a lack of connectivity within and beyond the estate which compounds the issue" – this is subjective and requires further explanation. <u>The Social Audit by the Roehampton Audit Steering Group (RASG) in 2010 produced a Social Audit.</u> The comment regarding transport, i.e. <i>"connectivity"</i>, was stated as follows;</p> <p><i>"c) TRANSPORT</i> <i>Generally Roehampton is well covered by public bus transport which provides convenient links to mainline stations at Barnes, Kingston and Putney. The 85 route Putney Bridge- Kingston is a 24 hour service. The nearest tube link is Putney Bridge (one bus journey) or East Putney (two bus journeys). Public transport was used</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------|---|
| | <p><i>extensively by the auditor throughout the study and proved the statement 'there is always a red bus in sight in Roehampton'. Some public and voluntary services within Roehampton are only reached by taking 2 bus journeys. This may be problematic to some elderly or disabled users. Special mention must be made for the twice weekly return 969 return service to ASDA Roehampton Vale which enables elderly or buggy bound passengers to access shopping from Lennox and Alton Estates—the driver even carries heavy baskets to nearby doorways!"</i></p> <p>The RASG comprised of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rev Jim Mc Kinney – Holy Trinity Church, Roehampton, Chair Roehampton Forum & Roehampton Partnership ➤ Susan Melhuish – local resident, member of Holy Trinity Church ➤ Pam Harris – local resident, member of Holy Trinity Church, member of Roehampton Forum ➤ Pauline Brueseke- former Ward Councillor, member of Roehampton Forum ➤ Alison Macdonald- former Mental Health worker in area, Chair Housebound Learners and member of Roehampton Forum ➤ The steering group were joined at the questionnaire analysis stage by Cathie Chandler and John Martyn- both members of Roehampton Forum. John completed the analysis of the 'likes and dislikes' <p>It can be seen that the Roehampton Forum had a prominent role with this Social Audit and it should be queried as to what is so different with the current situation. Bearing in mind this latest regeneration begun only two years after this survey.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD159 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:12</p> |
| 2.14 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"A step change in the quality of the service offer in Roehampton Local Centre is required to meet the daily needs of residents, whilst providing access to higher order centres such as Putney and Kingston".</i> Now, the Alton Estate is supposed to service those from the <i>"catchment population"</i>, when were Alton Estate residents meant to be informed of this?</p> <p><i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> to be amended to <i>"Danebury Avenue"</i>.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD160 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:13</p> |
| 2.15 | <p>Regarding the text <i>"there is only one GP surgery"</i> this is incorrect, there are two and they are listed in paragraph 1.29 as <i>"Danebury Avenue Surgery"</i> and <i>"Alton Medical Practice"</i>.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD161 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:14</p> |
| 2.16 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"The services are dispersed and there is a lack of facilities that can provide holistic and integrated services, as well as gaps in provision (particularly relating to recreation, arts and culture)"</i> - at the Roehampton Partnership of 3rd December 2014 meeting it was mentioned that the replacement community centre would not have outdoor playground. In conjunction with the loss of the outdoor space at the Dilton Gardens Youth Club and the Roehampton Youth Club does this mean that there will be no outdoor space at all for the community groups of the Alton Estate?</p> <p>Can information be provided as to how the <i>"modern needs"</i> are not being met?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD162 Response Date: 19/05/15 22:14</p> |
| 2.17 | <p>Regarding this comment – <i>"The University also has facilities and accommodation within the SPD area, including Whitelands College and Mount Clare. There are opportunities to improve access to and the quality of these facilities/buildings, particularly where they impact adversely on the settings of significant heritage assets"</i>. – for whom will this be</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

50%, this is true on a standalone basis, though versus the London figure of 39% the 50% figure seems to be on the high side for a comparison.

When the basis for what "deprivation" is defined as and how this relates to the Alton Area there would seem be questions as to what they actually mean and how they will be tackled.

The "deprivation" levels are defined as (based on page 136 of the Baseline report) as ;
1. Employment: any member of a household not a full-time student is either unemployed or long-term sick.

Paragraph 4.5 states that "*may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents*" though how many of these "*new jobs*" will go to existing residents and not to students or to new residents that come into the Alton Estate?

2. Education: no person in the household has at least level 2 education, and no person aged 16-18 is a full-time student.

This is referred to in more detail in paragraph 2.30.

3. Health and disability: any person in the household has general health 'bad or very bad' or has a long term health problem.

Assuming this relates to Table 16 on page 137 of the Baseline report, then 1% of the count applies to the Alton Area, Wandsworth Borough and London and therefore is an irrelevant measure for the purposes of the Council's justification of the regeneration.

In terms of a "long term health problem", Table 16 does not seem to provide a statistic for this?

The challenging of the use of the health figures has been raised on the roeregeneration blog in the article "[What health benefits will the Alton regeneration bring?](http://roeregeneration.wordpress.com/2014/12/29/what-health-benefits-will-the-alton-regeneration-bring/)".

<http://roeregeneration.wordpress.com/2014/12/29/what-health-benefits-will-the-alton-regeneration-bring/>

4. Housing: Household's accommodation is either overcrowded, with an occupancy rating -1 or less, or is in a shared dwelling, or has no central heating.

So, part of this answer is to demolish lots of 3 bedroom maisonettes and replace them with 1 to 2 bedroom apartments? There's circa 250 properties which have three to four bedrooms and if overcrowded then how are they to be replaced?

It is assumed that all the properties have central heating which means that housing must be overcrowded, leaving one to ask the question how the replacement buildings will bridge this gap when circa 250 properties which have three to four bedrooms are to be demolished? It does seem to make sense to demolish properties with more rooms unless they are to be replaced with properties with more rooms?

Summary

In short, whilst the SPD is highlighting various figures they do not portray an accurate assessment of the situation for this does not provide a fair assessment versus comparable figures for the Wandsworth Borough nor London figures. The figures on their own do not provide sufficient background as to the issues that these are representing. Additionally, there is no clear provision for how these various deprivation levels are to be tackled.

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------|--|
| | <p>Presently, this regeneration seems to be all about the financial element rather than the provision of improving these various deprivation figures provided. This seems to be something which is theme as highlighted in the "<u>London Assembly paper - Knock it Down or Do it Up</u>". On page 19 it states a useful suggestion which should be applied to this SPD, that is the SPD should be able to support the Social Return on Investment (SROI), which is clearly not the case. An "<i>SROI is a framework which measures and accounts for a broader concept of value than the purely financial. It encompasses social, environmental and economic costs and benefits</i>".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD254 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:00</p> |
| 2.29 | <p>The figures used in the section are taken from Table 8 of the Baseline report, page 132. When the "student" figure is removed, the percentage of employed increases from 38% (Example A) to 47%. This should be a consideration given the amount of student population of the area. Refer to Example B.</p> <p>Bearing in mind, that paragraph 4.5 that is states that the regeneration "<i>may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents</i>", if the 200 jobs are added as full time, this would increase the figure from 47% to 49%. Refer to Example C. Therefore, these 200 jobs are but a drop in the ocean if referring to these figures as a true and an appropriate source of data for decision making.</p> <p>For the Examples, refer to the following link - https://onedrive.live.com/redirect?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!553&authkey=!ACLL7wHiFqN OqJ4&ithint=file%2cpdf</p> <p>Referring back to Example A and B, would the amount of full time workers increase if more granular information could be produced for the section "Economically inactive"? Referring to the Census 2011 definitions this group consists of the following;</p> <p>"Economically inactive <i>A person aged 16 and over is described as economically inactive if, in the week before the census, they were not in employment but did not meet the criteria to be classified as "Unemployed". This includes a person looking for work but not available to start work within two weeks, as well as anyone not looking for work, or unable to work - for example retired, looking after home/family, permanently sick or disabled.</i></p> <p><i>Students who fulfil any of these criteria are also classified as economically inactive. This does not necessarily mean they were in full-time education and excludes students who were working or in some other way economically active.</i></p> <p>Economically inactive: 'Other' <i>Economically inactive 'Other' includes people aged 16 and over who were not in employment and did not meet the criteria to be classified as unemployed for reasons other than being retired, a student, looking after home or family or being permanently sick or disabled."</i></p> <p>Note that "economically inactive" includes students and retirees, and if they could be removed from the data, would the numbers again improve?</p> <p>The Census numbers provided as not granular enough to support the percentages provided by this paragraph for the reasons highlighted. Furthermore, those responsible for putting together the Baseline report seem to underplay the growth in student numbers, for on page 132 is states "<i>The major change in activity of residents has been the proportion of the population that are students which has increased 5% between the 2 Census surveys</i>". Fine, the figure has moved from 12% to 17% which is five percent, though the student numbers went from 512 to 923 which is an increase of 80%!! This</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|------------|---|
| | <p>growth could be included within the "economically inactive" figures thereby distorting the percentages.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD255 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:03</p> |
| 2.30 | <p>Regarding the comment "<i>Despite having a strong proportion of young adults in higher education (again largely as a result of the presence of the university)</i>" can this relationship between higher education and presence of the university please be explained? Having a university nearby naturally derives this aura of going to higher education?</p> <p>In the Wandsworth Guardian, 25th September 2015 page 8, the letter titled "University's benefit to residents minimal", makes the following comment;</p> <p><i>"Virtually no one from Roehampton attends the university – less than 0.8 per cent of its students come from Roehampton. And the number of Roehampton people employed by the university is scarcely better".</i></p> <p>There were a series of letters on this topic within the Wandsworth Guardian, and it suggested that Team Roehampton has a read of these and revises this comment.</p> <p>Coming back to the point made, please validate this relationship.</p> <p>There is a University in close proximity to the Alton Estate and there is a ward Councillor that works for the university, so what has been done to increase the education attainment levels of the local students to achieve higher levels of education?</p> <p>Why are the figures only compared to the Wandsworth percentages and not the London averages? According to tables 10 and 11 of the Baseline report (page 133) for both the "no qualification" and "Level 1 qualification" are below the London figures. Also, the "no qualification" has decreased from 26% (Table 11) to 16% (Table 10).</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD264 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:43</p> |
| 2.31 | <p>Referring to paragraph 4.5 which states that "<i>may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents</i>" then what kind of jobs will these be? Being in the Alton Estate, how many of these jobs will require higher levels of education. One of the main employers will be a new supermarket?</p> <p>Given there is a University practically on the doorstep of the Alton Estate, a serious question has to be asked about the relationship between the local community on the Alton Estate and the University, and the attainment of further education. If not done now, how will the new buildings make this any different?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD256 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:06</p> |
| 2.8 | Property market |
| 2.32 | <p>So, property prices are too low and need to be increased to change the sections of the market whom would be interested? Hopefully the local jobs that will be created will be allow for the existing community to be able to afford these more expensive homes, especially as the starting price for a one bedroom apartment in Egleton House is currently £340,000.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD257 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:08</p> |
| 2.9 | Ownership patterns |
| 2.33 | <p>Paragraph 1.2 states "<i>The recommended masterplan reflects the aspirations of the Council as landowner</i>" though in this section "<i>The Roehampton area presents a complex pattern of land-ownership with at least 11 different types of landowners</i>". If truly referring to "Roehampton" I would imagine that there are many more landowners given</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>that, for instance, there are 184 sold freeholds on the Alton Estate alone [Source: provided by the Council].</p> <p>This may be the only time in this document that the freeholders of Kingsclere Close are mentioned, even if loosely. Comment ID: RSPD259 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:10</p> |
| Figure 2.1 Key Sites and Opportunities | <p>Regarding Figure 2.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD260 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:11</p> |

Section 3 – Vision and strategic objectives

| Section | Comments |
|---------|--|
| 3.1 | |
| 3.1 | The vision |
| 3.2 | <p>So, the idea is to have housing which competes on price with the "south west London markets"? Hopefully most of the new homes will be "affordable" to allow some opportunity for existing locals to get on the housing ladder. Comment ID: RSPD189 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:19</p> |
| 3.3 | <p>... "existing sub-standard homes replaced" is subjective and requires a qualitative explanation and to date there has been no real explanation as to why these "homes" are "sub-standard". Comment ID: RSPD190 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:20</p> |
| 3.4 | |
| 3.5 | |
| 3.6 | <p>The comment - "<i>The area will become a safe, attractive, high quality and mixed neighbourhood</i>". – oh, I didn't realise it was that bad living here, I've only been here 14 years...and happen to have chosen to do so! Have a read of the roeregeneration article 'SPD Paragraph 2.9 Community safety' and see whether the figures support the need for a demolition of existing properties. Comment ID: RSPD261 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:15</p> |
| 3.7 | <p>Regarding the comment – "<i>Environmental improvements to make the area safer</i>" – this comment is subjective and no evidence has been provided which supports this.</p> <p>Why is the Library Plus not a "key outcome"?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "<i>Enhanced transport linkages to and from the Barnes Station, Queen Mary's Hospital, Roehampton University, along with improved pedestrian and cycle access to and from Richmond Park</i>". – how will transport linkages be improved to Barnes Station? Increased frequency of the existing bus routes? Will Barnes station be used when it is in zone 3 whereas Putney station is zone 2? Comment ID: RSPD192 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:21</p> |
| 3.2 | Strategic objectives |
| 3.8 | <p>Regarding the comment – "<i>Create a more mixed and balanced community</i>" – this seems to be recycled text from the earlier regeneration attempt. In the 2008 Labour survey "<i>Stuart King's Roehampton redevelopment Consultation</i>" with regards to the comment "balanced community" this translated into the following - "<i>And though the council says publicly it wants to help local people buy some of the new homes, in</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p><i>council committee reports it talks about creating a "balanced community" – political speak for getting more outsiders into Roehampton". I'm not clear as to what makes this current "community" not "balanced"? The SPD seems to indicate more expensive homes for outsiders coming into the community and potentially an increase in the student population. This term "balanced community" has been recycled from the previous regeneration attempt and fails to justify any real explanation as to what this is. This was even raised by a Roehampton Forum member at the 12th May 2015 with no explanation by Team Roehampton.</i></p> <p>Regarding the comment - "<i>Improve or replace poor quality buildings</i>" – which poor quality buildings are being improved, unless that's Minstead Gardens? "Poor quality buildings" still needs to be appropriately explained, which the SPD has not done. Comment ID: RSPD193 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:23</p> |
| <p>Figure 3.2 Site Wide Concept Diagram for the Roehampton Area</p> | <p>Figure 3.2 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD195 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:26</p> |

Section 4 – Core principles

| Section | Comments |
|------------|--|
| <p>4.1</p> | <p>A. Regarding the text "<i>replace existing poor quality homes</i>" this comment is subjective for it has not been proven from a qualitative basis that this is true. For the freeholders impacted, even if "poor quality" what right does the Council have to impose this view on these freeholders? I understand that 23 of the 28 Kingsclere Close properties are freehold and therefore can the Council please explain how this reference, especially, is pertinent to them? Can it be explained to leaseholders what makes their properties "poor quality"?</p> <p>B. "<i>Roehampton Local Centre</i>" to be replaced with "Danebury Avenue".</p> <p>B. Regarding "<i>balanced community</i>" refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>C. "<i>across the Roehampton area</i>" to be replaced with "across the Alton Estate area".</p> <p>D. Of the "<i>additional affordable housing</i>" how many of the 800 homes will be "affordable housing"?</p> <p>D. Regarding "<i>balanced community</i>" refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>E. Regarding "<i>balanced community</i>" refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>G. "<i>The area is unlikely to be appropriate for structured Private Rented Sector products</i>" is a subjective assessment and these new homes could be subject to a different type of buy to let landlord. Can the Council provide supporting evidence that this will be the case.</p> <p>H. "<i>Roehampton Local Centre</i>" to be replaced with "Danebury Avenue".</p> <p><i>"The masterplan identified the potential for up to 400 additional student units (with a net gain of approximately 250 units) to replace the existing accommodation at Mount Clare and support the needs of local universities"</i> – this sentence does not mention the</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|----------------|--|
| | <p>dependency of <i>"The masterplan area predominantly comprises land owned by the Council but land ownership complications concerning the Mount Clare site, currently owned by the Southlands Trust and managed by the local Methodists, will need consideration. Proposals for Mount Clare have been proposed and a memorandum of understanding has been drafted between the Council, the Southlands Trust and Roehampton University"</i> [Source: Appendix 1, Wandsworth Council Paper Number 15-7]. Does this mean that this dependency has been resolved? Comment ID: RSPD196 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:28</p> |
| 4.1 | Core principle 1 – deliver high quality homes within a mixed and balanced community |
| 4.2 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>"The core strategic planning objective for this area is estate renewal, with a primary focus on meeting the needs of the existing community"</i> – this does appear to the case as the following examples highlight –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MP Greening has had two meetings with residents as a result of what they have felt has ignored their needs and the recent meeting with the DARA was to discuss their concerns which has been neglected (refer to paragraph 1.2). 2. The community does not feel that there is a need for student housing (refer to paragraph 1.4). 3. In terms of health needs the Health Representative on the Roehampton Partnership and Team Roehampton can only come up with "modern GP surgeries" though no substantive evidence of what this will bring to the community. <p><i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> to be replaced with <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i>. Comment ID: RSPD197 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:29</p> |
| 4.3 | <p>Regarding <i>"balanced community"</i> refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"The provision of shared equity units will allow leaseholders who would otherwise be forced to relocate the opportunity to stay in the area. Affordable housing policy applies subject to viability, taking into account any intermediate provision for existing leaseholders"</i> – what about freeholders?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"The masterplan identified a principle of providing new homes for all Council tenants and the opportunity for all resident leaseholders to buy back into the development and the Council is committed to delivering this"</i> – what about freeholders? Comment ID: RSPD198 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:30</p> |
| 4.4 (pp 32-33) | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>"Subject to meeting a number of criteria, Policy DMH9 supports new student accommodation and seeks to resist the loss of existing units"</i> – is there sufficient evidence to indicate that there will be no "loss of existing units"?</p> <p>According to a Freedom Of Information request, there will be 60 away leasehold properties that will be demolished. If this is the case, assuming that each property is rented to student housing and there is an average of 3 per household, that is housing for 180 students. If we assume 4 students for 20 Kingsclere Close properties, that would 80 students. That is an estimated loss of housing for 260 students. The student housing proposed is for a net gain of 250. This is an estimated loss of student housing of 10, and that is assuming all leasehold and almost all freehold properties that are to be demolished are currently let to students. Also, as mentioned at the Roehampton Forum meeting of 12th May 2015, this student housing proposal will not stop pepper potting of students on the Alton Estate. Comment ID: RSPD199 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:32</p> |
| 4.2 | Core principle 2 – breathe new life into the existing centres |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| 4.2 Core principle | <p>A. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. What are these "New and improved shops and services"?</p> <p>B. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. "A convenience store in Roehampton Local Centre (of sufficient size to meet daily shopping needs) with associated car parking and visibility from Danebury Avenue". – Bye Bye Co-op and Premier?</p> <p>C. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>D. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD200 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:34</p> |
| 4.5 | <p>Regarding the comment – "It is estimated that the additional retail and service (A1-5) and employment (B1) floorspace may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents (source: HCA Employment Densities Guide, 2nd Edition, 2010)" – how many of these "200 new jobs" will be estimated to be provided to local residents which are non-students? There will need to be an analysis of how many of these jobs actually go to Alton Estate residents which are from the current existing population.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "Furthermore, the Roehampton area is experiencing significant change with the addition of new homes (e.g. St James development) and student accommodation, with limited additional services provided as part of those schemes" – these were built in the knowledge of what services were currently provided. If this is an issue, then the Council has allowed this to be an issue by allowing such buildings to be built without the appropriate level of infrastructure to support it. Further, it mentions new student housing here though not in paragraph 2.2 "Planning application history"?</p> <p>"Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD202 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:34</p> |
| 4.3 | Core principle 3 – deliver new and improved community infrastructure |
| 4.3 (core principles) | <p>A. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. Regarding the comment – "It is envisaged that the facilities may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new library facility in Roehampton Local Centre. • A new arts facility in Roehampton Local Centre. • New community services (including health, youth, and housing and police services) in Roehampton Local Centre. • A new community building at Portswood Place containing co-located community facilities, including the nursery and family services relocated from Roehampton Lane, additional health facilities, space for community organisations, workshops and enterprise space and local retail. • The Minstead Gardens senior citizens club will be replaced with a new community pavilion". <p>This is not strong enough, "may" should be replaced with "will". Also, I thought the idea was that the library will be a Library+ rather than a library?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD203 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:36</p> |
| 4.6 (p36) | Regarding the comment – "Existing community facilities are inadequate (both |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p><i>qualitatively and quantitatively) and do not meet the needs of the existing resident population”– can this be explained please as to why this is the case, for this has not been highlighted in either the Options or Preferred Options consultations as being not fit for purpose.</i></p> <p>The same goes for the comment <i>“Existing community and leisure uses are poorly sited and not of a form or quality that supports the vibrancy and vitality of Roehampton Local Centre or aligns with modern service delivery models”.</i></p> <p><i>“Roehampton Local Centre” renamed “Danebury Avenue Town Centre”.</i></p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“Consultation with the community and stakeholders during the preparation of the masterplan has identified a need for a new library to replace the existing services within Roehampton Local Centre with new space for study and meeting, as well as a new arts facility with space for community arts organisations, gallery space and a small rehearsal, performance and screening space”– does this mean the library will be included or not? Also, there is insufficient evidence to highlight that there is a need for the demolition of the library. Past evident would seem to support this view too, via the <u>Labour survey “Redeveloping Danebury Avenue: What Roehampton Wants”</u> based on the previous regeneration attempt.</i></p> <p>The results to this survey are outlined below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 8 - 51.5% very satisfied with the question “How satisfied are you with Roehampton Library?”. • Question 9 - 69.2% responded “Yes” to “Have you used the library in the past six months?”. • Question 10 – 74.1% responded with “No” to “Is replacing the current library with a new one a high priority for you?”. <p>In other words, leave the library alone.....</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD204 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:37</p> |
| 4.4 | Core principle 4 – deliver a high quality landscape and outdoor recreation facilities throughout the area |
| 4.4 (Core principles) | <p>C. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre” renamed “Danebury Avenue Town Centre”.</i></p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD205 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:38</p> |
| 4.7 | <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“According to the Wandsworth Open Space Study (2007) the Roehampton ward has the lowest population density per hectare in the borough and the highest amount of open space per 1,000 population (23.78 ha)”– this would seem to be a potentially misleading piece of information. The ward has green spaces though the density of the population has been commented on by various bodies.</i></p> <p>Putney Labour Party <i>“There is also a legitimate debate to be had as to whether the Alton estate – already the most densely populated part of the constituency – should be the focus of hundreds more homes. Love it or hate it, one of the things that cannot be denied about the Alton is that it was meticulously planned to provide green open space surrounding the blocks and avenues of council housing. The Council plans irreparably damage this plan by building on the green space and over-populating the estate”.</i></p> <p><u>Source: Redeveloping Danebury Avenue, What Roehampton Wants, 2008, Putney Labour Party</u></p> <p>Roehampton Ecumenical Church <i>“As might be expected in such a dense housing area some people did not take pride in</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>the immediate area outside their flat however this is well balanced by some ground floor dwellers who have maintained pleasant small gardens and sitting areas”.</i></p> <p><i>“As summarised in a recent report by Kairos Solutions Ltd [ref 2] ‘Roehampton is a densely populated...”</i></p> <p><u>Source: Social Audit of Roehampton, 2010, Roehampton Ecumenical Church</u></p> <p>Population density figures</p> <p>According to the Council’s population density figures it would appear that the density of the Alton Estate is actually Above the London Average But Below Borough Average Above London Average But Below Borough Average or Significantly Above Borough Average.</p> <p>Source: http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/downloads/file/1783/figure_31_population_density</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“The Open Space Study identifies the north and south of the Roehampton ward as being areas that have a significant deficiency in access to children’s play facilities. Approximately 13 additional Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) are needed across the Putney/Roehampton sub area to redress the deficiencies in children’s play provision within the sub-area”</i> – given this Study was completed in 2007, one should ask what has the Council done in the eight years since this report to fulfil this? Comment ID: RSPD206 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:40</p> |
| 4.7 | <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“The potential of Downshire Fields as an amenity is not being fully realised. The landscape could be significantly improved and more directly linked to Richmond Park, as well as providing new outdoor recreation opportunities to improve its usability and quality of life for residents”</i> – residents are fine with the spaces as they are as per paragraph 2.4. Comment ID: RSPD263 Response Date: 24/05/15 11:17</p> |
| Figure 4.1 Landscape Strategy Diagram | <p>Figure 4.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD207 Response Date: 20/05/15 21:44</p> |
| 4.5 | <p>Core principle 5 – respect the heritage of the area</p> |
| 4.5 (Core principles) | <p>B. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> renamed <i>“Danebury Avenue Town Centre”</i>.</p> <p>D. <i>“Any buildings of 5 or more storeys will however only be acceptable where they satisfy the criteria of DMPD Policy DMS4”</i> seems to be heading towards the Roehampton Partnership Vice Chair’s comment at the meeting of 25th March 2015 that 800 apartments is the equivalent of 18 towers and the <i>“more the merrier”</i>. However, Labour has stated that <i>“The buildings the Tories want to build will be too high. While Allbrook House is 9 storeys, all the surrounding buildings are of a human scale: 3 or 4 storeys along Danebury Avenue. Having all but a couple of buildings 5 or 6 storeys high will make Danebury Avenue darker, more like a canyon and could make the area bleak and windswept”</i> [Source: Stuart King’s Roehampton redevelopment Consultation 2008]</p> <p>E. What does <i>“Sensitive transport and community infrastructure improvements throughout the area”</i> translate into? Comment ID: RSPD226 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:10</p> |
| 4.6 | <p>Core principle 6 – update and activate the urban fabric</p> |
| 4.6 (Core | <p>D. <i>“The Council will support proposals that retain and improve existing good quality</i></p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|--|---|
| principles) | <p><i>buildings</i>”– can the Council provide a list of what it deems to be <i>“existing good quality buildings”</i>?</p> <p>E. <i>“rationalise car parks”</i> to what extent and how will current residents be impacted? Comment ID: RSPD224 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:07</p> |
| 4.9 | <p><i>“rationalise car parks”</i> to what extent and how will current residents be impacted?</p> <p>Much of the following text is subjective – <i>“A number of existing buildings within the area lack a positive relationship to surrounding buildings, streets and open spaces. There are spaces that are car dominated and poor quality with hiding places that encourage anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping”</i>.</p> <p>Much of the following text is subjective and could be resolved without the need for demolition – <i>“A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings contribute to the area’s problems. Fundamental design flaws have created an abundance of dark and insecure settings, including non-overlooked alleys and external stairwells, which are conducive to anti-social behaviour such as drug dealing, street drinking and vandalism”</i>.</p> <p><i>“The estate is isolated from neighbouring areas and has little presence on arrival to the area along Roehampton Lane”</i> – is incorrect, as the estate is not <i>“isolated”</i> as shown by the array of towns within easy reach by bus, and this regeneration is supposed to be about meeting the needs of the <i>“existing community”</i> (section 4.6) therefore this <i>“little presence”</i> comment is subjective and relates to those outside of the Alton Estate community. Comment ID: RSPD225 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:09</p> |
| 4.7 | Core principle 7 – improve access and connections |
| 4.7 (core principles) | <p>D. <i>“The provision of a new route passing through the heart of the area – this may be achieved through the extension of the existing K3 service”</i>. – Therefore Highcliffe Drive is still within scope to be opened? Comment ID: RSPD227 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:11</p> |
| 4.10 | <p><i>“However the relatively high journey times into central London, coupled with the distances from rail stations and town centres, result in a sense of general disconnection and remoteness for residents of the area”</i> – says whom? My wife and I have lived on the estate for 14 years and travelled to Canary Wharf and Bank for work for the past ten years and have not felt this. How has this subjective view come about?</p> <p><i>“Additional new housing on the site is likely to result in an increased population. This is likely to be reflected in increases buses on existing routes and the provision of a new route passing through the heart of the area”</i>. From this text it seems that barriers, possibly both Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive – are under threat and a Labour Councillor said there would be a 20% increase in the Alton West population at the Roehampton Forum meeting of 7th November 2014 and I’m not sure how a bus going <i>“through the heart of the area”</i> has anything to do with an <i>“increased population”</i>? Comment ID: RSPD228 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:12</p> |
| Figure 4.3 Access and movement principles diagram | <p>Regarding Figure 4.3 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD230 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:15</p> |
| 4.8 | Core principle 8 – create a sustainable environment |
| 4.8 (core | <p>Much of this section causes concern for how will this translate into service charges. For</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-------------|--|
| principles) | instance, <i>"Increase habitat availability through the addition of nesting bat and bird boxes, log piles, insect boxes and other features in appropriate locations"</i> will require ongoing maintenance and from a service charge perspective, whom will be paying for this? Can leaseholders challenge these costs if they are to be applied to them? Comment ID: RSPD229 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:13 |
|-------------|--|

Section 5 – Sub-area guidance

| Section | Comments |
|--|--|
| 5 | Sub-area guidance |
| 5.1 | |
| Figure 5.1 Key intervention areas | Regarding Figure 5.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD231 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:16 |
| 5.1 | Sub-area 1: Roehampton Local Centre |
| 5.1 Sub- area 1 - Roehampton Local Centre | <i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> renamed <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i> . Comment ID: RSPD232 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:18 |
| 5.2 | <i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> renamed <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i> . Comment ID: RSPD233 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:20 |
| 5.3 | A. What will these <i>"new and improved shops and services"</i> be? B. What will the <i>"improved community facilities"</i> do for the community? How will they differ from now? B. <i>"may include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>A purpose built, state of the art library.</i> • <i>A new community cultural arts facility.</i> • <i>Additional community services within smaller units"</i>. <p>Again a mention of "may" with regards to the library. See paragraph 4.3 for earlier comments regarding the library.</p> <p>F. <i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> renamed <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i>.</p> <p>H. <i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> renamed <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i>.</p> <p>L. <i>"Roehampton Local Centre"</i> renamed <i>"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"</i>. Comment ID: RSPD234 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:21</p> |
| 5.4 | Much of the following text is subjective – <i>"Roehampton Local Centre is not currently fulfilling its role in meeting daily needs and providing access to higher order centres. Although the shopping area is a highly visible gateway to the Alton estate, it presents a harsh environment at the front and rear, and overall largely unattractive. Public space has also seen significant deterioration over time"</i> . <i>"Policy DMC1 provides further guidance on the circumstances where a loss of community facilities may be acceptable. To access the loss of community facilities or floorspace, the Council will require evidence to justify the loss. The Council must be satisfied that either an adequate replacement facility is provided, or there are no reasonable prospects of reuse by an alternative community use"</i> – this text seems to |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>open the door for loss of community space. Comment ID: RSPD235 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:22</p> |
| Figure 5.2 Key Principles for Roehampton Local Centre | <p>Regarding Figure 5.2 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.</p> <p>Figure 5.2 is an awful diagram which is too opaque to obtain any real understanding of what is to happen and perhaps this lead to the confusion of whether or not Hersham Close blocks were due for demolition, as mentioned in paragraph 1.4. Comment ID: RSPD236 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:23</p> |
| 5.2 | Sub-area 2 – Portswood Place |
| 5.5 | |
| 5.6 | |
| 5.7 | <p><i>"Since its construction, Portswood Place has undergone significant change to the detrimental effect of the built environment and public realm. Extensive additions, demolitions and reconfigurations have left this space suffering from a lack of focus, also presenting a harsh environment at the front and rear. The Portswood Place Shopping parade lacks basic services and amenities"</i> – this contains a mixture of subjective comments and if proven true, the Council has allowed this to occur. Comment ID: RSPD237 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:24</p> |
| 5.3 | Sub-area 3 – Danebury Avenue housing |
| 5.8 | |
| 5.9 | <p>B. <i>"1-28 Kingsclere Close"</i> obtains a mention though throughout the document it does not state, according to information provided by the Council, that most of these properties are freehold. This document refers to leaseholders throughout it.</p> <p>B. <i>"New high quality homes (with no net loss of floorspace) will replace existing poor quality accommodation, including (but not limited to) those at...."</i> – though if a freeholder is happy with their home, poor quality or not, they should have the right of say on their home. Otherwise, any home is up for grabs depending on how "quality" is defined at a given moment.</p> <p>B. The comment - <i>"But not limited to"</i> – is confusing. Why not just list all the properties to be impacted, such as the list provided in Appendix 3 to Paper No 15-7 which stated that - <i>"The following properties were identified as part of the Masterplan consultation process as being proposed to be replaced with new homes"</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1-29 Danebury Ave 2. 31A-B, 33, 61A-B, 89A-B, 37-115 Danebury Ave 3. 1-45 Allbrook House 4. 117-211 odd Danebury Ave 5. 213-243 odd Danebury Ave 6. 1-31 odd Harbridge Ave 7. 33-83 odd Harbridge Ave 8. 85-115 odd Harbridge Ave 9. 2-32 even Harbridge Ave 10. 34-84 even Harbridge Ave 11. 1-28 Kingsclere Close 12. 1-14 Portswood place <p>In other words, only numbers 1, 2 and 3 are missing. What is the reason for not listing all properties? Is that so that the six properties of the Ibsley neighbourhood can be included (refer to paragraph 1.4)? Comment ID: RSPD238 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:25</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|--|---|
| 5.10 | <p>"A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings have contributed to current issues with this part of the site. The current design of areas such as Danebury Avenue have resulted in fragmentation and an excess of leftover, directionless and rarely used spaces" – a continuation of the subjective tone from the Council.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD239 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:26</p> |
| 5.4 | Sub-area 4 – central landscape |
| 5.11 | |
| 5.12 | <p>A. Leaseholders should be made aware of whether their service charges will be funding these "envisaged" facilities. If so, can leaseholders please be made aware of how they can challenge these costs?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A. Can it be explained why there would be a need for an "amphitheatre"? There is the Ibstock School theatre that will supposedly allow for community usage. In Application Number: 2013/0803 (Date: 11 June 2013) it states that;</p> <p><i>"The proposal has been granted planning permission for the following reasons: The development of a purpose-built Performaing Arts Centre (PAC) would result in the improvement of educational facilities at Ibstock Place School and create a facility that would be made available to other schools and community groups".</i></p> <p>How many community artistic facilities does the Alton Estate require?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD240 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:29</p> |
| 5.13 | <p>The comment – "Over the years however, the central landscape has become overgrown with trees and forest like sections of impermeable wilderness, barley a distinguishable space today" – is subjective and local residents like this space as highlighted in paragraph 2.4.</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD241 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:29</p> |
| Figure 5.5 Key Principles for the Central Landscape | |

Section 6 - Delivery

| Section | Comments |
|------------------------------|--|
| 6.1 | |
| Market Demand Factors | |
| 6.2 | <p>"Demand for housing is very strong in the south west of London and Roehampton areas" would seem to contradict paragraph 2.32 which states "The average property prices in the Roehampton area are considerably below London, the wider borough of Wandsworth, and other parts of the local area. This indicates a lack of demand from the market in this area, suggesting that it is not an area of choice for many potential owner-occupiers"?</p> <p>".....strong interest in investing in Alton" – should this be "...in the Alton Estate"?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD242 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:31</p> |
| 6.3 | <p>"Local retail demand has also increased in recent years, particularly with new residents arriving in the area at schemes along Roehampton Lane such as Queen Mary's, Emerald</p> |

SPD comments - WBC

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | <p><i>Square and other infill developments. New residents coming into the area as the masterplan is implemented will increase the demand for shopping in the area</i> – should the Council planners therefore be held accountable for allowing this increase in new residents without providing them with the ability to meet their demand for "shopping"?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD243 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:31</p> |
| 6.4 | <p><i>"Demand for purpose built and professionally managed student accommodation will continue to grow"</i> – is this the reason for including the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks with the SPD (refer to paragraph 1.4)?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD244 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:32</p> |
| Delivery Approach | |
| 6.5 | <p><i>"The Council is willing to use its statutory powers (including CPO) to facilitate the delivery of development across the whole site if required"</i> – that is an interesting inclusion.</p> <p>The CPO is included though not a mention the one move policy which has previously been stated as being a requirement. This was stated as a requirement at the Roehampton Partnership - <i>"Councillor Sutters welcomed the plan that affected residents would only have to make one move"</i>. [Source: Roehampton Partnership Minutes, 8th July 2014]</p> <p>Surely this should be part of the "Delivery Approach"?</p> <p>Additionally, where is the need to phase the demolition and the creation of new buildings?</p> <p>Comment ID: RSPD245 Response Date: 21/05/15 21:35</p> |
| 6.6 | |
| 6.7 | |
| Infrastructure lending | |
| 6.8 | |
| 6.9 | |
| 6.10 | |

[REDACTED]

From: Roland Gilmore [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 May 2015 10:58
To: PlanningPolicy
Subject: Alton Regeneration

I wish to register my opposition to the council's current plans that I believe are unimaginative and fundamentally flawed.

There is no demand or significant support among the local community for these proposals.

The proposals would result in a blight of the area over a long period of years resulting in additional road congestion and disruption. Those unfortunate enough to live close to the proposed work would be most adversely affected.

The most glaring mistake is a lack of adequate provision of urgently needed social rented housing. Wandsworth has over 10,000 families waiting for such accommodation. Home ownership is not within the reach of the majority of Londoners, even after allowing for government subsidies.

Another glaring error is the lack of provision of space for a future rail connection. Roehampton has the highest car use in Inner London and is one of the most deprived areas of the UK. local employment opportunities are scarce meaning residents must travel to find work. The increase of population is not matched by connectivity proposals. Roads in the area are already heavily congested with resultant air quality/health effects that have not been adequately considered. Before WWII, the owners of the District Line intended to extend by building a tunnel from East Putney to either Richmond or Kingston. They built the tunnel portal and it is still visible today. This scheme did not reappear following nationalisation and post war austerity. It's time is now here but Wandsworth Council continue to ignore this necessary means of ensuring beneficial change.

When the Danebury Avenue estate was built, it included a swimming pool. These proposals do not include adequate community facilities such as re-establishment of a pool. Sport England and the National Lottery Fund could help finance such a scheme.

There are significant doubts about the true sustainability of the council's proposals. They do not include modern, best practice.

Kind regards,

Roland Gilmore
[REDACTED]

Via email to: planningpolicy@wandsworth.gov.uk

22nd May 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am contacting you regarding the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for the Roehampton regeneration proposals. I have represented Putney, Roehampton and Southfields in Parliament since 2005 and I wanted to summarise my views on the SPD, taking into account the feedback I have received from local residents and businesses. My response is structured into three main sections, which address the strategic objectives, followed by the core principles set out, and finally the sub-areas that are covered by the SPD proposal.

1. Strategic Objectives:

I believe that the strategic objectives set out are the right ones. Roehampton as a community and in particular, the Alton estate is an area that would benefit from the sort of significant investment that has already happened in other parts of Wandsworth and London more generally. Following investment in the development of Queen Mary's Place, there is a real opportunity to now invest across the road in the Alton estate to bring major benefits including new jobs, homes and facilities to our local community. In doing so, it provides a chance to have Roehampton work as a whole community, economically, socially and culturally.

Continued consultation with residents to get the most from every pound of investment is a vital part of the process. The Alton estate is a large estate. The regeneration affects certain parts of the estate in particular. It will be important to particularly work with those communities that live in those parts that will see the most investment and change - especially residents who will have their homes replaced, but also there is the need to continue getting the views of the broader community on the Alton estate. If that can be achieved, the investment finally coming into the Alton estate could be transformative for people living there, and more widely in Roehampton.

2. Core Principles:

2.1 Core principal 1 – deliver high quality homes within a mixed and balanced community

It is essential that this section of Roehampton, which is characterised by a high proportion of rental properties, has a wider housing choice to create a better balance of rental to owner-occupier homes, and in particular to provide a better choice of family properties such as houses and maisonettes. For people who grow up in Roehampton, the chance to access housing that can match their different lifestyles and life stages is important. This should include provision for shared-ownership to allow residents the opportunity to own their own homes in the area using schemes that make home ownership more affordable. It is important to ensure a good diversity of tenure to seek to reduce the higher level of short-term rents, to increase long-term settlement in the area, which has positive social benefits.

In the SPD document, student accommodation is 'best located close to the place of study'. As a principle, this is reflected in the sentiments of local residents who have raised concerns about the noise experienced from student accommodation. It could also play an important role in alleviating pressure on residential rental property on the Alton estate, the use of which should be encouraged for longer term lets so that a greater proportion of people living on the estate have a long term stake in the local area. Clearly much depends on where any new student accommodation is located. The centre of Roehampton, including up to Whitelands College

which is very close to sub area 1, Roehampton local centre, in particular should be an area that is prioritised for the general community and facilities.

Encouraging the university to continue to play a role in the local community is vital, and a real opportunity. Additionally though, there is a sense that the Alton estate should not become an extended halls of residence for students, and additional housing should be principally structured to meet the need for more homes for local people, with the university continuing to provide accommodation for students on its own estate. This point is made in the SPD 2.21.

It is important that housing stock in the regeneration area is of a high standard to improve the quality of life of existing and new residents. Current poor quality property encourages buy-to-let purchasers who often rent units to students or offer shorter term lets. Higher quality accommodation should help stabilise social mobility by providing better longer term living options.

2.2 Core principal 2 – breathe new life into the existing town centres

Getting jobs and a vibrant local economy in Roehampton is key for the successful regeneration of the area. A regenerated Roehampton should provide a better, wider range of shops and facilities which are easily accessible from the surrounding development area. The large number of residents locally, combined with the proximity to Richmond Park which attracts many visitors, means there is the real potential for significant spending power to come into Roehampton shops and businesses. I would like to see efforts made to have a shopping offer that includes locally run independent shops as well as larger more national chains, to ensure that Roehampton can maintain a distinctive identity. Ideally the town centres would work as a whole, with the Roehampton local centre area on the Alton estate being thoughtfully developed as a single town centre effectively with Roehampton High Street. The two need to not operate separately but essentially enhance one another.

It is also crucial that the town centres become hubs for business and employment for our local community. With 62% of the population in Roehampton not employed as the SPD sets out, it is essential that the regeneration provides sufficient provision for jobs and new business space. I hope that work can be done through the regeneration project to have JobCentre Plus staff located on the Alton estate to support local people to get the jobs provided by investment. This should also involve encouraging entrepreneurship and local people who perhaps currently locate their businesses elsewhere to consider locating in Roehampton. It may also be worth considering whether any office space provision would be suitable to encourage businesses into the area given the attractiveness of the open space the regeneration area boasts, although improved transport links will be needed to make this option viable. It is also important that existing businesses are provided with sufficient support and options as part of the redevelopment.

2.3 Core principal 3 – deliver new and improved community infrastructure

Developing community and social infrastructure is key to improving the quality of lives of residents in Roehampton. It needs to be a place where residents can not only live and work, but that has great leisure and community facilities that can bring people together. The provision of new community infrastructure must be in line with community needs and be reflective of a growing population. It is important that the development of these plans take into account the consultation responses received and the facilities that residents most want to see.

Residents have stressed to me the importance of the library locally, which is where I also hold my MP surgeries, and the need to secure its ongoing provision, whether by improving the existing offer, or providing an improved new facility altogether. I also think that reference to youth community services alongside additional health facilities and police services is very welcome. Having a community building that is fit for purpose and has modern facilities could provide a focal point for local residents groups to operate more effectively. An enhanced sports and fitness centre would be welcome by the range of residents who use it. The idea of some sort of arts facility is also a strong one that Roehampton could very much benefit from.

It is also vital that, where existing community and social facilities are being changed or move to new locations, that the existing users of these facilities are properly engaged and brought into the discussions about how better community spaces are being developed.

2.4 Core principal 4 – deliver a high quality landscape and outdoor recreation facilities throughout the area

I was pleased to read that the SPD seeks to ensure that the Council will seek opportunities to extend the provision of open space and commitment to no net loss of public open space. Alongside the housing that was provided, the fantastic open spaces around the Alton estate were a major driver of how it was designed originally, to almost act as an extension of Richmond Park in terms of the landscape.

The regeneration is an important opportunity to improve green spaces so that they are areas that local people really want to spend time in and enjoy. Developing outdoor sports facilities is one option and I would like real attention to better youth facilities and spaces for children to be able to play outside, given that overwhelmingly, children on the Alton estate are growing up in flats. The design of the landscape should increase the connectivity between the open spaces within the regeneration area, as well as linking the less green northern part of the ward with the southern part of the ward to enable better access to wonderful outdoor spaces such as Richmond Park. There has never been a pedestrian entrance from the Alton estate to Richmond Park, in spite of a number of ideas and options being proposed. If a suitable place could be identified, I believe it is time that the thousands of people on the Alton estate who live next door to Richmond Park had direct access to it.

I very much support the requirement that developments will need to contribute to Roehampton's "green architecture" in terms of additional tree planting, tree lined streets and generally having a soft landscape that can add to the environment and improve the feel of the estate and Roehampton more generally.

2.5 Core principal 5 – respect the heritage of the area

Roehampton has a rich history which needs much more focus and to be a real strand running through all the development ideas. When the Alton estate was first built it had the biggest Boys Brigade branch in the whole of London. As part of the regeneration, it is time the Roehampton history and especially the Alton estate history was properly written and set out. I would like some work with the community, especially older members who have lived locally for some time, to record and document their thoughts and experiences of what the Alton estate has been like to live on and how that has changed over the years, so that it can be preserved for the future as the estate evolves. As the SPD sets out there are a number of areas of heritage significance which could be made much more of. It is essential that any development is sympathetic to existing heritage sites and maintains the integrity of these sites. Any opportunities to highlight the heritage assets to the local community should be encouraged, for example by creating a 'heritage walk' or perhaps talking with the Putney Society about an exhibition on Roehampton's history. Providing a platform for local culture and history is important as it provides an intrinsic value which bonds people with their local surroundings.

2.6 Core principal 6 – update and activate the urban fabric

It is important that the design of any new housing fits in alongside the existing buildings on the Alton estate and in the surrounding area. Ideally its design should enhance the local area and be high quality enough that it will continue to look outstanding for the years to come.

Combatting crime and anti-social behavior needs to be designed and built into how new areas of housing and open space are reconfigured. It is important that the design and layout of the regeneration proposal area tackles this issue head on by removing any areas of dead space and creating light and open areas that will discourage hotspots of anti-social behaviour.

2.7 Core principal 7 – improve access and connections

The issue of improving access and connections is one that has been raised regularly with me since the start of the regeneration consultation.

Alongside existing work to improve the frequency of buses and connectivity, it is vital that Roehampton is better connected, particularly to East Putney station which is currently a 40 minute bus ride away, as the SPD sets out in 1.31. I would like to see better cycling storage facilities for the many residents who own bikes and find them difficult to get up to flats. In my recent community survey, a number of residents were keen that Boris Bikes be provided in Roehampton. Work should also be done to make the case for some sort of underground link to connect the Roehampton and A3 corridor to the underground network, and the redevelopment should actively explore this potential, or at least have a sense of where any new station might be located.

Many residents have been concerned around the bottom end of Danebury Avenue area where many near-miss accidents have been witnessed. This issue is compounded by the presence of traffic to and from Ibstock Place School, which many parents drive their children to. It is important to make sure the estate is safe for pedestrians, particularly given the number of young families and elderly residents. I would strongly encourage the recommendation in the SPD to upgrade pedestrian crossings at both Danebury Avenue and Roehampton Lane. I would encourage the design to also consider the challenges of space restrictions of Danebury Avenue when considering where to relocate the bus turn-around, as the buses often obstruct the traffic flow and impair visibility.

I would also urge the Council to ensure that the information gathered at consultation stage and subsequently reflected in the Council's final masterplan proposal be used as a continuing point of reference when considering how to improve transport links within the estate. Residents I met with were strongly concerned about the opening of the barriers in both Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive. Although I note from the SPD that the Danebury Avenue barrier is to remain closed, residents have contacted me who are concerned that Figure 4.3 gives an impression that the Highcliffe Drive barrier is open to further investigation.

Both of these barriers were closed on the Council's final masterplan, which was informed by representations from local residents, businesses and community groups, and any change is likely to cause significant concerns amongst residents.

It is also important that any improvements to access and connections carefully deal with parking provision for an increased population, as well as the additional volume of traffic that is likely to result from the higher number of facilities that will be offered. The Alton estate is already difficult to park in for residents, particularly around the top end of Danebury Avenue, with some spaces being used by commuters who then travel onward using public transport to Barnes Station. It may be that improved pedestrian access throughout the area, combined with better connectivity, discourages car use for shorter journeys, but this cannot be assumed.

2.8 Core principal 8 – create a sustainable environment

It is important that the regeneration project ensures suitable water drainage not only to account for the new homes being built, but also throughout the construction phase when bad weather could cause substantial surface water run-off and ponding. I was pleased to see the SPD refer to sustainable urban drainage systems in new Downshire Fields. The design team may also like to consider incorporating into their design drainage that utilises rain water to irrigate existing green spaces.

I am very supportive of the points on enhancing biodiversity and habitats, and putting in place a tree planting and landscape strategy. It might be that local residents, schools and the university can be particularly engaged on this point.

Roehampton ward, bordering Richmond Park and close to Wimbledon Common and Putney Heath has a good level of wildlife and all possible precautions to protect existing habitats and mitigate the impacts of construction should be taken to preserve the biodiversity of the area.

3. Sub Area Guidance

These comments are in addition to those points above that already cover many of the points the SPD raises in the specific sections on sub-areas.

3.1 Sub Area 1 - Roehampton Local Centre

It is important that the centre of Roehampton and parts of Danebury Avenue that people visiting the estate use is an area that residents living in Roehampton can be proud of and shows the Alton estate at its best. Improved public spaces, better shops, facilities and pedestrian crossings are important suggestions. New homes should replace some of the poorer stock, though a number of residents have questioned whether this is the right location for more student housing, even given its proximity to Whitelands College. The idea of having students in better managed accommodation is a sensible one, but it should be delivered thoughtfully and primarily should only replace student housing (Mount Clare), that is demolished as part of the regeneration, ideally close to that location. It must be part of a viable approach that ultimately prioritises new homes for local residents who are going to have longer term stakes in Roehampton. The university is already improving its student accommodation on what is a large university estate. Certainly, the vast bulk of additional net homes should be for the local resident community in Roehampton.

3.2 Sub Area 2 - Portswood Place Important Local Parade

For many years, Portswood Place has been an important shopping parade for local people but has also suffered from antisocial behaviour and groups of street drinkers. Nevertheless, with its location across from one of the main open spaces on the Alton estate, it has huge potential to be a small community hub for residents in this part of the estate, so it is welcome that this area is now going to get the investment and improvement it deserves.

Having new community buildings and space for new, extended health services, a children's play area, and non-profit/business spaces are also sensible, welcome ideas but need to be worked into proposals through detailed consultation with the local residents in the area and those who will be most likely using the facilities.

From the SPD it was not clear how the bus turning area relocation would work in practice.

3.3 Sub Area 3 - Danebury Avenue Housing

As a local MP, some of the housing stock that is most complained about by residents in terms of quality of housing stock is in the area covered by sub-area 3, and it is important that those residents have the chance to live in new and improved housing stock. The way in which residents are dealt with and how their shift out of their homes whilst new homes are being built for them is something I know the council has already put significant thought into and is important to get right.

3.4 Sub Area 4 - Central Landscape

The ideas contained in the SPD can enhance what is a very important open space on the Alton estate. Having a space that is one that the local community can enjoy in one form, or another, on a daily basis would be a real step forward. How it is landscaped and the protection and use of trees is also extremely important. Seating areas that can make it easier for families and elderly people to sit and enjoy the open space is welcome, as is the chance to really make the most of the spaces between the blocks of flats on Highcliff Drive with community gardens. Overall, the regeneration should seek to minimise the amount of concrete public areas and maximise the amount of green space public areas. In relation to how many of the different proposals are taken forward, again, consultation with residents on the ground is vital, alongside

this more formal SPD process to make sure the final proposal really works for people living there.

I would be grateful if these comments can be taken on board and considered as part of the SPD consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

Rt Hon Justine Greening MP
Putney, Roehampton and Southfields