

Events: Roehampton SPD - draft March 2015

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Roehampton SPD - draft March 2015		<p>This document contains a significant number of errors and confusions. This undermines the credibility of the document and makes it more difficult to take the document seriously. It also makes a number of important assertions about Roehampton but fails to show evidence to back them up. Unfortunately there are too many to list so I will mention some examples. Page 6 Paragraph 1.16 has left Putney out, Page 6 paragraph 1.18 there is no mention of Roehampton University, isn't it a reputable institution. Section 2 paragraph 2.1 no evidence of why is not working to his full potential, page 20Paragraph 2.7 'a large number of existing homes within the site are at the end of their useful live' no evidence.</p> <p>1.1 "The Council is committed to delivering a new future for Roehampton...." Why Roehampton? The regeneration has mainly focused on the Alton Estate, first the West before moving to the East.</p> <p>If this is truly about the "regeneration of Roehampton" then why has the focus been on the "Alton". Even as recently as the Council Committee meetings of the <u>Housing and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee (21st January 2015)</u> and the <u>Executive (26th January 2015)</u> Paper No. 15-7 referred to the regeneration as "<u>the Alton area regeneration programme</u>".</p> <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>It has been noticed by many that the Council is trying to make sure the Alton is no longer. You can find an article in the ARW website name "We no longer exist".</p> <p>Unrelated to the above points is that this is document is difficult to follow as it is full of duplications and contradiction.</p> <p>1.2 With regards to the comment – "<u>The recommended masterplan reflects the aspirations of the Council as</u></p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.1	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>landowner</i> – this is not correct as there are other landowners within this SPD area. Kingsclare has 23 freeholds of the 28 properties who have largely been ignored.</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>The Alton Estate residents have had two meetings with MP Greening as they are not happy with the current plans.</p> <p>Point 2 – Ward Councillors refuse to justify student housing in Danebury Avenue Town Centre</p> <p>Our Labour Councillors refuse to answer its electorate with regards to the following about student housing in the Town Centre. A series of emails have been sent to all three Councillors, with Labour candidate MP Sheila Boswell and Wandsworth Labour Council leader Rex Osborne as copy parties.</p> <p>Point 3 – Roehampton Partnership ignores it’s residents</p> <p>Point 2 have been shared with the Roehampton Partnership on at least two occasions, July 8th 2014 and re-submitted at the 9th September 2014 meetings. Both times ignored. These figures do not reflect the <i>“aspirations of the Councils as landowner and planning authority following consultation with residents and stakeholder groups”</i>.</p> <p>Point 4 – Poor questionnaire response</p> <p>Only 254 questionnaires were returned to the Council. A member of The Roehampton Partnership mentioned this though did not try to address the issue. You could see the comments on their minutes from the <u>July 8th 2014 meeting</u>.</p> <p>Point 5 – Twentieth Century feedback not highlighted to residents</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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.</p> <p>1.3 The "Alton Area Masterplan Baseline Report (August 2013)" was published online on the 8th October 2014 as confirmed by Team Roehampton in an email dated January 8th 2015. 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>Residents have not been given the opportunity to look at this document and raise any questions or challenge the information. A question needs to be raise of why it was not shared with resident until the Masterplan was approved?</p> <p>It is another sample of how the Council tries to massage the information during the consultation. Another sample would be the usage other buy to let Landlords in the area. The masterplan states that - "Currently 40% of the units in the Alton area are privately rented owned by buy to let landlords and primarily let to students. 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 "The 40% mentioned on page 15 of the masterplan should refer to the percentage of leaseholders in general, and not specifically non resident leaseholders".</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 "The 40% mentioned on page 15 of the masterplan should refer to the percentage of leaseholders in general, and not specifically non resident leaseholders".</p> <p>Could this have lead to more discussion about whether this figure of 20% is sufficient justification for demolishing properties?</p> <p>Additional comments from this Baseline sentence will be ;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Could" is subjective and insufficient evidence for any demolition justification.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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? <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 further in section 1.4.</p> <p>There has been an exaggeration of the health issues of the Alton, or at least the figures to support such issues are flawed. Page 14 of the Masterplan states;</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 is improving too. The figure, based on Table 16 on page 137 of the Baseline report, 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 to possibly 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 – “What health benefits will the Alton regeneration bring?” on the regeneration website.</p> <p>In summary, all of the figures in the Baseline should be re-assessed for accuracy and whether they have</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				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.
				1.4 Section 1.1 refers as a regeneration programme for the Alton Estate, and the SPD focuses predominately on the Alton West, not Roehampton.
				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.
				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 :
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves	Paragraph	1.4	“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.
	Carazo Minguez			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;

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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.</p> <p>2. Or what the implications are for the fate of these, and other, maisonettes on the Estate 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.</p> <p>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 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).</p> <p>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?".</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Figure 1.2</p> <p>Please remove the six blocks from the Ibsley neighbourhood for reasons highlighted in section 1.4.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.5	<p>The SPD does not contain any detailed supplementary guidance. This document is full of errors and inconsistencies .</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.6	The Council has provide its own newsletters and leaflets with regards to the various stages of the consultation, though nothing has been provided for the SPD. In regards of "Given that it has been subject to extensive community consultation " this can be disputable. Team Roehampton has claimed that both English Heritage and he 20 th Century have been involved at every step of the process. We are aware that the 20 th Century was first contacted on the 19 th December 2013 which was after the first stage of consultation. Additionally the feedback from English Heritage has been taken more seriously that the 20 th Century.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	The SPD Site Boundary and Site Specific Allocations	Figure 1.2	Please removed the six block from the Ibsley neighbourhood reason highlighted on section 1.4
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.8	Regarding the comments "the 2 nd Proposed Submission Version of Local Plan", Leads to ask under what basis was this consultation communicated to Alton Estate Residents. There was not mention of this third consultation in any literature which was provide to residents. All resident received was a half-page leaflet from Team Roehampton, after the Executive approve the October Masterplan. Even Jonny More who used to work for Team Roehampton didn't report any third consultation at the Roehampton Partnership.
906283	Mrs Maria	Paragraph	1.9	Regarding the comments "The core strategy (Policy PL1) states that deprivation and inequalities will be tackled though regeneration initiatives" How will the deprivation be tackled?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	de las Nieves Carazo Minguez			There is not information to how this regeneration will actually tackle such issues it is only recently that the concept of "social regeneration" is being discussed by Labour councillors. The regeneration has only been around for two years.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.10	Roehampton Masterplan to be ammended to Alton Masterplan. Roehampton residents to be ammended to Alton Resident. What are these "new transport linkages"? MP greening proudly announced on the Putney SW15 website that both Danebury and Highcliffe barriers will remain off the Masterplan. Was this just a political tactic for the general elections?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.11	If these are the propose sites why included the six block of the Ibsley neighbourhood into the SPD discussed in 1.4
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.13	Regarding the comment "Mayoral CIL will however be charged and development will be" Will this CIL make it way back into Roehampton?
906283	Mrs	Paragraph	1.14	There is unreasonable to ask people to read a document which has more than 400 pages in conjunction with the

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez			SPD in such a short space of time.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.15	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. 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?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.16	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, Richmond, Barnes and Mortlake". 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".
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo	Paragraph	1.17	This section seems to contradict the view that there is a need to open up the Alton Estate to make is more accessible as many local town centres are "within easy access". It looks to me that we have access to many other locations for shopping and leisure. FYI, Sheen should be included as this is before Richmond via the 493 bus.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Minguez			
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Site Location and Wider Context	Figure 1.3	This does not comment on what makes an institution "reputable", also this list seems to disregard Roehampton University and the Priory Clinic. Is Roehampton University not reputable institution?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.19	Finally, "Alton Estate" receives a mention in its own right. The comment - "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" - 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.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.21	Regarding Figure 1.4 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves	Paragraph	1.22	In reference to the comment - "Numerous alterations have however taken place since the 1950s, including some insensitive later" – 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?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Carazo Minguez			<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 build.</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 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</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.24	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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 be listed please.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.25	<p>To be revised to “The public realm and public open space provides an important setting for the buildings and for the Conservation Areas”. The word “generous” implies that something could be done to impact this to make it less “generous”. Also who has decided it is “generous” this is another use of a subjective opinion expressed by the author of the document.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Existing Heritage Assets	Figure 1.4	<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>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves	Existing Building Heights	Figure 1.5	<p>Regarding Figure 1.5 refer to comment about the need to remove the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Carazo Minguez			
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.26	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. 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.
				Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4. "Roehampton Local Centre" to be renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre" as was the case in both the Options Consultation and the Preferred Options Consultation. Example 1: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan Options Consultation "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". Example 2: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan: Preferred Option Consultation "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
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.27	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.29	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?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.30	<p>It is very clear that the individual who wrote this section either doesn't know the area or is trying to provide misleading information. The SPD allows 40 minutes to get to East Putney, is that is true can you please explained how it is possible for me to get to Bank in 50 minutes to one hours every day.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – “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</p> <p>Waterloo, Weybridge, Richmond and Kingston (see Figure 1.7)” – 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”. 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 (accessible via the 265 bus, bus stop FE) or Putney Station (accessible via the 85 bus, bus stop B). 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. 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.</p> <p>Regarding Figure 1.7 this is of a very poor quality and is difficult to read. The page 6 map of the Queen Mary's Place brochure is of better quality.</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,</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				Southfields, Clapham Junction, and Barnes.
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.31	<p>Again more misleading information, 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? And why would you go to East Putney anyway?</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.</p> <p>Again it takes me no more than an hour to get to Bank station in the city so why would I go to East Putney.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.32	<p>"Roehampton" to be replaced with "the Alton Estate" .</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Existing Land Uses	Figure 1.6	<p>Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Existing Site Access	Figure 1.7	Regarding Figure 1.7 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.33	From a resident perspective the "Baseline" came after the "Masterplan completion" as commented in section 1.1 point 1.3. As mentioned in section 1.1 point 1.3 the Baseline contains flaws which needs to be revisited. If the Baseline is flawed
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.34	Regarding the comment – "At each of the above stages consultation has influenced the masterplan evolution" – 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. Regarding the comment – "The final masterplan therefore represents a broad consensus on the approach required to bring about the necessary change in the Roehampton area" – 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. "Roehampton" needs to be amended to "Alton Estate".
906283	Mrs Maria	Paragraph	1.35	Regarding the comment – "consensus of the opinion that resulted from the process" – this is not the case as

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	de las Nieves Carazo Minguez			<p>highlighted in section 1.2.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – “a working group of Council Officers (as landowner and planning authority)” – the Council is not the sole landowner and this needs to take into account the other “landowners”.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – “It will be published for consultation for a period of 7 weeks” – 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>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.37	<p>Regarding the comment – “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” – 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> <p>The local community leaders have various connections to the regeneration which raises some concerns about how transparent this process is.</p> <p>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.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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.</p> <p>Mention 1</p> <p>"Roehampton Regeneration</p> <p>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".</p> <p>Mention 2</p> <p>"Alton Regeneration - A Warning!</p> <p>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.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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!"</p> <p>Mention 3</p> <p>"Danebury Avenue - Tories don't listen</p> <p>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!</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	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.
906283	Mrs	Paragraph	1.39	Amend "Roehampton Local Centre" to "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez			
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	1.41	Amend "Roehampton" to "Alton Estate".
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.1	Regarding the comment - "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" – 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. 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; "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

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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”.</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 “What Roehampton wants” was that “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” 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>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.2	<p>There seems to be some notable omissions from this list such as;</p> <p>a) The current Ibstock school theatre (Application Number: 2013/0803)</p> <p>b) Whitelands college student accommodation (though mentioned in paragraph 2.17)</p> <p>c) Downshire House student accommodation (Application Number: 2013/1857)</p> <p>d) Digby Stuart and Southlands Colleges (Application Number: 2014/3330)</p> <p>e) Mosaic school (though mentioned in paragraph 2.17)</p> <p>f) Eglemont House apartments that have been advertised recently in the Wandsworth Guardian</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.3	<p>g) Emerald Square (though mentioned in paragraph 6.3)</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "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.." – 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>Regarding the comment – "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".</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 Social Audit by the Roehampton Ecumenical Church 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? 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</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.4	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>area have secure doors so is this really a problem?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "Poorly defined spaces that are frequently not overlooked and lack any positive active frontages". There are the following questions;</p> <p>What makes these spaces "poorly defined"?</p> <p>What is a "positive active frontage"?</p> <p>In whose subjective view are the above made?</p> <p>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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>supposed to be doing the supervising?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "Residential units frequently overlook refuse and service areas, external stairways and alleyways" – this does not validate a need for demolition.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "Ramps, steps and bollards around the retail parade combine with fences and walls around parking areas to create fragmented spaces and a series of obstacles to pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement (see Photograph 3)" - This picture is taken not far away from the Danebury Avenue and Roehampton Lane intersection and this intersection allows for access to "pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement".</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "A number of the open spaces (including Downshire Fields) lack facilities and amenities" – whom is making the decision that "facilities" and "amenities" are required?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "detracts from the usability and historic openness of the spaces" – again, refer to the Social Audit feedback mentioned earlier which supports the open spaces.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.5	<p>"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"- 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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p data-bbox="220 1249 252 1597">Twentieth Century Society</p> <p data-bbox="284 129 435 1597">“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.</p> <p data-bbox="467 129 619 1597">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.’</p> <p data-bbox="651 174 683 1597">[Source: Listing bid on cards to stop Alton Estate demolition, Jim Dunton, 27 October 2014, Architects Journal]</p> <p data-bbox="715 1350 746 1597">The Putney Society</p> <p data-bbox="778 129 1090 1597">“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”.</p> <p data-bbox="1121 1429 1153 1597">Labour Party</p> <p data-bbox="1185 129 1305 1597">“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</p> <p data-bbox="1337 197 1409 1597">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.</p> <p data-bbox="1441 141 1473 1597">It’s a great shame that the Council never even considered improving Allbrook House, which contains some large</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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”.</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 “Allbrook House and the library – why demolish them?” which highlights this, and other comments regarding support for keeping Allbrook House and the library.</p>
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.6	<p>Regarding the comment - “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” - 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 - “The external and internal design has negative effects on residents and family living conditions” – 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 - “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.” – is farcical, as has been highlighted by a Senior Lecturer at a University as shown in the article “Questionable demolition”.</p> <p>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 “deteriorating stairwells” and “worn exteriors” are maintenance issues, something which was highlighted by the Twentieth Century Society in paragraph 2.5 and also by The Putney Society – “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 council, in due course? With proper maintenance (which has so obviously been lacking for too long), these blocks could provide quite sound residential accommodation”.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.7	Regarding the comment - "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" - - 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 "at the end of their useful life"?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.8	Regarding the comment - "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" - this is subjective and evidence is requested for the validation of this comment?
906283	Mrs Maria de las Nieves Carazo Minguez	Paragraph	2.9	Regarding the comment - "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" - makes the area seem worse that was portrayed in the Baseline report. The Baseline report stated that "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" [Source: Alton Baseline Report September 2013, p137]. 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. 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? According to the Environment, Culture and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 19th February,

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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 "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".</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 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>"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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p> <p>Source: 'Crime Written' – Alton Regeneration Watch</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<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, Labour in Roehampton leaflet March 2014 section titled "Bring back the bobbies petition update". Has this reduction in police numbers contributed to crime figures?</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 "SPD Paragraph 2.9 Community safety" for a review of the figures.</p>

[REDACTED]

From: Joanna Ennis [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 May 2015 19:42
To: PlanningPolicy
Cc: GREENING, Justine; Peter Carpenter; David Cameron; info@altonwatch.org.uk
Subject: Local Resident's Response to Consultation re: Alton Area "Masterplan"

I have waded through yet another ambiguously phrased document which clearly has had PR consultants input on how not to be held accountable for deception. However, I will state my considered personal objections based on living on the Alton Estate, Roehampton continuously since 1966 and having been a council tenant on Highcliffe Drive for 22 years, 11 years with my mother as the tenant on Harbridge Avenue and currently 15 years as a freeholder on Laverstoke Gardens - all these areas face serious alteration so my opinion is extremely valid!

Those of you who have a copy of this email need to realise that despite many protestations during the recent election campaign to be on the side of the people, Wandsworth Borough Council is seeking to use land designated originally for working class people to to maximise profit for presently unknown individuals and also achieve maximum social cleansing! I appeal to you David Cameron as being a party for working people and Justine Greening who stated when she was re-elected that she always had the interests of the people of Roehampton at heart to intervene on behalf of the local citizens who do not benefit from this scheme.

I state below my challenges to the correctness of interpretation of what local residents wanted :

1. We wanted a safe crossing on Danebury Avenue for the elderly and parents with young children to cross to our bus stop at our library but Justine Greening says she cannot obtain this for us.
2. We want cleaners streets and estate, yet it is only thoroughly cleaned when Council Representatives do a check (having warned the local estate manager when they are coming)
3. We want the local multiple private landlords to be held accountable for filthy front and back gardens, etc but they lord it on the estate - one Landlord couple are related to the minister who arranged Right to Buy initially and live in Putney having their own portfolios of ex-council properties which they crowd with young students.
4. We want the University of Roehampton to take responsibility for the socialising of their students who live on the Alton Estate but the Principal of Parkside says they have no responsibility for the behaviour of their students as they are over the age of majority - this was said at a private meeting I had in his office some years ago when complaining about the all night parties through the week.
5. We want Environmental Services to have adequate staff which runs through the night 7 days a week to catch and fine the students who start up in the early hours of the morning as they do not go to their lectures until after lunch unlike the tax paying workers who live on the estate.
6. We want the Government to make a significant change in the law on noise pollution and accountability of Landlords in maintaining normal acceptable behaviour in a built up area. Justine Greening and Eric Pickles (leading cabinet MP's) have told me this cannot be done - despite both of them previously having held posts which made them responsible for Small Communities. Their letters which I still have, make a mockery of public representatives for those in small communities!
7. We want the childrens' playgrounds and play centre to remain intact and available but they are for the chop - whilst communal areas with students in mind will be abounding.
8. We want more than one place of Christian worship on the estate, yet we will have a multi-purpose share with everyone building! As Sunday is our day of worship how can the different denominations meet in one place? especially if other non-Christian groups vey for that worship space.

9. We need more recreation space for children of all ages but the playground on the Green and behind the Youth Centre by the Coop will disappear - the limited offer of recreation is in no way guaranteed once the desirable homes to match the St Mary's Estate of non-council homes have been secured by the Developers.
10. We want rent controls on the Private Landlords (some own hundreds of ex Council properties) who are using the current house price rise and desirability of London by visitors to make a fortune literally!! Yet they are going to be 'compensated' out of public money for the inconvenience!! Incidentally, they should not be given a penny unless they pay UK tax honestly.
11. We want restrictions on Right to Buy Owners who are on the Home Owning Ladder to be prohibited from selling direct to Private Landlords who are forcing up the rents locally each year due to supply and demand now we have more students.
12. We do not want specially developed buildings for students at the heart beat of our community when families are being bribed with monetary gifts to move further away from where they are already part of the community.
13. We want to keep the same amount of Doctors Surgeries and Mental Health establishments as we have at present, Wandsworth Borough Council has already sold off other mental health amenities in Roehampton despite us being the sickest ward in the borough! I see no like for like replacements of these facilities or other items that are on the demolition list.
14. We want an honest interpretation of what the long term residents of Roehampton want yet PR consultants and the printers have made a big profit from engineering a 'supposed scenario of what is needed and what we want. Is 254 returned questionnaires democratic? Incidentally, one of them is mine and I can say that the questions were 'loaded' to get the boxes ticked with the answers the Council and Developers want.
15. We want a Conflict of Interest List to be made public of all WBC workers and officials who have had significant input into this 'Regeneration' of a 50/60 year old estate, including personal contacts with the PR Agencies used and this to be enlarged to the Roehampton University heads involved in any way at all.
16. We want a Conflict of Interest List drawn up for those who have had any contact with the multiple private landlords who stand to gain a great deal on top of their previous profits.
17. We would like made public which Investment Companies and Property Developers have been negotiated with by WBC to gain this valuable land.
18. We would like an inquiry into how an area densely populated can be re-deployed for the local university and the property values of quality homes recently built on the other side of Roehampton Lane.
19. You don't need to be a detective to work out that the new library door faces Roehampton Lane, away from The Alton - also, Danebury Avenue barrier removal serves primarily the Private fee paying school and the newly built Arts Centre also away from The Alton. A walk past the barrier on any week day will show dozens of Landrovers, and au-pair's cars waiting to claim their privileged children and they have to endure turning their cars around and going back to Barnes and Putney from where they came - when it would be so much easier for them to speed on up through Danebury Avenue a highly populated area and passing the school for the estate children.
20. Everyone I know who lived on the estate before the Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive barriers does not want a return to the RAT RUN of commuters from Kingston and Richmond belting down Danebury Avenue to avoid the traffic. I still remember the horror we all felt when a young girl was killed by a car half way down Danebury Avenue not long after that the barrier was installed. I can testify that it is still difficult to cross Danebury Avenue at times due to the increase in population with cars now that we have a mixed community i.e. (more than one car owner per home - students, multiple lets, etc)
21. Which brings me to the obvious - through all the documents presented including the Alton Area Masterplan Executive Summary - there is talk of increasing the population in a small already densely populated area yet taking away the current car parks, where are the present cars going to stand let alone all the increased population - especially as you are seeking to upgrade the class of resident from those who ordinarily could not afford to run a car!!

22. This makes me think that the desire for building more shops and restaurants is more about providing suitable resources for those new residents you want to attract and those from St Mary's forced to pop across the track to buy some groceries.

If any of you who have read this far and are honest enough to admit that there is another agenda here (or 2 or 3) which does not truly have the ordinary Joe in mind, would you please reply to all (or any of the points I have raised) and let all the recipients of this email see it so that you can be accountable.

If there are any 'Greens' out there (I'm not one) consider just how many hundreds of mature or maturing trees and shrubs are coming down to squash in more homes which Prince Charles would happily agree with me will be a carbuncle on beautiful green Roehampton. Incidentally, I love nature and often walk down the length of Danebury Avenue to walk in Richmond Park, not having a gate nearer has never stopped me! however, it would be such a blessing for the students to not have to walk so far to get in or the more affluent getting their car out!!

Forgive me if I have been overly facetious, but it is hard to not be cynical when one has had the misfortune to read so much printed literature on how this Masterplan is for 'our good'.

1. Just keep the streets clean,
2. pay a bigger dividend towards the local police being on the Alton Estate,
3. invest in polyclinics and mental health resources,
4. make available more children's nurseries and play centres on the Alton,
5. make the Private Landlords as accountable as you do Council Tenants.
6. Deal with the dumping of the bi-yearly refits private landlords do (have WBC ever issued a license for a skip on the Alton?)
7. Change and improve to 21 century urban living noise pollution offenses by Statute.
8. Do an environmental survey of rubbish around student properties and in gardens Private Landlords' lettings!
9. Include in that survey the noise pollution experienced day and night, term in and term out!
10. Make the University of Roehampton accountable for their students as they benefit so much for being here.
11. Put back the seating you took away from outside our Post Office which the mothers and elderly used.
12. Don't raise even higher blocks near the Library thereby blocking out even more sunlight in a shadowy area.
13. Do put caring canvassers on the flow path of residents as they walk past the Co-op, the Post Office, at the primary schools, at the bus stops, the library, and the buildings which are listed for demolition and ask them "How do they feel that their block is being demolish, their playgrounds and doctors surgeries closed and not replaced adequately, more traffic on the road, etc.", and get honest answers from people who know this area inside out.
14. Give the honest people of Roehampton who will still be here after the students have finished their studies what they really need before the needs of those who have purchased homes on the Roehampton Lane, their property prices will still rise, albeit not by quite as much as if you lift the class of people and area.
15. The community is glued together by social interaction which mostly happens walking to the shops or PO or the Bus Stops to Kingston, Hammersmith. The locals primarily walk on the pavement closest to the shopfronts to reach these places and it occasions conversations which are affirming, encouraging, comforting or informative - we have no where else where we can do this. Walking back to the bottom and sitting on a green with the students who are connecting from Digby Stuart and Parkside etc is not satisfying or practical. You are missing a trick if you really want the community to thrive and prosper by not using the Coop Site, etc, as a village green, plaza with chairs and small cafe and junior play area, where people can connect and build up a village community in a civilised way with pleasure. It would be a perfect connect between old and new Roehampton and be

pleasant on the eye to those driving past on Roehampton Lane and would give a good image to prospective students of the University!

16. My faith in you all would be restored if you redeemed this financial project and agreed to a fundamental change in your Regeneration Plan by adopting a purely altruistic stance with this Roehampton Plaza which was only for the residents' bonding and happiness.

Thank you for having the integrity to read and examine my comments and I know I am not alone in feeling so passionately but not everyone is so vocal and pushy as me, so I am setting myself up as yet another voice pleading for compassion for Roehampton not Property development!

Joanna Ennis
29 Laverstoke Gardens
Roehampton
London SW15 4JB

Events: Roehampton SPD - draft March 2015

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	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</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>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 <u>Roehampton Partnership’s Term of Reference</u>]</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 <u>Housing and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Committee (21st January 2015)</u> and the <u>Executive (26th January 2015)</u> Paper No. 15-7 referred to the regeneration as “<i>the Alton area regeneration programme</i>”.</p> <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 “<i>Roehampton Supplementary Planning Document</i>” 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><i>We no longer exist</i></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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 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><i>“5. Council as the landowner</i></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>
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph 1.2		<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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p>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> <p>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’ .</p> <p>Point 3 – Roehampton Partnership ignores it’s residents</p> <p>In addition to the figures provided in point 2 the following figures were provided to the Ropehampton 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 “<i>aspirations of the Councils as landowner and planning authority following consultation with residents and stakeholder groups</i>” .</p> <p>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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>well as the new access route through into Richmond Park.</p> <p>Point 4 – Poor questionnaire response</p> <p>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 <u>July 8th 2014 meeting</u>.</p> <p><i>“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”.</i></p> <p><i>“Councillor Ambache said that the poor response was probably due to people being sceptical about consultations”.</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Point 5 – Twentieth Century feedback not highlighted to residents</p> <p>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.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>In the two summary consultation documents, neither time was the Twentieth Century mentioned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alton Area Masterplan Interim Consultation Report February 2014 (Section 2)</u> • <u>Alton Area Masterplan – Preferred Option Consultation Report July 2014 (Sections 2B, 2C, 2D)</u> <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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 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</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>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? <p>Looking at the Baseline report, this 40% is taken from Table 3 on page 147, which includes the lbsley 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</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>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, based on Table 16 on page 137 of the <u>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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	What is the role and purpose of the SPD?	1.2	<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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>The first consultation</p> <p>The following documents were delivered to properties;</p> <p>> <u>Options booklet</u></p> <p>> <u>Questionnaire</u></p> <p>Can you find where these six blocks are within these documents?</p> <p>The second consultation</p> <p>The following documents were delivered to properties;</p> <p>> <u>Preferred option booklet</u></p> <p>> <u>Options consultation questionnaire</u></p> <p>Can you find where these six blocks are within these documents?</p> <p>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 :</p> <p><i>“ 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.</i></p> <p><i>Both the Masterplan and the Roehampton SPD set out proposals for Roehampton Local Centre – see “5.1 Sub-area</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>However, this has later been retracted by the Council yet no explanation, as far as I aware, has been offered as to;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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 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).</p> <p>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 “<u>Spot the difference</u>”, and roeregeneration’s article “<u>Alton’s maisonettes under threat?</u>”.</p> <p>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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				apparently put together pre-resident consultations.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	The SPD Site Boundary and Site Specific Allocations	Figure 1.2	Please remove the six blocks from the Ibsley neighbourhood for reasons highlighted in section 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph 1.8		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

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p>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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.8	<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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	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>"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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				where the works are to take place?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.16	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, Richmond, Barnes and Mortlake". 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".
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.17	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 "within easy access". Additionally, Sheen should be included as this is before Richmond via the 493 bus.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.18	This is not to comment on whether an institution is "reputable" or not, rather this list seems to disregard Roehampton University and the Priory Clinic.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.19	Finally, "Alton Estate" receives a mention in its own right. The comment - "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" - 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

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				– as per the comments within section 1.2 point 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.21	Regarding Figure 1.4 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.22	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?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.24	Regarding Figure 1.5 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4. 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. 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 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”. The result from the <u>survey highlights</u> , questions 19 and 20, that residents are not in favour of tall buildings.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>The accompanying text was –</p> <p><i>“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.</i></p> <p><i>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”.</i></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 <i>“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”</i> – 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 <i>“Higher scale development exists along Roehampton Lane both within and outside the SPD site boundary”</i> – can this be listed be listed please.</p>
905286	Mr	Paragraph	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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Steven Fannon			<p><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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Existing Heritage Assets	Figure 1.4	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.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Existing Building Heights	Figure 1.5	Regarding Figure 1.5 refer to comment about the need to remove the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks mentioned in section 1.2 point 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.26	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. 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.
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	1.27	Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> to be renamed <i>“Danebury Avenue Town Centre”</i> as was the case in both the Options