

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p>Consultation and the Preferred Options Consultation.</p> <p><u>Example 1: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan Options Consultation</u></p> <p>"1 Danebury Avenue Town Centre</p> <p>New investment could create a cleaner, more attractive, more active and safer local centre which would be better used by local people. New shops could be provided and service areas could be better managed and secured".</p> <p><u>Example 2: Page 4 of the Alton Area Masterplan: Preferred Option Consultation</u></p> <p>"A REVITALISED TOWN CENTRE</p> <p>THE PREFERRED OPTION</p> <p>The preferred option aims to transform Danebury Avenue town centre, making it more attractive destination with new shops, better housing and potentially a new place for arts and community activities. There will be inviting public spaces, improved pavements and streets".</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	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?
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	1.30	<p>Regarding Figure 1.7 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "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</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p><i>direct connections to Clapham Junction, London</i></p> <p><i>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".</i></p> <p><i>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 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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the comment – "Buses provide access to neighbouring centres (Putney, Wandsworth and Richmond) and into the wider public transport network, including links into Hammersmith and Victoria" – this ignores Sheen, Southfields, Clapham Junction, and Barnes.</i></p> <p><i>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?</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.31	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				Using the TfL journey planner, the 265 bus from Roehampton Lane/Danebury Ave can take one to Putney Bridge station in 16 minutes. Using the TfL journey planner, from SW15 4LP to Hammersmith underground station this is 33 minutes. Therefore why would one take the "approximate 40 minute bus ride" to East Putney?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.31	Even going to Southfields underground station would be quicker than going to East Putney underground. Leaving at 7am on Friday morning, for instance, would take 13 minutes with the 493 bus- https://onedrive.live.com/redirect?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1!555&authkey=!AO6lyrtsFK-y-5U&ithint=file%2cpdf
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.32	"Roehampton" to be replaced with "the Alton Estate".
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Existing Land Uses	Figure 1.6	Regarding Figure 1.6 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven	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.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.33	<p>From a resident perspective the “Baseline” came after the “Masterplan completion” as commented in section 1.1 point 1.3.</p> <p>As mentioned in section 1.1 point 1.3 the Baseline contains flaws which needs to be revisited. If the Baseline is flawed it is fair to suggest that the following stages have been based on incorrect information.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.34	<p>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.</p> <p>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 Ipsley neighbourhood maisonettes.</p> <p>“Roehampton” needs to be amended to “Alton Estate”.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.35	<p>Regarding the comment – “consensus of the opinion that resulted from the process” – this is not the case as highlighted in section 1.1 point 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</p>

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

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<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>> Document - https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB11133&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey=!AJazMeuwZ2vouxk</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> <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>> Document - https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB11189&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><u>=!AH5FoZdb6tXX1q8</u></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> <p>The Tories took no notice of the huge number of residents who did not want the Danebury barrier opened. They are now proposing to open the barrier almost 24/7 - watch out for the rat-runs to develop. What have your Roehampton Tories done about this? Nothing!"</p> <p>> Document - https://onedrive.live.com/view.aspx?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB1135&ithint=file%2c.pdf&app=WordPdf&authkey=!AH-YKSJz7Dwlsgk</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	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.
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	1.39	Amend "Roehampton Local Centre" to "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	1.41	Amend "Roehampton" to "Alton Estate".
	Mr			Regarding the comment - <i>"An examination of the SPD area reveals a number of physical, environmental, social and market issues affecting the quality of the life of the people who live there"</i> – each of these "issues" have not been proven. An example is regarding "social" whereby only now, some two years after the beginning of this regeneration work stream, has there been any discussion regarding the "social" component of the regeneration. At the Roehampton Partnership of 25 th 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.
905286	Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.1	Even at the 12 th 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 <u>Roehampton Partnership Minutes of 3rd December 2014</u> which stated; <i>"Councillor Ambache then spoke about the Masterplan which he said appeared to deal with only the physical aspect of the regeneration. As the Council is committed to building a stronger community it would have to engage with other partners such as health, schools, the voluntary sector etc. This will promote improved health outcomes and educational achievement, employment as well as partnership working with the police and improved arts and culture, All of these are just as important as physical improvements and, as such, there ought to be a strategic plan for community regeneration to cover the next five years. This will require an assessment of community needs and how to measure progress. Councillor Ambache said there ought to be a paper on this for discussion and how</i>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>to move the matter forward. Councillor Carpenter agreed that there was health inequality within the borough and said that there was a need for the Council to engage with the NHS as stakeholders".</i></p> <p>Regarding the comment - "evidence suggests that the area is not working to its full potential" – this depends from whose perspective? If from the aspect of trying to cram as many people into such a confined area, something which Labour highlighted in their</p> <p>2008 survey "<i>What Roehampton wants</i>" was that "<i>There is also a legitimate debate to be had as to whether the Alton estate – already the most densely populated part of the constituency – should be the focus of hundreds more homes. Love it or hate it, one of</i></p> <p><i>the things that cannot be denied about the Alton is that it was meticulously planned to provide green open space surrounding the blocks and avenues of council housing. The Council plans irreparably damage this plan by building on the green space and over-populating the estate</i>" 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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<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 recently completed and have been advertised recently in the Wandsworth Guardian</p> <p>g) Emerald Square (though mentioned in paragraph 6.3)</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.3	<p>Regarding the comment - <i>“With its proximity to Richmond Park and the Georgian landscape setting, parts of the area are attractive and the generosity of the public spaces and public realm contribute to a general sense of openness, particularly around Downshire Fields..”</i> – does <i>“generosity”</i> mean a target for developers?</p> <p>This <i>“generosity”</i> is based on whose thoughts? A subjective view which should be removed.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.4	<p>Regarding the comment – <i>“Whilst the site benefits from the amount of open (and particularly green) space, there are issues with the quality, layout and functionality of the public realm and spaces that limit its usability, pedestrian accessibility and that detract from the quality of buildings”</i> .</p> <p>It should be highlighted that this <i>“open space”</i> is liked by residents of the Alton Estate. In the <u>Putney Labour Survey of 2008</u> two questions supported this, these being <u>questions 6 and 7</u>.</p> <p>In 2010 there was the <u>Social Audit</u> 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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>It should be noted that these surveys and social audit were conducted by members of the Roehampton Partnership which is the main advisory body for the regeneration and it should be asked why these representatives are now countering the views as shown by the residents?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“ 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”</i> – does this mean all buildings on the Alton Estate which do not have security doors are “ <i>deemed to be insecure and unsafe</i>” ? And therefore in need of demolition? Does this also extend to the 23 freehold properties of Kingsclere Close? Allbrook House and 117-211 odd Danebury Avenue in the demolition area have secure doors so is this really a problem?</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, <u>‘What price is security?’ [Saturday, 28 November 2009]</u> 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><u>The survey itself</u> 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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>Regarding the comment – <i>“Poorly defined spaces that are frequently not overlooked and lack any positive active frontages”</i>. There are the following questions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes these spaces “poorly defined”? • What is a “positive active frontage”? • In whose subjective view are the above made? <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“In particular there are small spaces between buildings and smaller car parks which are not well supervised or visible to residents or visitors”</i> – the visibility could be improved via signposting? Whom is supposed to be doing the supervising?</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“Residential units frequently overlook refuse and service areas, external stairways and alleyways”</i> – this does not validate a need for demolition.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“.....and the presence of these concealed inactive areas provide opportunities for anti-social behaviour”</i> - This is a leading comment, either these <i>“concealed inactive areas”</i> lead to <i>“anti-social behaviour”</i> or they do not. If they do, the Council needs to provide evidence for this.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“Many of the open spaces and parts of the public realm lack a clear role, function, definition and are underused”</i> – 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 - <i>“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)”</i> - This picture is taken not far away from the Danebury Avenue and Roehampton Lane intersection and this intersection allows for access to <i>“pedestrian, cycle and vehicle movement”</i>.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - <i>“A number of the open spaces (including Downshire Fields) lack facilities and amenities”</i> – whom is making the decision that <i>“facilities”</i> and <i>“amenities”</i> are required?</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				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>“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> <p>Twentieth Century Society</p> <p><i>“Among the buildings earmarked for removal are the Allbrook House slab block and the estate’s library – both of which the Twentieth Century Society said it would seek to protect. Parts of the estate are already contained in the Alton Conservation Area, which includes grade I and grade II* listed 18th Century houses as well as 10 grade II-listed point blocks and five grade II* listed slab blocks.</i></p> <p><i>The Twentieth Century Society said it supported the general aim of regenerating the estate, but believed Wandsworth’s approach was wrong. Case officer Clare Price said the majority of the estate’s problems were due to neglect rather than its buildings: “We think that a sensitive refurbishment that carefully conserves the heritage of the buildings on site should be enough to achieve what Wandsworth wants.”</i></p> <p>[Source: Listing bid on cards to stop Alton Estate demolition, Jim Dunton, 27 October 2014, Architects Journal]</p> <p>The Putney Society</p> <p><i>“6. The Society played its part in the review, three years ago, of the Alton Estate conservation area. One conclusion</i></p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.5	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>of that review was that the boundary of the conservation area should be extended to take in Roehampton Library and Allbrook House above it, together with the green space and established trees between these buildings and Roehampton Lane. We believe that this view is shared by many in Roehampton. These buildings are, we consider, worthy of being added to the council's local list of buildings of architectural and historic interest: they are a distinctive composition enhancing the entrance to the Alton Estate at this point. If the five slab blocks adjoining Clarence Lane are worthy of being listed Grade II*, then the similarly detailed Allbrook House should be considered for listing by English Heritage. It is equally distinguished".</i></p> <p>[Source: The Putney Society response to the Council regarding the regeneration, 19 September 2012]</p> <p>The Labour Party</p> <p><i>"The whole council plan rests on the demolition of Allbrook House, the "landmark" block above Roehampton Library. This is the one question where there was no majority opposition to the council plan, but a clear plurality – 45% - don't want the block demolished. Barely a third – 34% - supported demolition and a sizeable number – 21% - didn't feel able to give a view. We had 21 surveys back from the parts of Danebury Avenue, including Allbrook House, under threat of demolition. Of these, 4 supported demolition and 14 opposed it.</i></p> <p><i>It's a great shame that the Council never even considered improving Allbrook House, which contains some large properties within it with spectacular views of Roehampton. Recladding or even more radical remodelling of Allbrook House could transform this block – the gateway to the Alton estate".</i></p> <p>[Source: Redeveloping Danebury Avenue: What Roehampton Wants, 2008 survey results]</p>
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	2.5	<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 re regeneration 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>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<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>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.6	<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 "<u>Questionable demolition</u>". This seems to be focused more for those that come into the estate and just because a building might be unusual for visitors, this does not constitute a reason for demolition.</p> <p>Further "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". [Source: The Putney Society letter to Team Roehampton dated 9 April 2014].</p> <p><u>This photo is an interesting selection for the one of these maisonettes used to be police station.</u></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.7	Regarding the comment - <i>“Overall, a large number of existing homes within the site are at the end of their useful life and suitability to meet current and future housing needs”</i> - at this point this comment is subjective and there has been no validation of the need to demolish these buildings. What makes these buildings so ready for demolition compared to other buildings on the estate? Why are these buildings <i>“at the end of their useful life”</i> ?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.8	Regarding the comment - <i>“A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings are contributing to the area’s problems”</i> - this is subjective and evidence is requested for the validation of this comment?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.9	Regarding the comment – <i>“There is a particularly high rate of ‘violence against the person’ and ‘criminal damage incidents’ in the Roehampton ward, compared with Wandsworth Borough as a whole”</i> – makes the area seem worse that was portrayed in the Baseline report. The Baseline report stated that <i>“The Metropolitan Police Service produces annual ward based crime indices for their entire service area. The area is also lower than Wandsworth and London when comparing theft and handling. These statistics show that there is a higher rate of Violence Against the Person in the Roehampton ward as compared with Wandsworth as a whole, although rates are similar to London”</i> [<u>Source: Alton Baseline Report September 2013, p137</u>]. Table 17 has the <u>figures</u> 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?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>According to the Environment, Culture and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 19th February, 2014, the Alton Estate seemed to be making large improvements with regards to crime levels. This is even commented upon in Paper No. 14-147 which states <i>"The new Policing Model appears to be working well and delivering positive outcomes. There has been a significant reduction in reported crime within Roehampton when compared to the previous 12 months (January–December 2013). Additionally, detailed analysis of crime incidents on the Alton Estate (where the majority of crime has historically occurred) undertaken in August 2013 demonstrated that there had been a 30% reduction in crime (rolling year). These two sets of analysis indicate a continued downward trend in reported crime. Reports of anti-social behaviour have also decreased slightly"</i>.</p> <p>Source: <u>Paper Number 14-147</u></p> <p>For the figures, refer to the <u>Appendices 1 to 4</u> within Section 4 of the <u>Environment, Culture and Community Safety Overview and Scrutiny Committee Wednesday, 19th February, 2014 7.30 p.m.</u></p> <p>Does this mean that the Alton Estate was on the right path and not in need of this demolition? Or if that bad, this must be sign of the Council's failure to look after the Estate?</p> <p>Further, Roehampton University has stated the safety of the area as being important to its students by stating;</p> <p><i>"The University of Roehampton is one of the safest in London. Despite its location in a densely populated area, Roehampton and its surroundings have been judged the safest in inner London by the independent Complete University Guide. In the Greater London as a whole, only one other institution had a lower crime rate in its local vicinity.</i></p> <p><i>The statistics for Roehampton show only 18.3 reported offences per thousand people in the vicinity of the university, including all types of victims, not just students. The worst universities had figures of 36.65 offences per thousand, twice that found at Roehampton.</i></p> <p><i>Dr Ghazwa Alwani-Starr, the University of Roehampton's Director of Estates, who has overall responsibility for security, said: "Students and parents will be very reassured to know that at Roehampton, their sons and daughters</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p><i>are studying at inner London's safest university."</i></p> <p>Source: <u>'Crime Written' – Alton Regeneration Watch</u></p> <p>The reduction in the head count of police is topical, so much so this was highlighted by the Labour Councillors in one of their leaflets, <u>Labour in Roehampton leaflet March 2014 section titled "Bring back the bobbies petition update"</u>. Has this reduction in police numbers contributed to crime figures?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.9	<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 reeregeneration article <u>"SPD Paragraph 2.9 Community safety"</u> for a review of the figures.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.10	<p>Regarding the comment – <i>"Danebury Avenue (now known as Roehampton Local Centre)"</i> – when were Alton Estate residents going to be informed of this? There has not been formal notice of this to the Alton Estate. Who made this decision and on what basis?</p> <p>If the area <i>"contains limited community facilities"</i> that is due to the Council not continuing with existing facilities. Referring to the Labour survey of <i>'Stuart King's Roehampton redevelopment'</i> of 2008, page 3 states <i>"And closing the Alton Club in Dilton Gardens is the exact opposite of what we should be doing: young people need more to do to get them off the streets, not less"</i>. Can the Council provide a view as to what makes to current facilities <i>"limited"</i>?</p> <p>With regards to the comment that those community facilities <i>"which do exist are lacking in quality"</i>, it is</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				wondered what the likes of the DARA would make of this comment. This "lacking in quality" comment seems to be subjective rather than providing any qualitative assessment. Can the current community groups of the area, and the Council, please explain in what capacity the current community facilities are "lacking in quality"?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.11	<p>So the area needs good connections to the "Whitlands College beyond"? Can this be explained as to what benefit this will have to more "permanent year residents" (page 47 of the <u>Masterplan</u>)?</p> <p>"Roehampton Local Centre" should be replaced by Danebury Avenue such as time as the residents of the Alton Estate are formally made aware of the scope to service all of Roehampton.</p> <p>Comments such as "quality of the frontage and buildings are poor (presenting a tired and unattractive entrance to the estate) and the arrangement of buildings and level changes in this area are such that service areas, building backs, surface car parks, ramps and walls dominate and create unusable spaces with a lack of a public focal point. The area lacks well-defined and good quality public spaces and routes" are subjective and not based on any substantive evidence.</p> <p>Regarding the comment " the Sports and Fitness Centre and Youth Club are hidden away on the back streets with poor connections to Whitlands College beyond" the Sports and Fitness Centre and Whitlands College were built in the knowledge of what the access routes there would be. The "poor connections" needs to be explained further as they are all located currently quite close to the heart of the Danebury Avenue retail area.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.12	Regarding the comment – "Extensive alterations, demolitions and reconfigurations have left Portswood Place suffering from a lack of focus" – if this is true, then the Council has allowed this and has not been held accountable for this.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.13	Regarding the comment – "There are shops and services within the area which benefit

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Steven Fannon			<p><i>existing residents, however the quality of the offer fails to cater for the daily convenience needs of the catchment population". To the best of my knowledge Alton Estate residents have not been informed that the estate should be servicing the catchment area. Can the Council share with us any Options and Preferred Options consultation documents which highlighted that shops should cater to the "catchment population"?</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the comment – "The lack of suitable modern premises affects the level of services available and both areas are set within a poor quality environment which detracts from their attractiveness and appeal to local residents as places to shop and visit". To date Alton Estate residents have not been informed as to what "services" should be provided at this point in time that is apparently lacking?</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the comment – "Both areas suffer from a lack of connectivity within and beyond the estate which compounds the issue" – this is subjective and requires further explanation. The <u>Social Audit</u> by the <u>Roehampton Audit Steering Group (RASG)</u> in 2010 produced a <u>Social Audit</u>. The comment regarding transport, i.e. "connectivity", was stated as follows;</i></p> <p><i>"c) TRANSPORT</i></p> <p><i>Generally Roehampton is well covered by public bus transport which provides convenient links to mainline stations at Barnes, Kingston and Putney. The 85 route Putney Bridge- Kingston is a 24 hour service. The nearest tube link is Putney Bridge (one bus journey) or East Putney (two bus journeys). Public transport was used extensively by the auditor throughout the study and proved the statement 'there is always a red bus in sight in Roehampton'. Some public and voluntary services within Roehampton are only reached by taking 2 bus journeys. This may be problematic to some elderly or disabled users. Special mention must be made for the twice weekly return 969 return service to ASDA Roehampton Vale which enables elderly or buggy bound passengers to access shopping from Lennox and Alton Estates—the driver even carries heavy baskets to nearby doorways!"</i></p> <p>The RASG comprised of the following;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rev Jim Mc Kinney – Holy Trinity Church, Roehampton, Chair Roehampton Forum & Roehampton Partnership

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Melhuish – local resident, member of Holy Trinity Church • Pam Harris – local resident, member of Holy Trinity Church, member of Roehampton Forum • Pauline Brueseke- former Ward Councillor, member of Roehampton Forum • Alison Macdonald- former Mental Health worker in area, Chair Housebound Learners and member of Roehampton Forum • The steering group were joined at the questionnaire analysis stage by Cathie Chandler and John Martyn- both members of Roehampton Forum. John completed the analysis of the ‘likes and dislikes’ <p>It can be seen that the Roehampton Forum had a prominent role with this Social Audit and it should be queried as to what is so different with the current situation. Bearing in mind this latest regeneration begun only two years after this survey.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.14	<p>Regarding the comment – “A step change in the quality of the service offer in Roehampton Local Centre is required to meet the daily needs of residents, whilst providing access to higher order centres such as Putney and Kingston” . Now, the Alton Estate is supposed to service those from the “catchment population”, when were Alton Estate residents meant to be informed of this? “Roehampton Local Centre” to be amended to “Danebury Avenue” .</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.15	<p>Regarding the text “there is only one GP surgery” this is incorrect, there are two and they are listed in paragraph 1.29 as “Danebury Avenue Surgery” and “Alton Medical Practice” .</p>
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	2.16	<p>Regarding the comment - “The services are dispersed and there is a lack of facilities that can provide holistic and integrated services, as well as gaps in provision (particularly relating to recreation, arts and culture)” - at the Roehampton Partnership of 3rd December 2014 meeting it was mentioned that the replacement community</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			centre would not have outdoor playground. In conjunction with the loss of the outdoor space at the Dilton Gardens Youth Club and the Roehampton Youth Club does this mean that there will be no outdoor space at all for the community groups of the Alton Estate? Can information be provided as to how the "modern needs" are not being met?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.17	Regarding this comment – <i>"The University also has facilities and accommodation within the SPD area, including Whitelands College and Mount Clare. There are opportunities to improve access to and the quality of these facilities/buildings, particularly where they impact adversely on the settings of significant heritage assets". – for whom will this be of benefit? How will this benefit the existing community of the Alton Estate?</i>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.18	What are <i>"high quality community facilities, shops and services"</i> ?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.19	Further explanation of <i>"tenant diversity"</i> is required. Should there be more tenant diversity within Emerald Square and Queen Mary's Place by having council homes located within these recently developed properties? Assuming there are none there already.
905286	Mr	Paragraph	2.20	How many of the leaseholds to be demolished are buy to let? And of these, how many are let to students?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Steven Fannon			
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.22	Refer to comment in paragraph 1.31 regarding the 40 minute journey time by bus.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.22	Refer to comment in paragraph 1.31 regarding the 40 minute journey time by bus.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.23	Regarding the comment – <i>“There is however no direct local route to Barnes Station and local buses tend to pass by or terminate within the estate, contributing to the sense of the estate being a cul-de-sac”</i> – there are buses to Barnes station from the Alton Estate and they are the 72 and 265. Other buses which take one very close, to the intersection of Roehampton Lane to Upper Richmond Road is the 295, and the 430 takes one near to the retail area near the corner of Upper Richmond Road and Dover House Road. As for the ‘cul-de-sac’ this seems to imply a negative connotation, can this be explained with along with an opportunity to respond?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.24	Regarding the comment - <i>“Roehampton Lane often experiences significant congestion and traffic queues for vehicles heading towards central London in the am peak and out of central London in the pm peak”</i> – how much of this is due to additional housing along Roehampton Lane such as Emerald Square, Queen Mary’s Place and the now released Egleton House. Also, how much worse will this be with the additional housing to be built under this

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			regeneration?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.25	Regarding the comment - "Vehicle access through the estate is limited by two vehicle gates on Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive" – should have the addition that local residents largely oppose the opening of these barriers.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.27	Regarding the comment - "...vehicle speeds along the central spine road of Danebury Avenue create an uncomfortable environment for pedestrians and cyclists" – leading into opening of the barriers....." – should be caveated that there has been a 20mph consultation which has been started and feedback as to next steps are forthcoming.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.28	Whilst 28% are not being deprived in any measure versus the Wandsworth figure of 50%, this is true on a standalone basis, though versus the London figure of 39% the 50% figure seems to be on the high side for a comparison. When the basis for what "deprivation" is defined as and how this relates to the Alton Area there would seem be questions as to what they actually mean and how they will be tackled. The "deprivation" levels are defined as (based on page 136 of the Baseline report) as ; 1. Employment: any member of a household not a full-time student is either unemployed or long-term sick. Paragraph 4.5 states that "may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents" though how many of

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>these "new jobs" will go to existing residents and not to students or to new residents that come into the Alton Estate?</p> <p>2. Education: no person in the household has at least level 2 education, and no person aged 16-18 is a full-time student.</p> <p>This is referred to in more detail in paragraph 2.30.</p> <p>3. Health and disability: any person in the household has general health 'bad or very bad' or has a long term health problem.</p> <p>Assuming this relates to Table 16 on page 137 of the Baseline report, then 1% of the count applies to the Alton Area, Wandsworth Borough and London and therefore is an irrelevant measure for the purposes of the Council's justification of the regeneration.</p> <p>In terms of a "long term health problem", Table 16 does not seem to provide a statistic for this?</p> <p>The challenging of the use of the health figures has been raised on the roeregeneration blog in the article "<u>What health benefits will the Alton regeneration bring ?</u>".</p> <p>4. Housing: Household's accommodation is either overcrowded, with an occupancy rating -1 or less, or is in a shared dwelling, or has no central heating.</p> <p>So, part of this answer is to demolish lots of 3 bedroom maisonettes and replace them with 1 to 2 bedroom apartments? There's circa 250 properties which have three to four bedrooms and if overcrowded then how are they to be replaced?</p> <p>It is assumed that all the properties have central heating which means that housing must be overcrowded, leaving one to ask the question how the replacement buildings will bridge this gap when circa 250 properties which have three to four bedrooms are to be demolished? It does seem to make sense to demolish properties with more</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>rooms unless they are to be replaced with properties with more rooms?</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>In short, whilst the SPD is highlighting various figures they do not portray an accurate assessment of the situation for this does not provide a fair assessment versus comparable figures for the Wandsworth Borough nor London figures. The figures on their own do not provide sufficient background as to the issues that these are representing. Additionally, there is no clear provision for how these various deprivation levels are to be tackled.</p> <p>Presently, this regeneration seems to be all about the financial element rather than the provision of improving these various deprivation figures provided. This seems to be something which is theme as highlighted in the "London Assembly paper - Knock it Down or Do it Up". On page 19 it states a useful suggestion which should be applied to this SPD, that is the SPD should be able to support the Social Return on Investment (SROI), which is clearly not the case. An "SROI is a framework which measures and accounts for a broader concept of value than the purely financial. It encompasses social, environmental and economic costs and benefits".</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.29	<p>The figures used in the section are taken from Table 8 of the Baseline report, page 132. When the "student" figure is removed, the percentage of employed increases from 38% (Example A) to 47%. This should be a consideration given the amount of student population of the area. Refer to Example B.</p> <p>Bearing in mind, that paragraph 4.5 that states that the regeneration "may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents", if the 200 jobs are added as full time, this would increase the figure from 47% to 49%. Refer to Example C. Therefore, these 200 jobs are but a drop in the ocean if referring to these figures as a true and an appropriate source of data for decision making.</p> <p>For the Examples, refer to the following link - https://onedrive.live.com/redir?resid=8D90ED9EB7AF0CB11553&authkey=!ACLL7wHiFqNOgJ4&ithint=file%2cpdf</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>Referring back to Example A and B, would the amount of full time workers increase if more granular information could be produced for the section "Economically inactive"? Referring to the Census 2011 definitions this group consists of the following;</p> <p>"Economically inactive</p> <p><i>A person aged 16 and over is described as economically inactive if, in the week before the census, they were not in employment but did not meet the criteria to be classified as "Unemployed". This includes a person looking for work but not available to start work within two weeks, as well as anyone not looking for work, or unable to work - for example retired, looking after home/family, permanently sick or disabled.</i></p> <p><i>Students who fulfill any of these criteria are also classified as economically inactive. This does not necessarily mean they were in full-time education and excludes students who were working or in some other way economically active.</i></p> <p>Economically inactive: 'Other'</p> <p><i>Economically inactive 'Other' includes people aged 16 and over who were not in employment and did not meet the criteria to be classified as unemployed for reasons other than being retired, a student, looking after home or family or being permanently sick or disabled."</i></p> <p>Note that "economically inactive" includes students and retirees, and if they could be removed from the data, would the numbers again improve?</p> <p>The Census numbers provided as not granular enough to support the percentages provided by this paragraph for the reasons highlighted. Furthermore, those responsible for putting together the Baseline report seem to underplay the growth in student numbers, for on page 132 is states "The major change in activity of residents has been the proportion of the population that are students which has increased 5% between the 2 Census surveys". Fine, the figure has moved from 12% to 17% which is five percent, though the student numbers went from 512 to 923 which is an increase of 80%!! This growth could be included within the "economically inactive" figures</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				thereby distorting the percentages.
				Regarding the comment <i>"Despite having a strong proportion of young adults in higher education (again largely as a result of the presence of the university)"</i> can this relationship between higher education and presence of the university please be explained? Having a university nearby naturally derives this aura of going to higher education?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.30	In the Wandsworth Guardian, 25 th September 2015 page 8, the letter titled "University's benefit to residents minimal", makes the following comment; <i>"Virtually no one from Roehampton attends the university – less than 0.8 per cent of its students come from Roehampton. And the number of Roehampton people employed by the university is scarcely better"</i> . There were a series of letters on this topic within the Wandsworth Guardian, and it suggested that Team Roehampton has a read of these and revises this comment. Coming back to the point made, please validate this relationship. There is a University in close proximity to the Alton Estate and there is a ward Councillor that works for the university, so what has been done to increase the education attainment levels of the local students to achieve higher levels of education? Why are the figures only compared to the Wandsworth percentages and not the London averages? According to tables 10 and 11 of the Baseline report (page 133) for both the "no qualification" and "Level 1 qualification" are below the London figures. Also, the "no qualification" has decreased from 26% (Table 11) to 16% (Table 10). Referring to paragraph 4.5 which states that <i>"may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents"</i> then what kind of jobs will these be? Being in the Alton Estate, how many of these jobs will require higher levels of education. One of the main employers will be a new supermarket?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			Given there is a University practically on the doorstep of the Alton Estate, a serious question has to be asked about the relationship between the local community on the Alton Estate and the University, and the attainment of further education. If not done now, how will the new building make this any different?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.32	So, property prices are too low and need to be increased to change the sections of the market whom would be interested? Hopefully the local jobs that will be created will be allow for the existing community to be able to afford these more expensive homes, especially as the starting price for a one bedroom apartment in Egleton House is currently £340,000.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	2.33	Paragraph 1.2 states <i>"The recommended masterplan reflects the aspirations of the Council as landowner"</i> though in this section <i>"The Roehampton area presents a complex pattern of land-ownership with at least 11 different types of landowners"</i> . If truly referring to <i>"Roehampton"</i> I would imagine that there are many more landowners given that, for instance, there are 184 sold freeholds on the Alton Estate alone [Source: provided by the Council]. This may be the only time in this document that the freeholders of Kingsclere Close are mentioned, even if loosely.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Key Sites and Opportunities	Figure 2.1	Regarding Figure 2.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	3.2	So, the idea is to have housing which competes on price with the "south west London markets"? Hopefully most of the new homes will be "affordable" to allow some opportunity for existing locals to get on the housing ladder.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	3.3	... <i>“existing sub-standard homes replaced”</i> is subjective and requires a qualitative explanation and to date there has been no real explanation as to why these “homes” are “sub-standard”.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	3.6	The comment - <i>“The area will become a safe, attractive, high quality and mixed neighbourhood”</i> . – oh, I didn’t realise it was that bad living here, I’ve only been here 14 years....and happen to have chosen to do so!
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	3.6	The comment - <i>“The area will become a safe, attractive, high quality and mixed neighbourhood”</i> . – oh, I didn’t realise it was that bad living here, I’ve only been here 14 years....and happen to have chosen to do so! Have a read of the roeregeneration article ‘SPD Paragraph 2.9 Community safety’ and see whether the figures support the need for a demolition of existing properties.
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	3.7	Regarding the comment – <i>“Environmental improvements to make the area safer”</i> – this comment is subjective and no evidence has been provided which supports this. Why is the Library Plus not a “key outcome”?

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			Regarding the comment - "Enhanced transport linkages to and from the Barnes Station, Queen Mary's Hospital, Roehampton University, along with improved pedestrian and cycle access to and from Richmond Park". – how will transport linkages be improved to Barnes Station? Increased frequency of the existing bus routes? Will Barnes station be used when it is in zone 3 whereas Putney station is zone 2?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	3.8	Regarding the comment – "Create a more mixed and balanced community " – this seems to be recycled text from the earlier regeneration attempt. In the 2008 Labour survey " <u>Stuart King's Roehampton redevelopment Consultation</u> " with regards to the comment " balanced community " this translated into the following - "And though the council says publicly it wants to help local people buy some of the new homes, in council committee reports it talks about creating a " balanced community " – political speak for getting more outsiders into Roehampton". I'm not clear as to what makes this current "community" not "balanced"? The SPD seems to indicate more expensive homes for outsiders coming into the community and potentially an increase in the student population. This term "balanced community" has been recycled from the previous regeneration attempt and fails to justify any real explanation as to what this is. This was even raised by a Roehampton Forum member at the 12 th May 2015 with no explanation by Team Roehampton.
				Regarding the comment - "Improve or replace poor quality buildings" – which poor quality buildings are being improved, unless that's Minstead Gardens? "Poor quality buildings" still needs to be appropriately explained, which the SPD has not done.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Site Wide Concept Diagram for the Roehampton Area	Figure 3.2	Figure 3.2 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>A. Regarding the text <i>“replace existing poor quality homes”</i> this comment is subjective for it has not been proven from a qualitative basis that this is true. For the freeholders impacted, even if <i>“poor quality”</i> what right does the Council have to impose this view on these freeholders? I understand that 23 of the 28 Kingsclere Close properties are freehold and therefore can the Council please explain how this reference, especially, is pertinent to them? Can it be explained to leaseholders what makes their properties <i>“poor quality”</i>?</p> <p>B. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> to be replaced with <i>“Danebury Avenue”</i>.</p> <p>B. Regarding <i>“balanced community”</i> refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>C. <i>“across the Roehampton area”</i> to be replaced with <i>“across the Alton Estate area”</i>.</p> <p>D. Of the <i>“additional affordable housing”</i> how many of the 800 homes will be <i>“affordable housing”</i>?</p> <p>D. Regarding <i>“balanced community”</i> refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>E. Regarding <i>“balanced community”</i> refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>G. <i>“The area is unlikely to be appropriate for structured Private Rented Sector products”</i> is a subjective assessment and these new homes could be subject to a different type of buy to let landlord. Can the Council provide supporting evidence that this will be the case.</p> <p>H. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> to be replaced with <i>“Danebury Avenue”</i>.</p> <p><i>“The masterplan identified the potential for up to 400 additional student units (with a net gain of approximately 250 units) to replace the existing accommodation at Mount Clare and support the needs of local universities” – this sentence does not mention the dependency of “The masterplan area predominantly comprises land owned by the Council but land ownership complications concerning the Mount Clare site, currently owned by the Southlands Trust and managed by the local Methodists, will need consideration. Proposals for Mount Clare have been proposed and a memorandum of understanding has been drafted between the Council, the Southlands Trust and</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				Roehampton University” [Source: Appendix 1, Wandsworth Council Paper Number 15-7]. Does this mean that this dependency has been resolved?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.2	Regarding the comment - <i>“The core strategic planning objective for this area is estate renewal, with a primary focus on meeting the needs of the existing community”</i> – this does appear to the case as the following examples highlight – <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MP Greening has had two meetings with residents as a result of what they have felt has ignored their needs and the recent meeting with the DARA was to discuss their concerns which has been neglected (refer to paragraph 1.2). 2. The community does not feel that there is a need for student housing (refer to paragraph 1.4). 3. In terms of health needs the Health Representative on the Roehampton Partnership and Team Roehampton can only come up with “modern GP surgeries” though no substantive evidence of what this will bring to the community. <p><i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> to be replaced with <i>“Danebury Avenue Town Centre”</i>.</p> <p>Regarding <i>“balanced community”</i> refer to comments in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“The provision of shared equity units will allow leaseholders who would otherwise be forced to relocate the opportunity to stay in the area. Affordable housing policy applies subject to viability, taking into account any intermediate provision for existing leaseholders”</i> – what about freeholders?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“The masterplan identified a principle of providing new homes for all Council tenants and the opportunity for all resident leaseholders to buy back into the development and the Council is committed to delivering this”</i> – what about freeholders?</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“Subject to meeting a number of criteria, Policy DMH9 supports new student accommodation and seeks to resist the loss of existing units”</i> – is there sufficient evidence to indicate that there will be no “loss of existing units”?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.3	
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.4	

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			According to a Freedom Of Information request, there will be 60 away leasehold properties that will be demolished. If this is the case, assuming that each property is rented to student housing and there is an average of 3 per household, that is housing for 180 students. If we assume 4 students for 20 Kingsclere Close properties, that would be 80 students. That is an estimated loss of housing for 260 students. The student housing proposed is for a net gain of 250. This is an estimated loss of student housing of 10, and that is assuming all leasehold and almost all freehold properties that are to be demolished are currently let to students. Also, as mentioned at the Roehampton Forum meeting of 12 th May 2015, this student housing proposal will not stop pepper potting of students on the Alton Estate.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 2 - breathe new life into the existing centres	4.2	<p>A. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. What are these "New and improved shops and services"?</p> <p>B. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. "A convenience store in Roehampton Local Centre (of sufficient size to meet daily shopping needs) with associated car parking and visibility from Danebury Avenue". – Bye Bye Co-op and Premier?</p> <p>C. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>D. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.5	<p>Regarding the comment – "It is estimated that the additional retail and service (A1-5) and employment (B1) floorspace may generate approximately 200 new jobs for local residents (source: HCA Employment Densities Guide, 2nd Edition, 2010)" – how many of these "200 new jobs" will be estimated to be provided to local residents which are non-students? There will need to be an analysis of how many of these jobs actually go to Alton Estate residents which are from the current existing population.</p> <p>Regarding the comment - "Furthermore, the Roehampton area is experiencing significant change with the addition of new homes (e.g. St James development) and student accommodation, with limited additional services provided</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>as part of those schemes" – these were built in the knowledge of what services were currently provided. If this is an issue, then the Council has allowed this to be an issue by allowing such buildings to be built without the appropriate level of infrastructure to support it. Further, it mentions new student housing here though not in paragraph 2.2 "Planning application history"?</p> <p>" Roehampton Local Centre " renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 3 - deliver new and improved community infrastructure	4.3	<p>A. " Roehampton Local Centre " renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. " Roehampton Local Centre " renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>B. Regarding the comment – "It is envisaged that the facilities may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new library facility in Roehampton Local Centre. • A new arts facility in Roehampton Local Centre. • New community services (including health, youth, and housing and police services) in Roehampton Local Centre. • A new community building at Portwood Place containing co-located community facilities, including the nursery and family services relocated from Roehampton Lane, additional health facilities, space for community organisations, workshops and enterprise space and local retail. • The Minstead Gardens senior citizens club will be replaced with a new community pavilion". <p>This is not strong enough, "may" should be replaced with "will". Also, I thought the idea was that the library will be a Library+ rather than a library?</p>
905286	Mr Steven	Paragraph	4.6	<p>Regarding the comment – "Existing community facilities are inadequate (both qualitatively and quantitatively) and do not meet the needs of the existing resident population" – can this be explained please as to why this is the case, for this has not been highlighted in either the Options or Preferred Options consultations as being not fit for purpose.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p>The same goes for the comment "Existing community and leisure uses are poorly sited and not of a form or quality that supports the vibrancy and vitality of Roehampton Local Centre or aligns with modern service delivery models".</p> <p>"Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>Regarding the comment – "Consultation with the community and stakeholders during the preparation of the masterplan has identified a need for a new library to replace the existing services within Roehampton Local Centre with new space for study and meeting, as well as a new arts facility with space for community arts organisations, gallery space and a small rehearsal, performance and screening space" – does this mean the library will be included or not? Also, there is insufficient evidence to highlight that there is a need for the demolition of the library. Past evidence would seem to support this view too, via the <u>Labour survey "Redeveloping Danebury Avenue: What Roehampton Wants"</u> based on the previous regeneration attempt.</p> <p>The results to this survey are outlined below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question 8 - 51.5% very satisfied with the question "How satisfied are you with Roehampton Library?" • Question 9 - 69.2% responded "Yes" to "Have you used the library in the past six months?" • Question 10 – 74.1% responded with "No" to "Is replacing the current library with a new one a high priority for you?" <p>In other words, leave the library alone.....</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 4 - deliver a high quality landscape and outdoor	4.4	C. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
		recreation facilities throughout the area		
				Regarding the comment - "According to the Wandsworth Open Space Study (2007) the Roehampton ward has the lowest population density per hectare in the borough and the highest amount of open space per 1,000 population (23.78 ha)" – this would seem to be a potentially misleading piece of information. The ward has green spaces though the density of the population has been commented on by various bodies.
				Putney Labour Party
	Mr			<i>"There is also a legitimate debate to be had as to whether the Alton estate – already the most densely populated part of the constituency – should be the focus of hundreds more homes. Love it or hate it, one of the things that cannot be denied about the Alton is that it was meticulously planned to provide green open space surrounding the blocks and avenues of council housing. The Council plans irreparably damage this plan by building on the green space and over-populating the estate".</i>
905286	Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.7	
				Source: <u>Redeveloping Danebury Avenue, What Roehampton Wants, 2008, Putney Labour Party</u>
				Roehampton Ecumenical Church
				<i>"As might be expected in such a dense housing area some people did not take pride in the immediate area outside their flat however this is well balanced by some ground floor dwellers who have maintained pleasant small gardens and sitting areas".</i>
				<i>"As summarised in a recent report by Kairos Solutions Ltd [ref 2] 'Roehampton is a densely populated..."</i>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>Source: <u>Social Audit of Roehampton, 2010, Roehampton Ecumenical Church</u></p> <p>Population density figures</p> <p>According to the Council's population density figures it would appear that the density of the Alton Estate is actually Above the London Average But Below Borough Average Above London Average But Below Borough Average or Significantly Above Borough Average.</p> <p>Source: http://www.wandsworth.gov.uk/downloads/file/1783/figure_31_population_density</p> <p>Regarding the comment – <i>“The Open Space Study identifies the north and south of the Roehampton ward as being areas that have a significant deficiency in access to children’s play facilities. Approximately 13 additional Neighbourhood Equipped Areas for Play (NEAPs) are needed across the Putney/Roehampton sub area to redress the deficiencies in children’s play provision within the sub-area”</i> – given this Study was completed in 2007, one should ask what has the Council done in the eight years since this report to fulfil this?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Landscape Strategy Diagram	Figure 4.1	Figure 4.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven	Core principle 5 - respect the	4.5	<p>B. <i>“Roehampton Local Centre”</i> renamed <i>“Danebury Avenue Town Centre”</i>.</p> <p>D. <i>“Any buildings of 5 or more storeys will however only be acceptable where they satisfy the criteria of DMPD Policy DMS4”</i> seems to be heading towards the Roehampton Partnership Vice Chair’s comment at the meeting of</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon	heritage of the area		<p>25th March 2015 that 800 apartments is the equivalent of 18 towers and the “more the merrier”. However, Labour has stated that “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” [Source: Stuart King’s Roehampton redevelopment Consultation 2008]</p> <p>E. What does “Sensitive transport and community infrastructure improvements throughout the area” translate into?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 6 - update and activate the urban fabric	4.6	<p>D. “The Council will support proposals that retain and improve existing good quality buildings” – can the Council provide a list of what it deems to be “existing good quality buildings”?</p> <p>E. “rationalise car parks” to what extent and how will current residents be impacted?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.9	<p>“rationalise car parks” to what extent and how will current residents be impacted?</p> <p>Much of the following text is subjective – “A number of existing buildings within the area lack a positive relationship to surrounding buildings, streets and open spaces. There are spaces that are car dominated and poor quality with hiding places that encourage anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping”.</p> <p>Much of the following text is subjective and could be resolved without the need for demolition – “A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings contribute to the area’s problems. Fundamental design flaws have created an abundance of dark and insecure settings, including non-overlooked alleys and external stairwells, which are conducive to anti-social behaviour such as drug dealing, street drinking and vandalism”.</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<i>"The estate is isolated from neighbouring areas and has little presence on arrival to the area along Roehampton Lane" – is incorrect, as the estate is not "isolated" as shown by the array of towns within easy reach by bus, and this regeneration is supposed to be about meeting the needs of the "existing community" (section 4.6) therefore this "little presence" comment is subjective and relates to those outside of the Alton Estate community.</i>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 7 - improve access and connections	4.7	D. <i>"The provision of a new route passing through the heart of the area – this may be achieved through the extension of the existing K3 service". – Therefore Highcliffe Drive is still within scope to be opened?</i>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 7 - improve access and connections	4.7	Regarding the comment – <i>"The potential of Downshire Fields as an amenity is not being fully realised. The landscape could be significantly improved and more directly linked to Richmond Park, as well as providing new outdoor recreation opportunities to improve its usability and quality of life for residents" – residents are fine with the spaces as they are as per paragraph 2.4.</i>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	4.10	<i>"However the relatively high journey times into central London, coupled with the distances from rail stations and town centres, result in a sense of general disconnection and remoteness for residents of the area" – says whom? My wife and I have lived on the estate for 14 years and travelled to Canary Wharf and Bank for work for the past ten years and have not felt this. How has this subjective view come about?</i> <i>"Additional new housing on the site is likely to result in an increased population. This is likely to be reflected in increases buses on existing routes and the provision of a new route passing through the heart of the area". From this text it seems that barriers, possibly both Danebury Avenue and Highcliffe Drive – are under threat and a Labour Councillor said there would be a 20% increase in the Alton West population at the Roehampton Forum meeting of 7th November 2014 and I'm not sure how a bus going "through the heart of the area" has anything to do with an "increased population"?</i>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Access and movement principles diagram	Figure 4.3	Regarding Figure 4.3 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Core principle 8 - create a sustainable environment	4.8	Much of this section causes concern for how will this translate into service charges. For instance, "Increase habitat availability through the addition of nesting bat and bird boxes, log piles, insect boxes and other features in appropriate locations" will require ongoing maintenance and from a service charge perspective, whom will be paying for this? Can leaseholders challenge these costs if they are to be applied to them?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Key intervention areas	Figure 5.1	Regarding Figure 5.1 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in section 1.2 point 1.4.
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Sub-area 1 - Roehampton Local Centre	5.1	"Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	5.2	"Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".
				<p>A. What will these "new and improved shops and services" be?</p> <p>B. What will the "improved community facilities" do for the community? How will they differ from now?</p> <p>B. "may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A purpose built, state of the art library. • A new community cultural arts facility. • Additional community services within smaller units". <p>Again a mention of "may" with regards to the library. See paragraph 4.3 for earlier comments regarding the library.</p> <p>F. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>H. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p> <p>L. "Roehampton Local Centre" renamed "Danebury Avenue Town Centre".</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	5.4	Much of the following text is subjective – "Roehampton Local Centre is not currently fulfilling its role in meeting daily needs and providing access to higher order centres. Although the shopping area is a highly visible gateway to the Alton estate, it presents a harsh environment at the front and rear, and overall largely unattractive. Public

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Fannon			<p>space has also seen significant deterioration over time".</p> <p>"Policy DMC1 provides further guidance on the circumstances where a loss of community facilities may be acceptable. To access the loss of community facilities or floorspace, the Council will require evidence to justify the loss. The Council must be satisfied that either an adequate replacement facility is provided, or there are no reasonable prospects of reuse by an alternative community use" – this text seems to open the door for loss of community space.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Key Principles for Roehampton Local Centre	Figure 5.2	<p>Regarding Figure 5.2 refer to comment about the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks in paragraph 1.4.</p> <p>Figure 5.2 is an awful diagram which is too opaque to obtain any real understanding of what is to happen and perhaps this lead to the confusion of whether or not Hersham Close blocks were due for demolition, as mentioned in paragraph 1.4.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 5.7	5.7	<p>"Since its construction, Portswood Place has undergone significant change to the detrimental effect of the built environment and public realm. Extensive additions, demolitions and reconfigurations have left this space suffering from a lack of focus, also presenting a harsh environment at the front and rear. The Portswood Place Shopping parade lacks basic services and amenities" – this contains a mixture of subjective comments and if proven true, the Council has allowed this to occur.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 5.9	5.9	<p>B. "1-28 Kingsclere Close" obtains a mention though throughout the document it does not state, according to information provided by the Council, that most of these properties are freehold. This document refers to leaseholders throughout it.</p> <p>B. " New high quality homes (with no net loss of floorspace) will replace existing poor quality accommodation, including (but not limited to) those at...." – though if a freeholder is happy with their home, poor quality or not, they should have the right of say on their home. Otherwise, any home is up for grabs depending on how "quality"</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
				<p>is defined at a given moment.</p> <p>B. The comment - "But not limited to" – is confusing. Why not just list all the properties to be impacted, such as the list provided in Appendix 3 to Paper No 15-7 which stated that - <i>"The following properties were identified as part of the Masterplan consultation process as being proposed to be replaced with new homes"</i>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1-29 Danebury Ave 2. 31A-B, 33, 61A-B, 89A-B, 37-115 Danebury Ave 3. 1-45 Allbrook House 4. 117-211 odd Danebury Ave 5. 213-243 odd Danebury Ave 6. 1-31 odd Harbridge Ave 7. 33-83 odd Harbridge Ave 8. 85-115 odd Harbridge Ave 9. 2-32 even Harbridge Ave 10. 34-84 even Harbridge Ave 11. 1-28 Kingsclere Close 12. 1-14 Portswood place <p>In other words, only numbers 1, 2 and 3 are missing. What is the reason for not listing all properties? Is that so that the six properties of the Ibsley neighbourhood can be included (refer to paragraph 1.4)?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	5.10	<p><i>"A combination of physical factors, including fundamental design flaws in the development layout, along with poorly sited and constructed residential buildings have contributed to current issues with this part of the site. The current design of areas such as Danebury Avenue have resulted in fragmentation and an excess of leftover, directionless and rarely used spaces" – a continuation of the subjective tone from the Council.</i></p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 5.12		<p>A. Leaseholders should be made aware of whether their service charges will be funding these "envisaged" facilities. If so, can leaseholders please be made aware of how they can challenge these costs?</p> <p>1. Can it be explained why there would be a need for an "amphitheatre"? There is the Ibstock School theatre that will supposedly allow for community usage. In Application Number: 2013/0803 (Date: 11 June 2013) it states that;</p> <p><i>"The proposal has been granted planning permission for the following reasons: The development of a purpose-built Performing Arts Centre (PAC) would result in the improvement of educational facilities at Ibstock Place School and create a facility that would be made available to other schools and community groups".</i></p> <p>How many community artistic facilities does the Alton Estate require?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 5.13		<p>The comment – "Over the years however, the central landscape has become overgrown with trees and forest like sections of impermeable wilderness, barley a distinguishable space today" – is subjective and local residents like this space as highlighted in paragraph 2.4.</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 6.2		<p>"Demand for housing is very strong in the south west of London and Roehampton areas" would seem to contradict paragraph 2.32 which states "The average property prices in the Roehampton area are considerably below London, the wider borough of Wandsworth, and other parts of the local area. This indicates a lack of demand from the market in this area, suggesting that it is not an area of choice for many potential owner-occupiers"?</p> <p>"strong interest in investing in Alton" – should this be "...in the Alton Estate"?</p>
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph 6.3		<p>"Local retail demand has also increased in recent years, particularly with new residents arriving in the area at schemes along Roehampton Lane such as Queen Mary's, Emerald Square and other infill developments. New residents coming into the area as the masterplan is implemented will increase the demand for shopping in the</p>

Person ID	Full Name	Title	Number	Comment
	Steven Fannon			<i>area</i> ” – should the Council planners therefore be held accountable for allowing this increase in new residents without providing them with the ability to meet their demand for “shopping”?
905286	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	6.4	“Demand for purpose built and professionally managed student accommodation will continue to grow” – is this the reason for including the six Ibsley neighbourhood blocks with the SPD (refer to paragraph 1.4)?
	Mr Steven Fannon	Paragraph	6.5	<p>“The Council is willing to use its statutory powers (including CPO) to facilitate the delivery of development across the whole site if required” – that is an interesting inclusion.</p> <p>The CPO is included though not a mention the one move policy which has previously been stated as being a requirement. This was stated as a requirement at the Roehampton Partnership - “Councillor Sutters welcomed the plan that affected residents would only have to make one move”. [Source: <u>Roehampton Partnership Minutes, 8th July 2014</u>]</p> <p>Surely this should be part of the “Delivery Approach”?</p> <p>Additionally, where is the need to phase the demolition and the creation of new buildings?</p>

SPD comments - WBC

Steve Fannon

[REDACTED]
Roehampton

London [REDACTED]

roeregeneration@yahoo.com

Planning Policy
Planning and Development Services
Housing and Community Services Department
Wandsworth Council
The Town Hall
Wandsworth High Street
London SW18 2PU
planningpolicy@wandsworth.gov.uk

24th May 2015

Dear Planning Policy team,

Please find below my comments regarding the Roehampton Supplementary Document (SPD) March 2015 draft document.

This document is divided into two sections.

- a) A high level overview of 15 areas which are challenges to the SPD, and
- b) A paragraph by paragraph response to the SPD.

Please note that with regards to point (b) the responses have been added to the SPD Consultation portal though have been added to this document. They have been added to this document in order than all of the feedback is aggregated, and with regards to point (b) these comments should be responded to via the consultation portal.

Regards,

Steve Fannon

SPD comments - WBC

Section A: High level review of SPD

1. Library

Is it in, or is it out? According to the SPD it "may" be included (Core principle 4.3B and paragraph 5.3). No mention of a LibraryPlus, what is the reason for this?

2. Density

There is a vague attempt at highlighting the Alton Estate and not being densely populated (paragraph 4.7), which is not what other community stakeholders (such as current Roehampton Partnership members) or Council maps have highlighted in the recent past.

3. Inclusion of the six blocks from the Ibsley neighbourhood within the SPD

Paragraph 1.4 highlights that these blocks were not presented to Alton Estate residents in either of the Options Consultation or the Preferred Options consultation for inclusion within the SPD.

4. Freeholders of Kingsclere Close – are they landowners or not?

There are "landowners" other than the Council in the Alton Estate, though paragraph 1.2 and 1.35, makes no reference to this. Also, the owners of the freehold properties (and leaseholders for that matter) should have a say in whether their properties are not suitable for habitation, something which paragraph 4.1 seems to make on their behalf with the comment "replace existing poor quality homes".

5. No mention of a requirement to factor in minimal impact on service charges to existing leaseholders

Service charges are made up of a "block" charge and an "estate" charge. For instance, Core principle 8 refers to "Increase habitat availability through the addition of nesting bat and bird boxes, log piles, insect boxes and other features in appropriate locations" (page 49). Whom will be paying this? Presumably this will be added to "estate" charge? There are currently circa 1,200 leasehold properties on the estate (pre-regeneration), and is there an expectation that each one will chip in to cover the ongoing maintenance of this and other aspects attached to the regeneration?

6. Green space

Twice residents have informed prominent community stakeholders that the green space is well liked, so just leave it alone. Refer to paragraph 2.4 comment of this document.

7. Highcliffe Drive and Danebury Avenue barriers

In the main, residents have said "no" so leave the barriers alone. Refer to paragraph 2.25 of this document. As a minimum, Danebury Avenue was mentioned by Team Roehampton at the Roehampton Fourm meeting of 12th May 2015 that this barrier will stay closed, and as such this should be mentioned in the SPD?

8. Socio-economic and safety references

These are predominately based on the Baseline report which was published online on the 8th October 2014, which was after both the Options and Preferred Options consultations. These figures on their own do not provide any thorough analysis and are insufficient on their own merits for the demolition of properties.

9. No mention of structural weaknesses of buildings

There is nothing in this SPD to indicate any structural weaknesses of the existing properties, instead relying on subjective comments which are linked to other reasons, such as *"ground floor level units are not secured in every instance"* (paragraph 2.4). Well, this is reaching for the bottom of the barrel in terms of excuses for steam rolling this regeneration. This excuse could be applied to much of the estate and the obvious question to this, is *"why aren't there secure doors if they are so vital to safety?"*

10. Reasons provided could be extended to other properties on the estate

The example of the *"secure door"* mentioned in *"No mention of structural weaknesses of buildings"* and other reasons for demolition could be extended to other parts of the estate. Therefore, thorough reasoning and evidence is required, not these *"poorly sited and constructed"* (paragraph 2.6) subjective comments.

11. Accessibility to local transport

Why would a resident of the Alton Estate travel to East Putney underground station for a train (paragraph 1.31)? By bus, it's quicker to go to Southfields (493 bus), Putney Bridge (265 bus) or Hammersmith (72 bus). The use of East Putney station exaggerates the issue of accessibility to a train station?

As part of the regeneration, why not make Barnes station zone 2 rather than zone 3 to encourage more use of the station? Barnes station is easily reached by various buses of the estate.

12. Contradictions

There are contradictions such as paragraph 1.2 versus 2.33. One highlights the Council as a landowner and another refers to *"different types of landowners"*. Another is paragraph 2.32 versus paragraph 6.2. Is there or is there not, a high demand for properties in Roehampton?

13. Omission of dependencies

Two that come to mind is the agreement to be reached with the Methodist Church regarding land – refer to paragraph 4.2 of this document. Another, there is no mention of phasing of the regeneration and the need for the Council to implement a one move policy for those impacted by demolition.

14. Renaming of Alton Estate features

The SPD has now renamed various features such as *"Danebury Avenue Town Centre"* to *"Roehampton Local Centre"* and *"Bull Green"* to *"Downshire Fields"*. Shouldn't Alton Estate residents have been made aware of this beforehand and not just have this pop up from nowhere? Having

SPD comments - WBC

attended many of the recent Roehampton Forum and Roehampton Partnership meetings over the past 15 months, this, to the best of my knowledge not mentioned.

15. Poor leadership from community stakeholders

The likes of the Roehampton Partnership, Roehampton Forum and the ward's Councillors have done little to respond to the concerns of residents. Therefore any mention of the word "*consultation*" is little more than a public relations exercise. MP Greening seems to have had more interest in listening and acting to a few of the resident's concerns.