

London Borough of Wandsworth

CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISALS – RESPONSES ANALYSIS

April 2023

Alton Estate Conservation Area

A public consultation regarding the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) for Alton Conservation Area received 12 responses: 11 from members of the public and 1 from Historic England. 5 responses were in favour, 1 response were neutral, and 6 responses disagreed with the draft CAA.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
1	Agree	No
2	Agree	Agree	Agree	.	.	No
3	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	I believe the area doesn't have much historical value as the blocks are built in an architecture style which is generally seen as out of date and unsightly. The large blocks have issues around insulation in winter, the lifts are old and the car park around the blocks are hazardous. I believe the Alton estate isn't suitable for future London. I believe the Estate is very disconnected from surrounding streets and promotes a feeling of isolation from the wider Roehampton/Putney Heath area. The boundary between Roehampton Lane and the estate below creates a "them and us" effect.	Noted that the respondent feels that the CA lacks historical value and architectural interest. The history and development of the estate have been identified as being integral to the planning of future estates across the UK and buildings form some of the earliest building types of their style. The importance of the conservation area and its contribution of the buildings to the character and appearance is referred to throughout the Appraisal.	None required

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					Other comments are noted but largely outside the remit of the Appraisal document.	
4	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	.	.	No
5	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	.	.	No
6	Agree	Agree	Don't know	It would also be good if the cleaning company employed by the council to keep the area clean would actually do just that, also tenants that have dogs picked up their dogs mess, rubbish is a big problem on the estate, rats are now a problem because of it. Far too much of our heritage has already been eroded and its vital that no more does.	The respondent's comments are noted and will be passed to the Environment team. Noted that the respondent feels that the heritage has already been eroded. The new appraisal aims to set out what remains of the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area and ensure further erosion is avoided.	None required
7	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	.	.	No
8	Agree	Agree	Agree	I agree with this. I am a resident in Finchdean House. I also wanted to add that just outside Finchdean House is a historic tree of London. - oak tree.22. Danebury Avenue Danebury Av, Roehampton, Greater London Road · Wandsworth · The street was once part of the gardens of Grove House (now Roehampton University) - the large 18th century Lucombe oak slightly to the south of Finchdean House is one of the Great Trees of	Noted that No.22 Danebury Avenue has a significant oak tree, reference will be made of this feature in the relevant section of the appraisal. Noted regarding the feeling that Tangly Grove block should be listed. We encourage the	Yes, see officer comments.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>London https://foursquare.com/kevan/list/the-great-trees-of-london No 22. Would it be possible to include this details in the assert and management plan.</p> <p>I believe that tangly grove block should have listed status. I also feel that repair undertaken lack sympathy for the fabric and design of the blocks.</p>	<p>respondent to submit an application for listing if they feel it meets the criteria, which can be found on the Historic England website.</p>	
9	Neutral	Agree	Agree	<p>Neither – comments and suggested corrections below. However the new sections of the Buildings Audit and Boundary Treatments and the separation into sub-areas are welcomed.</p> <p>1. The boundary is not clear on the ground. Location and Setting: The Alton Estate as a whole is distinctive, not only Alton East. 2. A clearer map is in the 2013 version. 3. Why are the maisonettes on Clarence Lane excluded from the CA?</p> <p>1a. The area's built form, while contemporary with the surrounding area, derives... The surrounding areas are generally much older, not contemporary.</p>	<p>1. Alton East is only one character Area – Alton West is equally assessed within the Appraisal document.</p> <p>2. Noted that the boundary it is not clear. A better, interactive map will be included in the adopted appraisal.</p> <p>3. The maisonettes on Clarendes Lane are excluded as they are not part of the Alton Estate development and were built later.</p> <p>1a. The respondent's comments are noted.</p> <p>2a. 3. Noted the suggestion of unlisted individual buildings, not all</p>	Yes, see officer's comments.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>2a. Examples of other impressive but unlisted individual buildings are: Ibstock Place School, Maryfield Convent, Cedars Cottages and Hartfield House. Allbrook House and the Library were previously included in this list – please confirm that this omission is not due to any demolition plans. Historical Development</p> <p>3a. Figure 3 1867 maps should be better related to each other – rotate to fit web page.</p> <p>4a. Figure 6: No mention is made of the fact that Roehampton Lane was a country lane with a row of Victorian terrace houses (whose ground floors were shops) until the late 1940s when it was widened, re-surfaced and became the A306 connecting to the A3. Clarence Lane remained un-tarmacked until the 1960s.</p> <p>5a. Alton East Point Blocks: These are situated so that every flat in all directions has a long green view.</p> <p>General Description</p>	<p>the buildings are described in the appraisal, but their omission does not reduce on their significance and contribution.</p> <p>3a. The respondent’s comments are noted.</p> <p>4a. The respondent’s comments are noted.</p> <p>5a. The respondent’s comments are noted and the text will be updated.</p> <p>6a. The respondent’s comments are noted. The word 'village' is missing in the body of the text and will be amended</p> <p>7a. The respondent’s comments are noted. The text will be reviewed and updated in considered necessary.</p> <p>8a. The respondent’s comments are noted but this is outside the</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>6a. Although in close proximity to Roehampton Conservation Area... Should read 'Roehampton Village Conservation Area'.</p> <p>Landscape</p> <p>7a. This should include reference to the once open Downshire Fields becoming Downshire forest.</p> <p>8a. The parking around the Bull was deplored in 2013, but no action has been taken – time to change this? Routes and spaces</p> <p>9a. that found in traditional Victorian or Georgian terraced housing... A better comparison would be to Victorian terraced housing or interwar suburbs.</p> <p>10a. Private or public paths often lead nowhere... Many of the footpaths are the result of people walking the same route on the grass, subsequently surfaced.</p> <p>Views</p>	<p>remit of this document. The suggestion will be passed on to the Highways team.</p> <p>9a. The respondent's comments are noted and text will be reviewed and amended as necessary</p> <p>10a. The respondent's comments are noted but this is outside the remit of this document.</p> <p>11a. The respondent's comments are noted and will be passed to the Parks and Open Spaces team.</p> <p>12a. Noted, a clarification will be added to the map.</p> <p>13a. Noted the typo in Harbridge, to be amended.</p> <p>14a. The respondent's comments are noted – text to be reviewed and amended if necessary</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>11a. Views towards Mount Clare primarily are from across Downshire Fields and whilst these are currently compromised... These are compromised by uncontrolled tree growth which should be addressed.</p> <p>Buildings Audit</p> <p>12a. Clarify which map this refers to – the interactive one in the Introduction?</p> <p>Alton East – Streetscape</p> <p>13a. Typo: Harbridge.</p> <p>Alton West</p> <p>14a. nonetheless successful in its own way... Rather under-selling one of London’s most admired estates?</p> <p>Sub Area 4: Architecture</p>	<p>15a. The respondent’s comments are noted.</p> <p>16a. The respondent’s comments are noted – section to be reviewed and clarified if necessary</p> <p>17a. The respondent’s comments are noted.</p> <p>18a. The information of Maryfield Convent is noted – the text will be reviewed and additional information incorporated if deemed suitable/necessary</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>15a. The facilities block itself is overly large for the site... Agreed and should be regarded as a negative rather than positive building.</p> <p>Sub Area 5: Townscape</p> <p>16a. there could be some consolidation here... Assume this means cut down some trees to preserve the openness.</p> <p>17a. Figures 98 & 100 – Views of Grove House Rooftop clutter on the slap blocks adversely affect the setting of Grove House.</p> <p>Sub Area 8: Danebury Avenue and Maryfield Convent</p> <p>18a. Further information about Maryfield Convent: Maryfield was known as Roehampton Court when it was built in Georgian style in 1914 by Lancelot Hugh Smith of Mount Clare in his grounds. It was bought by the Congregation of the Poor Servants of the Mother of God in 1927 as a Novitiate House in 1 acres of land when St Mary's Convent in Roehampton High Street was not able</p>		

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				to house such a number. A new wing and the Chapel were completed in 1939. The original house was damaged by incendiary bombs during WW2 but it was re-built to the original design and became the Headquarters of the Religious Order when they returned in 1945. 1974-1995 the Novitiate was re-located to the top floor of the original house and the vacated wing was used as a Residential Home for "ladies with learning difficulties". When new regulations forbade dormitories and demanded Family Units, the Nuns commissioned a purpose-designed Home to be built next to their Convent and Chapel in Roehampton High Street where it is to this day.		
10	Disagree	Agree	Disagree	I disagree with the assessment for the Alton Estate Conservation Area, and specifically the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area, because the area of Alton West comprising the blocks on Danebury Avenue, Harbridge Avenue and Kingsclere Close (the area previously designated by Wandsworth Council as the regeneration 'intervention zone') are not included in the proposed extensions to the Conservation Area and remain excluded from it. I note that other areas are proposed to be included 'to	Noted the disagreement of respondent's proposals to include Danebury/Harbridge/Kingsclere will be considered. It was not considered that these areas held sufficient merit to be included in the conservation area boundary. References in relation to the masterplan red line will be reviewed and updated if necessary.	None

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				<p>restore completeness' with the original estate masterplan and so I do not understand why the Danebury/Harbridge/Kingsclere area should remain excluded. This position is illogical because the buildings in this area are of the same design and construction as others in Alton East and Alton West that are included as part of the Conservation Area. I further note that, within the proposed extension of the Area to include the Laverstoke Gardens terraces, there is a reference to this 'central section of the Estate' (Danebury/Harbridge/Kingsclere) and an assertion that 'this central section is to be redeveloped and is within the red-line masterplan of the Estate regeneration'. This statement is no longer accurate or relevant to the consideration of the area because, in September 2022, Wandsworth Council's Housing Committee formally resolved to 'to terminate the procurement process to find a joint venture partner for the delivery of the Alton Masterplan Regeneration and to review the objectives and options for improvements to the Alton Estate'. Whilst this 2014 Masterplan for Regeneration is no longer being pursued by the Council and the options for regeneration are still</p>	<p>Regarding Laverstoke Gardens, further research on the merits of this part of the estate has been undertaken and it is now not considered that these terraces are of sufficient interest to be included in the Conservation Area. The proposed extension to include Laverstoke Gardens will not proceed.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
				being considered it is factually inaccurate to state that this central area of the estate 'is to be redeveloped'. Furthermore, it is inappropriate to utilise it's former 'red line' designation as a regeneration area to exclude this part of the estate from the Conservation Area. I therefore suggests that it is logical to include this central area of the estate within the Conservation Area.		
11- Historic England comments	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	The comments from this respondent are very long so they have been included as appendix 1.	<p>Noted re comments on useability and the addition of page number or section numbering to improve referencing. The purpose of the web-based document is to make it more accessible to other members of the public. However, this will be reviewed and changes made if considered necessary.</p> <p>The respondent's comments are noted, and Richmond Park will be mentioned in the appraisal.</p> <p>Noted re misuse of setting, it will be replaced for character. (para 4, Statement of significance)</p>	Yes, see officer's comments.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>Noted re Allbrook House and the Library references have been removed. Both buildings are located outside the CA. Furthermore, the library's demolition has been approved in principle as part of the former masterplan proposals, and so it is not deemed suitable to include at this time. The scheme was not consented as the time of the previous adopted appraisal.</p> <p>Noted re to provide a summary of the significance of the designed landscape. This will be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted – reference to historic parks will be replaced by registered parks.</p> <p>The respondent's comments are noted re the benefit of graphic illustrating key views. This will be reviewed and an additional image addition if considered necessary.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>Noted to describe Roehampton Archaeological Priority Area in general description, revisions will be made accordingly.</p> <p>Noted re to mention the use of the Swedish humanist idiom in both architecture and, the integration with earlier landscaping of the previous Victorian villas. This will be reviewed and updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted re to clarity on the contribution made by the Garnett College Facilities building to the area. This will be reviewed and updated accordingly.</p> <p>Noted re to expand description, currently HAR status of The Temple at Mount Clare, and proposed restoration project, the text will be updated accordingly.</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>Noted re recommendation to add as a priority the Temple in the management plan.</p> <p>Regarding Laverstoke Gardens, further research on the merits of this part of the estate has been undertaken and it is now not considered that these terraces are of sufficient interest to be included in the Conservation Area. The proposed extension to include Laverstoke Gardens will not proceed.</p>	
12 -				The comments from this respondent are very long so they have been included as appendix 2.	<p>1- Noted re the introduction. It is considered that the historic development seeks to set out the stages of development of the area from the period when it was individual stately homes.</p> <p>2- The start dates will be corrected for Alton East and Alton West.</p>	Yes, see officer's comments.

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>3- Noted re no mention of Roehampton Lane was a country lane with Victorian terrace houses – it will be added to the appraisal.</p> <p>4- Noted re comments on Parkstead House’s original name, reference will be included in the appraisal.</p> <p>5- Noted re error in the period of occupy by the Jesuits. It will be reviewed and amended as necessary.</p> <p>6- Noted re about St Joseph Church, a description of the early gothic building will be added in the appraisal.</p> <p>7- The respondent's comments are noted.</p> <p>8- Noted that the respondent remarks on the proliferation of car parks.</p> <p>9- Noted re typo of quoting Danebury Road. It will</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>amended to Danebury Avenue.</p> <p>10- Noted re about Allbrook House and library to be listed.</p> <p>11- Noted re typo Manresa House was/is Parkstead House.</p> <p>12- Noted re entrance way to Richmond park. This will be changed to Roehampton Gate.</p> <p>13- The respondent's comments are noted.</p> <p>14- The respondent's comments are noted but outside the remit of the CAA.</p> <p>15- The respondent's comments are noted but outside the remit of the CAA.</p> <p>16- The respondent's comments are noted but</p>	

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree/Neutral	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Local List of Buildings	Agree/ Disagree/ Neutral Boundary changes	Respondent comments	Officer comments	Changes required to the CAA draft?
					<p>outside the remit of the CAA.</p> <p>17- Noted re Harbridge Avenue was associated with Maryfield, not with Parkstead House.</p> <p>18- Noted re is Special Needs housing. The text will be reviewed and amended as necessary</p> <p>19.20.21.22 - noted</p> <p>23- the respondent's comments are noted – the history and development section will be reviewed and additional information added if deemed suitable</p>	