

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/H5960/W/25/3371729

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/H5960/W/25/3371729

Appeal By AKA CAPABILITY LLP

Site Address
Mount Clare Campus
Minstead Gardens
Roehampton Gate
SW15 4EE

SENDER DETAILS

Name MISS SUSAN MARKS

Address
39 Swaythling House, Tunworth Crescent
London
SW15 4PQ

Company/Group/Organisation Name Swaything House & Charcot House Residents Associations

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☒ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☒ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

OBJECTION

The Appeal Statement of Case fails to acknowledge—indeed, dismisses (5.3) - the concerns raised by local residents, including George Mills and myself for the Swaythling House Residents Association and Lila Palmer for the Charcot House Residents Association. These concerns (5.2, 5.6 and 5.8) relate to the proposed extremely cramped living conditions, the lack of adequate communal space and on-site welfare support, the absence of meaningful community consultation, and the potentially disruptive impact on the local area of introducing 270 unsupported individuals with complex needs.

The Appellant's reference to a "professional management partner" is not equivalent to providing on-site welfare officers. Similarly, "supervision" and "welfare checks" cannot be regarded as substitutes for continuous, on-site welfare services.

To date, there has been no evidence of the Appellant's declared "willingness" to engage with Residents' Associations or other local community structures such as the Roehampton Partnership or Our Roehampton.

In paragraph 4.74, the Appellant acknowledges that the demographic profile of the occupants will change. While it may be true that a change in demographic need not affect conditions relating to Energy and Sustainability, this demographic change is central to the objections raised against the proposal. The previous occupants of the site were engaged in the common purposes of study or employment that shaped their days. The students were part of a community that offered support and amenities, and none of the occupants were "homeless," even if some students were living far away from their permanent homes. None of these stabilising characteristics apply to the proposed future occupants.