



---

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry held 20 -24 January, 26-27 January and 3 February 2026

Site visit made on 24 January 2026

**by J Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09/03/2026

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5960/W/25/3371729**

**Mount Clare Campus, Minstead Gardens, Roehampton Gate, SW15 4EE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
  - The appeal is made by AKA Capability LLP against the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth.
  - The application reference is 2025/0074.
  - The development proposed is use as hostel accommodation (sui generis) with associated landscaping and cycle parking.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission for use as hostel accommodation (sui generis) with associated landscaping and cycle parking at Mount Clare Campus, Minstead Gardens, Roehampton Gate SW15 4EE, in accordance with the terms of application, reference 2025/0074, is refused.

### Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by AKA Capability LLP against the Council of the London Borough of Wandsworth. This is the subject of a separate decision.

### Preliminary Matters

3. There has been discussion, as part of the appeal, about the description of the proposal. That detailed above is taken from the appeal form as it more precisely describes the proposal. The hostel would be for temporary accommodation (TA) for homeless people on local housing authority housing lists. Within the campus, the TA would be within modern 1960's accommodation blocks, Picasso House and a former bungalow known as the Lodge.
4. The appeal is against the non-determination of a planning application by the Council. Had it been in a position to do so, the Council indicates that it would have refused the planning application on the main issues set out, having regard to development plan policy and material planning considerations. During the Inquiry, it became clear that another issue related to the provision of play space, which has been commented upon in closings, and has been set out as a main issue as well.
5. In addition, the Council indicated that it would have refused planning permission on the grounds of inadequate details and measures to secure CO<sub>2</sub> reduction targets.

Following the submission of a Revised Energy Statement (RES)<sup>1</sup> and agreement on planning conditions, the Council no longer wishes to defend this putative reason for refusal. The RES details that on-site reductions in carbon emissions exceeding the target requirements of Policy SI 2 of the London Plan (LP) 2023. The RES pre-development assessments also indicate that an 'excellent' rating under BREEAM would be achievable. RES sustainability building measures would ensure the proposal's compliance with the climate change mitigation and adaptation requirements of Policy LP10 of the Wandsworth Local Plan (WLP) 2023. On this basis, the proposed CO<sub>2</sub> reduction details and measures are acceptable and there is no need to consider this issue further.

6. A planning obligation pursuant to section 106 (s106 agreement) of the Act was completed on 9 February 2026. It relates to the provision of affordable housing (AH), by way of a viability review prior to the first occupation of the proposed development and travel plan monitoring contribution. It partly seeks to address the Council's putative reasons for refusal based on AH provision and this will be discussed within the reasoning of this decision.
7. Before the Inquiry, the appellant submitted elevational plans regarding the Lodge building and, supported by a later submission, a structural assessment report (SAR)<sup>2</sup> maintained that the proposal would be a re-use of this building. The Council's Verification and Critical Analysis Report (VCAR)<sup>3</sup> disputed this. In comparison with the VCAR, the SAR is based on a site survey and therefore, in the absence of comparable evidence to the contrary, the proposal has been treated as a building re-use. Nevertheless, if any permitted use of the Lodge necessitated a re-build, the appellant would need to reassess the development to see if works undertaken were in accordance with the planning permission. The Council could of course consider enforcement action, to remedy any possible breaches of planning control, if it was considered expedient to do so.
8. Under section 192(1) of the Act, an appeal<sup>4</sup> was dismissed for a certificate of lawful use for TA at Clare Mount Campus and a subsequent legal challenge to the decision was unsuccessful. There has been discussion about the lawfulness of the use of the site in assessing a benchmark or fallback position when considering the effects of the proposal. Nevertheless, the main parties agreed as part of this appeal that the evidence on baseline lawfulness was not required to be examined. It was not a significant consideration in assessing effects and based on the evidence before me, there is no reason to depart from this agreed position.
9. At the Inquiry, room illustrative plans of typical 1- and 2-bedroom TA hostel units and room plans for a TA scheme at Tooting were accepted within the Inquiry evidence. A 2015 document "Living Space per prisoner in prison establishments: CPT standards" was not accepted as part of the Inquiry evidence because of its date and lack of reference within evidence submitted. Later in the Inquiry, the appellant submitted website screen shots confirming the acceptance of new patients at local GP surgeries whilst the Council submitted a letter from the local NHS trust detailing exceeded doctor/patient accepted ratios. These submissions were accepted into the evidence at the Inquiry with opportunities for parties to

---

<sup>1</sup> Revised Energy Statement, Mount Clare House, Consult Sustain November 2025.

<sup>2</sup> Structural Assessment Report, Mount Clare House, London, SW15 4EE, Coyle Kennedy Consulting Engineers, November 2025.

<sup>3</sup> Verification and Critical Analysis Survey Report for Wandsworth Borough Council, Mount Clare, Minstead Gardens, Roehampton Gate, London SW15 4EE, Rapleys, December 2025.

<sup>4</sup> APP/H5960/X/25/3358768.

comment upon them and no injustice was caused to any interested parties. It was therefore considered as part of the evidence.

### **Main Issues**

10. Having regard to local and national planning policies, the main issues are whether the proposal would;
  - a) preserve a Grade I listed building known as Clare Mount House and a Grade II\* listed building known as The Temple, along with setting or features of special architectural or historic interest that each possesses; preserve a Grade II Alton West Registered Park and Garden; preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Alton Conservation Area (CA);
  - b) optimise site capacity, having regard to dwelling type, AH, mixed and balanced communities, local plan allocation and best use of land, and residents' accessibility to services and facilities;
  - c) provide acceptable play space provision; and
  - d) result in a high-quality living accommodation.

### **Background**

11. The appeal site comprises Mount Clare Campus, formerly part of the University of Roehampton. It includes various buildings including the Grade I listed Mount Clare House, Grade II\* The Temple building, the 1960's modernist style Picasso House and former student accommodation blocks (15 in total), the single storey Lodge building, and two small outbuildings (garage and store). The site lies within the Alton Estate Conservation Area (CA) and within the Landscape to Alton West Registered Park and Garden (RPG) (with the exception of the Lodge and The Temple buildings).
12. The TA proposal would be for homeless households waiting for their local housing authority application to be determined, or whose application has been accepted but no suitable permanent secure accommodation has become available. Local housing authorities have a duty to find accommodation for those defined as homeless in connection with Part VII of the Housing Act 1996. TA takes the form of hotels, bed and breakfast accommodation and hostels.
13. The accommodation blocks, Picasso House and the Lodge would be refurbished to provide 193 TA units, mainly comprising 1 bedroom (135), 2 bedroom (49), 3 bedroom (7), 5 bedroom (1) and 6 bedroom (1). It was agreed some 60-70 children would be accommodated within the TA. All rooms would have a WC, shower facility, kitchenette, and dining/living spaces, with smaller accommodation having combined bedroom/living spaces with kitchenette and dining facilities. The TA would be for those with general housing needs, not for those with particular needs and/or requirement for on-site support or care. All potential occupants would be screened to assess appropriateness and there would be management procedures to re-house households not within this general housing category.
14. In cross-examination, the appellant's planning witness agreed the applicability of WLP Policy LP31 (Specialist Housing for Vulnerable People and for Older People) which contradicted the appellant's housing witness evidence. However, this proposal is for a particular form of housing, TA, a sui generis use, and Policy

LP31's explanatory text<sup>5</sup> indicates housing for vulnerable people and older people as defined in use classes C2 and C3. The text, whilst it lists homeless people, read as a whole, relates to housing to enable people to live as independently as possible, with provided care and support, with examples confirming this focus. Similarly, LP Policy H12 is for supported and specialised housing, with references in its title and text. Consequently, these policies are not applicable in this case.

15. Picasso House would also have a communal common room, kitchen, WCs and a concierge office room. WLP Policy LP29 (Housing with Shared Facilities) supports housing with shared facilities but the appeal proposal would not come within the separate shared facility housing categories listed under this policy. For parts A and B (Houses in Multiple Occupation(HMO)), the site would be managed by a local housing authority provider that would be exempt from HMO licensing requirements. For parts C and D (Large-scale purpose-built shared living accommodation), the proposal would be large-scale and shared living accommodation, but it would not be purpose-built, being a re-use of an existing building. Therefore, the proposal would not be closely aligned with these parts of the policy and WLP Policy LP29 is not applicable.

## Reasons

### Heritage assets

#### Mount Clare House

16. The Grade I listed Mount Clare House is two storeys in height, with an imposing five bay frontage, and is constructed in painted stucco with a rusticated stone basement. The listed building statutory description (list entry 1184436) indicates construction in 1772, designed probably by Sir Robert Taylor, enlarged with an entrance front portico in 1780 by Columbani. Sir Robert Taylor was a notable architect of the mid to late eighteenth century. The entrance has a three-bay projecting centre with pediment, Doric tetrastyle balustraded portico, and two curved flights of stone steps. Within the portico, there is a modelled plaster ceiling and railings raised above the arched basement. The rear elevation has a central semi-octagonal projection.
17. Mount Clare House reflects the 18th century trend for smaller scale villas positioned on the peripheries of the capital and was used as a weekend and summer retreat for the aristocracy. Mount Clare has group value with other retained 18th century villas, including nearby Grove House and Devonshire House, with Capability Brown designed lawns and mature groups of trees retained between them. The house, elevated above a treed landscaped area, has intervisibility with rear of Devonshire House, across the Alton estate.
18. Mount Clare House has high aesthetic and architectural value, with its classical Palladian style encompassing symmetrical facades, use of ashlar stone and smooth finish, and rigorous classical detailing. It has historic interest, with its role as a summertime retreat in the 18th century and associations with people of the time. Such historical and architectural qualities are of interest and significance. The intrinsically high significance of the house is reflected in its Grade I listing.

---

<sup>5</sup> Paragraph 17.57

### The Temple

19. The Temple is a Greek style stone folly building with prominent Doric style columns and pediment above on its frontage, and lies within the grounds of the Clare Mount House. Its diminutive scale is characterful whilst its Greek Doric style, with baseless fluted columns and slanting entrance door represent an early example of the style in an English context. It was built in 1770-72, brought here from Bessborough House in 1913 and consequently, it was possibly designed by Sir William Chambers, the architect of that building.
20. The statutory listed building description (list entry number 1065545) indicates the modelling based on an illustration from Stuart and Revett, "The Antiquities of Athens", and it has sculptured panels within its portico and an interior covered frescoed ceiling. The elegant neo-classical interiors are attributable to either Giovanni Battista Cipriani, who Chambers met in Rome or Biagio Rebecca, who had a reputation for this type of decorative scheme and had worked with Chambers on Somerset House in London.
21. The building demonstrates the popularity of small classical buildings and follies, within designed 18th century landscapes of houses and has group value with Mount Clare House. As well as historic, it has a strong degree of aesthetic and architectural value reflecting its Grade II\* status. Such qualities result in a great degree of significance.

### Setting of Mount Clare House and The Temple

22. In its original form, raised areas of lawn, mature landscaping, views and bodies of water would have highlighted the importance and grandeur of the summertime palace at Mount Clare House. The original landscaped gardens to the house were laid out by Capability Brown, a prominent landscape designer of the 18th century. There would have been widespread views of Richmond Park and other prestigious houses, such as Devonshire House. Although moved from another location, the Temple, as a folly, with its lake, would have added to the splendour of a carefully designed 18th /early 19th century parkland and gardens enhancing the status of the house.
23. However, the extensive grounds of Mount Clare House have been developed with modern municipal housing, in different forms, as part of the 20th century Alton Estate. This has significantly reduced and diminished the importance of the grounds in highlighting the house's status as a summertime retreat. The grounds remaining are fragmentary and incomplete. The 1960's blocks, Picaso House and the Lodge building, have been developed in the vicinity of Clare Mount House eroding the original spacious nature of its grounds. Such buildings, along with outbuildings, also block a visual connection between the house and The Temple. The original pond framing The Temple has been infilled.
24. The 1960s individual blocks are splayed out at an angle from Clare Mount House, on either side, and there is a view from the rear of the listed building, towards Richmond Park, albeit part obscured due to the presence of mature boundary vegetation. The wider area has been developed with the 1960s Alton Estate and whilst associated residential buildings of varying types and scales have been developed within a landscaped setting, the subdivision has largely eroded any sense of the original grounds contributing to the appreciation of these heritage assets. For the house, the main important contributing areas to setting are the

immediate spaces around it, including and extending to the landscaped areas, in particular, the lawn to its rear, to the front and side (north). For The Temple, the most important contributing areas to setting are the immediate spaces around it.

#### Alton to Alton West Registered Park and Garden (RPG)

25. The RPG includes the Mount Clare House as well as the modern 1960s Alton Estate residential development, comprising different building typologies, including multi-storey apartment blocks, low rise maisonettes, terraced housing and single storey bungalows. This 1960s development was set within the parkland and landscaped gardens of Mount Clare and Downshire Houses. However, the boundary of the RPG excludes The Temple and the Lodge.
26. The RPG's statutory description (entry number 1466474) details the park and gardens as showcasing London City Council's Architects department, the largest and most influential design department in the world in the 1950s, including young architects who went on to have international careers. The estate is regarded as an important example of low cost 1960s housing and the landscaping is an integral component of the quality of the overall design. The entry details an architectural approach inspired by the work of Le Corbusier in its architecture and landscaping which, in competition with the softer Swedish Idiom represented at Alton East, was a major influence on the architect's department.
27. The carefully composed mix of distinguished architecture and the integrated elements of earlier landscaping, planting and vistas are of particular interest. As a whole, the landscape survives well, within the estate plan and principal buildings, views, planting and several new features introduced. Within the RPG, the entry further indicates a coherent and well-preserved ensemble of listed buildings and public sculptures throughout the estate. The RPG's significance is derived from the layered nature of the 18th century landscape and the innovative post war housing of the Alton West estate, which integrated existing planting, topography and vistas into the development.

#### Alton Estate CA

28. The appeal site lies within Alton West part of the Alton Estate CA which contains a variety of different modern building forms and typologies, set within the parkland and landscaped gardens of Mount Clare and Downside Houses.
29. The Alton Estate Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) 2023 details a special sense of place derived from an environment created by atmospheric landscaping, historic layout and architectural quality of buildings. The CAA further details developments of distinct historic eras and styles of architecture, Georgian, Victorian and Post-war/modernistic) are expressed alongside the distinctive landscaping, creating areas of important open space. Indeed, the character is derived from layers of different buildings of different eras, all set within an historic landscape, based on the modernistic estate and the grounds of the surviving Georgian villas. It is these historical and architectural qualities that contribute to the significance of the CA.

#### Contribution of site to the significance of the heritage assets

30. The part of the site to be developed comprises the immediate areas around the blocks, Picasso House and the Lodge. The blocks are repetitive in form and design, with little architectural detailing, whilst Picasso House, is a substantial and

dominating building, with little design articulation and is set within hard surfaced surroundings. The Lodge building, similarly, lacks any design appeal, being flat roofed with modern and poor quality modern openings and parapet details. They were built within the landscaped grounds of the house and The Temple, and there is little evidence of any meaningful innovative landscape design around them. As such, the parts of the site, to be developed, contribute negatively to the understanding and appreciation of the significance of these heritage assets.

31. For the RPG, the 1960's blocks and Picasso House are part of the diversity of building typologies but were not part of the masterplan. They are of poor design quality for reasons indicated and there is little evidence of any quality landscaping around them. As such, they add little to the attractive historic layering of modern development within the former 18th century landscape and overall, the parts of the appeal site, to be developed, contribute negatively to the significance of the RPG.
32. For the CA, the CAA notes that the blocks are not particularly interesting architecturally, not contributing positively or negatively to the CA. For Picasso House, it is in keeping with a modern idiom but is large and an unplanned feature harming the original intended planned relationship between the house and the Lodge. Within the CAA, the Lodge is identified as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the CA, adding to the variety of building typologies of the area and identified as a subordinate counter point to the grand and imposing Mount Clare House. Nevertheless, such buildings are poor quality with little evidence of any quality landscaping around them. As such, the parts of the site, to be developed, contribute negatively to the significance of the character and appearance of the CA, taken as a whole.

#### Effects of the proposal

33. WLP Policy LP3 requires proposals to sustain, preserve and where possible enhance the significance, appearance, character, function and setting of any heritage asset and the historic environment. WLP Policy PM7 requires the preservation, conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings and the special character and qualities of the area should be responded to. Development should maintain and enhance the Parkland setting of the Alton estate.
34. LP Policy HC1 requires proposals, affecting heritage assets and their settings, to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation with their surroundings. Under part B3 of the policy, proposals should integrate the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with innovative and creative contextual responses that contribute to their significance and sense of place.
35. Parties agreed the main effects of the proposal related to cycle and play space provision. Most cycle stand provision would be within Picasso House and attached shed, and a landscaping plan<sup>6</sup> shows 3 stands (6 spaces) adjacent to blocks largely hidden from view from Mount Clare House. There would also be a group of 6 stands (12 spaces) on the Minstead Gardens frontage of the Lodge, again largely hidden from view from this heritage asset and The Temple. For the play space, the landscaping plan similarly mostly shows equipment and areas behind blocks relative to Clare Mount House. The exception would be the balance beam equipment and areas beyond the end of the two rows of blocks. These areas lie

---

<sup>6</sup> P101 Rev P05

- adjacent to the formal grassy area extending out from the rear of Clare Mount House.
36. For Clare Mount House, the outside provision of the stands, with cycles, and play space would be within discrete areas not impinging on the main areas contributing to the setting of the house. Setting does not relate solely to visual aspects, but within the areas of the blocks, the setting has been degraded and compromised. There would be play space visible across the lawn area from the back of the house, but this would be very much within the periphery of the views towards Richmond Park from this heritage asset. They would also be located within boundary vegetation areas.
  37. For The Temple, there would be similarly little intervisibility between it and the cycle and play space due to buildings, principally the Lodge and ancillary buildings. Again, although visibility is not the only factor in setting, such play space would be located within areas where setting has been significantly degraded and weakened. Consequently, the appreciation of the significance of Clare Mount House and The Temple would not be affected and there would be no harm to the setting of these listed buildings.
  38. For the RPG, the cycle and play space provision would not be prominent, being mainly located close to buildings (the blocks and Picasso House), that have a negative quality and in areas with little landscaping quality. The play space equipment would be constructed of natural materials. For similar reasons, the siting of the stands, cycles and play space would preserve the character and appearance of the CA taken as a whole. In summary, the proposal for use as a hostel for TA, with cycle and play space provision would not harm the significance of the heritage assets. For the listed buildings and CA, the proposal would comply with requirements of s66(1) and S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
  39. However, WLP Policies LP3 and PM7, and LP Policy HC1 are more restrictive in requiring the preservation and enhancement of the heritage assets than the statutory heritage requirements. In the case of WLP Policy LP3, the setting of any heritage asset is required to be enhanced, where possible. WLP Policy PM7, covering the Roehampton and Alton Estate Regeneration Area more strongly requires the enhancement of existing heritage assets. Within the policy explanatory context, an objective of the Area Strategy for Roehampton and Alton Regeneration Area is the protection and enhancement of existing heritage assets and the special character of the Alton Estate and Roehampton. LP Policy HC1 requires the integration and enhancement of heritage assets.
  40. The proposal would introduce a landscape management to open grassed areas around the Picasso House and Mount Clare House and there would be management and tidying up of overgrown areas around The Temple. Nevertheless, in the absence of any persuasive details, such management and activities would be no different to what would be reasonably expected of the required upkeep of a site, which any landowner would be likely to undertake.
  41. There would be passive surveillance through increased activity on the site, deterring vandalism and damage to heritage assets, and ongoing management and maintenance of the listed buildings implemented by way of a condition. The Temple has been identified as a building at risk, but it has been enclosed with a high metal

fence, for a temporary period to protect it, from vandalism and graffiti. With this fence, there is no evidence of anti-social behaviour or graffiti in the area. Similarly, landowners generally maintain and repair properties because it is in their interests to do so to prevent deterioration. There is no specific repair issues identified with the built heritage assets and the Council has powers, if it chooses to use, to require the repair of listed buildings. Importantly, these heritage considerations relate to conservation, maintenance and managing change<sup>7</sup>, rather than enhancement. For the Lodge building, it would be restored to its former condition, but it has a negative contribution to the significance of the heritage assets (listed buildings and CA) and therefore, restoring would not be an enhancement.

### *Conclusion*

42. In cross-examination, the Council's heritage witness agreed that there were enhancements to heritage assets whilst its planning witness maintained otherwise. However, in assessing the evidence, I conclude that the proposals would conserve but not enhance heritage assets, for the reasons indicated. Consequently, there would be conflict with WLP Policies LP3 and PM7, and LP Policy HC1.

### **Optimisation of site capacity**

#### *Affordable housing*

43. Under the s106, obligations set out provisions for an offsite AH contribution following a viability review. WLP Policy LP23 and LP Policies H4 and H5 set out requirements for AH for schemes of 10 or more units. LP Policy H4 identifies a strategic target for all new homes to be delivered across London to be genuinely affordable. In support, paragraph 2.51 of the London Mayor's AH and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2017 indicates that AH contributions would be required for hostels.
44. The SPG assists in the interpretation and application of LP policies, but firstly, an assessment of whether the TA is a form of AH, has to take place. Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) defines AH as housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market. One definition is AH for rent, where the rent is set in accordance with the government's rent policy for affordable rent or is at least 20% below local market rates including service charges where applicable, the landlord is a registered provider and there are provisions for rent to remain at affordable price for future eligible households. The proposed TA would be for people homeless or at risk of being homeless on a local housing authority list with needs not been provided for by the market. TA rents would be set at Local Housing Allowance levels, 20% below market rent, as set out in the appellant's Redloft Consultancy letter<sup>8</sup>, with the local housing authority or registered landlord paying the difference. Through a lease, the Council or registered landlord would act as a landlord.
45. Consequently, the TA would be a form of AH and additional AH would not be required. For all these reasons, there would be no AH requirement arising from WLP Policy LP23 and LP Policies H4 and H5.

---

<sup>7</sup> Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 18a-002-20190723.

<sup>8</sup> Redloft correspondence dated 8 January 2026.

Mixed and balanced communities

46. The TA would provide a range of bedroomed TA and during the Inquiry, it was accepted about 60-70 children would live at the site. However, the accommodation range would be very limited in quantity terms. About 70% of the TA units would be for 1-bedroom and the combination of 1- and 2-bedroom accommodation would represent almost all of the TA and would be characterised as smaller households.
47. WLP Policy LP24 Part A2 is not supportive of an over-concentration of single size homes but this is not applicable as this is in respect of private market housing. In cases of AH, Part D indicates support where the AH contributes to the Council's preferred housing mix detailed in an attached table. Part E states dwelling mix will be considered on a site-by-site basis, and in applying the preferred housing mix, regard will be given to current evidence in relation to housing need, the surrounding context and character, and the overall level of AH proposed.
48. In June 2025, the Council had around 3,800 households living in TA, just over 11% increase compared to the previous year. Of these households, there are about 45.4% single households and 54.6% family households. A November 2025 Housing Overview and Scrutiny Committee report indicated 47% of homeless households require studio or single bedroom TA. Homeless pressures are rising and the Council's housing witness agreed that there were about 1800 general needs households (excluding those needing support and care), with approximately half of these having to find TA outside of the borough.
49. The Council's has objections to the proposed TA but assuming TA did take on homeless households, the proposed 193 TA units (265 bedrooms) would contribute to addressing the TA need, including single households and family households. This would include households who would otherwise be placed in TA outside of the borough. The proposal is not located within an area characterised by comparable uses or a large concentration of them, and the buildings have in the past being used for single person student accommodation. Moreover, the grounds of the site would allow separation from neighbouring areas, and the TA would be managed, further reducing potential off-site impacts and there is no evidence of complaints associated with previous use.
50. Nevertheless, the Council currently manages to find placements for homeless people into TA and fulfils its statutory duties. The proposed TA would also provide mainly smaller households, with 1- bedroom being approximately 70% of the total TA units, well above the preferred 1-bedroom AH preferred mix under LP24 Part D. It would also be well above the mix of single households based on the Council's June 2025 TA list. Whilst the risk of resident neighbourliness would be small, the preferred housing mixes are informed by Local Housing Need Assessment (2000) based on housing mix requirements. For all these reasons, there would be conflict with WLP Policy LP24.
51. LP Policy H10 (Housing size mix) requires schemes to generally consist of a range of unit sizes. The policy indicates that to determine the appropriate mix of unit sizes in relation to the number of bedrooms, regard shall be made to the requirement to deliver mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods. LP Policy GG4 (delivering the homes Londoners need) requires mixed and inclusive communities, with good quality homes that meet high standards of design, in order to create a housing market that works better for all Londoners.

52. LP Policy H10 uses the wording 'schemes' as well as 'housing' whilst in LP Policy GG4 the word 'housing' is used as well as 'homes'. The proposal has been described as residential accommodation or TA. However, the TA would provide homes because the units would provide self-contained facilities for day to day living. Within these policies, varying terms are used, including 'housing', but the range of wording, including 'homes' and 'schemes', illustrates, in my judgement, the inappropriateness of applying an overly rigid approach to their interpretation and therefore, such policies are applicable in this case.
53. The wording of LP Policies H10 and GG4 are general in their requirements for mixed and inclusive communities but even taking this into account, the proportion of smaller households, especially single bedroom, would be overly dominating within the housing mix. For all these reasons, the proposal would not result in a mixed and balanced community, and hence, there would be conflict with WLP Policy LP24 and LP Policies H10 and GG4.

Site allocation and the best use of land

54. WLP Policy RO2 details allocation for mixed-use development with residential uses<sup>9</sup> under paragraph 9.29. The proposed TA would fall within the scope of residential uses, and the allocation does not preclude phased development for the site, including uses for the listed buildings. The TA would not sterilise further uses coming forward and the appellant intends to bring forward separate proposals for Mount Clare House and The Temple, once the proposed hostel is established and revenue streams are secured for the future.
55. However, the appeal site covers the whole of the allocation and yet the proposals only cover part of it. Irrespective of whether the paragraphs setting out the details of the allocation must be complied with, the policy allocation is for mixed-use development with residential uses. There are no detailed proposals for the remaining part of the site/allocation which is particularly sensitive given its heritage assets context, including Grade I and II\* listed buildings. Both heritage assets are currently vacant, and whilst the appellant's intentions for the listed buildings are welcome, they do not provide certainty that future proposals will come forward to fully develop the site. The appellant proposes a detailed repair and maintenance schedule for the listed buildings by a way of a condition, but this does not ensure acceptable optimum uses will be found for them. Given the heritage sensitivity of the site, this omission of detailed proposals for the remainder of the site is significant.
56. Furthermore, LP Policy D3 Part A requires development to be the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations. The policy states optimising site capacity means ensuring that development is of the most appropriate form and land use for the site, and that the design-led approach requires the consideration of design options to determine the most appropriate form of development, that responds to a site's context and capacity for growth. Whilst the appellant has plans for the listed buildings, there are no design options presented in the evidence to determine the most appropriate form of development for the site and allocation.
57. LP Policy D3 Part D11 also indicates proposals should respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features, and

---

<sup>9</sup> Paragraph 9.29.

characteristics that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute towards the local character. In this regard, special and valued heritage features and characteristics have been identified but irrespective of whether proposal respects and enhances heritage assets, the proposal does not utilise the heritage assets.

58. For all these reasons, the proposal fails to optimise the capacity of the site, having regard to the policy allocation, being design-led and the utilisation of heritage assets in conflict with WLP Policy R02 and LP Policy D3.

#### Accessibility to services and facilities

59. The explanatory paragraph 9.5 to WLP policy PM7 indicates how low public transport accessibility results in Roehampton feeling disconnected. It is beyond acceptable walking distances to rail and underground stations and the Transport for London (TfL) Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) scores for the area range from 1B to 3 reflect this. It further indicates severe congestion experienced in the area, due in part to inadequate public transport services and cycling infrastructure.
60. For the appeal site, the PTAL score ranges are between 1b and 2 based on TfL WebCat tool. The appellant's transport POE revised this to 3, due to a path providing access to bus services on Clarence Lane. Nevertheless, even at 3, this PTAL is below a good level of public transport accessibility (score of 4). The nearest railway station at Barnes is 30 minutes away and although there are bus stops near the site, the frequency and range of these would be reflected within the PTAL score. In this regard, many of the TA's residents would not have links to the Roehampton area but many, given the number of TA units, would have to travel further afield for work, school and seeing friends and family.
61. However, the appellant's transport POE<sup>10</sup> details convenience stores, local supermarket, food takeaway and café within reasonable walking distance, ten minutes based on guidance<sup>11</sup>. There are local GP surgeries, taking on additional patients, within reasonable walking distance, albeit NHS accepted doctor/patient ratios have been exceeded. Furthermore, importantly, the site has been allocated for mixed use development with residential uses which would indicate acceptability in terms of PTAL and accessibility to services and facilities.
62. TA residents would be likely to be on lower incomes compared to the general population and the nearby local store and supermarket would be more expensive than larger supermarkets. However, as with any shopper, the buying of items would have to be tailored to their income and there is public transport access to larger supermarkets, just over 1km away further afield, for shopping.
63. WLP Policy LP50 states that development generating a large volume of trips must have a good public transport access levels (PTALs) of 4 or higher and/or be in an area with sufficient public transport capacity or be capable of supporting improvements to provide good public transport accessibility and capacity. However, the Council has concluded that the likely number of trips generated by the development would not have a severe impact. Based on this and the information on trips by their Transport officer, the development would not generate a large volume of trips and therefore, this policy is not applicable.

---

<sup>10</sup> Transport POE. Mount Clare Campus, Minstead Gardens, Velocity Transport Planning.

<sup>11</sup> Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) guidance 'Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot 2000.'

64. LP Policy T1 requires impacts on transport networks and supporting infrastructure to be mitigated whilst LP Policy T2 states that proposals should deliver patterns of land use that facilitate residents making shorter, regular trips by walking or cycling. The Council's Transport Officer has raised no objection to the proposal, citing no severe impact on the operation of the bus network, and made no requirement for transportation improvements within the area. For all these reasons, accessibility to services and facilities would be acceptable and there would be no conflict with LP Policies T1 and T2.

### **Play space provision**

65. WLP Policy LP19 Part B states new major residential development will be required to make on-site provision for 10 sqm of dedicated play space per child. During the Inquiry, main parties agreed a children yield of 60-70. Part D of the policy states these spaces should provide a range of facilities, be of sustainable construction and use in differing weather conditions, with shelter and protection from lightning. LP Policy S4 also requires good quality play space with same sqm of floorspace to be provided. Under the proposal's landscaping plan, there would be play space, but such space would be significantly less in extent than the 600-700 sqm required by the policy based on the children yield.
66. Both policies refer to residential development which TA would be. In simple area terms, the site would be larger enough to accommodate the additional play space of 600-700 sqm and details could be agreed through condition. However, the site comprises a number of heritage assets and Part D of WLP Policy LP19 would require built form (like the facilities shown on the landscaping plan) and therefore, it cannot be certain that the submission of further details would be acceptable given the sensitive heritage context. Part C of WLP Policy LP19 requires the provision of a financial contribution where the provision of on-site play space would not be feasible or appropriate. Even if such a scenario applied, no such contribution provision has been made under this part of the policy.
67. The Council has not raised the issue of unacceptable play space provision as a putative reason for refusal. The Greater London Authority (GLC) calculator to work out required space areas also does refer to TA. In a Council scheme at Tooting, provision of play space was less than that required by policy and there was no evidence of any contribution to remedy any shortfall.
68. However, although the Council has not specifically commented on a conflict with the policy prior to the Inquiry, it has raised the issue in documentation<sup>12</sup> in terms of inadequate details. In response to details emerging of children yield, it raised the issue of policy conflict. Although it assists in explaining the policy, the GLC calculator is not policy and both WLP Policy LP19 and LP Policy S4 refer to residential developments, that TA would fall within, requiring this play space provision. The Tooting scheme attracts weight, moderate, as an example of TA in the Council area in dealing with play space provision but every proposal has to be considered on its particular merits. In this case, there remains a policy conflict given the children yield, of greater weight, and the Tooting scheme is located within a built-up area with other attractions and would have differing PTAL levels. For all these reasons, the play space provision would be unacceptable given the children

---

<sup>12</sup>Officers Report, page 44 onwards and Statement of Case, paragraph 5.51.

yield, harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers, through insufficient play space and would conflict with WLP Policy LP19.

### **High quality living accommodation**

69. WLP Policy LP27 requires all new residential development, including conversions and change of use schemes, to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS), be inclusive, accessible and safe to all, in accordance with the requirements of LP Policy D5. LP Policy D3 Part D12 requires high quality development and thorough consideration to the practicality of use, flexibility, safety and building lifespan. LP Policy D6 Part A requires that housing development should be of a high design quality, providing adequate sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose. LP Policy D6 Part F requires all housing developments to meet the minimum standards set out in an accompanying table that mirror those of NDSS.
70. The proposal is for TA for homeless people and not permanent accommodation negating the applicability of NDSS. The TA has been designed to accord with the requirements of Setting the Standard (StS)<sup>13</sup> which sets inspection criteria for this type of accommodation across the capital. The StS standards do not apply to permanent or long stay accommodation or to emergency placements in commercial hotels paid on a nightly paid basis. The appellant confirmed that TA would be leased to a local authority provider and costed on a nightly paid basis.
71. The StS details minimum internal floorspace areas for sleeping rooms containing cooking facilities dependent on maximum number of persons. Floorspace plans annotated floorspace areas for 1-person accommodation below the minimum StS floorspace areas but this was due to rounding down of dimensions to derive the areas. At the Inquiry, the illustrative plan showed internal dimensions for the typical 1- and 2- person units) and the internal floorspace area, excluding internal wall divisions and shower room, which showed compliance with the minimum StS floorspace areas for 1- and 2- person units. This was consistent with a plan within the appellant's architecture proof of evidence (page 24). Based on my site visit, the dimensions in a sample of accommodation rooms were not inconsistent with those on the submitted illustrative plan.
72. StS, Appendix 1 Space Standards, part h, indicates where a room opens into a narrow space, the floor area covered by the swing of the door should be discounted. However, in both option layouts for the 1-person bedroom units, the front door would not open into a narrow space but rather the room itself. For option B, the area by the door would be adjacent to a kitchenette. It was not disputed that the larger bedroom units complied with the minimum floorspace requirements of the StS. The evidence of the appellant's architect further demonstrated that the TA would be graded A under a grading matrix assessment. The proposal would also comply with similar space standards set out in the Local Government Association (Out of Placements Guidance) (OfPG) January 2023.
73. Within the Council area, the average stay of an occupant of TA would be from 3 to 4 years despite TA accommodation being intended for short stays. However, the proposed TA has not been designed for permanent stays and although there are housing pressures, local housing authorities or registered social landlords would

---

<sup>13</sup> Setting the Standard – Temporary Accommodation Inspection Service – Guidance Note for STS Inspection Officers and Local Authorities (October 2020),

have to have regard to this in the placement of households and duration of stays. Furthermore, if all TA accommodation was to be judged on permanent stay design requirements, this would have significant repercussions in accommodating homeless households on a temporary basis. Both WLP and LP policies require high quality design. Within the context of its purpose, the TA design would be high quality meeting the requirements of the StS and OfPG, and would provide acceptable living conditions for residents. However, technically, there would be conflict with WLP Policy LP27 and LP Policy D6 in that the proposal does not comply with NDSS.

**Benefits of the proposal**

74. Within London and Wandsworth, there are currently large numbers of homeless people within TA waiting for permanent accommodation placement. Homeless pressures are rising and assuming the Council does place households at the site, the proposed TA would provide for up to 265 persons contributing to this need. The appellant has attached very substantial weight to this consideration. However, the Council is currently meeting its statutory requirements in finding placements for homeless people within TA. The TA would also be mainly focussed on providing smaller scale accommodation and would provide limited larger bedroom family accommodation. Whilst the benefits of providing TA for households from other parts of London are accorded separate weight by the appellant, this relates to the same TA housing need issue. For all the reasons indicated, significant weight is attached to the housing benefit of meeting demand for TA.
75. The proposed TA could provide homeless Wandsworth households who would otherwise be located outside of the borough. However, households could be housed here from other parts of the borough in this location which they have little connection with. As a result, significant weight rather than substantial weight is attached to this social benefit. Economically, there would be reduced expenditure for in providing TA in a hostel rather than more expensive hotels or bed and breakfast accommodation. The annual overspend on homeless accommodation in Wandsworth is considerable and the appellant places substantial weight on this cost benefit. However, the households would still pay a significant proportion of the rent in the proposed TA and although hostel TA is cheaper than other forms of TA, such as hotels, the extent of typical savings arising from this proposal has not been demonstrated. Consequently, moderate weight is attached to this economic benefit.
76. The TA would provide high quality accommodation meeting the StS and OfPG standards attracting significant weight. However, the benefit of on-site management would be limited in weight because the proposal does not cater for those households requiring care and support. Although only on part of the site, the proposal would bring buildings back into use and the use of existing buildings would help address climate change through ensuring energy embodied in the fabric is not wasted or released in accordance with LP Policy SI 2 and WLP Policy LP10. Such an approach would be beneficial compared to a more energy demanding development with new build but the development would still generate carbon emissions through its lifespan, and it would not be net-zero carbon. Therefore, moderate rather than very substantial weight is attached to this benefit.
77. Re-using the site would bring about increased surveillance, deterring graffiti, vandalism and ant-social behaviour, which in the absence of particular issues being evident, within the wider context of the site and area, would attract small weight.

For play space provision, the development would result in facilities providing a wider benefit, but the provision does not comply with the requirements of WLP LP19 limiting the weight to be attached to this benefit. In terms of sustainable transportation, small weight rather than moderate weight would be attached as a benefit because the PTAL score is still below good. Finally, weight is given to local economy benefits through the construction and job creation opportunities, but this would be small rather than moderate because the proposal would be a re-use rather than re-build.

### **Other matters**

78. A previous proposal for temporary change of use for TA was refused planning permission whilst an associated listed building consent (for minor works associated with the use) was consented. No heritage assessment was submitted with the proposal. However, every proposal has to be determined on its merits, having regard to the arguments and evidence presented. This proposal would be for permanent TA at the site and there are heritage issues, relating to both conservation and enhancement which were not considered previously, and other relating to allocation site optimisation, mixed and balanced communities, and provision of play space. Accordingly, only limited weight is attached to this consideration.

### **Section 106 agreement**

79. A completed s106 agreements sets out AH obligations but for the reasons indicated, no AH would be required. Consequently, the obligations are not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the statutory tests of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations (as amended) and those of paragraph 58 of the Framework would not be met. Under schedule 1, the requirements would be deemed to have a nil effect and have no consideration in this decision.

80. An obligation of the s106 requires a travel plan monitoring contribution in relation to a plan to be submitted by planning condition. LP Policy T1 requires facilities for the delivery of sustainable transport whilst LP Policy T2 requires assessments of transport capacity and travel plans. The contribution has been calculated in accordance with Wandsworth Planning Obligations SPD. The obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and the statutory tests of the CIL Regulations (as amended) and those of paragraph 58 of the Framework would not be met.

### **Planning Balance**

81. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

82. In terms of housing, the proposed TA would meet a growing need assisting in meeting housing requirements of the development plan. Socially, it would help households reside in the Council area rather than outside. Financially, the Council would incur reduced expenditure and there would be the provision of high-quality designed homes albeit it would not comply with NDSS. The proposal would bring back buildings into use on part of the site. Re-use of buildings would result in carbon energy reduction benefits compared to new build in accordance with WLP

Policy LP10 and LP Policy S12. Re-use would result in increased surveillance for the area. There would be sustainable transportation benefits in accordance with Policies T1 and T2 of the LP. There would also local economy benefits through construction and job opportunities. Cumulatively, these benefits would weigh substantially in favour of the proposal.

83. The proposal would preserve but would not enhance the heritage assets in conflict with WLP Policies LP3 and PM7 and LP Policy HC1. The proposal would fail to optimise the capacity of the site, having regard to the policy allocation, being design-led and the utilisation of heritage assets in conflict with WLP Policy R02 and LP Policy D3. It would not result in a mixed and balanced community in conflict with WLP Policy LP24 and LP Policies H10 and GG4. Additionally, the development would result in unacceptable play space provision and harm to the living conditions of the occupiers based on the conflict with WLP Policy LP19.
84. There would also be a conflict with WLP Policy LP27 and LP Policy D6 in that the proposal would not comply with NDSS. However, such policies do not relate to TA proposals and therefore, the conflict would be of a technical and minor nature.
85. Nevertheless, the failure to optimise the capacity of the site is of substantial importance and overriding weight because the remaining part of the site/allocation comprises built heritage assets of great significance. The Grade I status of Mount Clare House and Grade II\* The Temple are assets of national architectural and historic importance. There are no detailed re-use proposals for these assets. LP Policy D3 requires a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites, including site allocations, and utilises heritage assets. The proposal would not enhance the heritage assets in conflict with the WLP and LP policies. These policy conflicts, allied with those relating to mixed and balanced communities and play space provision, would result in unacceptable conflict with the development plan, taken as a whole.
86. There would be housing, social, reduced Council expenditure, high quality accommodation, building re-use, increased surveillance, sustainable transport and local economy material planning considerations in favour of allowing the proposal. There would also be compliance with statutory requirements, S66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. However, full weight is given to the primacy of the development plan, and such considerations would not be of sufficient weight to indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with development plan and therefore, planning permission should be refused for this proposed development.

## **Conclusion**

87. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

*J Parsons*

INSPECTOR

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE APPELLANT

J Neill, Barrister

Landmark Chambers (instructed by AKA  
Capability LLP)

He called

C Rose BA(Hons)  
A Cooley, Dip FCMI FRSA  
D G Lewis MSc MCIHT  
M S Sahota BA DipTP MRTPI

Director, The Heritage Practice  
Principal Consultant, Itair  
Velocity Transport Planning  
Partner, NTA

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

R Wald, KC

Winckworth Sherwood (instructed by  
London Borough of Wandsworth)

He called

B Sellers Ma (UD) BA (Hons Arch) BA  
(Hons) TP, DIP UD, MRTPI

Principal Planner (Urban Design and  
Conservation, London Borough of  
Wandsworth

D Worth

Director of Housing Services, London  
Borough of Wandsworth

N Smith BA (Hons) Ma MRTPI

Nexus Planning

### INTERESTED PARTIES

Councillor M Tiller

Local councillor

Right Honourable F Anderson

MP

### INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

1. Revised illustrative floor plan
2. Appellant's opening statement
3. Council's opening statement.
4. Third party statement – Councillor M Tiller.
5. Council's note on Habitat Regulations.
6. GP Capacity with screenshots.
7. NHS letter to Council.
8. Council comments on appellant's Unilateral Undertaking.
9. Third Party Statement – Right Honourable F Anderson, MP.
10. Appellant's closing submission.
11. Council's Closing submission.
12. S106 agreement dated 9 February 2026.