

Appeal Ref APP/H15960/W/25/3371729

Mount Clare Campus, Minstead Gardens, Roehampton Gate,

London W15 4EE

CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SUMMARY

1. The case management conference (conference) was held on 6 November 2025 and was led by myself, the Inquiry Inspector, Jonathon Parsons. This is my note of the meeting, the agreements made and actions set out. Please respond if any clarifications or corrections are necessary.

Attendance

2. The main parties were represented at the Conference by:
 - Mr James Neill for the appellant.
 - Ms Victoria Hutton for the Council.
3. They will perform the roles of advocates during the Inquiry for their respective parties.

Background

4. As this is an appeal against non-determination, there are a number of issues that need to be urgently addressed. Given the tight timetable and the nature of the appeal, this is a reiterative process. At the end of this note, there are required actions with dates detailed. Please consider them carefully.

Procedural Matters

Statement of Common Ground

5. Although indicated as a draft, the submitted Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been signed by both parties and accepted as such a document.

Description of proposal

6. Considerable discussion took place regarding the description of the proposal, especially regarding whether operational development would occur in respect of the building known as the Lodge/The Bungalow. Recently, the appellant has submitted elevational and layout plans for this building.
7. At the conference, the following was agreed:
 - the appellant would consider their position and whether to commission a structural survey and assessment report (SSAR) to ascertain whether operational development would occur, in bringing this building/structure into use.
 - the Inspector would then determine whether operational development or repairs to bring this building/structure into use would occur.

- If operational development is determined to occur, the Inspector would then decide as to the publicity and consultation (with necessary heritage consultees, if necessary) to be carried out by the Council.
 - Irrespective of the above, the Inspector is aware of the Council's view that additional publicity and consultation is required because it sees the existing building as incapable of being brought into use without rebuilding/replacement.
7. If further publicity and consultation is to be carried out, there should be time to carry this out prior to the Inquiry in January. However, this will depend on how quickly the appellant decides on their position and whether a SSAR will be commissioned and if the answer is yes, the submission of the SSAR to the Inspector.
8. **Actions: Please can the appellant inform the Inspector of its position and whether it is commissioning a SSAR by November 14 2025 and if it is, the submission of this SSAR by noon of Friday November 28 2025. Any later than this would be likely to unduly delay the proceedings.**

Amended/amplifying plans

9. For the Lodge, there are submitted elevation and layout plans. The appellant is to report back to PINS as to the status of these plans and how they wish these to be considered in light of the above matters.
10. **Actions: Please can the appellant clarify these matters by November 28 2025.**

Inconsistencies between plans

11. Under section 8D (The former Lodge (bungalow)) of the Council Officer's report, it is indicated that application documents are inconsistent in terms of room numbers and that the amended/amplifying plans illustrate four double bedrooms within the Lodge building whereas the planning statement refers to five bedrooms. The appellant needs to clarify matters.
12. **Actions: Please can the appellant clarify these matters by November 28 2025.**

Energy Statement

13. The Council is considering the energy statement submitted to PINS in October and the appellant will also address any further points raised within the Council's Statement of Case and attached Officer's report.
14. **Actions: Please can the Council clarify whether the putative reason for refusal on this matter remains by 28 November 2025.** If it does not, the appellant and Council should submit a Statement of Common Ground detailing reasons for agreement and compliance with relevant development plan policies. If the answer is yes, there is a need to clarify the disagreement by this date. If this is the scenario, it is suggested that

proof evidence is produced by parties on this issue and the Inspector will be likely deal with the matters in around table session. This will be decided upon by the Inspector soon after this date.

Likely Main issues

15. After discussion, the likely main issues are whether the proposal would:
 - a) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Alton Conservation Area; preserve a Grade II Alton West Registered Park and Garden; preserve a Grade I listed building known as Clare Mount and Grade II listed building known as The Temple, along with their setting or features of special architectural or historic interest that each possesses;
 - b) result in a high quality living accommodation;
 - c) result in a requirement for affordable housing provision; and
 - d) Optimise the capacity of the site to maximise housing delivery, having regard to dwelling type, needs, mixed and sustainable communities, and heritage assets.
16. Although the above is my current understanding of the main issues, I shall keep them under review. Furthermore, proofs of evidence have also not been exchanged, and the Inquiry has not commenced. The issue list could be added to if the other putative reasons for refusal are not resolved; energy and carbon matters and sustainability and local infrastructure. In addition to the above, I will, of course, need to consider any heritage and planning balances, including planning benefits.

How the Main Issues will be dealt with

16. This was considered at the Conference. For each main party, there would be a heritage witness dealing with heritage assets (issue a), a housing/design witness dealing with the living qualities of the residential accommodation (issues b) and a planning witness dealing with planning issues (issues c) and d). The later will include evidence on whether this proposal should attract affordable housing provision. In addition, the appellant intends to field a witness on need for the hostel accommodation for the homeless.
17. Both the Heritage and Planning evidence will be considered by way of formal presentation (Examination-in-chief, cross-examination and re-examination). After hearing views, I have decided on a round table session led by myself on the living qualities of the residential accommodation and need for the hostel accommodation for the homeless. These are largely technical matters and in respect of need, there appears to be little dispute between parties.
18. Heritage SoCG. No Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted as part of the appellant's documentation. The Council's heritage putative heritage reason for refusal is based of insufficient information on significance. There is a need for further information before proofs of evidence stage of the Public Inquiry. There is a need to submit a heritage SoCG detailing significance of the heritage assets identified and where there is disagreement, this should be clearly identified. **As proofs of**

evidence are required to be submitted by Tuesday 23 December, the Heritage SoCG is required by no later than Tuesday 9 December 2025. It is essential that this deadline is met.

19. Proofs of Evidence – what should be on the proofs is a matter for main parties but based on the documentation before me, the following would be of assistance to the Inquiry.
- (a) Heritage – local and national heritage policy; relevant emerging local plan policy; significance of the heritage assets (as detailed in the issue above); the settings of Mount Clare House and Temple; the effects of the proposal positive, negative or neutral; amongst the effects that should be considered, cycle parking infrastructure, vehicle parking, landscaping, transport signage; sub-division of site, fences, security hoardings; activity; any requirement for the long-term management and maintenance of heritage assets; any need for the reinstatement of the pond in front of The Temple and are development plan policies complied with/conflicted with.
 - (b) Living accommodation standards - local and national policy; relevant emerging local plan policy; need for hostel accommodation of homeless; relevance and weight to be given to Wandsworth Minimum Amenities Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wandsworth HMO standards) and Setting the Standard – Temporary Accommodation Inspection Service Guidance Note (October 2020); Are room sizes, provision of living rooms, communal kitchen dining areas, communal amenity areas, spaces, storage, shower room sizes acceptable or not: any requirement for the provision of wheelchair accessible rooms (London Policy D7 of the London Plan); Are development plan policies complied/conflicted with.
 - (c) Planning - local and national policy; distinction between policy and explanatory text; relevant emerging local plan policy; explanation of terms optimisation of site capacity, design-led, mixed and sustainable communities, any requirements for affordable housing under local and national policy; heritage local plan policy requirements; objections by third parties (appellant), Heritage (if required) and Planning balance; weight to be given to harms and benefits.

Conditions

20. The Council has submitted suggested conditions and the appellant's comments are required before submission.
21. Careful attention to the wording is required and the conditions will need to be properly justified having regard to the tests for conditions set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the test of necessity. You are reminded in this regard, that as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), planning conditions should be kept to a minimum and that conditions, that are required to be discharged before development commences should be avoided, unless there is a clear justification.
22. The reasons for any pre-commencement conditions will need to include that justification. The conditions should also be set out in the order

proscribed by the PPG, with standard time commencement conditions first, followed by plan adherence condition, pre-commencement conditions.

23. Any difference in view on any of the suggested conditions, including suggested wording, should be highlighted in the schedule with a brief explanation given.
24. **A finalised draft without prejudice set of planning conditions should be submitted by 2 December 2025.** Such a timescale would enable me to give comments, revisions to be undertaken, if necessary, and a further draft, again, if necessary, before the Inquiry

Planning Obligation

25. If a s106/UU is to be submitted, I will need an early draft of the planning obligation, with a final draft to be submitted shortly before the Inquiry opens. **It is of the utmost urgency that heads of terms are agreed and the Inspector would like to see such a document approved by main parties by November 17 2025. Detailed evidence of working on a preliminary draft must be produced by Tuesday 23 December 2025. A finalised draft must be submitted by 13 January 2026.**
26. The final draft must be accompanied by a CIL Compliance Statement prepared by the Council. The statement must contain a fully detailed justification for each obligation sought, setting out how it complies with the CIL Regulations, in particular the test of necessity in order to mitigate a harm arising out of the development proposed.
27. It should include reference to any policy support and, in relation to any financial contribution, exactly how it has been calculated and on precisely what it would be spent.
28. With regard to any financial contributions, I need to know whether any relevant schemes are the subject of other financial contributions in order to be able to come to a view on whether any contribution sought in relation to this appeal is justified.
29. A short time will be allowed after the Inquiry for the submission of a signed version.

Core Documents

30. A Core Document List (CDL) should be progressed and agreed in accordance with the suggested timetable set out at the end of this note. It is required before proof of evidence documents are produced because they should cross-reference CDL documents. The Council indicated that this will be done on their website so that documents can be easily accessed at the Inquiry.
31. **Action: 9 December 2025 - Appellant to confirm CDL document and the Council to confirm the date when documents will be seen online prior to the Inquiry.**

Inquiry running order/programme

32. The Inquiry is scheduled to sit for 5 days on Tuesday 20 January 2025 to Friday 23 January 2025, with an additional day on Monday 26 January 2025. In light of discussions, it was agreed that a further day be reserved on Tuesday 27 January 2025. The Inquiry is to be held locally at LBW Grand Chamber Committee Room, Town Hall, Wandsworth High Street SW18 2PU.
33. On the first day, the Inquiry will open at 10:00 am. I understand that there is a committee meeting in the evening and that we will need to finish at 3pm. On other days, we shall aim to finish at around 17.00 but it might be necessary to finish slightly later, if there is good reason to do so. On a second and subsequent days, it is likely that the Inquiry will start earlier at 9.30 am.
34. Running Order: In terms of running order, following my opening comments on Day 1, I will invite opening statements from the appellant and then the Council. I will then hear from any interested parties, followed by the formal presentation of evidence on heritage starting with the Council. It may be only possible to hear the evidence-in-chief of the Council on the first day. On Day 2, it is likely further formal presentation of evidence on heritage matters will take place with the Council and appellant. On Day 3, it is likely that there would be a RTD led by myself on living standards of the housing accommodations and need for the hostel accommodation. At the end of Day 3 and much of Day 4, there is likely to be formal presentation of the planning evidence. On Day 5, there would be RTD on conditions and Planning Obligation. I shall then hear the closing submissions, setting out your respective cases as they stand, having tested the evidence, before I close the Inquiry. If there are any applications for an award of costs those will be heard after the closing submissions before I close the Inquiry.
35. Inquiry Schedule: I will produce an Inquiry Schedule in the lead-up to the Inquiry, in accordance with the above, and for review by the main parties.

Timetable for the submission of documents

36. Please find below a table listing all the key deadlines leading up to the Inquiry, in chronological order.

Item	Deadline	Party
Venue details		Council has submitted these details
Structural Survey & Assessment Report (SSAR) Yes/No	14 November 2025	Appellant

Agreed Heads of Terms of s106/UU, if to be submitted.	17 November 2025	Appellant & Council
Energy Statement – Putative reason for Refusal overcomeable or not answer	28 November 2025	Appellant & Council
If SSAR to be undertaken, submission date	28 November 2025	Appellant
Status of amended/amplifying plans	28 November 2025	Appellant
Comments/inconsistencies on plans	28 November 2025	Appellant
Inspector ruling on proposed description and plans	2 December 2025	Inspector
Agreed without prejudice set of planning conditions	2 December 2025	Inspector
Heritage SoCG	9 December 2025	Appellant & Council
Energy SoCG	9 December 2025	Appellant & Council
CDL and confirmation when documents will be seen online	9 December 2025	Appellant & Council
Inquiry notification letter and copy of site notice/press notice	23 December 2025	Council
Detailed evidence of draft s106/UU	23 December 2025	Appellant and Council
Proofs of Evidence Heritage, Design and Need, Planning (at present).	23 December 2025	Appellant and Council
Time estimates for the examination of evidence	9 January 2026	Appellant and Council
Route map for Inspector	9 January 2026	Appellant and Council
Inquiry schedule	13 January 2026	Inspector
Draft 106 agreement	13 January 2026	Appellant & Council
CIL compliance report	13 January 2026	Council
Inquiry starts	20 January 2026	All

*If not before.

Costs

37. An indication of a possible cost application has been received from the appellant. In the absence of any appellant arguments on the lawfulness of the existing use, the Council has indicated no cost application would be made at this stage. If any cost application is to be made, PPG makes it clear that this should be made in writing before the Inquiry. You are also reminded in this regard, that to support an effective and timely planning system in which all parties are required to behave reasonably, I have the ability to initiate an award of costs, although hopefully I won't have to use this power. Whilst not inviting them, if other parties wish to submit additional cost claims, these must be made before the close of the Inquiry

Other Procedural Matters

38. Site visit: The Inspector intends to carry out an unaccompanied site visit prior to the Inquiry. The appellant, in liaison with the Council, should produce a walking plan with viewpoints from which the Inspector should view the site from. The Inspector will be in touch with the appellant to arrange access for a date after 9 January 2026
39. Viability: there was some discussion on this. No viability assessment has been submitted. All documentation should be submitted in accordance with agreed deadlines. If a viability assessment was submitted, this would have implications for the arrangements for this appeal. The Council has already indicated consultation with a consultant would be required to properly assess any assessment and this has time implications. Therefore, whilst not encouraging any submission, the Inspector would ask that if a viability assessment is to be submitted, it is not done at a late stage.
40. I welcome any comments that any party has on any of the above.

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR
11 November 2025