



# John Innes (Merton Park) Statement of Community Involvement



# John Innes (Merton Park) Conservation Area Character Assessment

## Statement of Community Involvement

### Appendix 1 to the Assessment

---

#### **Summary of Consultations Undertaken**

A public consultation exercise was undertaken on the draft appraisal during May and June 2006. This consisted of the following:

- A copy of the Draft Conservation Area Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Conservation Area Boundary Assessment report were made available for inspection at the Council offices between 13<sup>th</sup> May and 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks).
- A copy of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Boundary Assessment report were made available for inspection at Wimbledon Library and Morden Library (the nearest libraries to the site) between 13<sup>th</sup> May and 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks).
- A downloadable PDF version of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Boundary Assessment report were placed on the Council's website on 13<sup>th</sup> May with a deadline for comments of 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks).
- Letters were sent out between 1<sup>st</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> May to properties within the Conservation Area as defined according to both the existing Conservation Area boundary and according to the proposed boundary revisions (map at Annex 2 shows which properties were consulted). This letter specified a deadline for comments of 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks). These letters advised where copies of the Draft Character Assessment and associated documents could be viewed, and where copies could be obtained.
- Letters and copies of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Boundary Assessment report were sent out in early May to residents associations and amenity societies deemed likely to have an interest in the Conservation Area (see Annex 3) with a deadline of 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks).
- Letters and copies of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Boundary Assessment report were sent out on 8<sup>th</sup> May to relevant Ward Councillors deemed likely to have an interest in the Conservation Area (see Annex 4) with a deadline of 24<sup>th</sup> June (6 weeks).

#### **Summary Table of Responses and Proposed Amendments**

The table below summarises the content of the responses from consultees, the Council's comments on these and proposed amendments as a result.

**John Innes (Merton Park) Conservation Area**  
**Summary Table of Responses and Proposed Amendments**

<b>N o.</b>	<b>Respondent &amp; Comment</b>	<b>Council comment</b>	<b>Proposed amendments</b>
1.	Mr P Zerdin <u>Comment:</u> Oppose the removal of the Primary School from the CA. – concern that the site might be redeveloped.	Agree to the retention of the school within the CA. The school is important as a social focus for the community, and it provides a strong entrance feature to the CA when approaching from the south. (This response will involve amendment of the Appraisal so as to include all the necessary references to the school).	Retain the school within the boundary of the CA, and make consequential changes to the character appraisal as set out in annex 5 to this document.
2.	Mr & Mrs Saitch <u>Comment:</u> Support for the proposals.	Support noted	No change.
3.	Mr & Mrs Saitch <u>Comment:</u> Include the holly hedges in the protected area as intrinsic to its character.	Holly hedges in the area generally lie within either the Merton Park CA or the Wilton Crescent CA. To give a reasonable level of protection to these hedges will however require article 4 direction powers as well, but seeking such powers is included in the recommended actions for both of these CAs.	No change.
4.	Mr & Mrs Saitch <u>Comment:</u> 2a/b Poplar Rd should remain in the CA, as excluding it could open way to damaging development.	Any possible proposals for development at this property would remain subject to UDP policy BE.3 which gives protection to the CA setting and to views into and out of the CA. The property itself is not considered to have any historic or architectural merit, and of itself is not considered to warrant its CA status.	No change.
5.	Mr & Mrs Saitch <u>Comment:</u> Primary School should remain within the CA, it contributes to its character from a social and environmental perspective.	See comment in relation to item 1 above.	See proposed amendments in relation to item 1 above.
6.	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> Concerned about the proposed removal of properties from the CA from the point of view of potential relaxation of standards, which regulate changes to properties.	Properties should only be included within a CA if they can be justified in terms of the special character of the area. Their inclusion should not be justified in terms of imposing strict standards in respect of change. However in respect of the School, see comment in relation to item 1 above.	No change, except in relation to item 1 above.
7.	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> Need for speed restriction in all streets in and adjacent to the area.	This issue is not essentially one for the Conservation Area. It has been referred to Street Management officers to consider.	No change.
8.	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> Would like to see restoration of grass verges in	Accept the suggestion and include it in the list of recommended actions.	Add this item into the list of recommended

	Dorset Rd.		actions, see also recommended action in respect of item 37 below.
9.	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> Should extend the CA so as to include the houses on the NE side of Dorset Rd, between the tramway alley to opposite Melrose Rd. Currently the CA boundary runs down the middle of the road. No 28 Dorset Rd is particularly noteworthy.	The issue of extending the CA in this part of Dorset Rd was examined in the Boundary Assessment Report, and this acknowledges that the CA boundary runs down the middle of part of Dorset Rd. No. 28 Dorset Rd in fact already lies inside the CA. The representation does not provide any sufficient justification for reversing the conclusions of CA Boundary Assessment.	No change.
10	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> Efforts to preserve/enhance the character of the area may be undermined if badly designed buildings nearby are permitted, (proposed development at no 30 Dorset Rd cited as an example).	Policy BE.3 in the UDP provides some planning protection in respect of development just outside the CA boundaries, in terms of protection of the CA setting and protecting views into and out of the CA.	No change.
11	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> in section 4, page 5 top line, refer to the gate being moved by the John Innes Horticultural Institute to its present position.	This factual correction is accepted.	Amend section 4 accordingly.
12	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> page 6, 3 <sup>rd</sup> para, 3 <sup>rd</sup> line, should read "It was built in the 1820s"	This factual correction is accepted.	Amend page 6 accordingly.
13	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> page 6, 8th para, , amend to refer to "Tooting Loop" rather than "Tooting to Streatham Line"	This factual correction is accepted.	Amend page 6 accordingly.
14	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> page 6 final para, 1 <sup>st</sup> line should read "consisted of large and small Victorian villas"	The factual correction is accepted, though reference to small Victorian cottages is preferred to small Victorian villas.	Amend to refer to "small Victorian cottages".
15	Mr & Mrs Barrett <u>Comment:</u> a most helpful and researched piece of work.	Comment noted.	No change.
16	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> Add reference to the view across the Glebe Field from the western gate in Erridge Rd, in winter this gives a view of the church, reflecting older, longer views of the church from the south, across open fields.	Agree to the proposed amendment.	See proposed amendment for item 22 below.
17	Mr H Child (note 1)	Comment noted.	No change.

.	<u>Comment:</u> A Planning Inspector has recently referred to views into the Glebe Fields as “a rare oasis of tranquillity in an otherwise busy urban environment”.		
18	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> It is difficult to argue that Stratton Close is worthy of retention within the CA, but the trees that form a back drop to one corner of the Glebe Field should be protected, eg use of TPO.	Comment on Stratton Close is noted. Investigation will be undertaken to the possible need for trees within the Stratton Close gardens to be protected by TPOs, on the basis that they would lose protection afforded by their CA status.	No change is needed to the appraisal document.
19	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> Welcome the suggested inclusion of Manor Gardens in the CA.	Comment noted.	No change.
20	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> page 21, start section 20 with the words “Larger green spaces make a significant contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.”	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Amend page 21 accordingly.
21	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> page 24, TPO 152 is stated to cover various trees around the boundary of the site, a TPO also covers the trees that run across the middle of part of the Glebe Field (between Erridge Rd and the Church/ vicarage).	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Amend section 22 (TPO 152) to refer to trees “within the Glebe Field”.
22	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> insert, on page 26, under sub heading on Views, after 1 <sup>st</sup> para, “Probably the finest view is from the more westerly of the two Glebe Fields Gates in Erridge Rd, across the Glebe Field towards the Church and Vicarage”.	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Amend page 26, to include the wording proposed by Mr Child.
23	Mr H Child (note 1) <u>Comment:</u> Pleased to see the recommended action to seek appropriate Article 4 Direction powers to give protection to holly hedges.	Comment noted.	No change.
24	Mr N Clarke <u>Comment:</u> The decision to include Manor Gardens in the CA appears to have been pre-judged, in that the draft assessment is written on the basis of its inclusion, and that a blue conservation area street name sign has been erected at the end of that road.	The draft boundary assessment and the draft character appraisal were written in parallel, each informing the other. The fact that a blue CA street name sign has been erected at the end of the road is not a sign of any pre-judgement. This fact played no part in the recommended boundary alteration. It is noted that Mr Clark does not specifically object to the inclusion	No change.

		of this area in the CA.	
25	Mr N Clarke <u>Comment:</u> It is disingenuous of the Council to have permitted changes to be made to Merton Park school (windows and extension), which are then used as argument for taking the school out of the CA. What else might be done to the school if it is taken out of the CA, and thereby not be subject to Article 4 Direction control.	There was no calculation to secure de-designation of the school site, when the alterations to the school building were undertaken. However see comment in relation to item 1 above.	See proposed amendments in relation to item 1 above.
26	Mr N Clarke <u>Comment:</u> The changes made to the School, (see comment above), do not appear to be too damaging, and do not warrant excluding the school from the CA. It is a major landmark in the local community.	See comment in relation to item 1 above.	See proposed amendments in relation to item 1 above.
27	Mr N Clarke <u>Comment:</u> The proposed article 4 directions (especially those for small scale alterations) are rather draconian in scope. They appear to try to preserve rather than to conserve. Individualisation and personalising properties is normal. Further consultation with people is needed on this. Have these proposals been considered by elected representatives.	It is true that the suggested Article 4 Direction would be quite far reaching, but it is intended that they be tailored only to control changes which potentially (on a cumulative basis) might adversely affect the character/appearance of the CA. They specifically do not try to preserve, and renewal of building fabric will occur, but only under planning control, in order to ensure that such changes are done in a way sympathetic to the character of the CA.	No change.
28	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> welcome the opportunity to re-appraise the CA and to consider proposals for enhancement.	Comment noted	No change.
29	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Proposed CA boundary changes are generally supported, especially the inclusion of Manor Gardens.	Comment noted.	No change
30	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> The boundary change deleting the Merton Park School is not supported. The school is important to the vitality and sustainability of the area. It is part of the social fabric of the area. Would not wish to see the use changed to residential. The school is essentially pleasing architecturally, and the	See comment in relation to item 1 above.	See proposed amendments in relation to item 1 above.

	changes that have occurred are minor.		
31	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Generally support the opportunities and recommended actions.	Comment noted	No change
32	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Removal of redundant crossovers should not be limited to those in Mostyn Rd. (recommended actions)	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Amend section 29 (Opportunities and Recommended Action) accordingly.
33	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Suggested re-phrasing of action in respect of article 4 for holly hedges, controls should be sought "where they form part of the character of that street", and the planting of new holly hedges should be encouraged when opportunities present themselves.	This comment makes a more specific reference to the intended extent of the suggested article 4 coverage. The suggestion for new holly planting is also supported. Agree to the proposed amendment.	Amend section 29 (Opportunities and Recommended Action) accordingly.
34	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> The action to prepare a brief for Wykeham Lodge has been overtaken by events with a planning application now submitted for the site. We need to rely on the Design and Conservation Team to give detailed scrutiny to the application.	Whilst it is quite possible that a brief for the site may not be required, it is considered premature at this stage to delete reference to this, as a possible required action. Currently (June 2006) no planning permission has been granted in respect of the application, neither has work started on site. Even if these things had happened, this would only affect part of the Wykeham Lodge site.	No change.
35	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Disagree with the suggestion for the redevelopment of the car park site in Church Path. Retaining the car park is essential to the functioning of the activities in the hall, and to Church Path. Holly hedge planting has been undertaken to delineate a soft boundary to the road.	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Delete the reference to the recommended action - to prepare a design brief for the car park site, in section 29.
36	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Views into the Glebe Field from Church Path could be improved by the removal of outbuildings at the rear of the car park.	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Add a new recommended action to section 29, to seek improvements to the views of the Glebe Field if possible through the removal of the outbuildings.
37	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> Grass verges	Agree to the proposed amendment, see also response to	Add new recommended

	should be restored where possible, especially along Dorset Rd. Here the footways are broad, and the streetscape would be softened and enhanced.	comment 8 above.	action to section 29, noting that this is not limited to Dorset Rd.
38	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> The blue CA street name signs (with the holly motif) should be used where new signs are required.	Agree to the proposed amendment.	Add new recommended action to section 29.
39	Respondent, see note 2 <u>Comment:</u> The view of the Glebe Fields from the gate in Erridge Rd should be added to the list of noteworthy medium distance views in para 24. A Planning Inspector has noted that the fields are “a rare oasis of tranquillity in an otherwise busy urban environment”, this view offers one of the best views into them.	See response to comment 22 above.	See recommended change referred to against comment 22 above.
40	Mr Ian Stopher <u>Comment:</u> Support for the removal of 2a/b Poplar Rd from the CA.	Comment noted	No change.

Note 1 – Mr Child is the Representative of the John Innes (Merton Park) CA on the Conservation And Design Advisory Panel.

Note 2 – Joint representation from Merton Park Ward Independent Residents (Ward Councillors), Merton Park Ward Residents Assn. And the John Innes Society.

## ANNEX 2: Map showing properties consulted



**LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON**  
**Environment and Regeneration**  
Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 6DX.  
Telephone 020 8543 2222 Web [www.merton.gov.uk](http://www.merton.gov.uk)

John Innes (Merton Park) Conservation Area  
Letter Distribution Area  
Plan No DLU/2210

Scale: 1/4500

Date: 28/7/2006



Reproduced from the 2006 Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the controller of Her Majesty's stationery office (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Merton LA 100019259

### **ANNEX 3: List of relevant organisations consulted**

1. John Innes Society

### **ANNEX 4: List of Councillors Consulted**

Councillors representing Merton Park Ward

### **ANNEX 5:**

Proposed changes to the text of the Character Appraisal, consequent upon the retention of the Merton Park School within the Conservation Area boundary are indicated in the revised Draft Character Appraisal (July 2006).

Albanian	Nese deshironi me shume informacion ne gjuhen tuaj, ju lutemi te na kontaktoni ne adresen e dhene ne kutine me poshte.
Arabic	إذا أردت معلومات إضافية بلغتك الأصلية الرجاء الاتصال بنا في العنوان المدون ضمن الإطار أدناه.
Bengali	যদি আপনার নিজের ভাষায় লেখা আরও তথ্য চান তাহলে দয়া করে আমাদের সঙ্গে যোগাযোগ করুন, উল্লিখিত বক্সে আমাদের ঠিকানা রয়েছে।
Chinese	如果你需要用中文印成的資料，請按低端方格內提供的地址與我們聯繫。
Farsi	اگر مایل به اطلاعات بیشتر به زبان خود هستید، لطفاً با ما از طریق آدرس زیر تماس بگیرید.
French	Pour tout renseignement complémentaire dans votre propre langue, veuillez nous contacter à l'adresse figurant dans l'encadré du bas.
Gujarati	જો તમને તમારી પોતાની ભાષામાં વધારે માહિતી જોઈતી હોય, તો કૃપા કરીને નીચે અંતમાં આપેલા ખાનામાં દર્શાવેલા સરનામે અમારો સંપર્ક કરો.
Punjabi	ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਪੰਜਾਬੀ ਵਿਚ ਹੋਰ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਲੈਣੀ ਚਾਹੁੰਦੇ ਹੋ ਤਾਂ ਹਿੱਥਾ ਵਰਕੇ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖੇ ਖਾਨੇ ਵਿਚ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਪਤੇ 'ਤੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।
Somali	Hadii aad u baahan tahay faahfaahin intaa kabadan oo ku soobsan afkaaka hooyo ama Af Somali fadlan lana soo xiira cinwaanka hoos ku qoran.
Spanish	Si usted desea mas informacion en su propia lengua, por favor contactenos en la direccion al pie del formato.
Tamil	உங்கள் மொழியில் மேலதிக தகவலைப் பெற விரும்பினால், அடியிலுள்ள பெட்டிக்குள் தரப்பட்டுள்ள விவரத்தில் எம்முடன் தொடர்பு கொள்ளுங்கள்.
Urdu	اگر آپ اپنی زبان میں مزید معلومات حاصل کرنا چاہتے ہیں تو براہ کرم ہم سے اس پتے پر رابطہ قائم کریں جو کہ نیچے کے بکس میں درج ہے۔