Merton Hall Road
Statement of Community Involvement
Summary of Consultations Undertaken

A public consultation exercise was undertaken on the draft appraisal during April and May 2005. 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 12th April and 24th May (6 weeks).
- A copy of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and boundary assessment report were made available for inspection at Wimbledon Library (the nearest library to the site) between 12th April and 24th May (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 12th April with a deadline for comments of 24th May (6 weeks).
- A notice was placed in the Wimbledon Guardian of 7th April advertising the availability of the Draft Character Assessment documents, for public comment (at the Council offices, Wimbledon Library and the Council’s website) with a deadline of 24th May (6 weeks). A copy of the notice can be found at Annex 1.
- Letters were sent out between 1st and 12th April 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 24th May (6 weeks). These letters advised where copies of the Draft Character Assessment 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 on 6th April to residents associations and amenity societies deemed likely to have an interest in the Conservation Area (see Annex 3) with a deadline of 24th May (6 weeks).
- Letters and copies of the Draft Character Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal Report and boundary assessment report were sent out on 6th April to relevant Ward Councillors deemed likely to have an interest in the Conservation Area (see Annex 4) with a deadline of 24th May (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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Respondent &amp; Comments</th>
<th>Council Comments</th>
<th>Proposed Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ainsworth family</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Agree with recommendations regarding poor quality road platforms (traffic calming) at school entrance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ainsworth family</td>
<td>The wording of the proposed action in respect of Article 4 Direction powers, as set out in the draft Appraisal, is clear in that it seeks control over changes to the fronts of buildings (porches, doors and windows). On this basis it appears that the respondent may be supportive.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Article 4 needs to be clearer on which aspects of buildings are affected. Potentially they might not be concerned if such Directions dealt only with changes to the fronts of properties (eg doors, windows porches).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ainsworth family.</td>
<td>Agree the comment, and amend the Appraisal accordingly.</td>
<td>Under the heading Opportunities and recommended action, add a further action as follows: “To install street name signs in accordance with the normal “Conservation Area” pattern.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: CA does not have blue street name signs like other CAs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lisa Waters</td>
<td>The comment relating to Table 1 appears to be a criticism of the leaflet “Conservation Areas: A Guide for Residents”, which was distributed to occupiers at the same time as the consultation letters were distributed. No change to the content of the Character Appraisal documents is warranted from this point of view.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Discrepancy between rules and Table 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lisa Waters</td>
<td>Developments which are designed to be sympathetic to the character of a CA should in any event be granted planning permission, at least from the point of view of conservation area policy. Officers are however of the opinion that insensitive replacement of window frames (or similar work), which use inappropriate materials such as UPVC, can</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: No reasonable or sympathetic development should be refused. (eg replacement windows may be rotten, energy inefficient, insecure and possibly unsafe. UPVC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
windows may look like originals. be harmful to the character of a CA. Article 4 Direction powers are therefore needed to protect against such adverse changes if the character of an area is not to be eroded.

6 Lisa Waters Comments: Off street parking does not seem to be a conservation issue. However maintaining some frontage planting should also be encouraged.

The insensitive implementation of front garden parking areas can be harmful to the character of a CA. Having said that this appears to be less of an issue in this CA than it does in some others. For this reason no Article 4 Direction powers are suggested in respect of front garden parking.

No change.

7 Cllr. Philip Jones Comments: Disagrees that nos. 279-291 should be taken out of the CA.

This seems to be a misunderstanding arising out of the work on the Quintin Ave/Richmond Ave CA, where it was envisaged that the issue of 279-291 might be open to question when the time came for the Merton Hall Rd CA to be examined. In the event the Merton Hall Rd Appraisal work concluded that 279-291 should remain in the Merton Hall Rd CA. The Merton Hall Rd Appraisal has therefore reached a conclusion which accords with the wishes of the respondent.

No change.

8 Bob Jenkins Comments: “Conservation Areas” are 30 years too late.

The ability of Council staff to determine residents’ building rights amounts to corruption.

Officers consider that the existing character and appearance of this area warrants CA status, and to that extent its CA status is not felt to be “too late”. The allegation of “corruption” is unsubstantiated. Council officers follow national planning guidelines in devising and implementing planning policy in relation to CAs.

No change.

9 Local Ward Cllrs. Comments: Support the retention of nos. 279-291 Kingston Road in the CA.

Support noted.

No change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Local Ward Cllrs.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10 | Comments:  
Support retention of Nelson Hospital within CA. The detailed appraisal of the Hospital buildings will provide valuable guidance when a site brief is prepared for the site. | Support and comment noted. | No change. |
| 11 | Comments:  
Strongly agree Manor Gardens should be included within one of the CAs, however there is a case for including it in the Merton Hall Rd CA, (rather than the Merton Park CA), on the basis that the character of this street is quite different to any in latter. However the idea of including this street within either of the CAs would be supported. | It is true that the character of Manor Gardens is rather different to that of the John Innes Merton Park CA. However this reason is off set by 2 factors. Firstly there is no direct connection (in terms of public access routes) to link the Merton Hall Rd CA to the public street in Manor Gardens, without first passing through the Merton Park CA. Secondly the John Innes Merton Park CA already has some diverse character elements, (eg the garden suburb and the mediaeval village core) and adding Manor Gardens would simply be a further aspect of diversity. This could be treated as a sub area of the Conservation Area, as happens with other CA character appraisals. It is concluded, (mainly for the reasons of the greater proximity of the Merton Park CA to Manor Gardens), that it would be more appropriate to include that street within the Merton Park CA rather than the Merton Hall Rd CA. | No change. Manor Gardens will be considered as a strong candidate for inclusion in the Merton Park CA, when the Character appraisal for that area is prepared. In fact work carried out to date towards the preparation of a first draft of the Merton Park Character Appraisal has already come to the conclusion that this street should be added to the Merton Park Conservation Area. |
| 12 | Comments:  
The appraisal of the Rush should be re-considered in the light of the newly instigated CPZ.  
Reason:  
The CPZ is helping to reduce disorganised parking. | The works at the Rush relating to the CPZ have been assessed, and it is felt that they have not achieved very much in terms of the environmental improvements as envisaged in the draft Appraisal. The area is therefore in still need of street works aimed at improving pedestrian space, planting and landscaping and an overall reduction in the space given over to vehicles. There may be potential to achieve these | No change. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Richard Weston (CADAP Area Rep. for Quintin/ Richmond Aves. CAs)</th>
<th>Things in conjunction with the development of the Nelson Hospital site.</th>
<th>No change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Comments: Merton Hall &amp; Quintin/Richmond Aves. CAs could be merged.</td>
<td>It is felt that there is sufficient difference in the feel and the character of these 2 Conservation Areas to keep them as separate CAs. Merton Hall Rd has a feeling of greater diversity and activity, while the 3 short culs-de-sac that form the proposed new Quintin/Richmond (Chase) CA are quieter and more regimented in terms of their layout. The reason given by the respondent for merging the 2 areas is not one which is generally recognised as a sound basis for defining the extent of a CA. In any event a single representative could in practice seek to represent the 2 separate CAs.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason: Merton Hall CA is not actively represented by anyone on the CADAP. A single representative could cover both areas. Disparity of design occurs in other CAs within the Borough and therefore not a barrier to keeping areas separate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wimbledon School of Art</td>
<td>Support noted.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Supports the main thrust of the document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wimbledon School of Art</td>
<td>It is considered that these two buildings are of equal value from a historical and architectural point of view when compared to others within the Conservation Area which have been assessed as making a positive contribution to the area. The architecture and detaining of these buildings are fine examples of houses of their period, and from an external appraisal, they appear to have retained their original features. While the overall form of these 2 buildings is rather different from that of the other “positive contribution” houses in the area, (they are two storey</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: 46 &amp; 48 Merton Hall Road do not make a positive contribution to the area. Reason: They are not on keeping with any of the immediately adjoining buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wimbledon School of Art</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Agreement/Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>double fronted detached buildings, the contribution that they make to the character of the area is no less.</td>
<td>Stated building heights are incorrect. Building heights range from 2 ½ to 3 ½ and 4 storeys in height in the northern part of the site, whilst to the south buildings range from single storey to 3 storey.</td>
<td>Agree amendments in relation to the height of buildings within the School of Art site. Delete the final 2 sentences in the 1st paragraph in section 9. Replace them with “The frontage buildings at the Wimbledon School of Art range from 2 ½ storeys (46/48 Merton Hall Rd), 3 storeys (the 1930s building), and 1 ½ and 2 ½ storey buildings in between. At the rear of the site the theatre is the equivalent of 4 storeys, and there are several single storey buildings.”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Agreed amendment to plan 7 to detail 3 building types within the School of Art site.</td>
<td>In relation to plan 7 “Building Types”, there are 3 building types not 2 (including 46/48) within the School of Art site.</td>
<td>Amend plan 7, to identify 3 building types (the 1930’s building, 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, and the later buildings in between.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18 | Plan 6 concentrates on positive/negative contributions made by buildings, rather than open areas. The open storage area referred to is located at the rear of nos. 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, and as a result from the point of view of the general public’s perception, it has almost no impact on the character and appearance of the area. However comment should be included in section 25 (Opportunities and Recommended Action) to indicate the potential for the development of this open storage area. | Draft describes buildings only, not open storage space. There is an open storage area which should be identified on plan 6 (Building Contribution). | No change to plan 6. Amend section 25, with the addition of a further bullet point, to say “There is an opportunity to develop the open storage area at the rear of 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, including the removal of the associated temporary storage sheds, and to provide new buildings”.
| 19 | The reason for this being raised as an issue is on the basis of a misunderstanding of the extent of the extent of the School of Art site. The group of trees referred to in this paragraph are located on the west side of Merton Hall Rd, to the north of The Chase, mostly surrounding a car parking area. This area is in the ownership of the Chase School. | Section 19 (Trees) (2nd paragraph) mistakenly refers to a group of trees within the School of Art site. | Replace the 1st sentence of the 2nd paragraph of section 19, with “The contribution made by trees to the character of the area is most notable in the area on the west side of Merton Hall Rd to the north of the Chase.”. Amend the 2nd sentence so that it says “In the surroundings of the car park, there are magnificent ……….”. |
| 20 | Wimbledon School of Art | Comments: On pages 18/19, and on plan 6 the buildings at 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, and the “industrial character buildings” within the School of Art site should be identified as “Neutral Features”. | In respect of 46/48 Merton Hall Rd this issue has been raised in 15 above. The officer response is therefore the same. With regard to the “industrial character” buildings, section 7 of the draft Appraisal indicates that all frontage buildings within the School of Art site are considered to make a positive contribution. This would include the “industrial character” buildings. Whilst the design of these quite modern buildings is distinctively different to that of all others in the Conservation Area, they are nevertheless considered to add to the character of the area. | No change. |
| 21 | Wimbledon School of Art | Comments: Southern part of School of Art site would benefit from redevelopment. | This comment relates to the open storage site, referred to in 18 above. The response is therefore the same. | See 18 above. |
| 22 | Wimbledon School of Art | Comments: In relation to the Boundary Assessment report, the statement which says that “All properties which front Merton Hall Road display architectural interest, high quality building detail, architectural cohesion, or a combination of these” is disputed. This statement should be applied to the majority of buildings. | Plan 6 in the Assessment (Building Contribution) clearly indicates that all buildings fronting Merton Hall Rd are either Locally Listed or they make a positive contribution. Locally Listed buildings are also considered to contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area. This comment cannot therefore be accepted. | No change. |
| 23 | Wimbledon School of Art | Comments: In relation to the Sustainability Appraisal document Officer responses in relation to comments 15, 20 and 22 do not accept the representations made. Therefore no consequential changes to the Sustainability Appraisal in this respect are warranted. | | No change. |
(page 2 para 2), the reference to the numbers of Locally Listed buildings and numbers of buildings that make a positive contribution would need to be changed consequent upon acceptance of the representations 15, 20 and 22 above.

| 24 | Wimbledon School of Art | In relation to comment 18 above, it is agreed that the Appraisal can include reference to an opportunity to develop the open storage area at the rear of 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, including the removal of the associated temporary storage sheds, and to provide new buildings. On this basis the Sustainability Appraisal should also identify this as one of the Actions. | To add a further bullet point to the section on Actions, within the Sustainability Appraisal, to say “There is an opportunity to develop the open storage area at the rear of 46/48 Merton Hall Rd, including the removal of the associated temporary storage sheds, and to provide new buildings.”.

| 25 | Wimbledon School of Art | This table only assesses the sustainability implications of any proposed actions arising out of the Character Appraisal. It is not therefore supposed to be an assessment of the contribution to sustainability of the School of Art, as it currently stands. However given the proposed amendment envisaged as a result of comments 18 and 24 above, it would be appropriate to include a change to the table in the Sustainability Appraisal (the sections dealing with “Work and the Economy” and “Education”, to reflect the benefits that might flow from the development of the open storage site. | Amend the table in the Sustainability Appraisal as follows: Under the heading “Work and the Economy” amend the “comment” to read “The development of the open storage site within the School of Art will offer the potential to increase employment opportunities”. Under the heading “Education” amend the “comment” to read “The development of the open storage site within the School of Art will offer the potential to increase educational opportunities”.

<p>| 26 | Wimbledon School of Art | The photographic record cannot give complete coverage of all features within the Conservation Area. There would be no specific benefit derived from inclusion of an additional photograph of the open storage area within the | No change. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School of Art site.</th>
<th>School of Art site. The open storage site has only very limited impact on the public perception of the Conservation Area.</th>
<th>No change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust</td>
<td>The 4 pavilion buildings are considered to make a positive contribution to the character/appearance of the Conservation Area. Their retention is therefore desirable from the point of view of the character and appearance of the CA. The 3rd paragraph of section 23 does say that any development proposals for the hospital site will be expected to retain these elements, and this statement goes beyond the provisions of policy BE.2 which allows some circumstances in which the demolition of such buildings might be favourably considered. However the 4th paragraph goes on to make this clear. It sets out the circumstances in which positive contribution buildings might be demolished, as specified in policy BE.2. On this basis no change to the wording of the document seems to be warranted.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE
ACT 2004.
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
(LOCAL DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2004
CONSULTATION ON DRAFT CHARACTER
ASSESSMENTS FOR SEVEN DESIGNATED
CONSERVATION AREAS.
(SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENTS)
The London Borough of Merton's Design and Conservation Team has
prepared draft Character Assessments for seven of its Conservation Areas,
and is seeking your views on them.
The seven areas are:
Lambton Rd Conservation Area
Merton Hall Rd Conservation Area
Quintin Ave/Richmond Ave (the Chase) Conservation Area
John Innes (Wilton Crescent) Conservation Area
Dunmore Rd Conservation Area
Bertram Cottages Conservation Area
Pelham Rd Conservation Area
The purpose of Conservation Area Assessments is to justify the Conservation
Area designation and to define the features of interest that gives each area its
special character. The Assessments are also used to define any features
which detract from the character of the area.
In some cases the Assessments propose to alter the Conservation Area
boundaries, either to enlarge the Conservation Area or to reduce it.
The Assessments also make a number of proposals which are aimed at either
protecting the special character of the area, where it is seen to be under
some threat, or enhancing the character of the area where there are
opportunities to do so.
Copies of the draft Assessment documents are available at Wimbledon
Library, and at Merton Link in Merton Civic Centre. The documents can also
be viewed on the Council's website (www.merton.gov.uk).
Please send any correspondence regarding the Assessments by letter or by
email to: Phil Ryder, Design and Conservation Team, Environment and
Regeneration Dept. Merton Civic Centre, London Rd, Morden SM4 5DX, or to:
phil.ryder@merton.gov.uk,
Comments should be received between 12 April and 24 May 2005. You may
also request written notification from the Council of the Assessment's final
approval date.
ANNEX 3: List of relevant organisations consulted

1. John Innes Society
2. Wimbledon Society
3. Merton Hall Rd Conservation Area CADAP* Representative

(* CADAP is Conservation and Design Advisory Panel)

ANNEX 4: List of Councillors Consulted

Councillors representing Merton Park Ward and Dundonald Ward.
Nese deshironi me shume informacion ne gjuhen tuaj, ju lutem te na kontaktoni ne adresen e dhene ne kutine me poshte.

إذا أردت معلومات إضافية بلغتك الأصلية الرجاء الاتصال بنا

في العنان المدون ضمن الإطار أدناه

ফুলি আপনার নিজের ভাষায় লেখা আরও তথ্য চান তাহলে দরক করে
আমাদের সঙ্গে হেঁচাহেস করুন, তাহ করে আমাদের থিকানা রাখেন।

如果你需要用中文印成的资料，
請按低端方格內提供的地址與我們聯系。

اقرأ مايل به اطلاعات بيشتر به زبان خود هستید، لطفاً با ما از طریق آدرس زیرتماس
بگیرید.

Pour tout renseignement complémentaire dans votre propre langue, veuillez
nous contacter à l'adresse figurant dans l'encadré du bas.

जो तभी तमामी पोस्टरी भाषामा दुःखाए आफ्नै जहाँ जरूरी हो, त्यो कुनै करी
नै अंतमा आफनामा भाषामा दशविश्वा सर्नोलो अभारो संपर्क करिए।

સેવા કીમત એવી હવે ઉપમાન નાખવા ખેલી જવું ટિકી ટેલિફ્નને તે જે ડિબફ થવે તેને તેના ઈન્ડન્ડ પાડી, તે માણસ માથે બને。

Hadii aad u baahan tahay faahfaahin intaa kabadan oo ku soobsan afkaaka
hooyo ama Af Somali fadlan lana soo xiira cinwaanka hoos ku qoran.

Si usted desea mas información en su propia lengua, por
favor contactenos en la direccion al pie del formato.

நேர்மயன் சுருக்கிக்கும் முகமாகவும் உந்துகள் ஆக்ஷனில்
புரிபடுத்தும் ஹவுஸ் எங்களிடமிருந்து வந்துள்ளதோ தமிழ் நூற்றணக்கு

آگر کپی اپی نیاز هم اطلاعات صاحب ۲۰۰/۲۰۰۰ میلیون یون outfield
سے آپ کے پر ایک بھر کے کریم کے کپی اپی نیا دل نہیں

Urdu