



Supplementary Planning Document
London Borough of Merton



Pelham Road Statement of Community Involvement



©10/2005

Pelham Road 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 brief 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 (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.

No.	Respondent & Comments	Council Comments	Proposed Amendments
1	Trudi Kemp <u>Comments:</u> Draft character assessment incorrect in stating no. 31 contains flats. <u>Reason:</u> It was converted back into a house in the 80's.	Agree amendment.	page 11 revised from 'Nos 27 to 33: Nos. 27 to 33 have each been converted into three flats' to 'Nos. 27 to 33: No. 27, 29 and 33 have each been converted into three flats'.
2	Trudi Kemp, Tina & Colin Harris, and Giulia Tulley <u>Comment:</u> Welcomes the proposal to use Article 4 powers to control alterations. <u>Reason:</u> (Tina & Colin Harris): Residents could be required to plant greenery during parking space conversions. <u>Reason (Giulia Tulley):</u> The Direction should also be used to remove the higher piers along the front boundary.	An Article 4 Direction might form part of a future enhancement scheme for the Conservation Area to require greenery to soften the impact of car parking spaces in front gardens. It is not clear which piers are referred to. The Council has no plans to require the height of the piers to be reduced since they form part of the character of the CA	No change No change.
3	Giulia Tulley, Tina & Colin Harris. <u>Comment:</u> Pedestrian accessway between nos. 16 & 20 is poorly maintained by the Council.	The Council considers that the accessway is not poorly maintained.	No change.
4	Giulia Tulley, Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> There are no garages on the lower ground floors,	Valid comment.	The words 'in a couple of houses the lower ground floor has been converted to a garage' have been omitted from page 10

5	Giulia Tulley, High Morgan <u>Comment</u> There is no non-residential use of any property,	Valid comment.	The words 'and some of the houses and/or flats have been converted to non-residential use' have been omitted from page 11.
6	Giulia Tulley, Hugh Morgan <u>Comment</u> No. 27 contains 3 flats not no. 25 as stated.	Valid comment.	The reference to 3 flats has been removed from house No. 25 and added to house No. 27.
7	Giulia Tulley, High Morgan <u>Comment</u> There is no garage at No. 12.	Valid comment.	The reference to a garage on page 12 has been removed from description of No. 12 Pelham Road
8	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Questions the usefulness of the proposed character assessment (CA) as Design Guide (DG) is, in parts, more detailed (with only a minor exception re 153/155 Merton Road),	A character assessment is a survey of the character of a CA, to assist the Council in deciding the appropriateness of planning applications, and the Council is producing them in response to requirements of central government.	No change.
9	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Character Assessment does not make clear its relation to the Design Guide,	It is not part of the function of a Character Assessment to explain its difference to a design guide.	No change.
10	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Cover is inappropriate because it highlights a satellite receiving dish and fly tipping. Photo of well proportioned houses would be preferable.	A revised cover is to be used.	Final cover design will be consisted with standard layout of all documents.

11	High Morgan <u>Comment:</u> With reference to CAAC Meeting 04.01.96 assumed that the eastern end of the northern pavement had been included within the boundary,	CAAC Meeting of 04.01.96 and subsequent decision to be investigated	No change
12	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Brickwork should be referred to as light coloured, not white	Valid comment.	Reference to 'white brickwork' on pages 10 and 13 changed to 'light coloured brickwork'
13	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Original coach houses in Merton Road are described as "extensions"	Valid comment.	Reference to 'extensions' to Nos. 153 and 155 on page 14 changed to 'original two storey gabled coach houses'
14	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Ground floor bay windows were not 'reinstated'; the developer removed them and then had to replace them as original.	Council considers that 'reinstatement' is an appropriate description of the process of removing windows and then replacing them as original.	No change.
15	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Separate descriptions of properties in Pelham and Merton Road undermines the consistency of the architecture because of their consistency,	The purpose of the Assessment is to consider the whole CA, not just the houses, and the two roads in which the houses are situated are different in character.	No change.
16	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> CA prematurely lists the proposal of garages being built at no. 2 Pelham Road,	Valid comment	Reference to proposed garages omitted from pages 11 and 14, and description and history of earlier applications inserted.

17	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> No. 39 Pelham Road was not converted into 3 flats	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Respondent informed of revision.	Reference to conversion of No. 39 to 3 flats, on page 11, removed.
18	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Bay window to No. 39 reinstated with the help of a grant from the Council	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Respondent informed of addition.	Words 'In 1988 a grant was provided for the reinstatement of the bay window to No. 39' added. page 11.
19	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> There is not a shortage of road parking and garages.	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Respondent informed of change.	Reference to shortage of parking spaces omitted from section on Front Gardens, page 10.
20	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Supports the prevention of removing brick piers.	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Comment noted. The Council has no plans to removed the brick piers.	No change.
21	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> One of the brick piers to No. 37 removed.	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Comment noted.	No change.
22	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Assessment does not mention that in 1988 grants were awarded for property maintenance.	Responded by letter to respondent's comments. Responded informed of addition.	Words ' For a limited period in 1088 small grants were provided for the area's enhancement' added, page 4.
23	Hugh Morgan <u>Comment:</u> Assessment does not mention that a permanent mould was to reinstate stucco window head features.	Responded by letter to respondent's comments Respondent informed of addition.	Words 'including the creation of a mould as the basis for the reinstatement of stucco mouldings' added, page 4

24	<p>Bob Jenkins</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> “Conservation Areas” are 30 years too late</p> <p>The ability of Council staff to determine residents’ building rights amounts to corruption.</p>	<p>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</p>	No change.
----	---	---	------------

ANNEX 1: Newspaper advertisement

ANNEX 2: Map showing properties consulted



