



Supplementary Planning Document
London Borough of Merton



Lambton Road Statement of Community Involvement



©10/2005

Lambton Rd 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 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.

Lambton Road Conservation Area
Summary Table of Responses and Proposed Amendments

No.	<i>Respondent & Comments</i>	Council Comments	<i>Proposed Amendments</i>
1	<p>Cllr. Philip Jones</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Nos. 51-53 Lambton Rd are inaccurately described (semi detached). No. 63 Lambton Rd may have redevelopment potential which may justify the need for continued CA protection of properties on that side of the road.</p>	<p>It is correct that nos. 51 and 53 are not semi-detached. There is a gap of approx 5 cm between them. The description given in the Boundary Assessment Report should be amended accordingly. No. 63 may in fact have possible development potential. It has a wider plot, with garages to one side. However it is not the function of CAs to block development, rather it is to protect areas of special character/appearance. It would be wrong therefore to delineate the boundaries of the CA on the basis of a desire to prevent development of no. 63.</p>	<p>Amend the Boundary Assessment Report to indicate that nos. 51 and 53 are in fact not semi detached houses.</p>
2	<p>Mrs J. I. Fletcher</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Local commemorative plaque will disappear when work starts on development of adjacent garage site. This is more of an observation than a critical comment.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

3	<p>Mrs J. I. Fletcher</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Detailed information supplied on the history of the area.</p>	<p>Research carried out by the respondent in 2002, covers information on the original builder who was responsible for the CA, and the origin of street names can be added to the History of Development section of the appraisal.</p>	<p>In the Section on History of Development, refer to WS Sims who was responsible for laying out Lambton, Pepys and Cambridge Roads on the sale of the Cottenham Estate. Also refer to the builder of the houses, William Louis Peters, who came from Cornwall, and the fact that he named the 5 internal roads within the CA after 5 small villages in and around Truro and St Mawes in Cornwall. Refer to the date of the Methodist Church Hall building as 1928.</p>
---	--	---	---

4	<p>Dr Louisa Kreeger Mrs. C. de Vere Hanna Koscia Mrs. M. Mason Susan McCrossan Mrs. C Moulden Miss J. Taylor Ms. M Slemp E. Richardson Miss E. Edgeler Mr & Mrs Ballingal Jenny Heffron Mrs. S. M. Wright Mr N Walden</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Against the exclusion of nos. 3-69 Lambton Rd from CA. (Why not include all the houses in the specified roads within the CA. – E Richardson).</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> 1. Inclusion within CA is a selling point/possibly adds financial value.</p> <p>2. Poor architectural judgements in past justify preservation.</p> <p>3. The oldest houses in the road would be excluded.</p> <p>4. No protection for trees in front gardens of excluded properties.</p> <p>5. Questions why some properties must be excluded to allow inclusion for others.</p> <p>6. Lambton Rd gives its name to the CA, and so properties in the road should not be taken out of the CA.</p> <p>7. No. 47 Lambton Rd has been used as an illustration on one of the Council booklets on CAs, it is therefore illogical to exclude it from a CA.</p>	<p>Several of the reasons given in support of the comment do not provide valid criteria for the inclusion of properties within a CA. These non-valid reasons are numbered (see numbered reasons given in the column to the left) 1. 2. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.</p> <p>In relation to these comments above, the following additional responses can be given: 2. If there have been poor architectural judgements, then this is more likely to point to the area not being in a CA. 5. It is not a question of needing to exclude properties in order to allow others to be included within the CA. The two decisions are independent of one another. 6. The name of the CA is more a matter of convenient identification, rather than a defining factor. 7. It is perhaps unfortunate that this property has been selected for the leaflet on advice to residents living in a CA, but it can not be allowed as a defining factor to determine the boundaries of a CA. 8. It is questioned whether the sites referred to in the comment are in fact within the CA. 9. There is no connection between the recommended exclusion of these houses and any plans for parking (real or otherwise). 10. The fact that the original designation of this part of the CA took place in two stages is not material in respect of assessment of the quality of the area today, however some factual amendment of the document in respect of designation history is required.</p> <p>With regard to the other reasons, the following</p>	<p>Amend the Designation History (section 3) as follows:</p> <p>Delete first part of 2nd sentence "There have been no since this first designation, except for", and replace it with "The Area was subsequently extended to include nos. 3 to 15 (odds) Lambton Rd, in 1992. The only other boundary alterations consist of"</p> <p>In respect of the proposed boundary change to the CA, no change from the recommendation made in the appraisal.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to making Tree Preservation Orders on the most important trees within front gardens, on the western side of Lambton Rd.</p>
---	---	--	--

	<p>8. Some buildings/sites which are to remain within the CA have questionable architectural merit.</p> <p>9. Question whether the removal of properties from the CA has anything to do with possible plans for street parking in the road.</p> <p>10. Nos 3 – 15 Lambton Rd were previously the subject of an extension to the CA (1992).</p> <p>11. The proposed boundary alteration would leave one side of the road within, and one side outside, the CA.</p> <p>12. What has changed since the original decision to include these houses in the CA ?</p> <p>13. Concern about possibility of changes, or demolition, occurring if the houses are removed from the CA.</p> <p>14. The houses affected are handsome, interesting late 19th century, and much loved, more so than the houses which would remain within the CA.</p>	<p>responses can be made:</p> <p>3. The houses in question appear to date from around 1880 to around 1900. Age of buildings can be a relevant factor, but is by no means the overriding factor, especially as these houses are not of such an age as to warrant age as assuming overwhelming importance.</p> <p>4. Protection can be afforded to most trees outside a CA, by means of a Tree Preservation Order.</p> <p>11. It is accepted that leaving one side of the road only within the CA is not ideal. However other factors (see below) lead to a different conclusion, and these other factors are felt to outweigh the concern.</p> <p>12. Small scale and adverse changes to properties do appear to have occurred since designation (see also below). Furthermore the original designation took place without the benefit of a full character appraisal.</p> <p>PPG15 indicates that CAs should be seen to justify their status, and that the concept is not devalued by the designation of areas lacking any special interest. Cancellation of designation should be considered where an area is no longer felt to possess special interest. The case for the exclusion of the properties from the CA is based on an appraisal of the qualities that are considered to make the area special. These qualities are defined in section 1 of the appraisal. The defining quality for all the residential parts of the CA is the way in which the houses use common detailing features, and the way in which long terraces or long runs of houses follow</p> <p>(contd. above column to right)</p>	<p>(contd. from below, column immediately on the left)</p> <p>the same architectural designs. With the exceptions of the Listed Church and 143 Pepys Rd, none of the buildings is of exceptional architectural or historical value in its own right. It is very much a CA of “group value”. The houses on the west side of Lambton Rd have no more architectural value than those to the east. In some cases they have distinctly less. Furthermore their age is not significantly greater than those to the east. The critical distinction is that the houses to the west lack that same sense of architectural unity, and lack the common usage of design details. It is true that amongst these houses there are some smaller groups of buildings each of which shares a common design, but the extent to which the area as a whole may be said to have a group value is far less than is the case with area to the east. Generally the area to the west may be said to have a rather disparate architectural character. It is also true to say that such common design details and features as do exist within this area are not shared with the houses to the east of the road. In addition to the main reason given above, it is noted that the buildings have been subject to quite substantial adverse alterations, including most notably some cladding of the brickwork which is very harmful to the overall architectural character, as well as some window and door alterations. The plan attached (DLU/2175) details these</p>
--	---	---	---

			alterations. This is not to say that some houses to the east of Lambton Rd have not also suffered in the same way, but here the differences appear less obvious.
5	<p>C Avid</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Council have failed to remind residents of or enforce building alteration guidelines.</p> <p>Did not receive leaflet referred to in letter.</p>	The comment is not directly related to the content of the Assessment. However the Assessment does recommend tightening up certain planning requirements, in the interest of giving more effective protection to the character of the area.	No change.
6	<p>Mrs. C de Vere S R Whiting</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Concerned about commuter parking/ traffic speed/ safety/ ineffectiveness of road humps.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Is putting children's safety at risk.</p>	These issues are matters which only have an indirect relationship to the Character Assessment. Any parking or traffic calming schemes should be designed with regard to potential impact on the character and appearance of the area.	No change.
7	<p>SR Whiting</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> There should be a restriction on the numbers of blocks of flats built in Raynes Park area.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Character of the area, and traffic generation.</p>	The Conservation Area does not extend to the whole of Raynes Park, nor would it be justifiable to extend it so that it did so. The characteristics of the CA make it rather unlikely that new blocks of flats would be built within it, given that most of the area is already quite intensively built up.	No change.

8	<p>G Walker K. Smyth Janet Fletcher Edwina Richardson</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Supports inclusion of shops/flats in Worple Road within the CA.</p> <p>In support of proposals.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> Properties were built and owned by William L. Peters whose buildings are included in the CA.</p> <p>Will ensure the character remains unchanged.</p>	Support noted.	No change.
9	<p>Susan McCrossan Edwina Richardson K Smyth</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Supports the proposed inclusion of the Pepys Road properties in the CA.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Will prevent front garden parking.</p> <p>Will ensure that the character remains unchanged.</p> <p>Designation will encourage more owners to maintain character of homes.</p> <p>Article 4 will provide some leverage for maintenance.</p> <p>Non-designation sends out the wrong signal about the area.</p>	Support noted. Protection in relation to front garden parking would only be achieved if an Article 4 Direction were to be approved, (as proposed in the Assessment).	No change.

10	<p>Susan McCrossan CM Avid SR Whiting</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> There should be control of front garden car parking. (S McCrossen specifically mentions this in respect of Pepys Rd). Traditional front gardens are disappearing to provide parking.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Protection in relation to front garden parking would only be achieved if an Article 4 Direction were to be approved, (as proposed in the Assessment). The front gardens in the interior streets within the CA are too small to accommodate a car, so this does not present the same problem here.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
11	<p>Susan McCrossan</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> There needs to be strong control of alterations to front windows, doors, porches, design and materials. There should have been stricter control of rear dormer windows than has happened in the past. Should control be extended to alterations of rear windows ?</p>	<p>Support in respect of the proposals for Article 4 Direction powers generally is noted. The Assessment needs to be clearer in its intent to seek Article 4 Directions in respect of front doors, front windows and porches, in all streets in the CA. However in CAs, dormers (front or rear) should in any event require the submission of a planning application, and do not therefore need to be made the subject of an Article 4 Direction.</p>	<p>In the section on “opportunities and recommended action”, delete reference to the need for an Article 4 Direction in respect of roof extensions.</p> <p>In the same section, make it clear that the proposed Article 4 Direction relating to front doors, front windows and porches would need to extend to all streets in the CA.</p>
12	<p>LG Packer</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Support for the suggested inclusion of properties in Pepys Rd, and for the suggested Article 4 Direction proposals.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

13	<p>LG Packer</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> The terrace at 23-75 Pepys Rd should also be included within the CA.</p> <p><u>Reasons:</u> The adverse alterations made to these houses were mostly made a long time ago. Some have been reversed recently.</p> <p>Designation would encourage owners to more sympathetic restoration. Not designating sends a negative signal to owners.</p> <p>Designation and Article 4, would help to resolve problems of front garden parking.</p>	<p>PPG15 indicates that CAs should be seen to justify their status, and that the concept is not devalued by the designation of areas lacking any special interest. The properties in question constitute a not unattractive terrace of late Victorian houses. They are constructed of yellow stock brick with (originally) slate roofs. Detailing uses red brick and stone, the latter being on the sills, capitals and keystones of window and door arches. While the terrace as a unit has strong architectural cohesion, its character is different from that of the houses within the CA. The terrace seems likely to have been built by a different builder, and does not accord with the overall group value which is evident within the CA boundary (as proposed). Unfortunately at the lower end the terrace has been subject to some particularly damaging alterations, notably cladding, rendering and pebble-dashing over the brickwork. This affects 4 houses. Many of the other houses have had car parking inserted into the front gardens. A few windows have also been altered, and in several cases the roofs have been re-covered using inappropriate tiles. In relation to the reasons given in the representation, for adding these properties to the CA, it would not be appropriate to designate an area on the basis of possible potential restoration work that might be carried out. The fact that the alterations may have been carried out some time ago again cannot be a basis for ignoring their adverse impact.</p>	No change.
----	--	--	------------

14	<p>Susan McCrossan L G Packer</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Supports tree planting in Lambton Road.</p> <p><u>Reason:</u> Will enhance the aesthetic effect of road.</p>	Support noted.	No change.
15	<p>Mr. & Mrs. J. Lea</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Would like to know reason for proposed changes (the exclusion of 3-69 Lambton Rd) as conditions of original directive haven't changed.</p>	See comments set out in relation to 4 above.	No change.
16	<p>Miss K. Whitehorn</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Would like clarification of "minor alterations".</p>	<p>The minor alterations referred to relate to small scale permitted development works which it is recommended should be brought within the scope of planning control by means of an Article 4 Direction. These are specified in the section on "Opportunities and Recommended Action" – section 23 of the Assessment.</p>	No change.
17	<p>E. Richardson</p> <p><u>Comments:</u> Raynes Park shopping area needs to be improved as does parking provision.</p>	Only two small terraces within the proposed CA boundaries, include shopping and town centre uses. The revitalisation of the town centre, and the provision of associated parking facilities are outside the scope of this Assessment.	No change.
18	<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>	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.

ANNEX 1: Newspaper advertisement

**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 2: Map showing properties consulted



LONDON BOROUGH OF MERTON
Environment and Regeneration
Civic Centre, London Road, Morden, Surrey, SM4 5DX.
Telephone 020 8543 2222 Web www.merton.gov.uk

Lambton Road Conservation Area
Letter Distribution Area
Plan No DLU/2165

Scale: 1/2500

Date: 1/8/2005



Reproduced from the 2005 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. Wimbledon Society
2. Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents Assn
3. Lambton Rd Conservation Area CADAP* Representative

(* CADAP is Conservation and Design Advisory Panel)

ANNEX 4: List of Councillors Consulted

Councillors representing Raynes Park Ward

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, উল্লার 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系。
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 ਕ੍ਰਿਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ 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 پتہ پر رابطہ قائم کریں جو کہ نیچے کے بکس میں درج ہے۔