

Wimbledon North Character Appraisal Consultation

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
A.D.Jenkins	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Opportunities	13.21	We support these proposals	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
A.D.Jenkins	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Positive and Negative Features	13.20.4	Infilling of sites by demolition and new build is detrimental to matters specified	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
A.D.Jenkins,	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Buildings within the Sub Area	13.2.2	Support proposed inclusion of identified properties within conservation area	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
A.D.Jenkins,	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Historic Development	13.10.27	No.104 Arthur Road is also 1970s infill	Partially Agree	Para 13.10.27 is not intended to be exhaustive of all buildings built in 1970s. Fig. 13.2 indicates the age of individual buildings.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park			Three commissioned reports on Wimbledon Park - what is the status of the report (sic).		LBM to respond to LBW direct to clarify status, following consultation with Leisure.	None
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park			Wandsworth Borough Council boundary and Wimbledon North conservation area covering the north portion of Wimbledon Park is not sufficiently referenced or explained.	Agree	Oversight	Add Borough boundary and outline of the LBW Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area to Figures 2.0, 12.1, 12.1A and 12.2. Para. 1.1.1, 2nd sentence: Add 'the LBM'. Para. 12.1.1 2nd sentence: Add 'to the north by the boundary with the LBW'. Paras. 1.1.1 and 12.1.1: Add final sentence 'The LBW is preparing a character assessment for the Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area, within its area.' Add LBW Character Appraisal document to 'References'.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review	12.1.1	The boundaries to the east, south and west are defined but not the Wandsworth boundary/conservation area.	Agree	Oversight	Add Borough boundary and outline of the part of the LBW Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area to Figures 2.0, 12.1, 12.1A and 12.2. Para. 1.1.1, 2nd sentence: Add 'the LBM'. Para. 12.1.1 2nd sentence: Add 'to the north by the boundary with the LBW'. Paras. 1.1.1 and 12.1.1: Add final sentence 'The LBW is preparing a character assessment for the Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area, within its area.' Add LBW Character Appraisal document to 'References'.
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park	Opportunities		Not clear if the opportunities identified apply to the Park as a whole or the area of the park within Merton.	Agree	Oversight	Para. 1.1.1, 2nd sentence: Add 'the LBM'. Paras. 1.1.1 and 12.1.1: Add final sentence 'The LBW is preparing a character assessment for the Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area within its area.' Add LBW Character Appraisal document to 'References'.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park	Opportunities		Support promotion of the historical importance of Wimbledon Park and the Elizabethan Manor House and its gardens.	Agree	The comment is in support of opportunities identified in the Appraisal	None
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park	Opportunities	12.22.1	Could any of the three reports prepared on Wimbledon Park provide the basis for the Design Guide proposed.	Disagree	The Design Guide will be a guide to appropriate residential alterations, extensions and redevelopments. The Management Plan, to be prepared in due course, will include the Park area and will utilise and reference these relevant documents.	None
Borough Planner, Wandsworth Council	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.18.5	Agree comments regarding ugly and incongruous concrete panel fences adjacent to Wimbledon Park Road. This is not mentioned in the opportunities, is there any proposal to encourage replacement.	Partially Agree	The 'Opportunities' put forward in paras. 12.22.6 and 12.22.8 are intended to encompass the enhancement of identified negatives, including the Park fences. It is considered unnecessary to refer to each negative element specifically. Specific proposals will be identified in the Management Plan in due course.	None
Ceinwen Probert	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Additional Planning Controls Needed	13.22.1	Support for Article 4(2) Directions to apply to the area	Agree	Comment is in support of the Additional Planning Controls suggested within the Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Ceinwen Probert	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1	Would be happy to see the rest of the surrounding area (where not currently covered) included	Disagree	The comment offers no justification to warrant further consideraion	None
Ceinwen Probert	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1	Support the extension of the conservation area as proposed	Agree	Comment is in support of the Appraisal	None
David Hedges	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review		Revised conservation boundary should include "the bottom part of Home Park Road from the Park entrance to where it meets Arthur Road"	Partially Agree	The houses and their gardens within Home Park Road that are opposite the Park are included, primarily for the way that they form part of the historic, wooded backdrop to the Park. Following the receipt of several representations it is agreed that this also applies to the buildings and their gardens on the south side of the road here. However, on the north side of this part of the road, the built form has a different character and appearance to that now identified for the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.	Include Nos. 35 to 45 Home Park Road in proposed extension to Conservation Area. Amend text and maps accordingly.
David Hedges	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Only half of Camelot Close is shown as being added to the conservation area. Whilst not historically interesting the remainder of Camelot Close does add to the character of the area and should be included.	Disagree	Nos. 1,3,5,7 and 11 Camelot Close are included because they adjoin the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The Close has no other special architectural or historic interest to warrant inclusion of the remaining properties.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
David Hedges	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Only half of Squires Court is shown as being added to the conservation area. Whilst not historically interesting the remainder of Squires Court does add to the character of the area and should be included.	Disagree	There is no change to this part of the existing C.A. boundary, apart from a small amendment to include the whole of the rear garden of Nos. 72/74 Arthur Rd. Part of the entrance to Squires Court is within the C.A. as it adjoins the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The remainder is a modern backland development with no special architectural or historic interest to make it worthy of C.A. status.	None
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Building Descriptions	12.13.11	Sailing Club building is hideous. Should be replaced by a lower more suitable structure that does not obstruct Capability Brown's view across lake.	Partially Agree	The Appraisal recognises that the Sailing Club building is harmful to the historic character and appearance of the Park. It is identified as a negative element (paras 12.13.11, 12.21.1, 12.21.2). 'Opportunities' put forward in paras 12.22.6 and 12.22.8 seek the restoration of historic views and the removal of unsightly buildings within the Park. In due course, the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the issue.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Highway Boundary Treatments	12.18.1	Para. Refers to original boundary wall of reinforced concrete moulded to imitate stone work. Leaning and painted in parts	Agree	Accept information given	Amend 2nd sentence to read: 'Many of these are original walls, about 1 metre high and of concrete, moulded to imitate stone work and sometimes painted. Others are of brick'
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Highway Boundary Treatments	12.18.5	When original(?) walls damaged they should be replaced with matching panels.	Partially Agree	Proposed Design Guide will deal with issue	None
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.3	House at No.87 Home Park Road is grossly out of keeping with the street scene. Planning regulations should be strengthened to prevent this type of construction.	Partially Agree	The consultation exercise has revealed that the building has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours. Planning regulations are beyond the scope of the study. The Design Guide and Conservation Area Management Plan, to be produced in due course, will provide opportunity to address issue.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours. Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No.87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Views	12.15.3	Scrubby bushes round edge of lake obstruct views and should be removed	Agree	The Appraisal recognises that insensitive tree planting on golf course obstructs views, and identifies this as a negative element (paras. 12.21.1, 12.21.2, 12.21.4). 'Opportunities' put forward in para 12.22.6 seeks the restoration of historic views. In due course, the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the issue.	After "tree" and before "planting" add 'and other' to all references to insensitive planting.
Douglas Gardiner	2: Wimbledon Park	Views	12.15.7	Ugly concrete platform built in lake spoils appearance and should be removed.	Partially Agree	'Opportunities' put forward in paras. 12.22.6 and 12.22.8 seek the enhancement of the landscape setting around the lake and the removal of unsightly buildings and structures within the Park as appropriate. In due course, the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the issue.	None
Dr. Elizabeth Nelson	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review	12.11.32	Support extension of Conservation Area	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Dr. Elizabeth Nelson	2: Wimbledon Park	Historic Development	12.11.31	Welcome modern family house at No.87, but consider further developments of multiple units (eg. Nos. 125 and 122) and use of garden land (No. 127) should be resisted.	Partially Agree	The consultation exercise has revealed that No.87 has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal now recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours. Para. 12.11.31 refers to development pressures in Home Park Road. Negative Features section identifies pressure to diminish spaces between and around buildings and the historic wooded backdrop to Park through redevelopment (paras. 12.21.1 - 12.21.5). The Design Guide and Conservation Area Management Plan, to be produced in due course, will provide opportunity to address issues.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours. Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No.87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'
Dr. Elizabeth Nelson	2: Wimbledon Park	Tree Preservation Orders		The trees at the rear of Home Park Road houses should be the subject of a Tree Preservation Order.	Partially Agree	Some trees here are worthy of protection but this will be afforded by proposed Conservation Area status. An opportunity to address the issue further will be provided through the preparation of a Management Plan in due course.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Francis and Geraldine Plowden				Can Article 4 Directions also apply to highway works particularly road coverings and signage. If not is there some other method of controlling inappropriate interventions of this kind.	Partially Agree	Article 4(2) Directions cannot apply to highway works. The Council has produced a 'Merton Street Design' guide which attempts to improve the design quality of street works. The proposed Design Guide and Conservation Area Management Plan will also provide opportunities to address the issue.	Add 'Merton Street Design' guide to References
Francis and Geraldine Plowden				Would urge Council to proceed with preparation of a design guide as soon as possible.	Agree	It is intended that a Design Guide will be produced as soon as possible.	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden				Support enlargement of the conservation area and introduction of Article 4(2) Directions.	Agree	Comment is in support of the Appraisal	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden				Found documents to be a thorough and interesting description of the state of the environment in the CA and its history.	Agree	Comment is in support of the Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Francis and Geraldine Plowden				Council now has enough experience through preparation of character assessments to produce some generic guidance based on some common principles for design of conservation areas.	Partially Agree	As Conservation Areas each have their own special historic or architectural interest it is considered appropriate that each has a specific Design Guide. Generic policies and guidance are, however, contained within the Adopted UDP and the emerging LDF and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's). An Historic Environment SPD is being produced.	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	1: Historic Core	Additional Planning Controls Needed	11.22.1-8	Endorse proposals for Article 4(2) Directions	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	1: Historic Core	Extent and Boundary Review	11.1.2	Support enlargement of conservation area	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal.	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	2: Wimbledon Park	Additional Planning Controls Needed	12.23	Agree proposed Article 4(2) Directions for residential properties.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review	12.1.1	Endorse proposals to enlarge conservation area as proposed.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Additional Planning Controls Needed	13.22	Agree with proposals for an Article 4(2) Direction for residential properties in the conservation area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Francis and Geraldine Plowden	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1	Agree with proposals to enlarge conservation area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Hans Swahn	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Additional Planning Controls	13.22.1	Support for Article 4(2) Direction to apply to the area	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Hans Swahn	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1	Strong support for suggested changes to boundary	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
J Wilson	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1	Agree with extensions to Conservation Area to the south and the north, but not to that including Lambourne Avenue as this road comprises new houses.	Partially Agree	Comment is partly in support of Appraisal. Lambourne Avenue included primarily because the buildings and their treed gardens form part of the historic, wooded backdrop to Wimbledon Park, and the road facilitates a long view over the Park from within Arthur Road.	None
K Choudhury	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Building Descriptions	13.12.10	Disagrees with proposal to include No 82 Arthur Road in the local list as it shows appalling lack of respect for the adjacent buildings which it denigrates with its excessive height and proximity and slab sides. The awards mentioned refer to ingenious internal features and construction methods - not its design which is a blight.	Disagree	For the reasons given in para. 13.12.10 of the Appraisal	None
K Choudhury	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1	Support the changes to the boundary	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
K Choudhury	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Positive and Negative Features	13.20	What will re-assessment of the conservation area do to strengthen obligations on land owners to do something about the denigration of character identified. Will Ricards Lodge School have a new obligation to manage its scruffy boundaries.	Partially Agree	Assessment will inform the preparation of a Design Guide to appropriate development, and, in due course, a Conservation Area Management Plan, which will provide an opportunity to address the issues raised. The 'Opportunities' put forward include that the Council will seek enhancement of some boundary treatments to school grounds (13.21.5). The purpose of the Character Assessment is given in the Introduction paras. 1.1.1 - 1.1.3.	None
K Choudhury	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Statutory Listed Buildings	13.5.2	Suggest the Coach House and Cottage at 55A and 55B Leopold Road be included for Statutory Listing, as they are of very significant local historical interest, the last remaining stabling areas from the former manor house, with unique facades and courtyard.	Partially Agree	These buildings are identified as making a positive contribution in para. 13.20.1 and on Fig 13.1. On the information given, they will now be considered for the Local List in the first instance.	Amend paras. 13.20.1, 13.21.10 and Fig.13.1 to indicate that 55A and 55B Leopold Road will be investigated for possible inclusion on the Local List
Margaret Rubens				Document very good	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Margaret Rubens	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.6	Support the proposed extension of C.A. to include Currie Hill Close	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Marion Blech		Additional Planning Controls Needed		Support making of Article 4(2) Directions. Extensions pointless otherwise.	Agree	Comment supports Appraisal findings	None
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Building Descriptions	12.13.16	To describe buildings as having sense of harmony and cohesive characteristics does not stand up to scrutiny.	Disagree	Comment is unjustified. As stated in 12.13.16, it is the repetition of strong design elements in differing house types within the road, and a flow of horizontal features, which create a sense of harmony.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review		Object to proposed extensions to Conservation area, specifically properties along Home Park Road facing SE edge of Park, on grounds of: emotive aspects of history cloud objectivity of document; fundamental flaws in justification, misguided and inappropriate. Buildings do not constitute a distinct or special architectural group, they are unremarkable, with few exceptions architectural quality is fair to mediocre; were previously excluded from Conservation Area, their inclusion would unreasonably restrict future development; historical landscape remnant does not justify designation.	Disagree	The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest as conservation areas. (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Appraisal demonstrates the strong historic interest of the area while also describing the positive characteristics of the buildings that frame the historic landscape. This is the only representation received objecting to the proposed Home Park Road extension. 7 representations support this element of the proposed extensions.	Critically review buildings in Home Park Road identified in Appraisal as making a positive contribution to C.A.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review	12.1.2	Disagree with assessment. Historical landscape remnant does not justify conservation area designation. Unremarkable group of houses, many altered and extended.	Disagree	This is a very important remnant of a historic landscape, still evident today, as described in the Appraisal. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special historic interest as conservation areas. (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.	None
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Other Unitary Development Plan Designations	12.9.8	Support UDP Policy NE8 re 'Green Corridors' and the designation of upper slopes of rear gardens in Home Park Road, but much of land behind Home Park Road houses is lawn. The irregularity of tree cover should be noted and acknowledged.	Partially Agree	Policy NE8 is included in the Adopted UDP. It is referred to in the Appraisal for ease of reference only.	None
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.3	Object to subjective and unjustified criticism of No.87 Home Park Road	Partially Agree	The consultation exercise has revealed that the building has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal now recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours. Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No.87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.4	Support streetscape and boundary improvements, particularly reference to some boundary treatments and harsh landscaping	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal. Proposed Management Plan will provide opportunity to address issues.	None
Matthew Hillier	2: Wimbledon Park	Views	12.15.3	Support streetscape and boundary improvements, particularly removal and remodelling of concrete boundary fencing to Park along Home Park Road	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal. Proposed Management Plan will provide opportunity to address issue.	None
Merton Historical Society		Additional Planning Controls Needed	14.22.1	Support introduction of Article 4(2) Directions to restrict alterations to dwellings	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Merton Historical Society	1: Historic Core	Adjacent Areas of Quality	11.24.1	Support that additional areas should be investigated for Conservation Area or Area of Distinctive Quality status	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Merton Historical Society	1: Historic Core	Opportunities	11.21.3	Both statutory and locally listed buildings should be protected and have their settings sensitively enhanced wherever necessary, eg. St Mary's Churchyard	Agree	Statutory and Locally Listed buildings are protected by other means, ie. legislation, Government advice and Council Policies. The comment is supportive of the opportunity identified by the Appraisal to enhance St Mar'ys Churchyard	None
Merton Historical Society	1: Historic Core	Opportunities	11.21.7	Support the inclusion of modern buildings of architectural merit within the local list, eg. The Garden Hall at St. Mary's Church	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Michael Allen, WNCA-CADAP				Welcomes drafts of the Introduction and Part 1 and sub areas 1, 2 and 3 appraisals. Regrets delays in producing drafts for sub areas 4, 5 and 6.	Agree		None
Michael Allen, WNCA-CADAP	1: Historic Core	Extent and Boundary Review	11.1.2	Query use of word "transgressed" which usually means "sinned".	Agree		Replace 'transgressed' with 'crossed'.
Michael Allen, WNCA-CADAP	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.3	Although he fully concurs with the assessment of negatives, he feels the text in relation to 87 Home Park Road is unfair. From the photo it looks like an interesting essay in the Modernist style which flourished in the 1930s.	Partially Agree	The consultation exercise has revealed that the building has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal now recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours. Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No.87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'
Michael Allen, WNCA-CADAP	Introduction and Part 1	Conservation Area in Context	3.10	Surely Lord Spencer sold the "Lordship" some years ago - or so it was widely reported at the time.	Disagree	No factual information is presented in the comment. If evidence is found then the Appraisal can be revised at a future review.	None
Michael Allen, WNCA-CADAP	Introduction and Part 1	Summary of Character	9.1	Is there evidence that this was "one of London's oldest hilltop villages". NB Para 11.7.1 does not quote any.	Partially Agree	Highgate, Hampstead and Harrow are other examples, but they are not relevant to this Appraisal.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Mirjana Johnson, Wimbledon House Residents Association	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review	12.1.1	The bottom of Home Park Road has been left out of the proposed extensions to C.A. Should be included for continuity. Special character/history etc does not stop and start within same road.	Disagree	The houses and their gardens within Home Park Road that are opposite the Park are included, primarily for the way that they form part of the historic, wooded backdrop to the Park. Following the receipt of several representations it is agreed that this also applies to the buildings and their gardens on the south side of the road here. However, on the north side of this part of the road, the built form has a different character and appearance to that now identified for the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.	Include Nos. 35 to 45 Home Park Road in proposed extension to Conservation Area. Amend text and maps accordingly.
Mirjana Johnson, Wimbledon House Residents Association	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1, 2, 3	Half of Camelot Close has been left out of the proposed extensions to C.A. Should be included for continuity. Special character/history etc does not stop and start within same road.	Disagree	Nos. 1,3,5,7 and 11 Camelot Close are included because they adjoin the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The Close has no other special architectural or historic interest to warrant inclusion of the remaining properties.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Mirjana Johnson, Wimbledon House Residents Association	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1, 2, 3	Half of Squires Court has been left out of the proposed extensions to C.A. Should be included for continuity. Special character/history etc does not stop and start within same road.	Disagree	There is no change to this part of the existing C.A. boundary, apart from a small amendment to include the whole of the rear garden of Nos. 72/74 Arthur Rd. Part of the entrance to Squires Court is within the C.A. as it adjoins the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The remainder is a modern backland development with no special architectural or historic interest to make it worthy of C.A. status.	None
Ms Chadder	1: Historic Core	Positive and Negative Features	11.20.6	Objects to critical reference to use of Church Field for car parking, with particular reference to Wimbledon Tennis Fortnight. Fortnight is an exciting, lively and good natured event that contributes to locality.	Partially Agree	Appraisal makes several references to positive contribution made by St Mary's Church and the open spaces around it. There are no proposals identified in Appraisal to prevent this occasional use of Church Field for car parking. However, the Council would wish to see this well managed. It is not the intention to dismiss the contribution that the tournament brings to the vitality of the area.	Para.11.20.6: Delete 'The impact of Wimbledon fortnight on the appearance of the area, including the use of Church Field as a car park, which is harmful to it's appearance.' Add: 'Concern that any temporary car parking on Church Field does not unduly harm the appearance of the locality'. Add to 11.21 Opportunities: 'The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address issues raised by Appraisal.'

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Ms Chadder	Introduction and Part 1	Introduction	1.1	Questions the purpose and status of the document	Disagree	Letter sent to respondent describing status and purpose of document. Introduction to document includes an explanation in paras. 1.0.1 to 1.1.3	None
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Inappropriate tree species and planting should be noted and considered for replacement	Partially Agree	Appraisal does refer to inappropriate tree planting in paras. 12.15.3 and 12.21.1, while 'Opportunities' 12.22.6 and 22.22.9 deal with issue generally by seeking enhancement and restoration of landscape setting and better management of ecological interest. Preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the issue.	None
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Would be useful to coordinate document with Glasspoole Thomson's 1998 lottery submission document for LBM re. the regeneration and conservation of Wimbledon Park.	Partially Agree	The Glasspoole Thomson's 1998 document was used in the preparation of the Appraisal, in order to ensure compatibility and consistency. It is listed in the 'References', and will be used to inform the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan in due course.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Character Assessment should include the northern part of the Park, within LBWandsworth, so Park considered as a whole.	Partially Agree	LBWandsworth in process of preparing appraisal for that part of the Park within their area.	Add Borough boundary and outline of the LBW Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area to Figures 2.0, 12.1, 12.1A and 12.2. Para. 1.1.1, 2nd sentence: Add 'the LBM'. Para. 12.1.1 2nd sentence: Add 'to the north by the boundary with the LBW'. Paras. 1.1.1 and 12.1.1: Add final sentence 'The LBW is preparing a character assessment for the Wimbledon North (Wimbledon Park) Conservation Area, within its area.' Add LBW Character Appraisal document to 'References'.
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Little info provided re. use, condition and character of historic lake, although it is single largest visible man made structure in area, and at heart of the valley. Silting, water levels, water quality, flow, pollution risks, outfall not described/acknowledged, nor condition of promenade etc.	Disagree	There are several references to use, Capability Brown's involvement, lake as focus of historic valley landscape etc. within Appraisal text and Fig. 12.3. The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the other issues raised.	Add specific reference to lake to para. 12.20.3 'Character and Appearance: A Summary'.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Should have covered the construction and retention of the lake by Capability Brown showing original lake size, and the fact that it is a registered reservoir.	Partially Agree	Capability Brown's involvement and fact that his landscape, including lake, is still evident today referred to in 12.11.9-11 & 12.20.3. 'Opportunities' para. 12.22.5 seeks the restoration of the historic shape of lake. The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide the opportunity to address the issue further.	Add wording "- Partial infilling of original lake to south" to 'Negatives' paras. 12.21.1 and 12.21.6. Add wording "It is a registered reservoir." after 1st sentence para. 12.12.2. Add original outline of lake to Fig. 12.3 'Character Analysis'.
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			Need to assess impact of all buildings that adjoin the lake, inc. pavilion, athletics stadium (presents future challenges) and facilities at the Wimbledon Club.	Disagree	Pavilion identified as positive and to be investigated for Local Listing (12.13.9, 12.22.12). Athletics Compound referred to in 12.13.10. Wimbledon Club and its cricket and tennis facilities referred to in 12.12.4 and 12.13.14. The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address the issue further.	None
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			No mention of the use of conifer hedging to stadium by bats	Disagree	Para. 12.9.6 re. Nature Conservation refers to the several species of bat attracted to the lake area. This is considered sufficient reference for a C.A. Character Appraisal.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			All key historic trees on ridges should be mapped and listed so that they retain special status, and a programme for renewal and replanting could be coordinated.	Partially Agree	The identification and protection of historic trees, and other trees of significant amenity value, is put forward as an 'Opportunity' in 12.22.4. The proposed extension to the Conservation Area to include the historic wooded backdrop will give protection to trees here. The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide the opportunity to address the issue further.	Add wording ", and consider a programme for their renewal and replanting as appropriate" to para.12.22.4.
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			No assessment or list of extensive Park uses is given.	Disagree	Paras. 12.12.2 - 12.12.5 list uses in detail and illustrate with photographs. Other references to the varied uses are made in paras. 12.2.1, 12.2.2, 12.3.2, 12.3.3, 12.11.22 and 12.11.25	None
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park			The assessment should cover access issues into Wimbledon Park.	Disagree	The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan, in due course, will provide an opportunity to address this issue.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Neil Thomson	2: Wimbledon Park	Views		Critical historic viewlines should be defined and protected.	Partially Agree	Section 12.15 'Views' describes historic views and illustrates them with photos. Views are indicated on Fig. 12.3 but graphic constraints originally prevented special identification of historic viewlines. The enhancement, restoration and preservation of historic views is sought in 'Opportunities' para. 12.22.6, and the issue will be addressed further when the Conservation Area Management Plan is prepared in due course.	Add critical historic viewlines to Fig. 12.3
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core			Commend careful analysis and attempt to identify the important part the historic building of St Mary's plays, together with the churchyard as an open space in the area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core			Would like to discuss maintenance issues for the Churchyard with the relevant Council Department.	Agree	Comment is welcome but more relevant to the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan, in due course. Will write to Parish of Wimbledon to offer meeting with the appropriate Council Officers/Departments.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core	Buildings within the Sub Area	11.20.1	Can see no justification for including Vicarage in the local list. Building is of modest construction and of no architectural merit.	Disagree	The local list includes buildings of both architectural and historic interest. The former Vicarage, now known as Steeple Court, dates from pre 1865. It is therefore of historic interest as well as being of bold, Victorian styling. As it would appear to meet the Council's criteria for local listing, consideration is warranted.	None
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core	Nature Conservation	11.20.4	Would welcome the opportunity to discuss the Churchyard nature conservation with an officer of the council.	Disagree	Comment is welcome but more relevant to the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan, in due course. Will write to Parish of Wimbledon to offer meeting with the appropriate Council Officers/Departments.	None
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core	Opportunities	11.21.3	Would invite Council to undertake an inspection of the Churchyard and will co-operate in any way. Would welcome Council intervention to deal with unsafe gravestones.	Partially Agree	Comment is welcome but more relevant to the preparation of the Conservation Area Management Plan, in due course. Will write to Parish of Wimbledon to offer meeting with the appropriate Council Officers/Departments.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Parish of Wimbledon	1: Historic Core	Positive and Negative Features	11.20.6	Extremely troubled that Council may seek an Order to prevent use of the Church Field for car parking.	Disagree	Appraisal makes several references to positive contribution made by St Mary's Church and the open spaces around it. There are no proposals identified in Appraisal to prevent this occasional use of Church Field for car parking. However, the Council would wish to see this well managed.	Para. 11.20.6: Delete 'The impact of Wimbledon fortnight on the appearance of the area, including the use of Church Field as a car park, which is harmful to it's appearance.' Add: 'Concern that any temporary car parking on Church Field does not unduly harm the appearance of the locality.' Add to 11.21 Opportunities: The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address issues raised by Appraisal.'
Philip Clarke	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.3	Architecture within lower end of Arthur Road, within proposed extension to conservation area, of no great note, some distinctly second rate, area not particularly well served by trees.	Partially Agree	Area is proposed to be included primarily for the historic, sinuous alignment of Arthur Road, as well as for the quality of most buildings, spaces between them and the mature planting. Several of the buildings within the proposed extension (Nos. 106, 108, 129, 131, 133 and 135) are on the local list.	None
Professor W Murgatroyd	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Building Descriptions	13.12.14	Description of Currie Hill Close incorrect	Partially Agree	Roofs are of concrete, not clay, tiles, and grey bricks and panelling are used.	Replace 'render' with 'grey brick' and 'clay' with 'concrete' in para. 13.12.14.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Professor W Murgatroyd	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.6	Reasons given for inclusion of Currie Hill Close in C.A. are invalid. Planning consents at Nos. 1,2 and 6 have/will alter Close from description given in Appraisal such that character completely destroyed. Council policy requiring special attention be given to areas adjacent to C.A. is sufficient.	Disagree	Although planning consents to redevelop bungalows with houses have been granted, it is contended that the spacious character and view from Arthur Road will be maintained, and that therefore inclusion remains appropriate.	None
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	1: Historic Core	Positive and Negative Features	11.20.6	Paragraph inappropriate as it seeks to specifically change an Established Occasional Use that has existed for well over 10 years. The use would need to be confirmed as established in the event of an application for a Certificate of Lawful Use.	Disagree	There are no proposals identified in Appraisal to prevent this occasional use of Church Field for car parking. However, the Council would wish to see this well managed. The latter comment is not relevant to the Appraisal - any application for a Certificate of Lawful Use would be dealt with on its merits.	Para. 11.20.6: Delete 'The impact of Wimbledon fortnight on the appearance of the area, including the use of Church Field as a car park, which is harmful to it's appearance.' Add: 'Concern that any temporary car parking on Church Field does not unduly harm the appearance of the locality.' Add to 11.21 Opportunities: The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address issues raised by Appraisal.'

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Additional Planning Controls Needed	13.22	Proposed Article 4 Direction inappropriate, heavy handed and an imposition on residents. It will not be readily understood and will therefore be breached by residents. The Conservation Area both as existing and as proposed does not warrant this approach.	Disagree	A significant majority of representations received are in support of Article 4 Direction. Proposed Article 4 Direction will be subject to statutory procedures which offer an opportunity to make further representations. The Appraisal has shown that additional planning controls are needed to prevent further erosion of the elements that contribute to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.	Add new paras. 11.22.9, 12.23.9 and 13.22.9 to read: 'The proposed Article 4(2) Directions will be subject to the procedures set out within the Town and Country Planning (General Procedures) Order 1995.
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Existing Pattern of Development	13.11.2	The added text is somewhat misleading and could be amended to be more accurate by reading "as well as many more buildings, mostly erected since the 1950s." With the exception of the proposed extension at the extreme northern end of the existing Conservation Area, all the areas that are proposed for the Conservation Area extension date from the latter half of the 20th Century.	Disagree	The text as drafted is considered to be satisfactory. Fig. 13.2 'Age of Buildings' clearly illustrates the issue.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Existing Pattern of Development	13.11.3	The assessment acknowledges that the houses in Camelot Close turn their backs onto Arthur Road, to the detriment of the road, and yet this area is proposed to be included in the Conservation Area. The area was rightly excluded in previous reviews and does not warrant inclusion now. Similarly the 7 dwellings to the south west of Camelot Close are undistinguished and fail to merit Conservation Area status.	Partially Agree	Nos. 1,3,5,7 and 11 Camelot Close, and the 7 dwellings to the south west are included because the entire length of Arthur Rd and all the buildings that front it are included, mainly due to the historic alignment, as well as the quality of most of the buildings and the spaces between them.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.1	The architectural quality of Currie Hill Close, Ricards Lodge High School and the former Park House Middle School do not warrant Conservation Area status and should be removed from the proposal. The historic significance and other reasons cited are not sufficient to provide a basis for inclusion. Previous reviews were correct in excluding them and there has been no significant changes in the intervening period. The concern for trees should be addressed through TPO's. Other issues already addressed by UDP policies.	Disagree	It is contended that these areas are worthy of C.A. status for the reasons given in the document. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance as conservation areas, and from time to time to review whether any further designations are needed.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.4	The historic wooded backdrop is not a reason for including this area within an extended Conservation Area. It is more appropriate to control the treed backdrop by using Group TPO's. This is endorsed since the quality of the buildings and other qualities of this area do not warrant the protection against demolition or the preservation that Conservation Areas are designed to afford. As there have been no significant changes since the last review excluded these gaps from the Conservation Area, they should remain excluded.	Disagree	Lambourne Ave. is included partly due to the fact that it forms part of the historic wooded backdrop, partly because the Arthur Road end adjoins the historic, sinuous alignment of that road, and partly as the road facilitates a long view over Wimbledon Park and beyond from Arthur Road. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance as conservation areas, and from time to time to review whether any further designations are needed.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.6	The reasons stated for the inclusion of Currie Hill Close within the extended Conservation Area are somewhat spurious and not sufficiently strong to outweigh the mediocre architecture of the Close. Earlier reviews were correct in excluding this area from Conservation Area status. The siting and height of the buildings are of very little significance.	Disagree	It is contended that the reasons given in the Appraisal are valid and that the inclusion of Currie Hill Close remains appropriate. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance as conservation areas, and from time to time to review whether any further designations are needed.	None
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Nature Conservation	13.8.1	The Nature Conservation issue is dealt with by a specific policy within the UDP and since this can be ported on to the LDF in due course it is not a valid reason for supporting the extension of the Conservation Area.	Partially Agree	The Nature Conservation reference is included for information purposes, rather than justification for C.A. status.	None
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Nature Conservation	13.8.8	The Green Corridor issue is embraced by a specific UDP policy that can be ported on to the LDF in due course. It is not a valid reason for extending the Conservation Area.	Partially Agree	The Green Corridor reference is included for information purposes, rather than justification for C.A. status.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Other Unitary Development Plan Designations	13.9.1	The Open Space issue is embraced by a specific UDP policy that can be ported on to the LDF in due course. It is not a valid reason for extending the Conservation Area.	Partially Agree	The Open Space reference is included for information purposes, rather than justification for C.A. status.	None
R.G. Pickett FRICS, Diocesan Surveyor, Diocese of Southwark	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Positive and Negative Features	13.20	The many negatives suggest that the proposed extensions of the Conservation Area have been conceived more as a means of Development Control than addressing that which is worthy of conservation. This endorses decisions made in correct earlier reviews not to include the areas now proposed for Conservation Area status.	Disagree	The negatives are far outweighed by all of the positives identified in the appraisal. The negatives have been identified in order to deter any re-occurrence, so that they may be addressed over time, and to inform the future design guide to appropriate development. C.A. designation also allows the opportunity for enhancements. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance as conservation areas, and from time to time to review whether any further designations are needed.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Richard Brookes				Recommends the preparation of a simplified more succinct document to help engage residents and interested parties to promote the merits of the conservation area.	Agree	Resources permitting, the Council would wish to amplify the published public consultation leaflets to provide a summary for each Sub Area. However, the Appraisal is in accord with advice given in the Government's Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment (PPG 15). A design guide for development and Conservation Area Management Plan will follow in due course.	None
Richard Brookes				Research, analysis and proposals contained within appraisal are excellent. Officers are congratulated.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Richard Brookes		Additional Planning Controls Needed		Not clear from appraisals as to whether or not an Article 4 Direction is to be declared and whether such a Direction would cover all properties in Sub areas 1, 2 and 3.	Partially Agree	Following this consultation exercise, the proposed Article 4 Directions will be subject to statutory procedures which offer an opportunity to make further representations. It is intended that the Article 4(2) Directions remove permitted development rights as described in the Appraisal from all residential properties within the three sub areas.	Add new paras. 11.22.9, 12.23.9 and 13.22.9 to read: 'The proposed Article 4(2) Directions will be subject to the procedures set out within the Town and Country Planning (General Procedures) Order 1995.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Richard Brookes		Opportunities	13.21.10	Supports proposed additions to local list, particularly 82 Arthur Road. Important to emphasise the important contribution that contemporary architecture can make to a conservation area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Richard Brookes	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review		Welcomes proposed extension of conservation area to include Home Park Road.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Richard Brookes	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review		Welcomes proposal to extend conservation area to include areas of street trees and verges along Church Road.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None
Richard Brookes	2: Wimbledon Park	Opportunities		There is poor access to Wimbledon Park from Church Road and the private Golf Course and Sports Ground creates a barrier. It is understood the Council own the Lake. Would like consideration to be given to creating a perimeter walk around the Lake as long term objective.	Agree	Comment is beyond the scope of Appraisal. The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan, in due course, will provide an opportunity to address these issues.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Richard Brookes	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.3	Concerned at the description of 87 Home Park Road as an incongruous design. Although not an excellent example of modern design and its scale and massing is somewhat unsympathetic to its surroundings is concerned that this description would discourage future developments from pursuing a contemporary design approach.	Disagree	The consultation exercise has revealed that the building has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal now recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours. Appraisal does not discourage appropriate contemporary design. Paras. 11.12.8 and 13.12.10 support the modern designs at The Garden Hall, St Mary's Road and 82 Arthur Road. The Design Guide to appropriate development and Conservation Area Management Plan, to be prepared in due course, will provide opportunities to address issue.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours.' Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No. 87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'
Richard Brookes	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Welcomes proposal to include the remaining parts of Arthur Road in the conservation area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Richard Brookes	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Opportunities		Suggests recommending the surviving 18th Century tunnel between the former Marlborough House and its servants quarters for statutory listing.	Partially Agree	The tunnel is indeed of historical and archaeological interest, as identified in paras. 13.1.5, 13.7.3, 13.12.4 and 13.19.3 of the Appraisal. As it is an underground structure it may not fit the criteria for listing. Nevertheless, the possibility that it be placed on the local list will be explored in the first instance, with the possibility of it then being investigated for inclusion on the statutory list.	Add new para. 13.21.11 "Investigate the possibility of adding the 18th Century tunnel under the Ricards Lodge School grounds to the Local List, with possible subsequent consideration for the Statutory List."
Robert Stewart	2: Wimbledon Park			All in all this is a good document and having a conservation area in Wimbledon Park will be a positive. He hopes his views will be taken into the final document.	Partially Agree	Comment is mainly in support of the Appraisal. His other views are considered elsewhere in this analysis.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Robert Stewart	2: Wimbledon Park	Building Descriptions	12.13.15-18	Feels there is a problem with attempting to describe predominant characteristics of Home Park Road, which is characterised by a totally diverse set of houses. Comment regarding size, gaps and sense of rhythm are totally true and should be stressed more. But trying to pull together the various design elements, such as hipped roofs is almost impossible. Should not try to make a false coherence between all the houses.	Disagree	Consider description of predominant characteristics is appropriate in a character appraisal. Paras. 12.13.16 - 12.13.18 recognise the variety but also identify the common elements. The gaps and sense of rhythm are further described in paras. 12.12.8 - 12.12.11 'Pattern of Development'.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Robert Stewart	2: Wimbledon Park	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.3	Disagrees with comment about incongruous designs of some buildings in Home Park Road. This clearly implies that modern designs are by their nature incongruous. Should distinguish between the design quality of new designs, for example between 57 and 87 where 87 is of high quality. Should aim to increase quality of design and not encourage pastiche.	Partially Agree	The consultation exercise has revealed that the building has solicited controversial opinion. Appraisal now recognises that the building is prominent and presents a contrast to it's neighbours. Appraisal does not discourage appropriate contemporary design. Paras. 11.12.8 and 13.12.10 support the modern designs at The Garden Hall, St Mary's Road and 82 Arthur Road. The Design Guide to appropriate development and Conservation Area Management Plan, to be prepared in due course, will provide opportunities to address issue.	Para. 12.21.3, line 8: Delete 'Incongruous design of some buildings in Home Park Road eg. Nos 57, 87', add 'Pressure to introduce prominent buildings that present a contrast to their neighbours.' Alter photograph caption to read 'The prominent building at No. 87 presents a contrast to it's neighbours'
S. Birch	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Properties on the North part of Arthur Road between Home Park Road and the existing conservation area are of differing type and vintage with no architectural or historic interest. No justification for inclusion in the conservation area.	Disagree	Several of the buildings within the proposed extension (Nos. 106, 108, 129, 131, 133 and 135) are on the Local List. The buildings are of varied age and style, as identified in the Appraisal, but it is the historic, sinuous alignment of the entire length of the road and the quality of most of the buildings and the spaces between them, including mature planting, that have resulted in the extensions being proposed.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Sim Comfort	2: Wimbledon Park	Extent and Boundary Review		Revised conservation boundary should include "the bottom of Home Park Road and Arthur Road"	Partially Agree	The entire length of Arthur Road is proposed to be included in the Conservation Area (Sub Area 3: Arthur Rd - Leopold Rd). The houses and their gardens within Home Park Road that are opposite the Park are included, primarily for the way that they form part of the historic, wooded backdrop to the Park. Following the receipt of several representations it is agreed that this also applies to the buildings and their gardens on the south side of Home Park Road here. However, on the north side of this part of the road, the built form has a different character and appearance to that now identified for the Wimbledon North Conservation Area.	Include Nos. 35 to 45 Home Park Road in proposed extension to Conservation Area. Amend text and maps accordingly.

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Sim Comfort	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Only half of Squires Court is shown as being added to the conservation area.	Disagree	There is no change to this part of the existing C.A. boundary, apart from a small amendment to include the whole of the rear garden of Nos. 72/74 Arthur Rd. Part of the entrance to Squires Court is within the C.A. as it adjoins the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The remainder is a modern backland development with no special architectural or historic interest to make it worthy of C.A. status.	None
Sim Comfort	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review		Only half of Camelot Close is shown as being added to the conservation area.	Disagree	Nos. 1,3,5,7 and 11 Camelot Close are included because they adjoin the historic alignment of Arthur Road. The Close has no other special architectural or historic interest to warrant inclusion of the remaining properties.	None
Sim Comfort	Introduction and Part 1	Extent and Designation History		Support removal of pockets within conservation area and creation of a series of conservation zones which interlink to establish a homogenous conservation area.	Agree	Comment is in support of Appraisal.	None

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Stephen Hammond MP	1: Historic Core	Positive and Negative Features	12.21.8	Concern at possible proposal to prevent car parking on Church Field	Disagree	Appraisal makes several references to positive contribution made by St Mary's Church and the open spaces around it. There are no proposals identified in Appraisal to prevent this occasional use of Church Field for car parking. However, the Council would wish to see this well managed.	Para. 11.20.6: Delete 'The impact of Wimbledon fortnight on the appearance of the area, including the use of Church Field as a car park, which is harmful to it's appearance.' Add: 'Concern that any temporary car parking on Church Field does not unduly harm the appearance of the locality.' Add to 11.21 Opportunities: The preparation of a Conservation Area Management Plan will provide an opportunity to address issues raised by Appraisal.'

Respondent	Sub-Area	Section	Para:	Comment	Response	Reasons	Proposed Change
Tony Colman	3: Arthur/Leopold Road	Extent and Boundary Review	13.1.4	Lambourne Avenue should remain outside of the Conservation Area	Disagree	Lambourne Ave. is included partly due to the fact that it forms part of the historic wooded backdrop, partly because the Arthur Road end adjoins the historic, sinuous alignment of that road, and partly as the road facilitates a long view over Wimbledon Park and beyond from Arthur Road. The Council has a legislative duty to designate any areas of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance as conservation areas, and from time to time to review whether any further designations are needed.	None