BOROUGH PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Notes of the meeting on 19.15 Thursday 06 December 2012

Committee Rooms D&E, Merton Civic Centre, Morden SM4 5DX

Councillors:

- Chris Edge
- Philip Jones
- Ian Munn (Chair)
- Diane Neil Mills (vice Chair)
- Henry Nelless
- Geraldine Stanford

Substitute members: Nick Draper, Maurice Groves

Also attending: David Freeman ((Raynes Park and West Barnes Residents Association).

---

1. **Declarations of pecuniary interest** – received from Ian Munn as a former Post Office employee and player on Southey Bowls Club

2. **Apologies for absence** – none received.

3. **Minutes of the Borough Plan Advisory Committee meeting**
   3.1 Councillors requested that papers be circulated within the 5 day deadline
   3.2 Councillors requested that all notes from meetings be uploaded under the meeting date on the council’s website.

4. **Presentation on Gypsies and Travellers** by Angela Chu, Merton’s housing strategy

4.1 Members noted the progress in delivering new government guidance on gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople and asked questions on the presentation

5. **Additional sites and policies report**

5.1 Borough Plan Advisory Committee members resolved to approve the report “additional sites, policies and Proposals Map consultation – towards a final plan” to Cabinet subject to the following recommendations.
Cabinet report - Recommendation C

5.2 Proposed change (additions underlined) to Recommendation C of the Cabinet report C.

That Members delegate approval of the documents and other consequential matters in accordance with the appropriate Regulations prior to public consultation to the Director of Environment and Regeneration in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability and Regeneration and the chair and vice chair of the Borough Plan Advisory Committee.

Cabinet report – appendix A

5.3 That the sites listed for removal from the Sites and Policies Plan in appendix A are monitored and can be reconsidered as part of the Sites and Policies Plan if circumstances change and the timetable allows.

5.4 Further recommendations:

Metropolitan Open Land – proposed boundaries for consultation

5.5 That the proposed Metropolitan Open Land boundaries be recommended to Cabinet for public consultation.

Open space proposed boundaries for consultation

5.6 That the proposed open space boundaries be recommended to Cabinet for public consultation subject to the following changes:

5.7 That the following designations be added to Merton’s Proposals Map, designated as open space prior to public consultation:

5.7.1 Road reserves (areas adjacent to roads and open areas that are part of, or essential to the prevailing character of the area (such as parcels of land within the St Helier Estate

5.7.2 Land along operational rail reserves (with restricted public access or limited visual amenity value

5.7.3 Very small areas (typically less than a quarter of an acre / 0.1ha) of green open space, which, as the result of a qualitative assessment are considered to have too restrictive access or are of a size or shape which result in them having a very limited functional use as open space and therefore do not warrant safeguarding by means of designating on the Proposals Map.

5.8 Cllr Munn & Stanford clarified that soft landscaped areas in adopted highways should also be considered for open space designation e.g. the land at the western end of Merantum Way.

5.9 That the area around the Wimbledon War Memorial should be designated as open space (page B1 of BPAC papers)

5.10 Cllr Edge requested that Southey Bowling Club site and the site at the southern corner of the intersection of Kingston Road and Lower Downs Road and Burstow Road be designated as open space. (page C1 of BPAC papers)

5.11 That the open space boundary be amended to

5.11.1 Include the small grassed area, pavement and bus stop north of Langdale Parade in Mitcham Town Centre,
5.11.2 Include the pavement and car parking around the buildings adjacent to Mitcham Fire Station, former Cricketers Pub and Vestry Hall
5.11.3 exclude the land where the new GP-surgery has been constructed adjacent to Ravensbury Park. (all illustrated on page C3 of BPAC papers)
5.11.4 include the land surrounding Mitcham Garden Village (page D3 of BPAC papers)

Wandle Valley Regional Park – proposed park boundary for consultation

5.12 That BPAC members agree with the recommendations of Cllrs Judge and Neil Mills (who represent the council on the Wandle Valley Regional Park board) and recommended that the Wandle Valley Regional Park boundary approved by the WVRP Board in 2011 be refined for greater accuracy.

5.13 Councillor Diane Neil Mills recommended the inclusion of all residential properties and all schools (e.g. Wimbledon Park school and Garfield Primary School)

5.14 Councillor Ian Munn recommended the inclusion of Brook House and other nearby sites within the park boundary.

Sites for Importance for Nature Conservation – proposed for consultation

5.15 That the proposed SINC boundaries be recommended to Cabinet for public consultation.

Green corridors

5.16 That the proposed Green Corridor boundaries be recommended to Cabinet for public consultation.

Raynes Park town centre boundary

5.17 That the proposed Raynes Park town centre boundary be recommended to Cabinet for public consultation.

Policy DM.H1 – supported care housing

5.18 That the wording in the third line of paragraph (d) be require rather than expect.

5.19 That an additional criterion be added to limit overconcentration of supported care housing in any one area (similar to DM.H5, criterion (iv) “... will not result in an overconcentration of similar uses detrimental to residential character or need”

Policy DM. R4 – Protection of shopping facilities in designated shopping frontages

5.20 That reference be made to the names of all other town and local centres in Merton to which this policy relates, to make the policy easier to apply.

5.21 Councillor Diane Neil Mills recommended that criterion (f) (which states temporary planning permission for reoccupation of vacant units may be granted for performance and creative uses be extended to allow for the demolition of vacant units and their use as temporary car parks.
Site 46: Old Lamp Works, High Path, South Wimbledon
5.22 That educational use be added to this potential site designation

Site 53 Southey Bowling Club, Lower Downes Road, Raynes Park
5.23 That this site be removed from the Sites and Policies Plan and the Bowls club can submit a planning application if they want to develop this site.

2 Proposed criteria for open space on Merton’s Proposals Map.

2.1 Merton’s 2003 Proposals Map only contains open spaces that are over 0.4 hectares (1 acre) in size. The protected open spaces that are associated with education are listed at the back of the UDP as part of Schedule 2, but they are not always marked on the map, especially if they are under 0.4ha.

2.2 On the 2013 Proposals Map it is recommended that there is no threshold for showing designated open spaces as people will eventually be able to view the map online.

2.3 As advised at the previous BPAC meeting, officers have reviewed the open space criteria and distributed maps to all ward councillors showing the proposed designated open spaces in their ward.

2.4 The criteria that officers have been used to determine the extent of the designated open spaces shown on the attached maps, now reads as follows:

2.4.1 Definition of ‘Open Space’ in Annex 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework:
“All open space of public value, including not just land, but also areas of water (such as rivers, canals, lakes and reservoirs) which offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.”

2.4.2 Definition of ‘Open Space’ in the London Plan 2011, p.305:
“All land in London that is predominantly undeveloped other than by buildings or structures that are ancillary to the open space use. The definition covers a the broad range of types of open space within London, whether in public or private ownership and whether public access is unrestricted, limited or restricted.”

2.4.3 From the above two definitions the following should be noted:
- The London Plan definition clarifies what is implied in the NPPF definition with the phrase “…open space of public value…”, that accessibility is not a limiting factor.
- With the use of the word ‘and’ the NPPF definition requires that open space conforms to both criteria: “…offer important opportunities for sport and recreation and can act as a visual amenity.”
- The London Plan clarifies that there can be ancillary buildings within Open Space.
2.4.4 For the sake of clarity, the following criteria will be used as guidance for the identification and boundary delineation of the land to be designated as Open Space on Merton’s Proposals Map.

**Inclusions:**

1. All open spaces within the borough such as parks, commons, play grounds, sports fields (including MUGAs, bowling greens), allotments, cemeteries and churchyards, urban farms and woods that are not specifically excluded below.

2. Buildings within open spaces that are ancillary to the use of the open space (e.g. changing rooms).

3. Large soft landscaped open spaces within school grounds (e.g. playing fields) and (hard) demarcated playing pitches (e.g. netball courts), including ancillary school buildings or hard standing (e.g. car parks) not in the immediate vicinity of the main school building.

**Exclusions:**

4. Main school buildings
   *(Their use is not ancillary to open space).*

5. The hard standing and ancillary buildings surrounding the main school buildings
   *(They form part of the conglomeration of non-ancillary structures where this use is most intense).*

6. Private residential gardens
   *(The primary use of these properties is residential and they would therefore not conform to the London Plan definition. They are explicitly removed from the definition of 'Previously Developed Land in the NPPF and in accordance with paragraph 53 of the NPPF, Core Strategy Policy CS 13(e) resists development on them)*

7. Soft landscaped areas associated with blocks of flats or housing estates, which have a sense of enclosure and privacy
   *(These sites are usually predominantly developed with various pieces of soft landscaped amenity space to serve the occupants. These parcels of soft landscaping would not conform to the London Plan definition.)*

8. Road reserves (areas adjacent to roads) and opens areas that are part of, or essential to the prevailing character of the area (such as parcels of land within St Helier Estate). *(These areas are protected from development via design. Highways improvement works generally take place as permitted development (i.e. without the need for)*
planning permission) so the protection of these areas from Highways improvements via the Proposals Map is unachievable.

9 Land along operational rail reserves (with restricted public accessibility or limited visual amenity value).

Rail or tram improvement projects generally take place without the need for planning permission, so the protection of these areas from rail related improvements is unachievable via the Proposals Map.

10 Very small areas (typically less than a quarter of an acre/0.1ha) of green open space which, as a result of a qualitative assessment, are considered to have too restrictive access or are of a size or shape which result in them having a very limited functional use as open space and therefore do not warrant safeguarding by means of designation on the Proposals Map.

11 Buildings, and their adjoining land, on the edge of open space of which the primary use is not ancillary to the use of open space.

(These sites would not conform to the London Plan definition.)