Dear Madam

13 December 2013

EXAMINATION: DRAFT SITES AND POLICIES PLAN: STATEMENTS ON SOUNDNESS

Enclosed are four copies of the five Statements concerning Soundness for consideration at the forthcoming Examination.

An electronic copy has been sent to you also, as requested.

Yours Faithfully

John Mays: Chairman, Planning Committee

encl
Currently the draft Plan allows for developments of up to 1000sqm (10,760 sq ft) in certain designated local centres, including Wimbledon Village.

The Village is in a conservation area, and has a number of Statutorily Listed as well as Locally Listed properties, with a locally unique distinctiveness.

The character of the Village is in part determined by the narrowness of the shop frontages, ensuring variety and individuality. Also the smaller size of the units allows for a wider range of small firms to have a presence.

If the 1000sqm were to be accepted, the small scale nature and character of the Village would be changed. Larger units, with bland frontages would result, and smaller firms would be unable to compete or afford the increased rental levels.

The policy is also written subject to the caveat that larger units would be accepted “if they were to contribute to the Council’s regeneration objectives”. In practice this would be interpreted by applicants as a reason for ignoring the policy.

This approach is considered to be contrary to the Core Strategy Objective 8 (page 37) relating to “promoting …..development …(where it) … contributes to the function and character of the Borough”.

And to Core Strategy Policy CS14a (page 145) which aims to “conserve and enhance Merton’s heritage assets….. particularly the valued centres ….”.

And also to the NPPF (58/4) guidance which says that policies should “respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings…”.

Also to the NPPF (126) which says that the Councils should take into account “the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses.”

Accordingly, the present Plan fails to reflect the nature of the Village, and is therefore considered to be unsound in that respect.

In order to be sound therefore:
(a) the reference to Wimbledon Village in DMR1a(ii) should be removed: and
(b) the phrase “unless….objectives” should be removed from DMR1c: or if this is not agreed, the reference to Wimbledon Village should be removed.
INNOVATIVE DESIGN RATHER THAN PASTICHE

Currently the draft Plan requires “appropriate architectural forms, language, detailing and materials, which complement and enhance the character of the wider setting”.

In practice, this approach is interpreted by applicants when briefed by planning officers to mean that new developments have to conform to the stylistic idioms nearby, or what has gone before.

The result is, perhaps unwittingly, a promotion of tame pastiche, lacking the conviction and quality of the originals.

This approach has resulted in some new building of very poor architectural and cultural quality.

This is considered to be contrary to the NPPF (57) which says that Councils should “plan positively for high quality …. design”. And should “not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes, and not stifle innovation …. (nor have) … requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles”. (60)

The present Plan fails to support or encourage innovative design, and stifles originality, and therefore is considered to be unsound in this respect.

In order to be sound, and comply with the policy guidance in the NPPF, the Plan should be more positive, and make clear that the Council wishes to encourage innovative modern design, that also meets the criteria set out in (a) – (xiii).

The following paragraph should be inserted into the text at the start of (a), as follows:

DMD2a (i) “The Council wishes to support and encourage innovative modern design that understands local distinctiveness, rather than a pastiche approach”.

Followed by (ii) Relate positively and appropriately etc…
TREE REPLACEMENT

DM02       NATURE CONSERVATION       page 87       R081/C325b

Policy DM02e says that “replacement planting … of a similar of greater value to that which has been lost will be secured through the use of conditions.”

Paragraph 5.29 indicates that the Council may require semi-mature replacement trees, in certain circumstances.

The Plan does not indicate how the “value” of a lost tree is to be defined.

Whilst the sentiments in the Plan are understood, in practice, the replacement of trees lost to development (some of which may be of substantial size) is normally by an equivalent or lesser number of quite small trees.

The result is that the local tree stock is much reduced, and takes some years to reach its former state, and local biodiversity is similarly reduced.

This is not in conformity with the basic Policy Aim of “securing suitable replacements”.

Nor is it in conformity with the Core Strategy Policy CS13g(8) (page 132) which says that “developers must propose full mitigation and compensation measures for any ecological damage caused”.

CS Strategic Objective 6 says that the Council aims to be “an exemplary borough in …… adapting to climate change, and make it more attractive”.

The NPPF says that (109/3) plans should “…provide net gains in biodiversity where possible…”.

As the proposed policy approach in the draft Plan tacitly accepts that replacements will be of less substance than the lost trees, it does not sufficiently address the issue of full replacement or enhancement or net gains.

It is therefore considered to be unsound in this respect.

Although the Council’s positive approach to replacement in the draft Plan Policies is welcomed, it needs to be enhanced to make it sound.

Accordingly, para 5.29 should be amended to read: “The Council will require replacement trees that match the combined ages of those trees that have been lost”.

The Plan’s (revised and additional) Policy on protecting the integrity of Green Corridors at DMO2a is welcomed.

Its accompanying paragraph 5.25 (page 88) which explains the importance of Green Corridors is also helpful.

However, there is no explicit reference to the existence of one of the very largest green corridor networks, covering almost the whole of the Borough, and being the rear gardens of residential property. The map (page 369) does not refer to these.

The Core Strategy says (CS13 page 132) that development in back gardens will need to be assessed against the value of (inter alia) green corridors.

The NPPF says (para 114) that Councils should “plan positively for the … protection … of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.”

Also that Councils’ planning policies should (para 117/3) “…. promote the preservation of….. ecological networks…..” and “…. identify and map components of the local ecological networks including ….. wildlife corridors.” (para 117/2)

The current Plan as amended goes some way towards meeting this guidance from the NPPF and Core Strategy, but it:

(a) fails to mention the specific importance of back gardens as ecological corridors, and also
(b) does not provide a map showing these.

This therefore suggests that the current approach in the Plan is close to being unsound in this respect.

In order to make the Plan sound therefore, and comply with both the NPPF and the Core Strategy, is suggested that:

(a) paragraph 5.25 (page 88) be amended to read: “….. and the survival of important species. The role of back gardens is of major significance in the network of green corridors throughout the Borough.”

(b) Additionally, the Plan’s current map on page 369 should be enhanced so as to illustrate the role of the many more green corridors formed by back gardens, and that contribute so essentially to the overall network.
REPLACEMENT OF THE CIVIC HALL IN WIMBLEDON TOWN CENTRE

SITE 01  page 333

R081/C343
R081/C388

See also DMR6 page 37
DMC1 page 63
R081/C329
R081/C462

The Council gave a formal public assurance in the 1980’s that the Civic Hall, then due for sale and demolition, would be replaced. That assurance was not carried out.

Currently the Plan permits such a replacement, but does not promote or support it.

This is considered to be contrary to the Core Strategy policies CS6c & d for Wimbledon Town Centre, which say that the Council will:
- “support the provision of community & leisure facilities”
- “encourage….cultural activities”.

The Plan’s proposed range of Allocated Uses for this site is wide, and in practice the selection would be determined by the developer selecting only those that were considered most lucrative.

The inclusion of a public facility such as a Hall would therefore be most unlikely, particularly as the Plan does not currently give any support to such a replacement.

The present approach is also considered to be contrary to the NPPF (section 70), which says that “to deliver the social, recreational & cultural facilities … (that) the community needs, planning policies should…. plan positively for the provision and use of … community facilities such as …. cultural buildings …. to enhance the sustainability of communities”.

The present Plan fails to support or encourage, or plan positively (as the two superior documents intend) for the provision of a Cultural facility, and is therefore considered not sound.

In order to be sound therefore, and comply with the Core Strategy and NPPF, and provide a clear positive encouragement and support for the appropriate development as they state, an additional paragraph should be inserted, (after the first) into the Issues (page 334) text, as follows:

“This is a site that would be eminently suitable for a significant public community hall and cultural facility, which would be enabled by other land uses.”