

Sites: Morden Station offices and retail unit
Sainsbury's (Peel House) Car Park
Proposal map
Community Infrastructure Levy

Dear Sirs,

re: Response to Consultation on Draft Detailed Planning Policies and Sites Proposed for New Uses.

I am writing to you in my capacity of Chair of the Merton Park Ward Residents' Association to give our views on this document.

Overall, there appears to be an imbalance in the provision of new residential sites to the provision of essential services for these new residents such as schooling and health provision. Given the enormous pressure Merton has experienced in the past few years, particularly with regard to primary school places, this is an area that warrants close consideration. We are also somewhat concerned that a number of car parks in close vicinity are included for redevelopment as residential or mixed use sites (for example the Peel Road, Morden Station and York Close sites) and would like some reassurance that these sites are being considered as alternatives rather than for wholesale transformation.

We welcome the desire to protect designated shopping areas (but object to the deletion of 142-156 Merton Hall Road as a Local Parade) and would urge the Council to ensure that other policies work to complement such aspiration. Parking is an obvious example where local shops that are surrounded by paid for parking with one hour minimum charges will struggle to attract custom. The proposal to allow petrol stations (which can always offer free parking, if only at the pumps) to increase their retail space would appear to be incongruous with a desire to support and protect Local Parades. In a similar vein, we disagree with the proposal to define 800 metres as the acceptable distance for local facilities and would support the retention of the current 400 metres/ 5 minute walk approach.

With regard to managing Heritage Assets, we are concerned that the qualification of the policy "where substantial public benefits outweigh the harm or loss" could be open to controversial interpretation. In instances where the Council itself is the landowner, would the provision of S106/CIL monies by the applicant, in addition to the sale proceeds, be deemed to be for the greater good? We would suggest that where the landowners are the Council itself or

another public (or quasi-public such as a water company) then financial gain should be specifically excluded as sufficient grounds for approval.

Obviously many of the sites for proposed redevelopment within our ward will be impacted by the master plan for More Morden and we look forward to seeing more details on this projects as they become available.

With kind regards,

Harold Forbes

Chairman, Merton Park Ward Residents' Association