

**From:** Plant. J

**STAGE 3 PUBLIC CONSULTATION DRAFT SITE AND POLICIES  
DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT AND SITE PROPOSALS MAP**

**Here are my comments, a local resident of the area affected by these sites:**

**Re: Site Proposal 41, Kingston Road opposite Lower Downs:**

As a local resident I object to the allocation of this site for housing use. It has long been an open space in an area that is accepted to be deficient in public open space.

Local residents believe this site should be reserved for use as a small park until funding can make this possible. Adding more housing will make the public open space deficiency worse when it could be alleviated.

It is on the corner of a busy and awkward road junction and vehicular access and servicing would be both difficult and dangerous. Having personally checked the Land Registry record ownership, it is unlikely Decaux own the site as is claimed.

**Re: E.5 Raynes Park - Open Spaces**

The term 'open space' used in this document covers a 'broad range of types of open space within London, whether in public or private ownership and whether public access is unrestricted, limited or restricted', the basis on which open space deficiency for general recreation will continue to be assessed should only be based on fully publicly accessible open space.

Some open spaces such as Prince George's Playing Fields are privately owned and not available to the public for unrestricted general recreation.

However, this site is shown on Figure 21.1 Merton's Open Spaces in the adopted LDF Core Strategy as being 'publicly accessible' which is inaccurate as the public can be excluded from it at any time and public access is not encouraged by the management.

**Re: Site proposal 77, 26 Bushey Road**

As a local resident I object to the proposed use of this site for housing because there is a demand for industrial land uses such as this site now provides and planning policy should reflect that.

If there were to be a change of use it should be for community use including the option of public open space, to help rectify the current open space deficiency.

**Re: Section E, Raynes Park Map E2.1, p496**

The revision to include an area south of the railway in the Raynes Park Local Centre within its revised local centre boundary is welcomed by local residents, but the boundary should extend further.

On the south side of the railway it should include the Rock Restaurant (formerly the Junction Tavern) and the commercial parade opposite and in West Barnes Lane it should match the council **adopted** Raynes Park Enhancement Plan area.

**Re: Site proposal 74, Southey Bowls Club**

As a local resident I object to the use of this site of existing private open space for housing, where vehicular access to the site is width restricted and there is a deficiency in open space. The choice should be public open space and/or community use.