### Alphabetical order by representative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation Response</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0703005UR</td>
<td>Acquah F</td>
<td>All three</td>
<td>In regards to the Pre Submission Estates Local Plan, I have had a look through and I'm fairly pleased with it.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0704005UR</td>
<td>Acquah F</td>
<td>All three</td>
<td>Although my only concerns are the sizes of the rooms as I am assuming that they will be quite small as your aim is to build more houses. Nevertheless the plan seems fine.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0705005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>We write with reference to pdf document '16-12-05-High-Path-boards_final-exhibition' we provide the following questions and considerations of the proposed redevelopment of the High Path Estate. We understand that the new population is 1,000 people, you could please provide information on the current population and therefore the need for new GP premises in this area, should premises be needed, this could be delivered within a regenerated High Path.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0707005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Please could the council advise on how future additional Doctors GP provision will be met?</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0709005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>We would like assurances from the council that all public services would cope with an increase in population.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0801005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Have TFL been consulted and confirmed additional tube services, especially during peak hours?</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Movement and Access HS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0802005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Please could the council advise on how future additional Doctors GP provision will be met?</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0803005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>We assume that Traffic Impact Studies have been carried out and the proposals have no negative impact on the current traffic?</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0804005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>What is the split between social housing, PBS and private ownership?</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0805005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Are all existing High Path residents in both private ownership and social housing, offered the opportunity to move back to high path with the same housing offer as their existing properties or better and at no additional cost?</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0806005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>What percentage of existing High Path residents are in favour of the proposed development?</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0807005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>What assurances can be provided that large volumes of people living in such a dense community will be satisfied with their built and social environment?</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0808005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The CGIs should genuinely show the intended construction materials and architectural details. The use of lower quality, cheaper materials should not be permitted.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0809005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Please could you advise on what the mechanism is for answering our questions? With regard to the strategies represented in the proposals we provide the following pros and cons: Pro: Coherent street layout responding to the existing street pattern; The principle of taller development to the rear of the tube station is appropriate, but general concern over the overall height shown in the development; Seemingly good provision of public realm; CGIs at end of dock titled 'Yeffers Yard', 'Manson Blocks', 'St. John's Mews' suggest properties will be massy constructed with good quality brick and present elements with attention to detail. The Council and the developer need to ensure that the quality suggested in the CGIs is upheld and not diluted into cheaper options such as characteristics polymer modified renderers</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0810005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The scheme is too dense, overdeveloped and out of scale with the context; All properties surrounding the proposals are primarily 2 – 3 stories; 4 stories onto the Merton High Street is twice the height of the existing properties on the north side of the road. The proposed new properties will tower above the existing on the opposite side of the road; We suspect that in order to maintain the large areas of the Merton High Street will be in shadow cast by the 6 story properties on the south side of the road; The majority of older London high streets are characterised by properties of a maximum height of 3 stories such as the existing context. 6 stories is not only out of character of the context. It is out of character to the city.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Building Heights HB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0811005HP</td>
<td>Andrews D and Macara M</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Existing schools are already strained and there is no provision for additional school places in the proposals.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy Area:**
- General
- Design
- Planning Application
- Other

**Policy Officer Response:**
- N/A
- Noted

**Clarion Housing Group Response:**
- There are 668 existing homes on the High Path Estate. The Socio-Economic Analysis confirms that according to GLA population estimates, there are 1,700 people in the immediate area of High Path.
- The scheme is too dense, overdeveloped and out of scale with the context.
- The majority of older London high streets are characterised by properties of a maximum height of 3 stories such as the existing context. 6 stories is not only out of character of the context. It is out of character to the city.

**Note:** All development proposals will need to adhere to relevant Development Plan requirements including those concerning core uses e.g. as set out in the Mayor’s London Plan | Table 3.3 Minimum space standards for new dwellings and also the Mayor's Housing SPG.

**SD.6a Schedule of representations received to pre submission publication (stage 3) of Merton’s Estates Local Plan December 2016 - February 2017 including officer responses**
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**Officer Response:**
- Design
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- General
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I don't think for one moment my opinion means anything to anyone involved in the above. I now realise that despite a lot of hard work
on behalf of the residents/tenants we were put on a loser right from the beginning with the council coming at us from one side and Circle
Estate from the other side determined to take our homes away from us. Mitcham is becoming as the song goes a town of little Boxes
in the tune from The Who. The recent survey regarding Wimbledon town centre identified that people do not want tall buildings. This applies to the areas outside
amenities.

I would like to make the following comments:-

- There is a grave danger of turning the High Path Estate and south Wimbledon into an urban jungle.
- The phasing of the development is still to be determined, but will be derived following consideration of the decant of all remaining residents to temporary accommodation. I think a number of residents have been rehoused on the Merton High Street estate.
- What timeline do you have for this development?
- As for building a road leading to Grove Road I think it won't be long before there are serious accidents as it is so close to the bend.
- There is much in the Estates Local Plan (High Path) to commend it.
- There is a great concern for people living in the estate as well. The High Path area has an excellent access to public transport and other facilities and can support more homes. London has an overwhelming need for new homes. Decreasing the number of new homes compared to the existing would deprive existing residents as well as new households of a home.
- There are prioritised for such a feature over others. Can you explain this to me.
- Building work, noise and dust pollution for all local residents and local schools. Can you give me an indication what disturbance I and my
neighbours are likely to endure. I am led to believe the actual building work could go on for over a decade. What timeline do you have?
- In regards to the High Path estate proposals, my main concerns are:
- There is much in the Estates Local Plan (High Path) to commend it.
- This plan deals with building heights specific to its local context. The guidance on building heights is appropriately based on this, rather than the
national framework.
- Noted. The Council has previously promoted traffic management measures in and around High Path to mitigate through movements. However, these were
rejected by residents during the statutory consultation process.
- Noted with thanks.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- The overall vision for the High Path at the South end.
- The phasing of the development is still to be determined, but will be derived following consideration of the decant of
all remaining residents to temporary accommodation. I think a number of residents have been rehoused on the Merton High Street estate.
- Noted. Any new major development is expected to prepare a detailed transport assessment to evaluate potential impacts and provide recommendations as to how these might be managed/mitigated. This review typically includes consideration of other significant planned development nearby. Traffic calming and
management measures can change over time to take account of the views of local residents and changes in traffic movements.
- There is much in the Estates Local Plan (High Path) to commend it.
- Noted with thanks.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Clarion Housing Group response. The phasing of the development is still to be determined, but will be derived following consideration of the decant of
existing residents and construction logistics. It is expected that the build period at High Path will extend to c.25 years. The potential for construction impacts
will be carefully considered as part of planning applications that are submitted, and the Council will use this assessment process and where necessary
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
- Noted.
The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan.

The following are my comments on specific sections of the document:-

2.46 p 37 - Defensible space - I welcome the statement that all perimeter blocks should have active frontages with well designed appropriate defensible space. I would like to suggest, from the perspective of a pedestrian, that the most pleasant defensible space in front of buildings such as flats, houses and office blocks, are those that have railings or a wall with a waist height with greenery between the building and the boundary, the greenery thus visible from the street. In addition, if the boundary is defined by a wall, greenery on top of the wall can be an attractive feature if it is well maintained. The use of railings or wall gives a feeling that the building is not encroaching on the pavement whilst requiring very little distance to separate the building from the street.

2.47 p 37 - Promoting sustainable development - does this take into account the carbon emissions etc of the building materials, machinery, equipment etc used in the construction as well as the carbon footprint of the finished buildings over the years of usage? If not, it should do so. There is no point in having a low carbon footprint building if it has used many times the carbon to build.

3.123 - Whilst Morden Road is perceived as a wide road, there is a danger the buildings will be too high and too close to the pavement (ie without defensible space) changing the aspect from a wide road to a hemmed in, over-shadowed road. This ‘wide road’ has nothing to do with width of the road but the height of the buildings (ie with defensible space).

3.119 - Whilst I acknowledge that the estate is badly designed in terms of buildings and space and that it has a high PTAL rating, this does not mean that all proposals for change will be permitted. The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The Estates Local Plan provides guidance for the regeneration of the three housing estates. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan. Such proposals for a school will be required to comply with the Statutory Development Plan.

3.129 - I welcome the suggestion that the estate should be designed to guide future developments outside the estate. Currently, there are no proposals for change to the vicinity, there seems little point in providing views. However, providing views to the Wandle and green area alongside is well considered.

3.130 - It is expected that the estates Local Plan will provide guidance for the regeneration of the estates. If there are any proposals for change it does not mean that all proposals for change will be permitted. The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The Estates Local Plan provides guidance for the regeneration of the three housing estates. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan. Such proposals for a school will be required to comply with the Statutory Development Plan.

3.135 - Whilst accessibility of the estate is badly designed in terms of buildings and space and that it has a high PTAL rating, this does not mean that all proposals for change will be permitted. The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The Estates Local Plan provides guidance for the regeneration of the three housing estates. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan. Such proposals for a school will be required to comply with the Statutory Development Plan.

3.140 - Any links with Rodney Place should only be made with the approval of the existing residents/property owners in Rodney Place. The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan.

The Estates Local Plan does not take into account the proposed new school on High Path - The Harris Academy Wimbledon.

Noted. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan.

#### Table 1: Policy Area and Officer Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation &amp; Impediments</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243007HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>p 108 - EP15 Movement and Access 1.47 - The development of the proposed new school is a redevelopment of the land between High Path and Merantun Way - presumably this will include the redesign of Merantun Way into a boulevard? and will presumably be discussed with TLS (2.148)</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Movement and Access H6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243107HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>p 126 - EP11 Building Heights: a) It is disappointing that the maximum building heights are not specified in the document. b) Merantun Road - the document states that taller buildings are more appropriate along Merantun Road and the heights should be guided by the sewer developments springing up along Merantun Road. These developments do not necessarily have the backing of residents and locals. The apparently unstructured and indeed ugly buildings that are being developed with inappropriate heights - too far out - are not necessarily to guide the development of the High Path Estate on Merantun Road. To create a boulevard feel it is not necessary to have extremely tall buildings. c) Any development along the north side of High Path must enhance the feeling of safety walking along the street at night. I do not think these buildings should be taller than the means streets within the estate. d) Merantun Way - Re: I understand it, the south side of this road is currently industrial usage and likely to remain so. This is another street that will not benefit from tall buildings.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Building Heights HB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243207HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>p 129 - Indicative Street Sections - I am puzzled by the diagrammatic representations of a high street (eg Merton High Street), an urban boulevard (eg Merantun Road) and a wider boulevard (eg Merantun Way). Currently there is insufficient width on all of these roads to accommodate 4-lanes of traffic or 4-lanes of traffic plus cycle lanes and footpaths. I cannot imagine how these roads will be widened sufficiently along their whole length to accommodate the additional lanes of traffic, cycles and pavements. I therefore have to assume these illustrations are not accurate and are misleading. In addition, the illustration of the urban boulevard in comparison with the high street shows just how inappropriate tall the buildings along the boulevard are.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Street Network H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243307HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>4.4 - P176: I am not sure if this paragraph leads on to point 4.5 and the following points or if there is some text missing... &quot;Withdrawing the requirements of the council's validation checklist the applicant will be required to provide information to address the following&quot;: There is nothing following this paragraph except the subsequent sections.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243407HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>4.5 - P176: I am concerned that there is a danger the idea that different phases of development have their own character may in itself lead to a mismatch in design rather than mitigate the concern on monotony.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243507HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>4.7 - P176: The materials should be in keeping with the existing local area. For example, in general brickwork of the buildings in the surrounding areas tends to be London yellow stock, multi-colour or red brick. Some buildings may be discovered due to pollution through the years from coal fires and soot and modern day traffic pollution. Care should be taken to not assume dark bricks were originally dark bricks and thus lead to the use of inappropriate or out of context building materials.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243607HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>4.7 - P178: I am not sure if this paragraph leads on to point 4.5 and the following points or if there is some text missing... &quot;Withdrawing the requirements of the council's validation checklist the applicant will be required to provide information to address the following&quot;: There is nothing following this paragraph except the subsequent sections.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243707HP</td>
<td>Cohen E</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>4.8 - P179: Ensure that street furniture does not hinder the path of pedestrians especially, for example, people pushing buggies, pulling shopping trolleys or mobility scooters.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089000EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency All-three</td>
<td>Ravensbury</td>
<td>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on the above. Having been involved in the previous consultations, we are satisfied that most of our comments have been incorporated in the Merton's Estates Local Plan pre-submission publication. Overall the pre-submission publication appears to be founded on robust and credible evidence base. The Environment Agency notes that the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal have been reflected in the document and used to inform the policies.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Protection ES H6 R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097000EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency Ravensbury</td>
<td>Ravensbury</td>
<td>The proximity of the Ravensbury Estate to the river Wandle and Ravensbury Park mean that there are good opportunities to restore the river Wandle through the park or undertake enhancements to improve the condition of the river as part of major redevelopment adjacent to it. Currently, the river is impounded and subject to a number of problems such as mches which have been problematic on a yearly basis. Redevelopment of the area provides an opportunity to improve the park and consider river restoration and enhancement to create a better functioning river and river corridor. This is recognised on paragraph 3.282, which we welcome.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Protection ES H6 R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097100EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency All-three</td>
<td>Ravensbury</td>
<td>It is clear that flood risk is a consideration that has been taken into account in the preparation of the plan. We certainly welcome that the preferred options for the redevelopment of the estates are seeking to ensure that flood risk elsewhere is not increased, ways to reduce flood risk are being sought and any opportunities to make space for water are being considered.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Protection ES H6 R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097200EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency Eastfields</td>
<td>Eastfields</td>
<td>Floods: This area is situated within Flood Zone 1. However, the need to ensure surface water runoff is suitably managed to allow for the runoff rates that are compliant with guidance and policy is noted, as are the references to the inclusion of SUDS. The suggestion of opening up a currently culverted watercourse on the eastern boundary of the site should be investigated further as part of the overall redevelopment. The opening up of a currently culverted watercourse could assist in managing flood risk at the site, as well as providing habitat and other biodiversity benefits.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Protection ES H6 R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098000EA</td>
<td>Environment Agency All-three</td>
<td>Eastfields</td>
<td>Several site wide comment on the Estates Plan, the legislation for permitting works on watercourses has changed. Flood Defence Consents have been superseded by Flood Risk Activity Permits and now fall under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Prior permission is still required for works in, over or under a main river or other BIM of the top of the riverbank. We have attached more detailed comments below for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss this further.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Environmental Protection ES H6 R6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 099000EA Environment Agency Highbury

This area is mainly situated within Flood Zone 1, though a part of the site is located within Flood Zone 2. The opportunity to increase the density of housing within a low flood risk area has been highlighted in the Plan. The recognition of needing to ensure surface water runoff is suitable managed to allow for the runoff rates that are compliant with guidance and policy is noted, as are the references to the inclusion of SUDS. The Bunces Ditch, a designated main river, runs along the edge of or just within the boundary of the overall site. We note that comment is made regarding further investigations into the origin and route of this watercourse, as the exact line of a culverted watercourse can be difficult to determine from the surface. If there was an opportunity to open up a culverted watercourse it should be looked into further, as this can help to manage flood risk as well as having a number of biodiversity benefits. If development could be moved away from the watercourse that would also be of benefit in terms of access for maintenance purposes.

**Policy Area:** Environmental Protection H6

- **Officer Response:** Noted. Opportunities for culvert enhancements at Bunces Ditch will be considered as part of the planning application process in accordance with the London PlanPolicy 7.24 Blue Ribbon network and policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature. The Sequential and Exception test will be undertaken for all sources of flooding in accordance with the NPPF.

### 000000EA Environment Agency Ravensbury

The Ravensbury Estate is shown as being located within an area considered to be a high risk to fluvial flooding from the adjacent River Wand. However the plan recognises that this needs to be effectively managed as part of the redevelopment of the estate. Ravensbury Estate is already developed for residential use and new development would offer the opportunity and potential for mitigation measures to be incorporated into the redevelopment. This would include the raising of the finished floor levels of dwellings to a minimum of 300mm above the 1 in 100 year flood level, taking into account climate change. There would also be the opportunity for flood resistant and resilient in the redevelopment, which is also welcomed. Reference is also made to a SUDS strategy as part of the redevelopment. However, due to the varying levels of flood risk across the Estate, there is a need to carefully consider the sequential and exception tests, as well as the requirement for a site specific flood risk assessments. Adequate provision and consideration needs to be given to the category of development proposed for each area on the Estate and its compliance with the NPPF and the Boroughs own Policy on flooding. The introduction of a greater number of residential dwellings in an area at risk to flooding should be carefully assessed to determine whether it can be considered as appropriate in that location. In addition, any redevelopment proposal should be able to clearly demonstrate that there will be no loss of floodplain storage capacity and ideally, further storage for flood waters should be created. It should also be noted that updated climate change guidance was released earlier this year, and therefore the most up to date information should be taken into account as part of any redevelopment plans. Any development should also take every opportunity to increase both the flood resistance and resilience to buildings and the surrounding environment.

**Policy Area:** Environmental Protection H6

- **Officer Response:** Noted. Opportunities for river corridor enhancements will be considered as part of the planning application process in accordance with the London PlanPolicy 7.24 Blue Ribbon network and policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature. The Sequential and Exception test will be undertaken for all sources of flooding in accordance with the NPPF.

### 010000EA Environment Agency All Three

We note that reference is made to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in relation to flood risk, and that it will be necessary to comply with the Sequential and Exception Tests as appropriate, and also the necessity of producing site specific flood Risk Assessments to accompany detailed plans for the redevelopment of these areas.

**Policy Area:** Environmental Protection E6

- **Officer Response:** Noted.

### 017000DP Fabian C Eastfields

Regarding Mitcham Eastfields estate plan. In my view I think the estate should stay the same but make improvements to what is already there, to make better, the front, rear and internal of the properties. This will save a lot of money, better than knocking down peoples homes. That is my view.

**Policy Area:** Townscape E1

- **Officer Response:** No comment required

### 213000GA GLA All Three

General. The Local Plan is supported in principle and confirms with the London Plan in aiming to bring forward the redevelopment of existing municipal housing and the delivery of new housing within the Morten Housing Zones. In particular the Local Plan aims to provide significant additional housing through making efficient use of land in line with policies in Chapter 3 of the London Plan.

**Policy Area:** Open Space

- **Officer Response:** Noted with thanks

### 213000GLA GLA All Three

General. The Local Plan makes clear that the redevelopment will include the protection of open space. This is welcomed and in line with London Plan Policy 7.18, and is an important element in providing a high quality environment for future residents.

**Policy Area:** N/A

- **Officer Response:** Noted. The Estates Local Plan will form part of the development plan once adopted, and any planning application must have regard to the whole development plan, including the London Plan [2016], the Morten Core Strategy [2011] and Sites and Policies Plan [2014], in accordance with Section 38D) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Estates Local Plan covers a significant regeneration and investment period of 15 years. It sets out a strategically pitched framework to guide regeneration over the 15 years, with the level of prescription, such as the quantum of housing to be determined at the planning application stage in accordance with relevant planning considerations and requirements set out by the whole development plan.

### 214000GLA GLA All Three

The Local Plan makes clear that the redevelopment will include the protection of open space. This is welcomed and in line with London Plan Policy 7.18, and is an important element in providing a high quality environment for future residents.

**Policy Area:** N/A

- **Officer Response:** Noted with thanks

### 215000GLA GLA All Three

However, there does not appear to be an indication of the quantum of rear development or even a range of new and re-provided homes for each of the three sites. Such a figure or range will be important to help set the context for most readers. The GLA and TfL are aware of the broad quantum envisaged through our involvement with Housing Zones designations but this will not be the case for many others.

**Policy Area:** N/A

- **Officer Response:** The Estates Local Plan covers a significant regeneration and investment period of 15 years. It sets out a strategically pitched framework to guide regeneration over the 15 years, with the level of prescription, such as the quantum of housing to be determined at the planning application stage in accordance with relevant planning considerations and requirements set out by the whole development plan. The Estates Plan Housing Market Assessment (examination/library reference SD12) accompanying the Plan sets out potential ranges of the number of homes that could be provided within each estate.
The Council will be aware of the Mayor has recently consulted on his Affordable Housing and Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance and Local Planning Authorities are strongly encouraged to follow the approach set out in the SPD. While this document is still in draft form, Merton is encouraged to take account of its approach and set a threshold level for viability for schemes coming through the planning system without any public subsidy (see SPD for detailed guidance) and have a clear approach to seeking to increase the amount of affordable housing delivered to 50% using grant (as set out in the recently published Affordable Housing Programme funding guidelines) and other public subsidy. The SPD also offers guidance in relation to vacant building credit.

### 21900GLA GLA All Three

**Affordable Housing**

The predominant land use for the estate will remain predominantly residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

**Minor modification 10 EP.H4** (Page 112) Insert the following

The land use for the estate will remain predominantly residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

### 21900GLA GLA All Three

**Detail Site and Design Policies**

The Plan includes an appropriate level of detail in relation to landscape and environmental protection, including flood risk and drainage, which are recognised as significant issues in some locations. For the three housing estates where development will be focused. The Local Plan also contains a range of more detailed points and policies relating to the design and height of buildings within the new developments, these are largely a local matter but are broadly in line with London Plan design policies.

### 21800GLA GLA All Three

**Transport Issues**

TfL welcomes the reference to estate car parking being provided in accordance with London Plan maximum standards and would recommend that reference is also made to cycle parking conforming with London Plan minimum standards. As stated previously, TfL would encourage the estate street networks to accord with TfL's Street Types guidance.

**Minor modification 28**

Insert the following into Policy EP.P4 (Page 160)

The predominant land use for the estate must be to retain as residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

### 21900GLA GLA All Three

**High Path**

Page 106/107: "Future extensions of the north-south streets ending at High Path southwards towards Merantun Way must be a possibility, subject to TfL's support. TfL would recommend that 'must be a possibility' is replaced with 'should be explored'. As stated previously TfL would be unlikely to support additional vehicle access points onto Merantun Way.

**Minor modification 11 EP.E4** (Page 68)

Exceeding the current London Plan density ranges may be considered appropriate where proposals will create developments of exceptional urban design quality.

### 25100GLA GLA All Three

**Transport Issues**

Page 106 para 3.139 – It is important to reiterate that TfL will not pay for the reconfiguration of the station but should there be either funding mechanisms for improvements, TfL would be willing to consider proposals. TfL welcomes reference to the tram extension to South Wimbledon and the requirement for developers to consult TfL on how to integrate the tram extension into development proposals on Morden Road. If you would like to discuss any of the representations in more detail please contact Kevin Reid who will be happy to discuss any of the issues raised.

**Minor modification 26**

Agree. Minor modification 13 proposed Policy EP.122 Street Network (f) Future extensions of the north/south streets ending at High Path southwards towards (as Merantun Way additional capacity should be explored subject to TfL’s support.”

### 25100GLA GLA All Three

**Community room.**

The land use for the estate will remain predominantly residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

**Minor modification 13 EP.R4(b)** page 112

The land use for the estate will remain predominantly residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

**Minor modification 14**

The following is a summarisation of comments by the High Path Community Association's members regarding the document: "Stokes Local Plan Winter 2016/17”.

**2. Background, Key Drivers, The Case For Regeneration, The Vision, Urban Design Principles**

It is far to point out that the residents' views was requested by Circle Housing (Merantun) (CHMP) at regular intervals since the idea of an upgrading of the estate was proposed around 2012. Complaints about the repairs and maintenance programme had reached a tipping point and, as usual tenants were voicing comments such as "we love it", "just be it down", "put it right and start again", in relation to a quick fix for restoring a well rounded aesthetic pride to the area, we need to note that these ever-changing what the work on the estate meant.

The latter remark has been a constant theme throughout the entire process and moving forward it is hoped that the Secretary of State and whoever is heading up strategic positions for the entire timeline of the estate will bring about an energy to regenerate an area that has suffered from multiple years of bad planning, and a very whelming sense of no control of the entire process. Set within this is the view of the homeowners (leaseholders/freeholders) who feel detached of the social tenants since the transfer of stock and even alienated the fact that they (leaseholders) have paid service charges since the transfer of the land.

If this is placed within the context as to why the regeneration was called upon (a general improvement to the internal/external areas of the estate) and as to how this changed the (the poor repairs and maintenance programme by Circle Housing Merton Priory and the Merton Council's 'Have Your Say' document. These two major documents which would ask a different set of questions but nevertheless wanted residents opinions on the issues posed caused much confusion among the majority. As a result residents questioned who was delivering the overall improvement to the area and when one considers that a proportion of residents are still under the misguided impression that Merton Council still own and manage the estate then the general view is of bewilderment, and a overwhelming sense of no control of the entire process. Set within this is the view of the homeowners (leaseholders/freeholders) who feel detached from the social tenants since the transfer of stock, and even alienated the fact that they (leaseholders) have paid service charges since the transfer of the land.

**Noted.** Merton Council welcomes and has responded to the consultation on the Mayor's draft Affordable Housing and Viability SPD. In addition, Merton Council is working with the GLA on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and other housing research to inform the London Plan review. The council is starting its own borough-wide Local Plan which, when adopted in 2019, will replace the borough-wide policies in the Core Planning Strategy and Sites and Policies Plan. The Mayor's approach to affordable housing will be actively considered then. The following amendment are recommended to clarify the policies:-

**Minor modification 10 EP.H4** (Page 112) Insert the following

The land use for the estate will remain predominantly residential with open space provision and with re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

**Minor modification 17 EP.H4 (a)** page 112

The predominant land use for the estate must be to retain as residential with the re-provision of the existing number of affordable homes, non-residential uses and designated open space to meet relevant planning policies.

**Minor modification 27**

Agree. Minor modification 13 proposed Policy EP.122 Street Network (f) Future extensions of the north/south streets ending at High Path southwards towards (as Merantun Way additional capacity should be explored subject to TfL’s support.”

**Noted with thanks**
We anticipate a wholesale improvement on the worsening promises (eg ‘11 Promises’ and ‘10 Commitments’) made by the resident provider in this regard as it is noted in the draft document of the stock transfer ‘WOULD MERTON PRIORY HOMES DO ANY WORK IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY? Yes.

Merton Priory Homes would work closely with residents, local councillors and public bodies like social services, education, the police, the health authority, GPs and voluntary agencies to help local communities tackle problems and improve the quality of life for residents. (Consultation on the proposal to transfer Merton Council’s homes to Merton Priory Homes - Appendix 3, 2013/8)

We have noted that at CHMP have not engaged with Merton NHS CCG as a community partner to the level we deem appropriate for a project of this magnitude, there is a concern on the part of not just the community on the whole and the services we use. If it is assumed that a near tripling of the density is to go ahead as preferred in that context, we have a heightened concern for the increasing population of the elderly and the indigenous vulnerable cohort. Moreover CHMP have sought to remove staff for this particular service last year (June 2016) as it was not considered appropriate or within their remit as a resident provider and this was partly due to their inability to engage with the areas they covered (East and West Merton also Merton Central). We need also to point out that in view of financial challenges in adult social care and the mitigating financial issues for the NHS (in general) there is no more robust level of discussion needs to be had with the respective agencies related to health and wellbeing in our community.

Last month we formed with other neighbouring resident groups the ‘South Wimbledon Enhancement Plan’ as the area is not only bereft of a neighbourhood plan but also any localised character. Heritage is important to those that live here and we are disappointed at the rapid advancement of planning for some heinous examples of design in the area. If ‘Rose Cottage’ in Hamilton Road is to go the way as consulted on numerous occasions that the finer details are yet to come. With that in mind we are concerned as to the height of the build and most especially the ‘right to light’ against Wimbledon’s Business Investment District and as Colliers Wood and us are twinned as an area of intensification then the fluidity will be given the new estate a homely feel and residents will have a place of community. The High Street will still act as a fulcrum for those nearest transport hub or currently quiet Merton Abbey Mills. Containing the estate (as it currently is) and minimising traffic flow will benefit the new estate a homely feel and residents will have a place of community. The High Street will still act as a fulcrum for those nearest transport hub or currently quiet Merton Abbey Mills. Containing the estate (as it currently is) and minimising traffic flow will benefit with the reduced offset of pollution should we decide to build with such organic materials.

We commend the retaining of mature trees in the area as this not only adds to the ‘greenspace’ aesthetic but also enhances the open space within the plans show little in the way for what we currently have and if the density is to be proposed as intended (608 homes to 1,000 homes) then the whole estate will be making a mad dash to the proposed central park for their uptake of vitamin D.

We are of the view that the estate needs to be made more integrated into the surrounding community. Noted. The street network is proposed to better support movement across the estate. The opportunity will be taken to promote the health and community

Noted. The council is supportive of this approach and officers and councillors have met with residents in the South Wimbledon area.

Friedland’s Business Investment District and as Colliers Wood and us are twinned as an area of intensification then the fluidity will be given the new estate a homely feel and residents will have a place of community. The High Street will still act as a fulcrum for those nearest transport hub or currently quiet Merton Abbey Mills. Containing the estate (as it currently is) and minimising traffic flow will benefit with the reduced offset of pollution should we decide to build with such organic materials.

The ‘Estates Local Plan’ refers to the Equality Act 2010, specifically “2.37. The Equality Act describes a disability as a physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on ones ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities. All development proposals will be expected to have consideration to people with disabilities as an equal by the Equality Act 2010. This includes physical and mental conditions - for example, disabilities.”

The street network is proposed to better support movement across the estate. The opportunity will be taken to promote the health and community benefits of reducing car travel in favour of walking and cycling. Proposals for a tram stop at South Wimbledon are still at an early feasibility stage and may therefore change; however any proposed development must consult TL at each stage, in addition to TL’s engagement on the Estates Local Plan. The Council Noted.

Noted. The council is supportive of this approach and officers and councillors have met with residents in the South Wimbledon area.

Page 7 of 11
5. Residents’ involvement in the management of estates
The ongoing management of the estate is vital to its sustainability. Residents should have the opportunity to participate in the ongoing management of the regenerated estate. In some cases this may be through a formal tenant or resident management organisation or through a resident-led group. Ongoing opportunities should be provided for residents to influence decisions and develop the necessary skills to take on more responsibility, if they choose. Where elected or self-selected residents represent the estate, local authorities should provide them with the resources to communicate and engage with all residents to ensure their representative approach is inclusive. This could include additional training to meet or consult with appropriate planning, distribution, or communication materials. Stage regeneration schemes can play an active role in identifying community facilities which can be owned and managed by resident and community groups. Where community assets are run by the community, people are more likely to have an active and sustainable voice in their neighbourhood. It is also important to undertake post-occupancy evaluation to understand the impact of regeneration, and to demonstrate an ongoing commitment to residents by acting on the results of any evaluations. This maintains trust with the local community, and encourages social sustainability and community cohesion. It is important that the aforementioned is the need for clear and transparent dialogue between the resident provider, local authority and the residents. In particular is the Council’s recent proposals with Harris Academy to build a secondary school on the area of South Wimbledon. We oppose such a venue as not only is it too small to accommodate the needs of its pupils but the proposed regeneration makes no mention of it and all affected stakeholders are unaware with anxiety, exacerbated by the impact of such a venture. Warned to this is the large contingent of disadvantaged young people who attend the local primary school that live on the estate and the neighbouring district therein it is folly of the Department of Education and wreaks of desperation on the part of the Council to entertain such a proposal. If any of the adjacent stakeholders considered such a proposal it is because they were not aware of the massive undertaking by the resident provider and as such the general conversation was as disjointed as we had previously noted in the consultation back in 2013. The head teacher of the local primary school was unaware of the proposed increase in the density of the estate as was the manager of the Resource Centre which houses groups for those with learning difficulties and the resident provider is unaware of the significantly high proportion of children or between schools, traffic management measures installed prior to any school opening. Noted. The existing primary school at Merton Abbey has a school travel plan and traffic management in the area assists with managing arrivals and departures. Should a new secondary school be built on High Path, measures could be put in place via the planning application to ensure that traffic and travel measures would not significantly harm local residents and others in the area. These include restricting car parking and drop offs, staggered arrival times for children or between schools, traffic management measures installed prior to any school opening. Noted. The existing primary school at Merton Abbey has a school travel plan and traffic management in the area assists with managing arrivals and departures. Should a new secondary school be built on High Path, measures could be put in place via the planning application to ensure that traffic and travel measures would not significantly harm local residents and others in the area. These include restricting car parking and drop offs, staggered arrival times for children or between schools, traffic management measures installed prior to any school opening. Noted. The existing primary school at Merton Abbey has a school travel plan and traffic management in the area assists with managing arrivals and departures. Should a new secondary school be built on High Path, measures could be put in place via the planning application to ensure that traffic and travel measures would not significantly harm local residents and others in the area. These include restricting car parking and drop offs, staggered arrival times for children or between schools, traffic management measures installed prior to any school opening.
Dear Future Merton Team and Secretary of State (Environment),

I would be pleased to take this opportunity to put forward my comments, based on my unique experience of life here on High Path Estate, where I've resided since 1973. I would say that it is the variety and character of the buildings that give this area a quality which the residents, especially the younger folk benefit from in their individual approaches to everyday living. This is a precious gift and should be maintained, for future generations; therefore the best way forward is to demolish the three ugly high rise blocks, to build, as proposed on the area behind the Old Lamp Works, and to house families in available houses elsewhere, in Merton, leaving new flats on the estate for use of single people, or older couples on their own.

I suggest level house is left alone, as is the rest of the area.

Noted with thanks.

SD.6a Schedule of representations received to pre-submission publication (stage 3) of Merton’s Estates Local Plan December 2016 – February 2017 including officer responses

Alphabetical order by representor

**Reference** | **Consultation Respondent** | **Estate** | **Comment** | **Policy Area** | **Policy** | **Officer Response**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
030016HP | How SA | High Path | As for the older flats, they were built to last, and will continue to provide solid weatherproof homes for about another 70 years, so why demolish. | Design | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | How SA | High Path | The playground and football pitch are excellent and they are, and I would say you might easily re-use the public paths and roads through the estate, leaving precious trees alone. | Environment | N/A | Noted. Maintenance of public paths and roads is outside the remit of the Estates Local Plan.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | Sheds and garages could be removed! | N/A | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | Across the road, there are blocks which could be improved on but basically are sound, because they offer privacy and more sheltered outlooks than the proposed new flat. I would be surprised to hear of many people wishing to leave – especially Merton Place which looks excellent, offering a historic perspective rather than the plans which Circle housing have put on the table, which are about dating, being boring, dull and soul less, and biased towards efficiency. | N/A | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | The block of Eleaston House, needs some attention. Eg the stair way and deep paving of walls to exterior but basically, again the homes are solid and sound enough to give at least 50 years more life. Minor improvements to surrounding areas could be undertaken and more trees put in to give shade and interesting outlook from our windows. | Planning Application | N/A | Noted. The council has resolved to support the regeneration of Eastfields, High Path and Ravensbury to improve all three estates comprehensively and provide decent new homes set in a well designed neighbourhood, which incorporates street trees and open space.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | Therefore I think the entire plan should be scrapped. I recommend a good environmental agency (eg Greenpeace) to collaborate with an open – minded think tank like Kevin McCloud, to investigate some Dutch housing estates, using new technologies, eg split level housing or spires. Also why use bricks? There are new materials now. ‘Think ahead!’ Merton should try to retain its reputation and find another site. | N/A | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | I have just received the 230 page plan about the regeneration plan on High Path Estate (the third one) I wonder how much all this costs? | N/A | N/A | Noted. I have just received the 230 page plan about the regeneration plan on High Path Estate (the third one) I wonder how much all this costs?

030016HP | High Path | High Path | I am a local resident in Bathurst Avenue and my house backs on to High Path. The estate is a huge eye-sore and a hideous blot on the landscape. All around are lovely Victorian terraced houses. The new proposed ‘cheap’ blocks are just replacing one eye-sore with another. The victorian style terraced houses work. They have stood the test of time. They will not need redeveloping in 30 years. The answer is staring us in the face - I think all the residents I speak to do not want to move especially my neighbours in Wiltshire Court who are mostly elderly and do not want to be uprooted at their time of life as they have done a lot of decorating and got new carpets, flooring, curtains and furniture and are happy where they are. | General | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | The houses in Wiltshire Court are only 30 years old and are big with separate kitchen and bathroom that suit the residents just fine. They also well insulated and warm in the winter and most look after the garden front and back which they will miss. I do hope that you can consider some of these points and think about the people who live here who are getting upset and worried about their future. | General | N/A | Noted.

030016HP | High Path | High Path | I do not for a form for franchise and said that all the residents I speak to do not want to move especially my neighbours in Wiltshire Court who are mostly elderly and do not want to be uprooted at their time of life as they have done a lot of decorating and got new carpets, flooring, curtains and furniture and are happy where they are. | General | N/A | Noted. Building at the scale of terraced houses would seriously reduce the number of homes on the estate, risking leaving existing residents without somewhere to live and not contributing to London’s overwhelming need for new homes. The vision for the High Path Estate is that of the New London Victorian - a vision which takes the characteristics inherent to Victorian neighbourhoods such as pitched roofs, use of brick, traditional streets, mansion blocks, at a higher density.

040016EP | Kimmy L | Eastfields | I agree with the through road proposal between Termalow Lane and Woodstock Way mainly to allow the diversion of or provision of a new fast route to serve the estate. But there could be a problem of traffic using the road as a ‘shortcut’ route through the estate. This section might require for non-estate traffic. In any case a junction improvement on Termalow Lane would be required. | Transport | N/A | Noted. This connection would improve connectivity to adjoining neighbourhoods, facilitate improved public transport and generally ease traffic movement throughout the area, especially given the rail safety and congestion problems prevalent around the nearby Mitcham Eastfields level crossing. Proposals will need to demonstrate how proposals will impact the road network and might include measures to smooth or restrict access as suggested by the Officer. The council has resolved to support the regeneration of Eastfields, High Path and Ravensbury to improve all three estates comprehensively and provide decent new homes set in a well designed neighbourhood, which incorporates street trees and open space.

040016EP | Kimmy L | Eastfields | In view of the increased number of residents planned consideration should be given for provision of a GP surgery on the estate. | Other Core Strategy | N/A | Noted. Noted. Policy DP.6.H.3b says support other commercial and community uses on the estate. Although there is not currently an indication that new GP premises are required in this location, should a GP premises be required the NHS there is scope to incorporate one within the estate.

040016EP | Kimmy L | Eastfields | Concern also for the increased amount of road traffic that will follow the redevelopment which will impact on the congestion that already occurs at the nearby railway level crossing. | Transport | N/A | Noted. Parking restrictions and traffic management will help to manage the flow and volume of traffic and especially the effects on the level crossing on Grove Road.

040016EP | Kimmy L | Eastfields | Thank you for the information that is available please keep me informed of further developments. | N/A | N/A | Noted. The "Urban Design Principles" (Part 02) of the ELP which apply to all three estates are all founded on the principles of Securing by Design, including active frontages, defensible space, permeable, legible and accessible layouts. These issues are woven throughout the Estates Local Plan.

040016EP | Latimer T | High Path | I am a local resident in Bathurst Avenue and my house backs on to High Path. The estate is a huge eye-sore and a hideous blot on the landscape. All around are lovely Victorian terraced houses. The new proposed ‘cheap’ blocks are just replacing one eye-sore with another. The victorian style terraced houses work. They have stood the test of time. They will not need redeveloping in 30 years. The answer is staring us in the face - I think all the residents I speak to do not want to move especially my neighbours in Wiltshire Court who are mostly elderly and do not want to be uprooted at their time of life as they have done a lot of decorating and got new carpets, flooring, curtains and furniture and are happy where they are. | N/A | N/A | Noted.

050016MP | Met Police | All three | Thank you for inviting me to comment on the Estates Local Plan update, please pass the following onto the Inspector. | Street Network | H2 R2 | Noted. Building at the scale of terraced houses would seriously reduce the number of homes on the estate, risking leaving existing residents without somewhere to live and not contributing to London’s overwhelming need for new homes. The vision for the High Path Estate is that of the New London Victorian - a vision which takes the characteristics inherent to Victorian neighbourhoods such as pitched roofs, use of brick, traditional streets, mansion blocks, at a higher density.

050016MP | Met Police | All three | This is further to my previous comments regarding Merton’s Estate Local Plan, please pass the following onto the Inspector. | N/A | N/A | Noted. The “Urban Design Principles” (Part 02) of the ELP which apply to all three estates are all founded on the principles of Securing by Design, including active frontages, defensible space, permeable, legible and accessible layouts. These issues are woven throughout the Estates Local Plan.
Policy 7.3 Designing Out Crime of the London Plan promotes a city of diverse, strong, secure and accessible neighbourhoods with greater security through design. “Boroughs and others should seek to create safe, secured and appropriately accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. ……” Development should reduce the opportunities for criminal behaviour and contribute to a sense of security without being overbearing or intimidating.………Measures to design out crime should be integrated into development proposals and be considered early in the design process, taking into account the principles contained in Government guidance on ‘Safer Places’ and other guidance such as Secured By Design published by the Police.

In the interest of creating safer, sustainable communities Secured By Design principles and practices should be incorporated within the Estates Local Plan for Eastfields, High Path and Ravensbury and the development carried out in accordance to those details. By working with the local Police Designing Out Crime Officers I am sure accreditation could be achieved.

Eastfields

In reference to your recent communication dated 15th January, please find attached a petition, signed by residents of Hammond Avenue in relation to our concerns regarding the draft proposed plans that Circle House are in the process of submitting.

We did not receive a response from Merton regarding this, so would appreciate if you could kindly follow-up accordingly and seriously enhance your further plan guidance with reference to the proposed layout and building heights.

Apologies for the late submission but my original email was rejected due to a typo in the email address.

I knew how long I was going to be living in my flat for, I would predict if it was worthwhile to spend almost £300 on a new front door as I moving or what year everything is likely to happen. I currently have a front door that is close to falling off, which the council refuse to replace because they said that they are knocking the estate down they don't see this as an urgent repair. This is frustrating because I know how long I was going to be living in my flat for, I would predict if it was worthwhile to spend almost £300 on a new front door so I would like to spend that kind of money and be told that we are moving within the next couple of years I would also like to know that if they would like to move away or out of the area, would be given priority to move quicker than others? thanks for reading and answering my questions.

A flexible approach is considered best to allow sufficient design freedom whilst respecting the local context.

It is not the intention of the plan to be too prescriptive as there are a variety of different opinions as to what constitutes acceptable development and high quality design.

A feasible approach is considered best to allow sufficient design freedom whilst respecting the local context.

The diagram for Policy EP.8 Building heights illustrates that the land to the rear of Hammond Avenue should be a base height (a) according to policy EP.8 (c) which states “the majority of buildings across the estate must be of a height similar and harmonious to surrounding residential areas to contribute to achieving a consistency with the surrounding character.” The policy continues with “building heights must be based on a comprehensive landscape analysis and visual assessment” Planning applications will be expected to demonstrate that they will make a positive, not negative contribution to the existing townscape.

Existing planning regulations and guidance on privacy, overlooking, daylight and sunlight, and general amenity will ensure that new buildings do not impinge unacceptably on existing residents. If plans are proposed that are not sufficiently based on the local context, and any other guidance in the Local Plan, then this will be taken into account in the decision making process.

The current designs are not taking any of this into consideration, which is very worrying, as there is plenty of scope for the designs to be amended and similarly the plan guidance needs to be reviewed to ensure that this is being addressed, as at present the guidance relating to the height and layout appears to be very generic.

The current designs are not taking any of this into consideration, which is very worrying, as there is plenty of scope for the designs to be amended and similarly the plan guidance needs to be reviewed to ensure that this is being addressed, as at present the guidance relating to the height and layout appears to be very generic.

I believe it was approximately page 88 in the plan guidance that has specific reference to building heights being "re buildings across the estate must be of a height similar and harmonious to surrounding residential areas to contribute to achieving consistency with the surrounding character and "when viewed from outside the estate, taller buildings must not be seen to dominate the landscape". The current designs are not taking any of this into consideration, which is very worrying, as there is plenty of scope for the designs to be amended and similarly the plan guidance needs to be reviewed to ensure that this is being addressed, as at present the guidance relating to the height and layout appears to be very generic.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

Our main concern / question is that this is only about reducing pedestrian severance, rather than any proposal to remove the traffic barriers on Milner Road to allow for through traffic to go from Milner Road, cross Morden Road into the estate.

This will be taken into account in the decision making process.

We would like to thank the Met Police for their contribution to date which has helped to improve the Estates Local Plan and we will continue to be a consultee on planning applications for the three estates. We are also aware that Clarion Housing Group has engaged with the Designing Out Crime officer at a very early stage.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

This is a submission to the Merton’s pre-submission Local Plan. We broadly welcome the proposal and revised pre-submission with four reservations. To gain a greater level of support amongst the residents, the final iteration of this plan must address the following:

Noted. The Estates Local Plan is in general conformity with the London Plan 2016. The London Plan is part of Merton’s statutory development plan and any planning applications for the three estates will be subject to the policies within it, including those on designing out crime. For example, paragraph 2.46 “active design “The design of new development and owners must promote active design. This approach incorporates local facilities that are easily accessible on foot or cycle, and create good-quality well maintained and safe places with convenient and direct routes through the development.” We would like to thank the Met Police for their contribution to date which has helped to improve the Estates Local Plan and we will continue to be a consultee on planning applications for the three estates.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.

The traffic barriers were installed onto Milner Road for a good reason and we want to ensure that they continue to be in place as part of this proposal.
The Sustainability Appraisal [SA] has been used to help ensure that there are realistic choices made during the process which enable redevelopment to go ahead while still achieving gains for the environment which are key to combating climate change and improving the health and wellbeing of those living in London where air quality is an issue. The options chosen give a good account of the reasons why and allow for a wide scope of improvements to the biodiversity on site across the three sites, with links to green corridors possible as well as green or brown roof spaces a possible feature.

Noted with thanks.

Natural England will of course consider further comment when next consulted either during or after examination. Broadly however we do not have any major concerns to highlight.

Final point, the plan has misidentified the estate’s location as Figg Marsh Ward (P.46) - it is in fact located in Longthornton Ward.

Noted; no change proposed. The estate is on the boundary of Longthornton ward but is located in Figg Marsh ward.

No. 45, 46 and 47 do not consider residents’ views from Grove Road in line of sight through Lonesome Primary school site. Therefore a limit of building is two stories within this line of sight. This would also address the feeling of being overlooked by residents of Woodstock Way whose property backs onto the site. Such a statement would add further weight and clarifies paragraph 3.30 para.

Noted. The principle land use will be residential in accordance with the existing site and surrounding area.

Noted with thanks.

3.Further develop the ideas stated on pg.64 to allocate reasonable space to the development of a business community to support local employment. Restrict zoning to avoid the sites use to serve fast food. This would be in line with the councils stated ambitions of making Mitcham a safer and healthier place to live.

Noted. As the estate is currently residential and sits within a suburban residential area, the council does not propose to require business floorspace as part of the Eastfields Local Plan. However as set out in para 3.65 on page 68 the council expects major development proposals to provide local employment opportunities during the construction phase. As part of the borough-wide planning guidance, the council is continuing to consider whether or not to introduce planning restrictions.

3. Further develop the ideas stated on pg.64 to allocate reasonable space to the development of a business community to support local employment. Restrict zoning to avoid the sites use to serve fast food. This would be in line with the councils stated ambitions of making Mitcham a safer and healthier place to live.

Noted. As the estate is currently residential and sits within a suburban residential area, the council does not propose to require business floorspace as part of the Eastfields Local Plan. However as set out in para 3.65 on page 68 the council expects major development proposals to provide local employment opportunities during the construction phase. As part of the borough-wide planning guidance, the council is continuing to consider whether or not to introduce planning restrictions.

4. Clear guarantee that the construction of a road adjacent to the Acacia Centre would not put at risk the continued existence of the centre i.e. that it would be demolished or footprint reduced because of the roads construction.

Noted. This will be reviewed as part of the construction management plan.

Please do keep us informed about the submission to the Secretary of State and the publication of the independent planning inspector’s report and adoption of Merton’s Estate Local Plan.

Noted.
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Noted. Policy Ep.E8 (a) states “the majority of buildings across the estate must be of a height similar and harmonious to surrounding residential areas to contribute to achieving a consistency with the surrounding character”. The policy continues with “building heights must be based on a comprehensive townscape appraisal and visual assessment” Planning applications will be expected to demonstrate that they will make a positive, net negative contribution to the existing townscape. The view of the estate across Lonesome primary school is somewhat screened by trees and other vegetation. Woodstock Way backs on to the BMX track which is not part of the Eastfields Estate.

Please use High Path area to build a hospital, and an arena like the O2, don’t forget there should be a large Safeway Superstore there. This place need where a lot of people will be around always. It is not safe for flats and houses. This country in general is a very dangerous place because of the set up. Most places have no roads or streets. It is a close or crescent. No proper bright street lights. And good place need where a lot of people will be around always. It is not safe for flats and houses. This country in general is a very dangerous place because of the set up. Most places have no roads or streets. It is a close or crescent. No proper bright street lights. And good place need where a lot of people will be around always. It is not safe for flats and houses. This country in general is a very dangerous place because of the set up. Most places have no roads or streets. It is a close or crescent. No proper bright street lights. And good
Consultation's Odera V

High Path
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Officer Response

As part of their planning application process, the local community will continue to be consulted, and the Estates Local Plan advises that CHG will need to consult with residents to ensure that they continue to have a say in how their neighbourhood will be developed. Residents needs and priorities have been the focus of our consultation and engagement with residents since 2013. The layout of replacement homes is not yet determined but houses will be capable of being built either as open plan or with separate kitchens and living space. Where the design allows bathrooms will have windows but the priority will be to provide natural light and ventilation to habitable rooms.

The housing association's measurements for Internal and external properties and facilities are selective and somewhat manipulative, for example, the house a 3 bed house, therefore we are financially penalised for the same sized house, which we are supposed to get as a replacement of our bread and butter. We require an independent on plot locked garage for our livelihood as we have had it for the last 30 years. The new replacement house does not have a garage at all. This means a loss of our livelihoods. Any financial compensation for loss of a big garage is not an answer to our requirements of daily housing space needs and economic sustenance.

A one size fits all approach is not the answer to our plight and the housing association must adapt flexible methods to meet our housing requirements, as we are enjoying now, as stated above.

The housing association's measurements for Internal and external properties and facilities are selective and somewhat manipulative, for example, we have a separate living room and kitchen, but in the new property it is open plan, so will we want to divide it separately, then the new wall which we will build will make it an even smaller house than what we have now. Also, access to living room is via the kitchen door which is totally impractical and dangerous for family living as well detrimental to home/self-employment.

Rodney Place replacement houses' internal designs and sizes are extremely undesirable. Our needs and views are totally ignored, particularly for internal designs and sizes, which is extremely demoralising.

The new replacement house does not have a garage at all. This means a loss of our livelihoods. Any financial compensation for loss of a big garage is not an answer to our requirements of daily housing space needs and economic sustenance.

We were going to convert our huge loft space into a third bedroom similar to 68 Nelson Grove Road, but cannot do it now due to the new designs which are extremely poor, for example, a bathroom is in the middle of two bedrooms, without windows.

For us to remove the chimney, we can have enough space to fit an office desk. So that is a total loss of space. Also we have big windows and windowills, which will be lost in the new designs. We will not have direct sunlight and natural air circulation because of the new designs which are extremely poor, for example, a bathroom is in the middle of two bedrooms, without windows.

New housing is supposed to resolve overcrowding problems for all residents affected by the housing regeneration proposals. We have plenty of loft space, which we are using for multi-purpose use, and we can convert it to another bedroom as per our needs. We are an overcrowded family and we look to have a bigger house in Rodney Place, but we will only be offered a 2 bed house as we have now, we are happy to upsize it to a 3 bedroom house to alleviate overcrowding by paying a reasonable cost to difference between 2 bed and a 3 bed house, but not at an open market value. We will be charged for a 3 bed house, which is in fact of the same size as our 2 bed house. The only difference is that the left in our 2 bed replacement house, is converted into a bedroom, calling the same size house a 3 bed house, therefore we are financially penalised for the same sized house, which we are supposed to get as a replacement house.

New housing is supposed to resolve overcrowding problems for all residents affected by the housing regeneration and not only the social tenants. We were social tenants in the past and just managed to improve our life chances after 40 years of struggle and hard work, only to face punishment for being prudent when we are at the end of our lifecycles.

There is nothing wrong with our current house. It is of sound build and has gas central heating, double glazing, loft and cavity insulation etc. and we are being forced to accept lower housing facilities to facilitate housing regeneration at our cost, basically to rob us to support the housing association to meet their decent home standards requirements at our cost. This should not be allowed because the housing association acquired Meriton's housing stock to bring it up to what it considers decent home standards within five years, and it failed to do so. And we are being penalised for Meriton Council’s and the housing association’s deficiencies.

We are a family of 6 and we need more than 2 bedrooms. The new replacement house has 2 bedrooms and we are being penalised for Merton Council's and the housing association's deficiencies.

We require an independent on plot locked garage for our livelihood as we have had it for the last 30 years. The new replacement house does not have a garage at all. This means a loss of our livelihoods. Any financial compensation for loss of a big garage is not an answer to our requirements of daily housing space needs and economic sustenance.

People mains utilities under the new replacement houses, when it is not necessary to do so.

Freehold house owners, when it is not appropriate. For example, linking street houses to a communal heating system, or running
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation Respondent</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06GO241HP</td>
<td>Didera V</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Pincott Road is a historical, traditional Victorian terrace street with some traditional terrace houses similar to Victory Road across Merton High Street, but it is not mentioned in any documents, and there are no prominent pictures of houses in Pincott Road in the housing association’s or Merton Council’s documents. All of High Path can be designed to fit in with the streets and houses across Merton High Street and Abbey Road which is more in line with the properties in the area. Rather than turning High Path into a concrete jungle of tower blocks owned by a monopoly multinational charitable organisation, robbing Paul to pay Peter. We were told that the tower blocks will be replaced with traditional street type houses as there was plenty of space on High Path to do so with innovative designs but this was just a ploy to meet their devious objectives.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Street Network H2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06GO241HP</td>
<td>Didera V</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The impact of a new proposed secondary school on High Path, is not mentioned anywhere in the whole document, and will have a detrimental and devastating effect on the current and future residents, the entire High Path regeneration project, antisocial behavior/law and order situation and an adverse effect on other residents of Merton passing through High Path. For example, extra traffic, footfall, problems at bus stops and underground stations, local supermarkets with more than 1000 children entering and leaving High Path at least 3 times a day and not to mention evening activities which is now a norm for all Secondary Comprehensive Schools. The above option is not mentioned or offered in any of the residents surveys or local plans and documents.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clarion / Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06GO241HP</td>
<td>Didera V</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The above option is not mentioned or offered in any of the residents surveys or local plans and documents.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06GO241HP</td>
<td>Didera V</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The impact of a new proposed secondary school on High Path, is not mentioned anywhere in the whole document, and will have a detrimental and devastating effect on the current and future residents, the entire High Path regeneration project, antisocial behavior/law and order situation and an adverse effect on other residents of Merton passing through High Path. For example, extra traffic, footfall, problems at bus stops and underground stations, local supermarkets with more than 1000 children entering and leaving High Path at least 3 times a day and not to mention evening activities which is now a norm for all Secondary Comprehensive Schools.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049D041HP</td>
<td>PHN Epc C</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Noted. Parking provision is required to meet London Plan standards. For a highly accessible location this is likely to mean reduced levels of parking provision. Measures will be put in place at the time of planning applications to manage demand and how spaces are used.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049D041HP</td>
<td>PHN Epc C</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Thanks for a copy of the above 'Plan'.I thought it was very Geometric in design.No curves or bends. Right angles and like it!!  And you have got now.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The above option is not mentioned or offered in any of the residents surveys or local plans and documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The law abiding, prudent citizens and true financial stakeholders, (owners of freehold traditional houses and leasehold houses and flats are the main losers because we are not treated fairly in terms of replacement houses and terms and conditions related to new housing/housing offer etc. in comparison to social housing tenants). It is rather strange that the housing association and Merton Council has decided to exclude the proposed Harris Academy Secondary School development on High Path from all their documents. The high Path local plan must not be inferior to any other housing standards applicable to other houses in Merton. The so called acute need for more houses in London must not be used to subsidise Council budgets at the expense of current freehold and leasehold owners of High Path. London Mayor’s minimum housing standards, density and parking restrictions must not be used to lower our current and better standards of housing and parking facilities.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Clarion Housing Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If our current housing standards and facilities cannot be improved by the regeneration project than please do not rob us of what we have got now.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The Estates Local Plan provides guidance for the regeneration of the three housing estates. The proposed Harris Academy Wimbledon may be located adjacent to the Estates Local Plan boundary, subject to land assembly, funding and planning permission. Should a planning permission be submitted for a secondary school on High Path, it will have to take account of the regeneration of High Path as set out in Clarion Housing Group’s initial proposals and the Estates Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The homes at High Path will be required to demonstrate that they adhere to the planning policies on housing use in place at the time of any planning application, as with any other development proposal in Merton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. The Impact of a new proposed secondary school on High Path, is not mentioned anywhere in the whole document, and will have a detrimental and devastating effect on the current and future residents, the entire High Path regeneration project, antisocial behavior/law and order situation and an adverse effect on other residents of Merton passing through High Path. For example, extra traffic, footfall, problems at bus stops and underground stations, local supermarkets with more than 1000 children entering and leaving High Path at least 3 times a day and not to mention evening activities which is now a norm for all Secondary Comprehensive Schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The above option is not mentioned or offered in any of the residents surveys or local plans and documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We the law abiding, prudent citizens and true financial stakeholders, (owners of freehold traditional houses and leasehold houses and flats are the main losers because we are not treated fairly in terms of replacement houses and terms and conditions related to new housing/housing offer etc. in comparison to social housing tenants). It is rather strange that the housing association and Merton Council has decided to exclude the proposed Harris Academy Secondary School development on High Path from all their documents. The high Path local plan must not be inferior to any other housing standards applicable to other houses in Merton. The so called acute need for more houses in London must not be used to subsidise Council budgets at the expense of current freehold and leasehold owners of High Path. London Mayor’s minimum housing standards, density and parking restrictions must not be used to lower our current and better standards of housing and parking facilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hello I live in Clay Avenue and I want know when the project will start because I’m going to decorate my house and changing a lot of stuff as well e.g. kitchen, bathroom etc. So it will start soon I don't need to spend my money.

Thank you!

Rahli Y
24/02/17
Paragraph 3.242 makes mention of the reversal of Ravensbury Court flats. This idea was revealed to the residents of Ravensbury Court who thought the idea proponentless. They were more than happy with their current layout as it provides the privacy & intimacy of a post-war news type arrangement. Furthermore, the interior courtyard provides for a sense of community and has done for a number of generations. It seems that the council is unhappy with a cohesive community such as Ravensbury and it is also unhappy that such an enormous amount of scorn has been poured upon their ideas. This idea has to be one of the most ridiculous ones ever met out on a thoroughly misunderstanding of number of residents.

In paragraph 3.243, Ravensbury Court is said to “is rather dead frontage”. Some residents thought it might be nice to be able to access the grassed areas through a new back door, but none thought it a good idea to actually revenue the entire layout to cut. Why this idea has been released at Stage 3 is beyond any understanding. It should also be noted that residents did not want further concrete patio to be installed to the rear of their properties.

Paragraph 3.252 makes mention of the ‘Morden Road access’ area. The access is currently served by a shared space and for incidental play. 

Paragraph 3.253 makes mention of the ‘Ravensbury Court’ flats. Some residents thought it might be nice to be able to access the building and their gardens which are currently served by a shared space and for incidental play. 

Paragraph 3.254 makes mention of the ‘Ravensbury Court’ flats. This idea was revealed to the residents of Ravensbury Court who thought the idea proponentless. They were more than happy with their current layout as it provides the privacy & intimacy of a post-war news type arrangement. Furthermore, the interior courtyard provides for a sense of community and has done for a number of generations. It seems that the council is unhappy with a cohesive community such as Ravensbury and it is also unhappy that such an enormous amount of scorn has been poured upon their ideas. This idea has to be one of the most ridiculous ones ever met out on a thoroughly misunderstanding of number of residents.
9.0 Policy EP R6: Environmental Protection
Little seems to be said in regards to the creation and promotion of habitat within the estate as the current estate layout provides for
wildlife through its large gardens, extensive number of trees and shrubbery. The new estate should reasonably incorporate wildlife provision
through the planting of hedges, trees and general shrub. There will otherwise be a sum loss of wildlife & habitat through the
regeneration of Ravensbury.

Gardens and even homes themselves should be designed to actively wildlife in the form of birds, invertebrates and small mammals. Green roofs could be incorporated but there seems to be no mention of this. This
Maintenance of the banks of the Wandle needs to be controlled by means of a wildlife statement detailing when its ok to trim vegetation and which trees should be left alone. We have had recent cases of Merton Council instructing their tree surgeon contractors to


9.0 Policy EP R6: Environmental Protection
9.0 Policy EP R6: Environmental Protection

Nothing has been said of the extensive area at the southern end of Ravensbury Grove and how the Ravensbury area will be made worse
by the overdevelopment of this uniquely sensitive area. Excessive height here impact on the entirety of Ravensbury estate and will also
damage the park itself. The public spaces here should be mostly retained, otherwise they will be lost forever.

We have included our response to the planning application as this covers many of the salient points in regards to Landscape in
Ravensbury. Please see Appendix 3.0, attached separately.

10.0 Policy EP R7: Landscape

We think that “taller buildings must be located around the edge of the estate” is open to misinterpretation, and that more specifically
Morden Road should be defined as the location for slightly higher buildings. Ravensbury Grove must not receive taller buildings and
neither must the southern boundary with Ravensbury Park.

It should be noted that Ravensbury Court is actually a part 3 and part 4 storey building. The part 3 storey is closer to the park and does
not attempt to compete with the surrounding tree canopy. This should inform future developments to not exceed 3 storeys in height. The 4
storey element of Ravenbury Court actually serves to screen the industrial estate. Therefore any building of 4 storeys in height will
effectively screen the tree canopy of Morden Hall Park and Ravensbury Park, which should be fully proscribed. We think it unfortunate that
no mention of storey heights has been made in section EP R8.
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not attempt to compete with the surrounding tree canopy. This should inform future developments to not exceed 3 storeys in height. The 4
storey element of Ravenbury Court actually serves to screen the industrial estate. Therefore any building of 4 storeys in height will
effectively screen the tree canopy of Morden Hall Park and Ravensbury Park, which should be fully proscribed. We think it unfortunate that
no mention of storey heights has been made in section EP R8.

We think that “taller buildings must be located around the edge of the estate” is open to misinterpretation, and that more specifically
Morden Road should be defined as the location for slightly higher buildings. Ravensbury Grove must not receive taller buildings and
neither must the southern boundary with Ravensbury Park.

It should be noted that Ravensbury Court is actually a part 3 and part 4 storey building. The part 3 storey is closer to the park and does
not attempt to compete with the surrounding tree canopy. This should inform future developments to not exceed 3 storeys in height. The 4
storey element of Ravenbury Court actually serves to screen the industrial estate. Therefore any building of 4 storeys in height will
effectively screen the tree canopy of Morden Hall Park and Ravensbury Park, which should be fully proscribed. We think it unfortunate that
no mention of storey heights has been made in section EP R8.
Consultation's Site analysis Ravensbury Residents Association N/A Eastfields Planning Reeves C Reeves C Reeves C Eastfields Access should be explored but if this was not desirable for residents safety, then this would not go.

SD.6a Schedule of representations received to pre submission publication (stage 3) of Merton's Estates Local Plan December 2016 - February 2017 including officer responses

113003EP Reeves C Eastfields The plan itself only appears to focus on the ‘negatives’ within the estate and, whilst I agree Eastfields does look slightly shabby (previously those dwellings owned by Housing Associations), I was concerned about Eastfields being seen as a ‘Fortress’. Having lived here for over 30 years, the sense of community is strong, as witnessed by the attendance at meetings and the anger and dismay of being told Eastfields was being regenerated.

115003EP Reeves C Eastfields As a homeowner, I am also concerned about the mixed messages being received from Circle Housing and Merton Council. Whilst the plan, and covering letter, denotes that the regeneration will go ahead, we were told by Merton representatives, at a meeting last year, that Eastfields was highly unlikely to be regenerated due to flooding, insufficient space for new builds (before houses could be demolished), and one road in, one road out making it impossible for lorries and building work to access the estate safely, and without major disruption to residents. How has this suddenly changed?

The Health Impact Assessment (HIA) was carried out by the council in partnership with Public Health and is a key piece of evidence that supported the preparation of the Estates Local Plan. The purpose of HIA is to promote sustainable development by integrating (including mental health) and wellbeing considerations into the preparation of plans or strategies; by identifying the key health and wellbeing issues and the groups that are likely to be affected by the implementation of the Plan or the development options. The HIA will be used to assess each stage of the Plan making process and make recommendations to mitigate identified negative impacts, to enhance the proposals or to secure a positive impact.

Noted. The council is unaware of the statement that Eastfields might not be part of the Estates Local Plan. Merton council has been working with Clarion Housing Group and the Environment Agency to consider the flooding within the Eastfields. Through the statutory planning process any development which takes has minimal detrimental flooding impact.

Noted. The council would agree that the community meetings it has held has attracted a large number (and proportion) of Eastfield residents.

Noted. The council's Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a through site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a through site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. As encouraged by national guidance and good practice, the council’s officers met with many different stakeholders as possible during the preparation of the Estates Local Plan residents, Clarion Housing Group, statutory consultees and other interested parties of all whom helped to shape the Estates Local Plan. This is set out in the council’s Statement of Consultation.

Noted. We are sorry that you received the plan in January when publication started on 8th December 2016. The council has adhered to relevant planning requirements e.g. the Town and Country Planning / Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012, concerning the preparation of the Estates Local Plan, to ensure that sufficient time has been provided at each stage of the Plan’s preparation to respond to consultation.

119003EP Reeves C Eastfields 3.23 & 3.27  ‘Access for vehicles is confusing as the estate is part access from Acacia Road and part from Woodstock Way.’ ‘This design principle is horrible. It is bad for children to have to go down a single street with full vehicular access at both ends.”

116003EP Reeves C Eastfields 2.6  ‘...promote biodiversity through open space, street trees...’ There will be much less open space once regeneration takes place, with over twice the amount of dwellings/units are there are currently. One of the features that attracted us to Eastfields was the open space, which creates light within our homes. Under the new designs, houses will be much closer together and overlooking each other, making them darker inside.

Design Townscapes E1

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.

Noted. The council’s Estates Local Plan is based on a thorough site analysis of the Ravensbury Estate and the area in which it is site. The vision for Ravensbury is based around a surfurban parkland setting. The policies in the Estates Local Plan for Ravensbury focus on maintaining the secluded parkland setting set out in the vision for Ravensbury. The Estates Local Plan will not scar the setting of the area nor will it result of quality public space nor will it result in a net loss of affordable housing.
The above five documents make up the Statutory Development Plan for the borough. These contain the planning
N/A
Site analysis.
All Three
Noted. Minor amendment proposed throughout plan: Circle Housing Merton Priory, Clarion Housing Group.

As we stated in our previous representations, the London Plan Policy 3.7 identifies that large sites (measuring 5ha or more) are able to
This is an important legislative context that should be included within the DPD. This is currently not clear in paragraph 2.8 of the draft
accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
The draft ELP will form part of the development plan and as such it is important to make it clearer, that any planning application must
Development Plan
The DPD at paragraph 2.21 refers to “comprehensive regeneration”. Whilst Latimer is committed to the delivery of all three schemes, in
but the wider Borough. Latimer is therefore supportive of the Council for bringing forward the DPD to aid the comprehensive
presents the greatest opportunity to realise significant physical, social, economic and environmental benefits for not only the Estates
after extensive assessment recognises that the full regeneration of High Path and Eastfields and the partial regeneration of Ravensbury
Latimer has undertaken an extensive feasibility and discounting exercise in selecting these three Estates for regeneration. Latimer has
Further to the issue of the “Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation – Stage 3 Consultation (December 2016 – February 2017)” we write to
Representations made on behalf of Latimer Developments Limited
Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation
Further to the issue of the “Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation – Stage 3 Consultation (December 2016 – February 2017)” we write to
make formal representations to the consultation on behalf of Latimer Developments Limited (Latimer). Circle Housing Merton Priory and Latimer Developments Limited. The Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation Responses made on behalf of Latimer Developments Limited.

Overview
Latimer welcomes the Council’s support for regeneration and intensification of the estates as set out in the Draft Local Plan and for the
broad changes and alterations made since the Stage 2 Consultation. Latimer (and Savills as their planning agent) also request to participate in the examination hearings on Merton’s ELFD and to be notified when the document is adopted.

As you will be aware, Latimer is at an advanced stage of preparation of the outline planning applications for the three estates and it is
anticipated that these will be submitted prior to the examination hearings. Following a thorough review of the latest draft ELFD, we have a number of minor comments and suggested amendments that we discuss in the following sections.

Comprehensive Regeneration
Latimer has undertaken an extensive feasibility and discounting exercise in selecting these three Estates for regeneration. Latimer has
considered a number of alternative options, such as meeting Decent Homes Standards only, as set out in the Case for Regeneration and after extensive analysis and assessment of the opportunities and risks and the partial regeneration of Ravensbury presents the greatest opportunity to realise significant physical, social, economic and environmental benefits for not only the Estates but the wider Borough. Latimer is therefore supportive of the Council for bringing forward the ELP to aid the comprehensive regeneration of each of the Estates. The ELP at paragraph 2.21 refers to “comprehensive regeneration”. Whilst Latimer is committed to the delivery of all three schemes, in planning terms planning permission could be granted for them individually. As such it would be helpful if the DPD recognised that the schemes are not mutually dependant and that they could therefore be granted planning permission separately should this be required.

Development Plan
The draft ELFD will form part of the development plan and as such it is important to make it clearer that any planning application must
have regard to the whole development plan, including the London Plan (2016), the Core City Strategy and Sites and Policies DPD, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is an important legislative context that should be included within the DPD. This is currently not clear in paragraph 2.8 of the draft ELFD.

Further to the issue of the “Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation – Stage 3 Consultation (December 2016 – February 2017)” we write to
make formal representations to the consultation on behalf of Latimer Developments Limited (Latimer). Circle Housing Merton Priory and Latimer Developments Limited.

Overview
Latimer welcomes the Council’s support for regeneration and intensification of the estates as set out in the Draft Local Plan and for the
broad changes and alterations made since the Stage 2 Consultation. Latimer (and Savills as their planning agent) also request to participate in the examination hearings on Merton’s ELFD and to be notified when the document is adopted.

As you will be aware, Latimer is at an advanced stage of preparation of the outline planning applications for the three estates and it is
anticipated that these will be submitted prior to the examination hearings. Following a thorough review of the latest draft ELFD, we have a number of minor comments and suggested amendments that we discuss in the following sections.

Comprehensive Regeneration
Latimer has undertaken an extensive feasibility and discounting exercise in selecting these three Estates for regeneration. Latimer has
considered a number of alternative options, such as meeting Decent Homes Standards only, as set out in the Case for Regeneration and after extensive analysis and assessment of the opportunities and risks and the partial regeneration of Ravensbury presents the greatest opportunity to realise significant physical, social, economic and environmental benefits for not only the Estates but the wider Borough. Latimer is therefore supportive of the Council for bringing forward the ELP to aid the comprehensive regeneration of each of the Estates. The ELP at paragraph 2.21 refers to “comprehensive regeneration”. Whilst Latimer is committed to the delivery of all three schemes, in planning terms planning permission could be granted for them individually. As such it would be helpful if the DPD recognised that the schemes are not mutually dependant and that they could therefore be granted planning permission separately should this be required.

Development Plan
The draft ELFD will form part of the development plan and as such it is important to make it clearer that any planning application must
have regard to the whole development plan, including the London Plan (2016), the Core City Strategy and Sites and Policies DPD, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is an important legislative context that should be included within the DPD. This is currently not clear in paragraph 2.8 of the draft ELFD.

Further to the issue of the “Submission Draft Estates Local Plan Consultation – Stage 3 Consultation (December 2016 – February 2017)” we write to
make formal representations to the consultation on behalf of Latimer Developments Limited (Latimer). Circle Housing Merton Priory and Latimer Developments Limited.

Overview
Latimer welcomes the Council’s support for regeneration and intensification of the estates as set out in the Draft Local Plan and for the
broad changes and alterations made since the Stage 2 Consultation. Latimer (and Savills as their planning agent) also request to participate in the examination hearings on Merton’s ELFD and to be notified when the document is adopted.

As you will be aware, Latimer is at an advanced stage of preparation of the outline planning applications for the three estates and it is
anticipated that these will be submitted prior to the examination hearings. Following a thorough review of the latest draft ELFD, we have a number of minor comments and suggested amendments that we discuss in the following sections.

Comprehensive Regeneration
Latimer has undertaken an extensive feasibility and discounting exercise in selecting these three Estates for regeneration. Latimer has
considered a number of alternative options, such as meeting Decent Homes Standards only, as set out in the Case for Regeneration and after extensive analysis and assessment of the opportunities and risks and the partial regeneration of Ravensbury presents the greatest opportunity to realise significant physical, social, economic and environmental benefits for not only the Estates but the wider Borough. Latimer is therefore supportive of the Council for bringing forward the ELP to aid the comprehensive regeneration of each of the Estates. The ELP at paragraph 2.21 refers to “comprehensive regeneration”. Whilst Latimer is committed to the delivery of all three schemes, in planning terms planning permission could be granted for them individually. As such it would be helpful if the DPD recognised that the schemes are not mutually dependant and that they could therefore be granted planning permission separately should this be required.

Development Plan
The draft ELFD will form part of the development plan and as such it is important to make it clearer that any planning application must
have regard to the whole development plan, including the London Plan (2016), the Core City Strategy and Sites and Policies DPD, in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This is an important legislative context that should be included within the DPD. This is currently not clear in paragraph 2.8 of the draft ELFD.
The submitted planning application will be determined in accordance with the London Plan Density Matrix using the TfL Webcat tool.

The design teams have undertaken an extensive review of the draft ELP and wider Development Plan and have developed outline masterplan proposals on the basis of detailed urban design analysis. We are broadly supportive of the changes the Council has made to rectify the conflicts between policies in the previous draft. Notwithstanding this, we have identified the following areas where amendments should be made:

- Policies HP 17, HP 7, HP 7E and HP 9E create restrictive land use requirements which do not align with the requirements contained under other relevant policies. For example, Policy HP 17 ‘Landscapes and ecological corridors’ requires a number of mature trees to be retained in the playground to the north of the ‘March Court’ block which is in direct contradiction with the urban design requirements for a building to be located fronting Pincott Road.
- The respondent gives no detail or example of the ‘design and existing utilities’ constraints they mention. Similarly, this point was made and answered in the previous consultation.

Policy HP 7 requires that where possible, existing trees will be retained, however retention should be based upon a robust arboriculture and urban design in line with Policy 7.2.1 of the London Plan.

The respondent gives no detail of how the central street is designed. As highlighted within our previous representations, the PPG (Reference ID: 26-010-20140306) notes that ‘Development proposals should promote accessibility and safe local routes by making places that connect with the network’. The role of Pincott Road and Nelson Grove Road are the most suitable locations for landmark buildings’. Policies HP 17, HP 7 and HP 7E and are in general conformity with. London Plan Policy 7.2.3 ‘Trees and Woodlands’ (ref: 102 Frequentiation) ‘Boroughs should follow the advice of paragraph 218 of the PPG to protect “veteran” trees and ancient woodland where there are not other policies to specify where such trees should be retained. The reasons for retaining the balance of arboricultural and specific building design will be undertaken as part of assessing any planning application, and any loss may be mitigated as also set out in London Plan policy 7.2.1 Planning decisions. Existing trees of value should be retained and any loss as the result of development should be replaced following the principle of “right tree, right place, right time”.

When appropriate, the planting of additional trees should be included in new developments, particularly large-crowned species.”

We welcome the increased flexibility in the draft policies; however, set out below are a few examples of where additional flexibility could be considered:

- **Traffic and Transport**
  - Street RP 20 and 21, General RP 19, Policy EP 10.2 (Traffic Generation), and Policy EP 10.3 (Traffic Routing)
  - This general approach is supported. However, this approach has not always been followed through in the policies and supporting text of the draft Plan.

To test any new development policy to show that it will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and that it will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall. We would refer applicants to the advice and flow chart within section 8 of our flood risk statement.

We support the increased flexibility in the draft policies; however, set out below are a few examples of where additional flexibility could be considered:

- **Traffic and Transport**
  - Street RP 20 and 21, General RP 19, Policy EP 10.2 (Traffic Generation), and Policy EP 10.3 (Traffic Routing)
  - This general approach is supported. However, this approach has not always been followed through in the policies and supporting text of the draft Plan.

To test any new development policy to show that it will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and that it will be safe for its lifetime, without increasing flood risk elsewhere and where possible reduce flood risk overall. We would refer applicants to the advice and flow chart within section 8 of our flood risk statement.
Street Network – Policy EP 1(b) provides prescriptive policy as to the street network to be retained and altered. Following the IJP guidance as noted above, providing a junction from Nelson Grove onto Morden Road may have traffic impact and movement issues, including being too close to the Merton High Street signalised junction. It would require all traffic to instead route through the masterplan site. As such, this policy could be amended to allow highways proposals to be developed at application stage through consultation with the relevant highways authorities.

Movement and Access - Policy EP10(c) refers to包括 measures to reduce the physical barrier of Morden Road. It is suggested this should be expanded to “where possible” to take account of this being outside of the site boundary and proposals to be developed in conjunction with the relevant highways authorities.

Open Space – Policies EP 17 (d), H 5 (d) and R 5 (d) state that “All new houses must have gardens that meet or exceed current space standards”. This blanket approach is too restrictive and does not take into account the nature of various styles of property. It is common for both means and town house properties to have smaller garden spaces, reflecting their historic design. As such, the policy could incorporate greater flexibility to reflect the various characteristics of different house types and character areas.

Design Requirements - This section provides “detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered”. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements - This section makes reference to providing communal bin stores for refuse storage. This could be amended to allow other solutions to be considered, for example Underground Refuse Systems, which will be subject to agreement with the Council’s waste team.

Design Requirements - This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.

Design Requirements – This section sets out the detailed guidance to applicants that they will be expected to focus on in more detail to demonstrate that the Vision, Urban Design Principles and Site-Specific Policies of the Plan can be delivered. The section continues to refer to the design principles as guidance throughout this section. The title ‘Design Requirements’ thereby limits the design-led process which the Council supports. The policy should therefore note that “where possible” existing trees will be retained; however retention should be based on a robust arboriculture and urban design analysis. This addition would reflect the wording contained within the High Path ‘Issues and Opportunities: Good quality landscaping and vegetation’ section (Page 102) which incorporates the statement ‘unite there are other compelling reasons that provide benefits to outweigh this’. It also notes that Policy EP 17 requires the widening and enhancement of the entrance to Ravensbury Park. This policy should suggest the implication of such measures only and be subject to flexibility.
I've had a quick look through the Estate local plan regarding Ravensbury Estate and would like to highlight three points. Firstly, photos of the estate show just about the most shod and down-at-heel section of the estate - in Ruster Gardens. There are no photos showing the trees and lovely open green area in front of the community centre, the raised flower beds at the end of Ravensbury Grove (near the garage) or the open/green spaces around Hengelo Gardens and Ravensbury Road. If the more typical/predictable parts of the estate were shown it would highlight the fact that regeneration isn’t really needed at all and that the current residents are at risk of losing some beautiful spaces if the current plans go ahead.

Secondly, the photos in the "The Vision" section, suggesting what the Ravensbury estate could look like (page 34), show mainly low-level buildings surrounded by plenty of green space. The actual plans however portray the pretty, low-level buildings currently in place as being replaced with high-rise blocks. No-one who lives on the estate wants high-rise blocks. We do not want to lose the current amount of open space or the low-level buildings which encourage a sense of community. Instead, I understand that parking will be reduced in the current plans, though this is not made clear in this stage. I would like to see the local estate plan all. Parking is already quite difficult around the estate. Reducing parking spaces and increasing residents will make the situation very stressful, and could, in effect, lead to residents parking permitsu something that no-one wants.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R8 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. Policy EP R8 "building heights" states "while there is a need to increase density, to do so too much would undermine the landscape character of the area. Building heights must not compete with established mature trees which envelope the estate. Any strategy for building heights should make a positive contribution to the existing townscape, character and local distinctiveness of the area".

Noted. The Ravensbury part 3 "site analysis and planning policies" contain a number of photos including of the raised flower beds outside Ravensbury Grove and the open / green spaces around Hengelo Court.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R9 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R9 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. Policy EP R8 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R8 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R9 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.

Noted. No change proposed. Policy EP R9 states that building heights in the vicinity of Ravensbury Garages must relate to the surrounding established tree canopy and to the scale of adjacent existing buildings.

Noted. As the main access, traffic conditions and movement along Ravensbury Grove is expected not to increase significantly but will be monitored at each stage of development. Alterations that encourage the belief that Ravensbury Grove is a through-road should not be installed. A best practice approach to streetcape design and access management will prevent improper use of this street.
The above five documents make up the Statutory Development Plan for the borough. These contain the planning policies that guide development in the borough, and it will sit alongside these documents and form part of the Local Plan.

The priority of these Estates is for residential re-generation. This has not been specially identified for the development of sports facilities however the consideration of sports facilities (See paragraphs 3.72 and 3.179) is enabled through the proposed open space policies. Where there is justification for the provision of a large public open space the Estates Plan encourages design to include sports courts and the plan states that development proposals for such spaces must be in accordance with para. 74 of the NPPF and Sport England’s Land Use Policy Statement ‘Planning for Sport Aims and Objectives’. The Estates Local Plan does not duplicate policies in the rest of the adopted Local Plan (e.g. sports and recreation). The planning application stage applications to develop these estates will need to be assessed against Merton’s Core Strategy Policies including Policy C33 (b-Lesure and Culture) which promotes new and improved sport and recreation facilities and Merton’s Sites and Policies Plan Policy O40 (Open Space) which encourages the protection and enhancement of playing fields and opportunities for sport, recreation and play. London Plan policies 3.16 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure) and 3.30 (Sports facilities) would also need to be considered. Proposed development and potential needs would also be assessed against Merton Council’s Merton Sports Strategy (June 2011).

The council prepared a Playing Pitch Study with Sport England in 2011. This strategy examines the boroughs supply and demand for pitches and the potential future requirements for pitch sports needs in Merton from 2012-2026, particularly in the first five years (to December 2016). From 2017 the council will be preparing a new borough-wide Local Plan which will include a new Playing Pitch Study to inform new borough-wide policies on sport and recreation, should any be needed. The council would welcome discussion with Sport England on the scope of the new strategy to ensure it meets their requirements.

Merton Modification 04 and 05 proposed to clarify that development proposals across the three estates will be assessed against the statutory development plan at the time of any planning application, including the Estates Local Plan, Merton’s Core Planning Strategy, London Plan 2016 and Sites and Policies Plan. The Estates Local Plan does not duplicate policies in the rest of the adopted Local Plan (e.g. sports and recreation). The planning application stage applications to develop these estates will need to be assessed against Merton’s Core Strategy Policies including Policy C33 (b-Lesure and Culture) which promotes new and improved sport and recreation facilities and Merton’s Sites and Policies Plan Policy O40 (Open Space) which encourages the protection and enhancement of playing fields and opportunities for sport, recreation and play. London Plan policies 3.16 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure) and 3.30 (Sports facilities) would also need to be considered. Proposed development and potential needs would also be assessed against Merton Council’s Merton Sports Strategy (June 2011).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation Requestor</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>010035A2</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>All Three</td>
<td>Sport England advocates that new developments should contribute to the sporting and recreational needs of the locality made necessary by their development.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Noted. At the planning application stage, developers will need to be assessed against Merton’s Core Strategy Policies including Policy CS13 (Leisure and Culture) which promotes new and improved sport and recreation facilities and Merton’s Ideas and Policies Plan Policy DM01 (Open Space) which encourages the protection and enhancement of playing fields and opportunities for sport, recreation and play. London Plan policies 3.10 (Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure) and 3.19 (Sports facilities) would also need to be considered. The Estates Local Plan does not duplicate policies in the rest of the adopted Local Plan (e.g. sports and recreation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035A8</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>All Three</td>
<td>Sport England would be happy to provide further advice on how local authorities can strategically plan for sports facilities. There are a number of tools and guidance documents available, which can be found on Sport England’s website at: [<a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/Planning/planning-for-sport/how-to-plan/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/Planning/planning-for-sport/how-to-plan/</a>]. In addition Sport England has a web-based toolkit which aims to assist local authorities in delivering tailor-made approaches to strategic planning for sport. This can be found on Sport England’s website at: [<a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/Planning/planning-for-sport/previous-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/Planning/planning-for-sport/previous-guidance/</a>]. The toolkit focuses on four facilities for sport and recreation, setting out how planners can make the best use of sport-specific planning tools to determine local facility needs. Information regarding planning obligations for sport can be found on Sport England’s website at: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/planning_contributions.aspx">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities/planning/planning_tools_and_guidance/planning_contributions.aspx</a>.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted with thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035A9</td>
<td>Sport England</td>
<td>All Three</td>
<td>We hope these comments can be given full consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or would like to discuss the response.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted with thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B1</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The plan appears to show a decrease in the amount of green areas, this too will mean that pollution will be increased. There needs to be focus on creating more green spaces, and more trees being planted and cared for.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Noted. The existing estate features a number of disconnected incidental areas of green space that have little amenity value and are not useful to residents. There is a lack of central open space or a network of open space areas for recreational use by residents. Policy EP H5 (a) of the Estates Plan states that there must be an equivalent or better re-provision of the area of designated open space with the boundary. Any planning application to re-develop the site will have to be assessed against this policy along with policies in Merton’s Core Strategy (Policy CS13 (a)), Merton’s Ideas and Policies Plan (Policy DM01) and the London Plan (Policy 7.18) which ensure developments maintain appropriate levels of open space and address identified deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B2</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The plan appears to show a decrease in the amount of green areas, this too will mean that pollution will be increased. There needs to be focus on creating more green spaces, and more trees being planted and cared for.</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Noted. This issue is outside the remit of the Estates Local Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B3</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>The tram stop need not be in South Wimbledon as the walk to either Morden Road or Merton Park tram stops are more than six minutes longer and both are within five minutes of South Wimbledon station. The tram stop would be better placed in Colliers Wood.</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Movement and Access</td>
<td>Noted. Proposals for a tram stop at South Wimbledon are still at a early feasibility stage and may therefore change. The Council will continue to work in partnership with TfL to ensure that transport infrastructure opportunities are incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B4</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Further to the pollution, it needs to be considered whether to have schools built in such a highly polluted area, any further increase in local schools will simply increase the number of children suffering from toxic air respiratory problems. Along with the impact on Teachers who will be required to work in the area and parents/residents.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B5</td>
<td>Thomas B</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>I would like to be kept informed about the submission to the Secretary of State, the publication of the independent planning inspector’s report and when Merton’s Estates Local Plan is adopted.</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B6</td>
<td>Tinnelly J&amp;H</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Thank you for your letter inviting us to view the ‘Pre-Submission Estates Plan’. Our main concern, that we would like to see reflected before submission, is that the plan does not seem to reflect the most recent proposals we have seen and objected to from Circle Housing. This raises serious concerns that the council and the housing authority are not in sync, and that Circle Housing is not reflecting key elements and policies laid out in your plan. In general we like and support your plan, which clearly puts the people who live in the neighbourhood at the centre of its policies. However we feel that these policies are not reflected in the plans of Circle Housing.</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Noted with thanks. Any regeneration proposals, including those presented by Clarion Housing Group, will be determined in accordance with the Estates Local Plan, the London Plan and other policies. Any proposals that are not in accordance with the plans set out above, require the applicant to justify their proposals and amend their proposals accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B7</td>
<td>Tinnelly J&amp;H</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>We raised objections to the most recent consultation which was the proposed purchase and regeneration of the Old Lampworks in Rodney Place (Planning Application 16/73718); an area which is almost entirely excluded from the plan you outline (exceptions are noted below). Attached are a copy of the concerns we raised in October, which in summary are right to light, disturbance/overcrowding, loss of privacy, the proposed houses do not fit the look &amp; feel of Rodney Place and historical significance.</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>In March 2017 Merton’s Planning Applications Committee resolved to grant permission (subject to Section 106) for The Old Lampworks in Rodney Place (Planning Reference 16/73718). The issues that you have raised were considered as part of this assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B8</td>
<td>Tinnelly J&amp;H</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>In relation to the ‘Pre-Submission Estates Plan’ we have the following comments: Building Height</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Street Network</td>
<td>Thank you for your support. Policy EP HB Building heights sets out what applicants must consider the sensitivities of Rodney Place. For example section (g) ‘the close proximity of Rodney Place and Merenuton Way create a need to respect existing low-rise development’... Building heights in this area must particularly respect and be sensitive to these constraints”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010035B9</td>
<td>Tinnelly J&amp;H</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Noted. This issue is outside the remit of the Estates Local Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**References**

The proposed 3-storey townhouse opposite our house may be marginally higher but add density in a very narrow estate, whilst a 7-storey apartment block directly contradicts your policy asking that the Rodney Place development be respected.

Noted.

The illustration on pg. 96 (site analysis) highlights a negative view from the centre of Rodney Place looking west to the existing blocks. We believe that a similar, if worse, view would exist looking south if the proposed apartment block were to be developed, as well as generally taller buildings in surrounding area than the existing majority 2-3-storey blocks (with the exception of the 12-storey tower block). Whilst you have considered the new buildings in the estate in relation to each other, you have not considered existing buildings who are also valid council members and part of this neighbourhood, and the impact on us.

Noted. The aim is for Rodney Place to integrate well with any new adjacent streets. There are no proposals to change the character of the street or alter its cut-de-sac layout. The plan shows a potential change to the access to Rodney Place, from Nelson Grove road (a main estate street) to a new north-south street (a minor street) that itself could have a new style character. This is likely to reinforce the secluded character of Rodney Place, rather than encourage more people to use it. Some changes are suggested to reinforce this point. Replace paras. 3.140 and 3.141 with new paras: “Mews style street development should be reserved for shorter streets - the existing Rodney Place is a good example. Whilst Rodney Place is outside the estate boundary, better linking it into the new street patterns should be considered in order to both protect it's character and improve access to it from the surrounding streets.” The key to the map on p127 regarding Rodney Place should be amended to: “Rodney Place potential integration into new street pattern.”

We believe that a similar, if worse, view would exist looking south if the proposed apartment block were to be developed, as well as generally taller buildings in surrounding area than the existing majority 2-3-storey blocks (with the exception of the 12-storey tower block). Whilst you have considered the new buildings in the estate in relation to each other, you have not considered existing buildings who are also valid council members and part of this neighbourhood, and the impact on us.

For High Path, unlike the other two, more self contained areas, there are a multiplicity of problems and challenges which have not been properly acknowledged, and therefore not properly resolved.

We also have the internal transport and access, and the existing cut off from Meretun Way is a problem. Ideally High Path should be converted to a quiet way for bicycles and pedestrians only, with access to Merton Abbey School, The Resource (disabled persons’ centre), St. Albans and Middle Park. Including policy HM.02.jpg (H3 Movement & Access) highlights a ‘green chain’ towards Wandle River crossing our front garden without any further elaboration on how or why this is proposed.

Illustration on pg. 99 (H3 Movement & Access) highlights a cycle/pedestrian path/flow through my back garden without any further elaboration on how or why this is proposed. Similarly the illustration on pg. 122 (H6 Environmental Protection) highlights a ‘green chain’ towards Wandle River crossing our front garden without any further elaboration on how or why this is proposed.

Illustration on pg. 133 (H3 Movement & Access) highlights a cycle/pedestrian path/flow through my back garden without any further elaboration on how or why this is proposed. Similarly the illustration on pg. 122 (H6 Environmental Protection) highlights a ‘green chain’ towards Wandle River crossing our front garden without any further elaboration on how or why this is proposed.

For High Path, unlike the other two, more self contained areas, there are a multiplicity of problems and challenges which have not been properly acknowledged, and therefore not properly resolved.

The proposed 3-storey townhouse opposite our house may be marginally higher but add density in a very narrow estate, whilst a 7-storey apartment block directly contradicts your policy asking that the Rodney Place development be respected.

Noted.

The proposed 3-storey townhouse opposite our house may be marginally higher but add density in a very narrow estate, whilst a 7-storey apartment block directly contradicts your policy asking that the Rodney Place development be respected.

Noted.

The proposed 3-storey townhouse opposite our house may be marginally higher but add density in a very narrow estate, whilst a 7-storey apartment block directly contradicts your policy asking that the Rodney Place development be respected.

Noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation Responses</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Policy Officer Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>160015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>This has been compounded with the plans of CRAB to demolish and re-build the area they supposedly have responsibility for. Residents have been treated by officers, agents, and staff as less than second-class citizens in a patronising manner, and vulnerable persons have had verbal promises made by persons whom have no authority to do so. The whole procedure has been handled in a stress-inducing manner and has (in my opinion) hastened to an early death at least 4 persons nearby on the estate.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Priory Close - The first block to be built (1953-57), mostly on the site of a larger villas, including Mulberry Cottage, the home of Lord Nelson’s gardener if I read the maps correctly. Its U shape gives a light and any-view access to St Johns Church, with all flats being at least dual aspect and maximising the south facing areas where possible. There is scope to add mansard roof or similar cedar clad dwelling units if the water storage tanks are replaced with modern mansard value. Controlled supplies to water services in the main flats. Similar style flats elsewhere in London (including where as part of consultation participation Stockwell Park) have been, albeit inevitably, lift shafts built to the stairwells giving step free access to all flats. This could be done, financed by sale or market rental of the mansard units. Priory Close also overlooks the toddler play area, which is good. The roadway around the internal of Priory Close is unnamed but specified as undesignated as Priory Close South Path. The road to the north of Priory Close I had always been Nelson Grove Road, but was renamed Rowland Way at the same time as the roads of Hayward Close and Downham Close were extended northwards in 1977 to form the housing areas and Rowland Way is confirmed as being adopted by Merton Council Highways Department. The double height archway within Priory Close presently allows for two flats to be larger than others within the block. Arguably it is confusing in that 4 entrances to the flats are within the internal of the U, with two stairwells to the external facing Rowland Way. One could only ask the logic of this of the original architect and their brief - more logical the entrances on Rowland Way would have been better named and numbered as a separate block name.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Gilbert Close / Beckton Close - This pairing form complementary, but slightly different layouts, to the east and west of the courtyard that is the hall-way for young people. Access to upper stories for persons with disabilities or information has same issues as the other mansard and low rise blocks across the existing high path estate. Again opportunities exist for providing dwelling accommodation to double or single-mansard level (similar in E1 flats to similar style at Hatfield Mead on London Road, Morden). It is unclear if Highways department are responsible for maintenance of road surfaces as in their list of adopted roads they exclude a number of un-named roads across the borough but do not specifically exclude this roadway around the block court. The garage block to the north takes advantage of the difficulties of building dwelling units adjacent to the large electricity transformer station of London Underground. The northern end of Beckton Close is determined by the access to the area to The Dark House (Kilkeney Tavern) on Merton High Street and other former land in private hands in Merton High Street prior to acquisition by Merton Council in the 1970s.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Ryder House - Broadly a blocks of flats facing east/west for dual aspect flats, with two stairwell cores on Hayward Close, and Two on area of named roads (arguably the East end of Rowland Way, or the , as I would say, the West extension of Nelson Grove Road, short arms north and south form an effective</td>
<td>shape</td>
<td>, with the far extensions thereof looking like elegance bay extensions, but again flat rooves suffer from the same lack of attentive maintenance. The main part of the block has an Italianate red tiled pitched roof, again the formation of mansard flats would not be impossible, along with extending the end flats over the flat roofs, to provide larger dwellings assisting with overcrowding. Much of Ryder House is built on the former repair works of Pilcher Motor Bodies (who moved to Andover in 1950s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Eleanor House - This provides a strange duplex of flats in an L shape. The external is not unattractive but access is difficult and appears impossible to improve for persons with disabilities, one solution would be to gut internally the unit, and re-configure as duplex</td>
<td>accommodation and space could be made at minimal disruption for a good gain.</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Ramley House - The lounges of this have an elegant view over the playing fields of the primary school and although steam trains no longer puff along the railway there is external movement to be noticed. Access to the stairwell cores is poor and the bin stores and washing areas need re-working. The roadway again is unspecified as to adoption by merton council. The verandas are the only ones on the estate to have elevated mansard level and the light and airy view on the estate. The four storeys only work here on high path itself because the building is set back from the road and behind a grass area, there is scope to break out the ground floor units as gardens, but gardens need time and maintenance which not every householder is able to devote effectively</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Pavel Road - With only the Traffalgur Public house standing from the original terrace of houses, it is important that alteration is decided is desirable that such building remains as a visible business. The terrace of houses, again with Plateau Faceting, are solid, desirable and quite spacious, with space for off road parking and rear gardens giving amenity. Quite how these were originally allocated is a mystery to me. I am sure a lot of people at the time would have liked much of high path estate to be built like these. Design</td>
<td>Planning Application</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Tanner House Built quite late into the 1950s what should be a good solid rooms was built unnecessarily small to my view, with a cramped form of the L Shape. But there is scope to extend at the east to build three larger flats, and with re-working of bin store, break the L and provide two separate blocks, otherwise overall I am personally unawared about the loss of this property if a building or buildings of quality can be placed on its footprint.</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SD.6a Schedule of representations received to pre submission publication (stage 3) of Merton’s Estates Local Plan December 2016 - February 2017 including officer responses

Alphabetical order by representor

Reference Consultation Respondent Estate Comment

170015SH Veacock I High Path Mychell House - the two commercial units built into the estate, one was a convenience store, replacing Lee’s Store on the site of May Court and a replacement for WW Lamps from Merton High Street, at present there is an office and convenience store, which I use from time to time and is important for a retail offering on the south side of Merton high street accessible by all persons. All flats are 2 Bed but they are smaller than other two bed units, sensitive re-construction maybe extending toward refusal road may provide some better space and more daylight.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path Deal Close The former estate office – then police station, less used, it should be brought back into use ideally as estate hub for residents use and for caretakers, community support persons etc, or converted into residential use. Our independent representatives minority way into earlier consultation were of the opinion that an estate and community centre was desirable where issues could be raised and solved promptly, our visit to Stockwell Park, an estate of similar size and density, had such, including strong local management by resident representatives, re-informed this need, which is ignored by merton council and CHIMP.

Design Planning Application Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path Vanguard House - Probably exemplifies some of the worse construction on the estate, small internal units, dark internal stairwell and corridor, dual entrance yet only four units per landing core – two per doorway, no access for wheelchairs to upper floors. I am afraid that demolition is the only sensible thing, and allowing rubble of the green space and trees to Merton High Street there is scope for a quality, four to three storey building in a modern (but not the brick and metal window design proposed) – a white render with flying V bays and some vertical timber cladding should look quite good on this corner, possibly moulded into the curve. Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Planning Application Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path De Burgh House - Raised on its plinth for no real reason that I can understand, slightly small one bed flats have little to commend them, as long as replacement can be no greater than 3 storeys on Nelson Grove Close and 4 storeys to a facing of Hillborough Close then if parking, amenity and a way around the plane trees to the north solved there is little that could be worse. Ideally where possible sound tiles, bricks, metalwork and timbers should all be set aside and re-used on the grounds of saving the earths scarce resources.

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path Wellington Close – its own little community of flats in desperate need of proper painting to timberwork and front doors. No one wishes to move from there, the last units on the estate to be built , almost as an afterthough, but still leaving space for merton high street to be widened.

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path Hillborough Close – Internals see Norfolk House. - Biggest problem is outlook is mostly to the north over not a lot, bedrooms and lounges face south, which is generally good. Solid construction, completed earlier just after merton place. Has black and brick construction thought, cavity wall and roof insulation in left space of tiled pitched roof. Possibly build mansard flats into rooftop if water tanks relocated.

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path Northfield House - Good, some 2 beds have triple aspect flats, spacious internals, 7mca approx ground floor storage, 3mca (3mca external storage on 2 beds, 3mca on 1 bed). 1 Bed has internal built-in bedroom wardrobe and plenty of storage space. Separate kitchen mean easy to entertain with guests overnighting in lounge if required. Original space heating Coal fire with back boiler to immersion heater – quite efficient some have back radiator to a bedroom. Design could have been better but overall 10ftx12ft by 12ft lounge beds 12ft by 20ft and good sized kitchen/diner with plenty of coat hanging etc space in hallways. Difficult to find longer flat in any purpose built block private or council house anywhere in South London or Surrey. Delays in completing original construction from 1959 to 1962 possibly led to some concrete failure by assured by Mr Harold Turner of Merton Housing Department in the 1980s this was under the foundations thereof.

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path N/A

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path N/A

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path N/A

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.

170015SH Veacock I High Path N/A

Design Area is located in Merton Place Archaeological Priority Area therefore any developer will be required to investigate with an qualified archaeological expert. In addition Policy EP H13 (d) references the need to highlight local history particularly around Nelson.

Design Noted. In February 2017 planning permission was granted for the former police office on Frincott Road to change use into a community centre. The centre will be run by South Wimbledon Community Association. Policy EP H4 Land Use (a) recognises the potential for commercial and community uses within a redeveloped High Path.
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### Alphabetical order by representor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Consultation Respondent</th>
<th>Estate</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>194015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Overall Hilborough, Roskirt and Lovell are rarely considered as part of High Path estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Tower Blocks – Cracking to concrete external faces appears no more than surface stress cracks are not important, give the external a wash down to improve. Some damage to roof from where cradles for double glazing installation works were hung. From a distance, including Wimbledon Hill Road and roads up Wimbledon Hill and Alexander Road, these identify home, externally not displaying having interesting mosaics to mulls to fronts. Improvements – build and sell two of penthouse glazed flats to roof level provide ground floor conservatory space and convert side accesses to storage areas to community uses, storage for gardening materials, coffee room, table tennis room etc. like all tower blocks the ground floor areas attract gale force winds from the generally prevailing westerlies. As replacement buildings should have wind flow modelled to ensure not excess to detriment of persons or chattels. Noted that original kitchen units not as well built as say Norfolk House, drawers have hardboard bottoms rather than plywood for example. Noted that a vacant units pass back to CHMP kitchens, bathrooms and flooring are replaced, weather needed or not it seems. As built space heating by means of gas-fired warm air system (not communal) didn’t work (my Grandmother and Cousin have lived in these blocks in the 70s and 80s) so dammed cold in winter, less so now conventional central heating and double glazing. Kitchens smaller and don’t work as dining, but replacement properties seem little gain for the pain involved, unless good justification on estimated physical life left less than 40 years seems to be no point replacing with anything that doesn’t look as nice. Either flats or a core level works well, if you like that few internals, one would not like to live in any of these, nor the replacement (but then I don’t like the listed Barbican development of similar age nor new build at Chelsea Harbour – private or social flats) but staggering across the centre of the estate is interesting view of type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>General – It is important that the scheme develop provide dimension details of all old flat &amp; nature HoHs including, doors, window lofts, space, gardem correctly measured, sheds where not in gardens, and all internal space including integrated storage space of the forgoing to the inspector for independent review of the assertion that replacement properties will in fact be larger than each flat they seek to replace and that the same amount of storage and living space be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>It is also contended that new properties will be easier to heat. As all of the existing have insulation in roof spaces where there are pitched roofs, most have insulated cavity, and all tenanted properties have double glazing. The only improvement would be if all roofs were pitched and insulated (admittedly today one would build with pitched insulation to flat roofs which exist do not have- they could be retrofitted), triple glazed and solar panels contributing to space heating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Garages could be built over using YMCA Y Cube design, would enhance area – see Eastfields development already completed we could have housed 12 families by now over all the talking we have had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Extremely confusing having block of flats and a road having same name. Someone needs to review one of them. Break Close would be topaz…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Road requires resurfacing – the pub garden had been part of an orchard from and onwards from Nelson’s Merton Place and it is also contended that new properties will be easier to heat. As all of the existing have insulation in roof spaces where there are pitched roofs, most have insulated cavity, and all tenanted properties have double glazing. The only improvement would be if all roofs were pitched and insulated (admittedly today one would build with pitched insulation to flat roofs which exist do not have- they could be retrofitted), triple glazed and solar panels contributing to space heating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Kilmcott House - Better to acquire and put into plan area if a truly comprehensive plan is desired, otherwise little justification for demolish and rebuild of Lovell or Norfolk House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Design – It is important that the scheme develop provide dimension details of all old flat &amp; nature HoHs including, doors, window lofts, space, gardem correctly measured, sheds where not in gardens, and all internal space including integrated storage space of the forgoing to the inspector for independent review of the assertion that replacement properties will in fact be larger than each flat they seek to replace and that the same amount of storage and living space be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Design – Noted and addressed in Policy EP.H6 Environmental Protection. Section (h) (iv) echos the London Plan 2016 and Merton’s Core Planning Strategy by stating that new “development should demonstrate energy-efficiency improvements at each level of the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy” when compared to the existing Environmental Buildings on the estate” - building fabric first before district heating or renewables. Section (iv) of the same policy goes into more detail to require proposals to provide suitable comparisions between existing and proposed developments in order to fully demonstrate the expected sustainable design and construction improvements: avoidance of internal overheating; efficient use of natural resources (including water), minimising pollution; protection of biodiversity and green infrastructure and sustainable procurement of materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Kilmcott House - Better to acquire and put into plan area if a truly comprehensive plan is desired, otherwise little justification for demolish and rebuild of Lovell or Norfolk House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Design – Noted and addressed in Policy EP.H6 Environmental Protection. Section (h) (iv) echos the London Plan 2016 and Merton’s Core Planning Strategy by stating that new “development should demonstrate energy-efficiency improvements at each level of the Mayor’s Energy Hierarchy” when compared to the existing Environmental Buildings on the estate” - building fabric first before district heating or renewables. Section (iv) of the same policy goes into more detail to require proposals to provide suitable comparisions between existing and proposed developments in order to fully demonstrate the expected sustainable design and construction improvements: avoidance of internal overheating; efficient use of natural resources (including water), minimising pollution; protection of biodiversity and green infrastructure and sustainable procurement of materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Design – Other properties have same name. Someone needs to review one of them. Break Close would be topaz…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180015HP</td>
<td>Veacock I</td>
<td>High Path</td>
<td>Noted. Responsibility for road renaming to outside the remit of the Estate Local Plan but is carried out by the council in consultation with the emergency services to avoid confusing or duplication of nameplates. More information can be found here: <a href="http://www.merton.gov.uk/struetrernamingandbranding">www.merton.gov.uk/struetrernamingandbranding</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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201015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Comment**

Navigation and signage - A criticism of the existing is difficult in finding your way around, and walkways that are designed inducing fear of crime. These problems can be overcome without wholesale demolition of the site. I have already stated that duplication of Hillborough Close is confusing, but many signs, and notices produced by CHMP are in the wrong places and not viewed by residents, nor are they easy to read at a distance by vehicle drivers, or pedestrians. The choice of white lettering on an orange background is unreadable, most signs are too small and located on flaps which do not face where the need to see them is.

**Design**

Officer Response

Clarion Housing Group

As part of their planning application process, the local community will continue to be consulted, and the Estates Local Plan advises that CHG will need to consult with residents to ensure that they continue to have a say in how their neighbourhood will be developed. Residents needs and priorities have been the focus of our consultation and engagement with residents since 2013. The layout of replacement homes is not set determined but houses will be capable of being built either as open plan or with separate kitchens and living space. Where the design allows bathrooms there will have windows but the priority will be to provide natural light and ventilation to habitable rooms.

210015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Design**

Overdevelopment - As proposed the scale and mass in brickclad shape (if not style) appears to be excessive for the area. We are suburban Zone 3, not a central location, and our roots remain in Surrey as much as London. The key to be had that buildings are properly "set back" from most of the main roads, to maintain airways, and to ensure a feeling of containerphobia does not occur. Exuviae of enclosed doorways around courtyards should be avoided. Ideally garden squares similar to Deligas could be created with a variety of dwelling types behind the facades. Blockwork built can be quick to construct, and provided disabled access can be maintained there is a possibility of up to four storeys plus maison being the ideal type across the main part of the estate.

219015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Design**

The biggest problem is that there have not been a limited range of options brought forward and assessed in public or presented to the residents, this should be done rather than ram-reading through one single option. Housing Associations must take as their priority the affordability of housing those in greatest need, while respecting those whom have bought under right to buy having respect in their property, but providing assistance when the likes of maintaining ones garden or externals to ensure a good and pleasing environment.

220015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Design**

Affordability of new build - Although some of my ideas may be an uncoordinated expensive wish list. It is still important that any build for rent must be at an affordable level. We cannot lift the drawdges of quality affordable homes for the working man that we and our parents exprienced in the properties that did replace some old, tired and substandard properties let at mere terences with rents that could rise without control, and we must ensure new generations have that enirthed into the new build that 100% must be affordable, there should be an in the High Path development to seek to cross-subsidisa other parts of the Scheme Promoters portfolio. Rents should be set at affordable levels for new numbers of flats, but at no greater levels than existing for replacement units. For Families, many have affordable properties, they own, outright, they stand their homes or have already in price for the limit of what they could afford to pay. In no way should be undersold or the theft of their landspace be compromised.

230015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Design**

Lack of Alternative Proposals with regard to Externals - I have already mentioned this in respect to consultation events. My personal dissapointment of the kind of building happening in the likes of Colindale/Hendon airport knows no bounds. The completed style at Wimbledon Hillborough Close is confusing, but many signs, and noticeboards provided by CHMP are in the wrong places and not viewed by residents, nor are they easy to read at a distance by vehicle drivers, or pedestrians. The choice of white lettering on an orange background is unreadable, most signs are too small and located on flaps which do not face where the need to see them is.

240015HP: Veacock I High Path

**Design**

Key to this is that High Path estate should not be the cash cow for funding other areas. Our profits arising from capital development in part belonging pre-cast to existing freeholders, and no corners cut to overspend or build undersize removing space from existing residents to fixed funds to elsewhere should be permitted. Development should be to quality, with no compromise to the space or structure many of our residents have at the present time.
Alternative accommodation on the estate. Ideally we would wish to remain in Abbey Road, despite the traffic issues, and although we understand a lift documented by customers that would be costly by virtue of the fact that we are not under local government control, to be in a celebratory situation for the provision of a replacement so that it can be served for the benefit of the residents. So there is an opportunity for some minor work to be carried out on the roof. We would like the opportunity to extend the lift to the garages at the rear of the property, which are outside the zone. It is important to note the potential for contaminated land is not limited to the immediate surrounding area.

Clarion Housing Group response
The Residents Offer has been a separate process and does not form part of the Estates Local Plan. It is outside the remit of Clarion Housing Group. It is outside the remit of the Estates Local Plan.

The Estates Local Plan will ensure that replacement homes are built to modern standards. The Development Plan comprises more than just the Estates Plan. It also includes the London Plan, Core Planning Strategy, and Sites and Policies Plan. Collectively these documents include policies which will ensure that the regeneration delivers housing choice and quality, including in relation to inclusive access. As part of their planning application process, the developer will continue to be consulted, and the Estates Local Plan advises that CIG will need to consult with residents to ensure that they continue to have a say in how their neighbourhood will be developed.
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Clarion Housing Group response
As part of their planning application process, the local community will continue to be consulted, and the Estates Local Plan advises that CIG will need to consult with residents to ensure that they continue to have a say in how their neighbourhood will be developed. Residents and prioritises have been the focus of our consultation and engagement with residents since 2013. The layout of replacement homes is not yet determined but houses will be of being built either as open plan or with separate kitchens and living space. Where the design allows bathrooms will have windows but the priority will be to provide natural light and ventilation to habitable rooms.
We act for a proposed purchaser of the above property and our Local Authority search has revealed a proposed route of a new road within 200 metres of the above property. We should be grateful if you could let us have further information regarding this including a Plan showing the proposed route and its impact on the property.

General

N/A
Residents’ involvement in the management of estates
The ongoing management of the estate is vital to its sustainability. Residents should have the opportunity to participate in the ongoing management of the regenerated estate. In some