Response to the proposed LDF, 7, 8 and 12 Waterside Way site 50

Numbers 7,8 and 12 Waterside Way are currently occupied by Cappagh who have proposed that it could be used for waste management. It is a part of a larger industrial site (651) which was one of those selected for consideration under the South London Waste Plan. However, after careful consideration using the criterion adopted for the selection of such sites, it was found that this site was not suitable for waste management and as a result it was withdrawn. This result was ratified by the government inspector at the subsequent public inquiry into the South London Waste Plan.

We refer, for example, to the submission to the consultation for the South London Waste Plan called ”Site 651 and the South London Waste Management Plan” by Peter West for a detailed discussion of the inadequacies of this site. It was found that the site did not satisfy the criterion relating to increased traffic, environmental health, flood risk and nature conservation. We note in particular that 7,8 and 12 Waterside Way is at the most southern end of the industrial site and so it is extremely close to the housing at Chaucer way and it is right next to the Wandle path way at one of its most beautiful parts. As such one cannot argue that site 50 is in some way more suitable for waste management than any other part of the industrial area in which it is located; indeed the contrary is the case.

We support the uses given for the site in the Draft Sites and Policies document 2012 published by Merton Council, namely mixed business, industrial, warehousing and storage.

To summarise; site 50 has recently been subject to the most careful consideration by local residents, three councils and a government inspector at the public inquiry who all concluded that it was not suitable for waste management. There was no point in the three councils carrying out such an extensive search, at great expense and time spent, for possible sites for waste management if the results are not to be respected. It would make a mockery of the planning process were waste management to be allowed on this site.
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