

17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



*There are also several abandoned cars  
in Arney's Lane; these need to be removed  
too!*



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (Crag) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood



Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021



17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX



Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood



Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021



17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

16<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
Morden  
London Road  
SM4 5DX

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17, of Policy T6.9

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if *"it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted"*. As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only approximately 36 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (approximately 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (3 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with heavy traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous. Additionally some houses in the area have suffered subsidence, more might be affected by construction of and heavy vehicle traffic on the new road.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

16<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
Morden  
London Road  
SM4 5DX


Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17, of Policy T6.9

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (Crag) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if *"it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted"*. As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only approximately 36 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (approximately 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (3 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with heavy traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous. Additionally some houses in the area have suffered subsidence, more might be affected by construction of and heavy vehicle traffic on the new road.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

20<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX


Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if *"it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted"*. As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only approximately 36 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (approximately 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (3 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous. Additionally, several properties in the area have suffered from subsidence, a problem that is likely to be exacerbated by the construction of the new road, or the heavy vehicles using it.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX





Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



RECEIVED

21 JAN 2021



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (Crag) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

RECEIVED

21 JAN 2021

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021



20<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX


Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area of the letter.

**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if *"it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted"*. As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only approximately 36 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (approximately 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (3 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous. Additionally, several properties in the area have suffered from subsidence, a problem that is likely to be exacerbated by the construction of the new road, or the heavy vehicles using it.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 SDX

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood

Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

17<sup>th</sup> January, 2021

Planning Future Merton  
Merton Civic Centre  
MORDEN  
London Road  
SM4 5DX



Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to the proposed new road which is listed as Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 that is part of Merton's Local Borough Plan Consultation 2a.

Enclosed is a list of several of the many objections we have to the proposal, which was prepared by the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) residents association.

Please cancel this proposal.

Yours sincerely



**As a local association representing residents in the Carshalton Road, Aspen Gardens and Goat Road (CRAG) area we believe that Proposal TN17 of Policy T6.9 should be rejected and abandoned. Here we list a number of the key arguments against the proposal.**

1) We were not informed by the planners or the Council that this proposal was being put forward. Neither, to our knowledge have any of the affected residents in this area been informed.

2) No consultation can happen without those affected being consulted. The Transport and Urban Mobility consultation document states at T6.9(a)(iii) that developments should only proceed if "it can be demonstrated that transport providers, operators and other relevant parties have been fully consulted". As interested parties we have not been consulted.

3) The council have not followed the National Planning Policy Framework (Para' 128). *"applicants should work closely with those affected by their proposal"*. They have not worked with us at all regarding their proposal.

4) In the Local Plan Appendices 18. TN17 the council state this road will: *"enable removal of commercial traffic from residential areas"*.

In fact this new road will bring traffic directly past the front and back garden of No 2 Carshalton Road, and the back garden of No 1A Aspen Gardens, the distance between these 2 houses is only 36.6 metres. This will be devastating for these 2 homes (one of which has 3 children), and all homes adjoining them. The new road will run directly behind and close to all residents of Aspen Gardens and many in Carshalton Road.

5) The same proposal was rejected at the planning stage in the early 1990's. The arguments against the proposal then, remain now – and more.

6) The proposed spur left of the new road which leads to only one business (Byrne Bros) runs so close to the properties in Carshalton Rd that the private garages at the end of these properties will be either unusable or dangerous, with a major industrial road running right by them.

7) This new road will cut out a major section of Tramway Path (at least 190 meters). Tramway Path is historic and marked on an Ordinance Survey map dated in 1894, but has been in existence much longer. Effectively turning this historic pathway into a 2 and 3 lane access road for heavy industrial vehicles will make what is currently a safe historic pathway into a dangerous, unhealthy and unpleasant route for any user.

8) This path is used frequently by walkers/ramblers, parents walking children to school (4 different local primary schools and 2 nursery schools) and locals making their way into Mitcham, or to the train/trams avoiding the polluted Carshalton Road. Staff and patients for the nearby Wilson Hospital also have an easy accessible route via Tramway Path. The new road would add disruption, pollution and danger to such trips.

9) For Mitcham Common, this new road will involve the destruction of many trees (including oak) and other flora, and the habitat of a wide range of wildlife and birds, including Wood



Peckers and Jays. This will have a devastating effect on the physical and mental well being of the locals in the area, affecting air, noise and visual pollution.

10) Children resident on Carshalton Road are currently able to play safely in the trees and on the green in front of their homes, which is part of Mitcham Common. This new road would open up direct access within the area the children play in, making it unsafe with high traffic volumes on Carshalton Road and the new road.

11) This section of the common has, literally, been cut off from the rest of the common by a series of roads over the years and we are completely surrounded by trains, trams, light industry and its traffic, and a major road. The trees on the common are the only buffer we have.

12) There is no need for this new road, there are already three access roads into the Industrial Estate. Two, 2-way southern access roads. One to the estate in general (via Wates way), and a second to service a couple of businesses (Jewsons and Byrne Bros). In addition there is a 1-way, weight limited access at the northern end of the estate via Willow Lane.

13) We believe to put a new road in such close proximity to a bridge, bus stops, access road to Mitcham Junction Station, Mitcham Golf Club, pedestrian crossings to access the tram and train lines, and the entrance to Aspen Gardens is dangerous.

14) The council have offered no evidence to support their claims that this planned road: *"Supports regeneration of the industrial estate"*.

In fact many residents are of the belief that if the council cleaned up and maintained the industrial estate better (there are problems with fly tipping, graffiti and abandoned cars in the area which this road will worsen), that this alone would improve appearances and encourage more businesses into the estate.

15) In total we have only been able to find two very short paragraphs supporting the proposed policy (despite its impact, cost and scale): one on page 17 of the Transport and Urban policy document and the other on page 3 of the Appendices document. Further, we cannot find any evidence accompanying the policy proposal that shows why the positive impacts claimed would ever be achieved.

16) The Appendix states that the new access road will support regeneration of the industrial areas, but no evidence is given to support this idea (businesses leaving, business failure or businesses not coming to the estate) because of a lack of another access road. The costs of this proposed new road and the disruption to the area would be substantial. Yet we cannot find any published cost benefit analysis backing the proposal. The costs to residents in terms of pollution, noise, danger and reduction in property values would be horrendous.

We urge the planners and Council to withdraw this ill conceived proposal.

15 January 2021

