

Merriman. D

## Observations on Merton Local Plan

Thank you for the comprehensive and informative plan for consultation. Some brief observations on parts of it are as stated below:-

### **Spatial Vision**

1.20

“By 2036...will have embedded health and wellbeing into all aspects of developments...and the look and feel of town centre..”

Strategic objective 5 (e) “...to improve health and wellbeing of Merton residents and workforce..”

### **Health and Wellbeing section**

I am pleased that “Health and Wellbeing” is promoted as a significant element in the overall draft plan. Can Merton please ensure that assurances can be provided to ensure that health and wellbeing are not ultimately squeezed out, or relegated in importance, due economic or commercial pressures such as “developer profit”, architectural preferences, etc

### **Morden Policy N3.3**

2.3.46 - 2.3.49

The pressure to provide such a significant increase in new residential units in the redevelopment of Morden town centre, and the introduction of high rise buildings would seem to introduce buildings of a scale that could easily undermine (a) the health and wellbeing which Merton is seeking to promote, (b) the provision of maximum daylighting and reduction in wind levels.

2.3.68 “...need to respect proximity of low density suburban...and to be respectful to sensitive edges...”

It is critical that the issue of “scale” is managed well.

2.3.77 “The quantum and mix of affordable housing to be provided within each phase .....kept under review, will be determined in light of the development and any other national, London-wide and local policy and guidance.

As drafted, this proposal seems too fluid and potentially provides (countless?) opportunities for developers to side step the levels of affordable housing that Merton seeks to maintain. With such a significant proportion of the Freehold of “Abbotsbury Triangle” already under Merton’s ownership, now is a “once in a lifetime” opportunity for Merton to establish its own definition of “Affordable Housing” in much the same way as Merton spearheaded its groundbreaking “Merton Rule” in relation to renewable energy requirements. Again, Merton’s ownership of the site provides the unique opportunity for it to have control over its future use and in particular to

incorporate a ban on “buy to let” acquisitions. This, coupled with its own definition of “affordable” will result in homes for future generations, rather than “golden bricks”, being Merton’s ultimate legacy.

### **Site Mo2 Farm Road**

Currently vacant, this building formerly provided significant community use in a location surrounded by high numbers of family occupied homes. To redefine its future use as solely residential removes its potential as a place for local community. It is suggested that council’s proposed site allocation be redrafted as mixed D1 and A3 use, as there is little in the way of community use within this sector of Morden.

Site Mo6 York Close Car Park Proposed Use : “....C3 if not needed for car parking”  
“..potential impact of displaced commuter parking...”

Unless the proposal is to build flats over the car park, as the car park is full every working day, it would seem appropriate to re-designate its use as “Car Park and A3”. The adverse consequences (ie displacement) of losing car parking facility here would be monumental.

### **Generally**

I was interested to see under “Points of Interest in Merton” - Plan that a star denoted “unique/major places of worship” and that such was restricted to a mosque and a temple. Please advise by what criteria did Merton decide which places were to be so designated?

I may have missed it somewhere in the pages of the Plan but it is important to ensure that safety and security is an integral part of all, but especially major, redevelopment schemes. This should be a vital element of the “health and wellbeing” proposals referred to earlier.