

From: Cllr Scott .R -, Raynes Park Ward.

Please find below a note of resolutions passed at a meeting of residents on 10 July, where it was evident that residents felt very strongly on the two particular issues set out below, namely the fact that the draft planning brief was compiled with so much input and resource from the owner and developer and without the apparent introduction and consideration in any detail of alternatives to the way forward proposed in the draft brief (it was understood that alternatives should form part of a `proper` draft brief compiled under the rules) and secondly there was a substantial majority of residents polled at that meeting, against housing on the site. I am therefore passing these comments to you (possibly you have already seen the resolutions below) in order that the community's wishes should be strongly represented in compiling comments on the draft brief.

For my own part, as one of the Raynes Park ward councillors, I would like to add the following comments:

1. Figures compiled and circulated/discussed as regards employment presently provided on the site (and suppositions made from them eg about how a similiar number of jobs can be provided under the brief proposals), should be treated cautiously. For some time this site has been `in play` with the prospect of development (as we realised when the anerobic digester was proposed). It is possible to believe that there has been somewhat of a `running down` of the site over the last few years, including a move to short, destabilising leases, non renewals etc. Also the numbers of employees in the site businesses who do not actually work on the site may not have been fully taken into consideration. If the site was to be completely revived for employment only and all jobs counted, we could see a considerable increase arising from many more SME`s on the site.

2. In my view, so far, the possibility of creating another vehicle access to the site has not been adequately considered nor a detailed feasibility study proposed to examine a new access to serve a completely changed site, eg, if in defiance of the community`s views, the present proposals go ahead, with up to 250 homes plus businesses. The traffic `hotspot` of the top of Grand Drive and Approach Road, including station access is almost unmanageable for our community at the present time, at several times of the day. These proposals will make the situation much worse and also add to the parking problems in this part of Raynes Park as there are almost bound to be more cars on site for such a number of homes, than the brief envisages. We should not be put off by the prospect of difficult negotiations with rail companies.

Bringing homes on site must bring a huge uplift in the value of the site, through the change of use. We can all multiply 250 by an average flat value of say £250,000, including affordables. Against the potential profit after clearing the site and construction, the figures mentioned in various local meetings for a bridge or tunnel for a new access of between £5m and £15m do not seem impossible to contain.

3. If however, housing is forced upon us, we all need to consider which type. So far only flats/apartments appear to be in the draft brief, and some flats would make sense given the proximity to a busy commuter station and the consequent appeal to younger people who have a great need for reasonably priced accommodation. However my experience as a councillor and having regard to the number of flats being built throughout Merton, is that there is an even greater need among purchasable and affordable housing requirements, for small `family` houses, say 3 bedrooms, with a garden for the children in particular to move in. If we have to have housing on this site, let us create a village atmosphere rather than monolithic blocks of flats, by having some small family homes for both sale and `affordable` rent. Again, considerable profit may be obtained from the council granting a change of use, why not have lower numbers of pleasant housing instead of a barracks?

4. One of the alternative uses for the site, which we have raised from time to time is that there should be a new school there, combined of course with adequate access. We are all aware of the huge increase in numbers of primary school children entering the system and how almost all will naturally progress to state secondary schools. At the last meeting of the governors of a local high school, we were discussing future requirements arising from the increases in numbers. One quite likely scenario is that the school will have 2000 pupils in the next 5 or so years. When my children were at school, I would have quaked at the thought they would be educated in a vast operation such as this! Why not have Merton think outside the box and consider the alternative of a new school in a new draft planning brief?

I would be grateful if you will fully consider these representations.

Subject: Rainbow Industrial Estate: Meeting for residents on the Draft Planning Brief for consultation, Raynes Park Library, 10 July 2012
Date: Tue, 10 Jul 2012 21:54:10 +0000

At a well publicised meeting for residents, called to consider the Draft Planning Brief, the following motions were passed:

`This meeting rejects the Draft Supplementary Planning Brief and urges Merton Council to produce its own planning brief in accordance with planning rules`

passed unanimously (the meeting objected to a brief prepared with substantial resource and input from the owner/developer and without review and consultation on alternatives to the proposal put forward in that brief) , and

`This meeting rejects residential/housing on the Rainbow site`

passed by approximately two thirds majority.

Can we be assured these important expressions of residents` considered and

debated views are given full weight in the future plans for the Rainbow site?
Thank you.