

Consultation questions

Tell us what you think of the council's draft Estates Local Plan

1) Having read and considered the council's draft Estates Local Plan and supporting documents please indicate your preference at this stage for regeneration.

Please tick one of the following options:

Option 1: Demolish and redevelop the entire Estate

Redeveloping the whole estate would mean demolishing and replacing the existing buildings to provide well-designed energy efficient new homes and general improvement to the neighbourhood, including connections to the surrounding areas.

Option 2: Partial redevelopment

Retain some buildings and redevelop the majority of the estate to provide a number of benefits, such as well-designed energy

efficient new homes but with fewer benefits to the neighbourhood.

Option 3: Invest in existing properties to bring them to minimum modern standards

Refurbish all Circle Housing Merton Priory and leasehold properties to ensure they meet current minimum housing standards and have reasonable kitchens, bathrooms, windows, wiring and insulation. All leaseholders would have to share the costs of this work. This would not include changes to the outside areas.

- should adhere to original ^{legally binding} commitment to improved "Merton Standard" of homes + includes fixing fencing etc...!!!

This estate plan is so vague-even if you were pro redevelopment--it isnt presenting a viable way forward!-there is no substance-just biased opinion!!!



2) To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following aspects of the council's draft Estates Local Plan? Please select one of the following ratings for each topic area:

*- This draft is so vague it is pointless, + if you can't identify acceptable places to build first phase - then it is dead in the water!
I don't want to live wedged between school + railway line = noise etc - when I have reactions that*

Draft Estates Local Plan	Ratings				
	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Townscape - How your neighbourhood looks and feels		<i>- biased opinion presented as fact "Farkon who" - (nonsense!)</i>			✓
Street Network - Where the streets will go				✓	
Movement and access - How people will move around				✓	
Land use - What uses can go in the new neighbourhood			✓		
Open space - How much and what sort of open space will there be			✓		
Environmental protection - How design will help to achieve a sustainable e.g. reduce flooding, encourage wildlife and provide energy efficient homes		<i>way too vague -</i>		✓	
Landscape - How open space, trees and planting should be provided				✓	
Building heights - How high buildings should be			✓		



pg (58) - has lots of biased subjective assertions --- who's ideas are they? and why are they presented as fact - when they are opinion?!

3) Please tell us if you have any other comments about the council's draft Estates Local Plan? - page (56) seems to have the most key points easily missed - buried like a needle in a haystack.

(Please include details of the page number(s) and paragraph number(s) of the council's draft plan to which your comments relate. Please continue on a separate sheet and attach to this form clearly indicating the question you are writing about.)

- All the "key drivers" you list are just a bunch of policies full of jargon and seem to be just waffle - when do you expect the average person has time to wade through + make sense of it all? - why not just summarise the key points in each? - if you are actually interested in being transparent + accessible

care for regeneration - trust me - I have heard enough on this since 2013!! - what your "extract" lacks is bridging the gap between the supposedly detailed + noteworthy masterplan (CITMP) + your vague mumblings about roads going ## - conventional streets etc.

- obviously, to get public support it would be essential that current residents get like for like + are not financially penalised by this project - (point 2.30 pg 201)

2.34
pg 26

- The vision "eastfields" - contemporary compact neighbourhoods... "...that recognises the existing estates experimental design + maintains a distinctive character..." = what a lot of meaningless nonsense! - The estate now is dual aspect + amazingly peaceful beautiful green - The layout of the estate - in my mind - is what makes it unique - (not its architecture/aesthetics!) - I note you make no mention of Ycube in your document - (affordable housing) - just opting for repeating aerial views with random other seemingly arbitrary shadings/hatchings demarcating random things -- why?!!? - you use very biased language in "design principles"

- I urge you to take a look at the Clay Avenue character study (LBM document - Merton Borough character study: 10 eastfields neighbourhood) - it addresses the same issues in a much more succinct/accessible + less biased way

pg 46 - site analysis - you don't even show Ycube! How + why not?

pg (50) = "Bian lila" - These are dark and unwelcoming spaces" - The public face of the estate is "very stark + forbidding + unattractive" (strange how CITMP have made lighting worse + LBM show no interest (despite previous efforts by me to get this addressed FIS use gave up!!))

- uneasy relationship between public + private space" - surprise? I love going from my back garden gate onto the green - my wedding party enjoyed the wonderful back green in this way

(52) you describe it as a "Fortress" + again on pg 58 pt 3.51
pg (54) - At least you note the impact of CITMP "gardens" improvements "to the defended space"

Tell us what you think about the council's consultation

- why bother mentioning what a design code includes? - this seems pointless - we need to see a prepared design code to consult on - otherwise it's just babble!
+ raise points & meaningful

4) How did you hear about this consultation?

Please select one or more.

- Email
- Letter
- Website
- Newspaper
- Other (please specify) _____

5) How well did you understand the council's draft Estates Local Plan?

Please select one

- Very well
- Reasonably well
- Not very well
- Not at all

6) Do you have any other comments about the council's consultation process that you would like considered?

pt 65 - rambling about flooding! (I've never seen it be an issue here! + All the blackberry hedges have been destroyed --- so not sure how that helps with Biodiversity "idea!")

- why is it that CHMP have only just noticed that eastfields has come on 4 side + school on the other? This hasn't changed since 2007 when I moved in --- their masterplan only got my approval because they intended to build near the cemetery + we could then just move into the new homes --- The explanation as to why this went happen has not been provided + further undermines trust and faith in their competence!

- The whole thing is pointless until you/they identify where they can start building (The sites suggested (+ dismissed!) show a disregard for local people anyway (cobble up the schools? I don't think so!!).

- It seems your only option (albeit unlikely) is to build on St Marks playfields - I certainly am not going to give up my current peaceful home to be sandwiched between the noise of the railway line, a main Rd and a high school play area!!

- I gather that the thru rd linking Acaia Rd with Woodstock way was key to the CHMP original plans + despite public opposition to that noted at public meetings - it seems you plan on doing that anyway - Your draft plan seems to be full of jargon + that finding key/important points is like finding a needle in a haystack - I have 2 degrees and found deciphering this like wading through mud!

The elephant in the room (1) 174 - pt 54, 57 - SIS