

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We write with reference to pdf document '16-12-05-High-Path-boards_final-exhibition' we provide the following questions and considerations of the proposed redevelopment of the High Path Estate.

We understand that the new population is 1600 people, please could you provide information on the current population and therefore the population increase?

Please could the council advise how future additional nursery, primary and secondary school provision will be met? Both primary and secondary provisions in the area have been extended to cope with the current population.

We would like assurances from the council that all public services would cope with an increase in population. Have TFL been consulted and confirmed additional tube services, especially during peak hours?

Please could the council advise on how future additional Doctors GP provision will be met?

We assume that Traffic Impact Studies have been carried out and the proposals have no negative impact on the current traffic?

What is the split between social housing, PRS and private ownership?

Are all existing High Path residents, in both private ownership and social housing, offered the opportunity to move back to high path with the same housing offer as their existing properties or better and at no additional cost?

What percentage of existing High Path residents are in favour of the proposed development?

What assurances can be provided that large volumes of people living in such a dense community will be satisfied with their built and social environment?

The CGIs should genuinely show the intended construction materials and architectural details. The use of lower quality, cheaper materials should not be permitted.

Please could you advise on what the mechanism is for answering our questions?

With regard to the drawings represented in the proposals we provide the following pros and cons:

Pros

- Coherent street layout responding to the existing street pattern
- The principal of taller development to the rear of the tube station is appropriate, but general concerns over the overall height shown in the development
- Seemingly good provision of public realm
- CGIs at end of doc titled 'Nelson's Yard', 'Mansion Blocks', 'St. John's Mews' suggest properties will be masonry constructed with good quality brick and precast elements with attention to detail. The Council and the developer need to ensure that

the quality suggested in the CGI's is upheld and not diluted into cheaper options such as characterless polymer modified renders

Cons

- The scheme is too dense, overdeveloped and out of scale with the context
- All properties surrounding the proposals are primarily 2 – 3 stories
- 6 stories onto the Merton High Street is twice the height of the existing properties on the north side of the road. The proposed new properties will tower above the existing on the opposite side of the road
- We suspect that in winter the large areas of the Merton High Street will be in shadow cast by the 6 story properties on the south side of the road
- The majority of outer London high streets are characterised by properties of a maximum height of 3 stories such as the existing context. 6 stories is not only out of character of the context it is out of character to the city
- Existing schools are already strained and there is no provision for addition school places in the proposals

Thank you.

Regards

