

Q11 What are your thoughts on the Design policies?

Answered: 22 Skipped: 143

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Public realm ** encourage** greater walking and cycling - wrong verb, guys. We've tried "encouragement" for 30 years, it doesn't work. We need a public realm that **enables** people to walk and cycle, alongside public transport, as their default choice especially for short journeys. Your use of "encourage" confirms why worst fears about this planning framework and the forthcoming LIP submission.	1/28/2019 10:54 PM
2	The design policy can be a bit more ambitious and provide an Urban Design Guide for architects and developers. This enables better design in the overall area.	1/24/2019 3:24 PM
3	keep development below 8 storeys	1/15/2019 5:28 PM
4	fine words but unfortunately not being reinforced by recent consents. Merton needs a very strong design champion to inspire design with economic back bone and compliment the officers.	1/7/2019 2:54 PM
5	The policies are silent as to the expectations on developers to think about greening the area. Will any policy like this be enforced? Too often poor design/ materials are waved through without regard to the surrounding area and without regard to any sort of cohesive strategy. Numbers on affordable housing must be adhered too. Too often developers seem to be able to wriggle out of their obligations during the construction process.	1/6/2019 11:05 PM
6	For anyone in Merton an urban centre is no more than 10 minutes away by bicycle. But, in most cases, there is little prospect that the cycling route to get there will look accommodating or feel safe. If the public realm is to be designed to prioritise active transport (Policy D5) then it is essential that Merton take account of the Draft London Plan's Policy T5 requirement that barriers to cycling are removed and infrastructure improved to create a healthy environment in which people choose to cycle. Strategic Policy LP D5.1 concerning Design item c) states: The public realm should be designed with priority for pedestrians and cyclists in mind and encourage greater walking and cycling around the area. Design Policy D5.2 Follows on: Proposals for all development and works to the public realm ..must accord...with .. principles of good urban design: a) The creation of urban layouts based on a permeable and easily navigable network of recognisable streets and spaces that link in seamlessly with surrounding development and facilitate walking, cycling and use of public transport. In order to achieve these objectives MCC would ask that that Merton acknowledges that a fundamental change is needed to increase cycling modal share. This will require high-quality, continental-standard cycling and walking infrastructure and the integration of the healthy streets and livable neighborhoods approaches. This section has no mention that motor traffic dominance is the primary factor that destroys a sense of "place". Motor traffic quickly turns a public realm into a private realm. Cars, whether parked or moving, are private spaces. Car parking reduces space available for active travel modes, while motor traffic dominates the environment, making it hostile to active travel, cycling particularly. Motor traffic introduces noise and pollution, making the streetscape a place no-one wants to linger, which harms businesses. D5.2 should explicitly include measures to control the electric car charging points. These are likely to proliferate in coming years as the government encourages motorists to switch to electric vehicles. They are a new form of street clutter, and if no thought is given to their size and siting, they will take away from space available for walking and cycling. 5.2.10 Gated Development: What is missing here is an acknowledgement that gated developments harm the permeability of an area and make it less easy to cycle or walk through. LD5.6: Advertising on streets often represents street clutter that takes away from space that could otherwise be used for cycling.	1/6/2019 10:12 PM

Merton new Local Plan

7	I applaud the consideration of good design in the policy. I think this should be given greater weight in the planning process, including allowance for planning officers to reject plans based on poor design. Many buildings of mediocre to poor design have been built in Merton over the past years, which in my view indicates that design quality is not currently given enough consideration. Design should also take more account of the attractive existing facades and materials in the area, as opposed to simply demolishing whole buildings and putting glass and steel structures in their places.	1/6/2019 9:50 PM
8	It's important that a respectful approach is maintained to avoid harming the nature of the areas identified as opportunities for development.	1/6/2019 7:56 PM
9	-	1/6/2019 4:36 PM
10	Section 5.10.4 cites the increased value of a property with a basement as being a factor in deciding whether to permit such development. I don't think that this should be the case and the section should be removed. There should be increased support for people to convert front gardens for off-street parking in cases where electric vehicles are being used. This should include solutions for crossing grass verges.	1/6/2019 9:15 AM
11	It's too early to say, until specific changes to specific areas are proposed	1/5/2019 10:27 PM
12	I am concerned that you mention the wind factor for tall buildings when I think the majority of people are against overly tall buildings in any of the locale of Merton. I want to make it clear that I am against over development of office buildings and want to ensure that heights are kept to 4-5 storey and 5-6 in exceptional circumstances - excepting the Britannia Point in Colliers Wood. Buildings with historical significance must be protected - look to NY to see church, modern office and shop alongside each other. Where there is mention of basements, and ground water issues, I want to be satisfied that the council is doing its bit to keep road drainage in good condition - this I do not feel is currently the case witness road drainage in Trinity Road, and at South Wimbledon tube station which regularly floods on intensive rainy days	1/5/2019 8:20 PM
13	Ensure the contracts are cost effective and kept to a minimum.	1/5/2019 1:35 PM
14	Policy D5 Design. D5.1 Place making and Design. Strong support for a) ii, v, vii, and viii. (design, preservation and enhancement.) Support for d) and f) I to vi (tall buildings) subject to concerns expressed under Wimbledon and Morden Town Centre Master Plans D5.2 Urban Design and Public Realm. Support for d) (views) g), h), i) j) (front garden parking). Support D5.2 k Public art need not be just statues and works of visual art. They could be useable or interactive, for instance an area of fountains with spouts from the pavement in the centre of an open space. An example of this can be seen at Somerset House, where the fountains alternate and children play among them. Also support justification 5.2.10 (against gated developments). D5.3.4 50m2 could prove inadequate for standard 3-bed family unit. We suggest this should read "either no less than 50 sq.m. or 50% of the original garden of the original dwelling – whichever is the greater". D5.4 Many of the strengths in DMD1 and DMD2 in the current plan are missing. At the moment we use DMD1 and DMD2 all the time when we object to un-neighbourly and damaging developments. We need to make sure the new policies are as good as the old ones. It is noticeable that the policy about maintaining spaces between buildings is missing. D5.5 Managing Heritage Assets Strong support for a), b), d) and f). We query c) about loss of heritage assets. If this policy is considered essential and needs to be retained, we feel that at the very least the expression "in exceptional circumstances" should be strengthened to read (in extreme and exceptional circumstances". Whereas in the current plan the Heritage Assets are listed in a schedule, in this plan it merely says a list will be maintained on the Council's web-site. Will that make it easier for Merton to delete heritage assets without prior consultation? We feel the current list should be brought forward to the new plan. D5.8 Shop front design and signage. Support d) i. and justification 5.8.6. against security shutters D5.9 Dwelling Conversions. Support Policy a) to prevent loss of family sized homes.	1/5/2019 11:36 AM
15	Are they are strong as the ones they replace? Need an additional policy to protect the gaps between buildings where they are part of the character of the area.	1/5/2019 10:26 AM

Merton new Local Plan

16	Design is subjective and today's "good" design will almost certainly be "tomorrows" bad design. Design taste change over time, new materials appear which provide significantly more benefits. Early Georgian buildings were considered of poor and inferior design quality at the time - but today what remains is listed - most are defined by their simplicity and "meanness" not by their architectural brilliance.	1/3/2019 9:01 PM
17	Yes, see comments box (20) below.	1/3/2019 8:09 PM
18	"Good urban design" is subjective and so each proposal will need to be judged based on the actual details. Overall, I am not in support of tall or mid rise buildings (above 8 stories).	12/27/2018 4:32 PM
19	Ok	12/25/2018 11:54 PM
20	see section 20	12/20/2018 12:17 PM
21	I support tall buildings in town centre to save space for public facilities if we are to have a 30% increase in population and aging population in Merton. Concentrating tall buildings in town centre also makes it clear where the town centre is and the construction will have less disruption to local community. In japan, korea and hong kong a lot of the most desirable apartments are the one above train station with a shopping centre on the ground floor.	12/13/2018 12:21 PM
22	Policies seem fine. The cohesiveness of design along the Broadway needs to be much better than it currently is.	12/10/2018 3:04 PM