

Ms Lynda Curtis comments

Page: [Chapter 4 Housing](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I am a member of Onslow Gardens Residents Association, an organisation that represents 600+ households in the South Wallington area of the London Borough of Sutton. This area has been named by the London Borough of Sutton is an Area of Special Local Character and as such, should be protected from the overdevelopment described in this plan. These plans fly in the face of a locally led and locally agreed plan for our area; a plan that has been consulted on and agreed to by residents of Sutton. The Sutton plan carries its own, very challenging target for new homes. The proposed plan for London will change the nature of our communities in terms of stress on local amenities (schools, healthcare, transport) and also the local character of Sutton. We disagree with the proposal to intensify housing in this area and the whole of outer London in the manner proposed. It will substantially and negatively alter the character of much of the suburbs. What makes the suburbs attractive is the housing being better spaced out than inner London and the gardens are bigger, giving a sense of peace and space. These proposals to intensify outer London with infill and back-garden development, demolition of large family houses to be replaced with blocks of flats, and residential conversions, will completely change the suburbs and make them into an identikit of inner London. To encourage building on gardens will adversely affect the natural habitat and local wildlife. Given that we need more green spaces we must respect and preserve those we have. Installing green roofing will not counteract this loss! We would in particular object to the small sites element of the housing target, which has been arrived at based on a % increase in housing units in areas of high public transport accessibility and near town centres. It has no regard to the individual character of those areas, beyond whether or not they are in conservation areas. There are also other areas of local character where the impact of this small site infilling will adversely impact on the general street scene. The identification of the small sites should be undertaken in consultation with local councils and amenity groups. There is clearly a lack of social housing in inner London. New homes have in fact have been built but these have not met London's very real housing crisis: rather, they are unaffordable and built to make money, not to provide homes. This plan seeks to push the issue on to outer London boroughs, which we deem unfair. The plan itself is very difficult to understand if one is not versed in planning nomenclature. Therefore it is not a consultation in the sense that an ordinary member of the public can understand it. For example: "proposals to increase the density of existing residential homes within PTALs 3-6v" is not explained. Also, the short turn-around time could be perceived as wish to rush though something, rather than a genuine consultation exercise. This does not feel like a two way process. While we would support the general move towards reduced car use and promoting public transport and the healthier alternatives of cycling and walking, we do not support the proposed maximum parking standards. The area that we represent is immediately south of the Town Centre and has PTAL values of between 2 and 4. That means that maximum parking provision for new residential developments ranges between 0.5 and 1.0 parking space per unit, as shown in Table 10.3. The lower levels are likely to create additional pressure on on-street parking, which is already at a premium. Also of concern is the requirement for all residential development in areas rated PTAL 5 and 6 to be car-free. The local Wallington station and town centre are currently PTAL 4, but if in the future services are improved it is highly likely that it would move into PTAL 5 or 6. Car free development would then again increase pressure for on-street parking in the adjacent residential areas. Proximity to a suburban station in outer London offers far less travel options than stations in