

mr pedro avery comments

Page: [Policy H1 Increasing housing supply](#)

Section: [H1](#)

These targets are meaningless if there is no penalty to councils for failing to meet them - you need failure to be clearly articulated to everyone

Page: [Policy H1 Increasing housing supply](#)

Section: [H1](#)

This clause needs better definition...

boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites through their Development Plans and planning decisions, especially the following sources of capacity:

1. sites with existing or planned public transport access levels (PTALs) 3-6 or which are located within 800m of a Tube station, rail station or town centre boundary[35]

outside zone 2 - more railway lines are ecological corridors and on top of which many have had councils working hard to add in SINC sites. This means they can legitimately say they cant develop on these close to transport hubs. Councils seem happy to allow building on brownfield industrial sites, yet local to stations has take a back seat in zone 5 and 6. Maybe you need to be clearer about the offsetting you mentioned for sites near railyways in zone 4-7

Page: [Policy H6 Threshold approach to applications](#)

Section: [H6](#)

This feels like a good idea - local councils are stalling their feet with applications and ward based councillors are the worst. It shouldnt be cavalier but many sites I know have been knocked back in london from Nimbyism and a council who dont help to get planning done but actively hope it doesnt. It needs to move from a system of No,,,to how can we help developers get things through.

Page: [Policy G5 Urban greening](#)

Section: [Table 8.2](#)

It feels like you need to make a distinction between small and large development sites here. Flat roofs, ideal for urban greening dont work well for residential properties, but doework well for large-scale apartments