

Mrs Lynne Bailey comments

Page: [Foreword](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I have concerns regarding the section on 'revolutionising the way we get around the city'. Many people are not able to increase the amount they can walk and may not be able to cycle eg (a number of) the elderly, the disabled, the very young. Whilst I believe a 'more active London' is a good thing, any additional opportunities for walking and driving should not be at the expense of other modes of transport. If you do this you are causing discrimination against the groups I have mentioned above. (I realise some of these points are addressed later in the document, however the fact they are missing here could imply the relative importance of these groups).

Page: [Chapter 1 Planning London's Future \(Good Growth Policies\)](#)

Section: [1.0.1](#)

As per my previous comment, whilst being car free is the ideal there are many people who are not physically able to walk any distance. I believe this is disability discrimination and ageism.

Page: [Policy GG3 Creating a healthy city](#)

Section: [GG3](#)

Point G Whilst I agree that there should be easy access to healthy food alternatives, I also believe that people should be able to make their own decisions and if they wish to choose an unhealthy food then they should be allowed to do so, hence I don't agree with the second part of this point which mentions restricting 'unhealthy food outlets'. Hopefully by having more healthy food outlets this will naturally lead to people making healthier choices - not by 'forcing' them to do so through political decisions. (Note - I exclude from this comment 'unhealthy options' within certain distances of schools as I agree these should be restricted).

Page: [Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need](#)

Section: [1.4.4](#)

Whilst later sections of the plan mention the need for additional schools, hospitals, GP surgeries, dentists etc the space the space these will take up removes potential house building space. Hence the more new homes you are building, the more additional infrastructure will be required. Boroughs are a finite size so whilst the aims of this plan are laudable, it may result in boroughs being asked to perform an 'impossible' task. It is easy to make high level statements and set targets but much more difficult to implement these targets.

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [2.0.2](#)

Totally agree, the green belt and green spaces need to be preserved for the benefit of all Londoners.

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [2.0.3](#)

If there are significant increases in housing levels in the outers boroughs, how will the transport system cope with the increased numbers? Trains are overcrowded currently; hence it would help for any significant increase in housing to be timed so it fits appropriately with transport initiatives eg Crossrail 2.

Page: [Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas](#)

Section: [2.1.62 Heathrow/Elizabeth Line West \(14\)](#)

Strongly support the Mayor's view with respect to opposition to Heathrow Airport.

Page: [Policy SD5 Offices, other strategic functions and residential development in the CAZ](#)

Section: [SD5](#)

Whilst I agree with point A), is there really no opportunity for residential development in these areas? If you are increasing the number of employment opportunities here then it would be useful (and cut down on travel requirements) for some of the people who work there to be housed nearby.

Page: [Policy SD6 Town centres](#)

Section: [SD6](#)

Point D - I am personally opposed to 'Build to Rent' unless it is social housing which is being built. (In which case I have no objection). My opinion is that building should help families who are trying to get on the housing ladder (or move up it) or people who are in need of social housing. I would not want to see scarce resources be used to assist private landlords in simply becoming richer!

Page: [Policy D2 Delivering good design](#)

Section: [D2](#)

Point 1 - do any calculations of population density take into account the amount of green space in a borough? The area of green space should be taken out of any calculations.

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

Section: [Table 4.1](#)

This table does not appear to take account of the size of the housing. For example, targets would be met more easily by building one bedroom flats rather than family homes, however the needs of the area do need to be taken into account as in areas where more new family homes are required this factor will make it more difficult to achieve targets. There are no details given which lead me to believe these needs have been taken into account.

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

Section: [4.1.6](#)

I agree - why market overseas at all?

However, provision should be made to accommodate British nationals who have been living abroad and wish to return to the UK.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [4.2.5](#)

Given the recent announcement by the mayor and Labour party leader regarding the provision of a resident vote on redevelopment, aiming to give residents greater say over their homes, will this right to a vote be extended to areas where housing development will change the character of that area? I believe it is only fair to do so.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [Table 4.2](#)

How were these figures arrived at? How were they checked for feasibility? For example, from knowledge of my own borough I am finding it difficult to see where small site development will produce over 600 additional homes per annum for the next 10 years.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [4.2.9](#)

I cannot see how having a green roof mitigates against a loss of green space - not exactly suitable for a game of football!!

Page: [Policy H13 Build to Rent](#)

Section: [4.13.1](#)

However there is a disadvantage with 'Build to 'Rent' as in having less housing stock available for purchase, fewer people are able to get on the housing ladder and house prices may increase due to increased demand.

If an organisation is building property to rent, unless it is social housing, someone will be making a profit out of it.

Page: [Policy H13 Build to Rent](#)

Section: [4.13.4](#)

Whilst this is a laudable aim, 'preferences' can easily be ignored!

Page: [Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure](#)

Section: [5.1.9](#)

Whilst I agree with this statement I believe this already happens - it certainly does in churches where I live. This section is 'stating the obvious'.

Page: [Policy S6 Public toilets](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this policy and was glad to see only limited mention of Unisex toilets.

Page: [Policy S7 Burial space](#)

Section: [5.7.5](#)

This feels like taking away green spaces 'by the back door'. Parkland used as a burial ground will not be the same.

Page: [Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Why is there no mention of electric cars and car charging points? I am aware these are mentioned in later sections but not including them here implies a lower level of importance.

Page: [Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport](#)

Section: [T1](#)

80% seems rather high given the number of lorries / vans on our roads.

Page: [Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport](#)

Section: [T1](#)

I could spot no mention of taxis or private hire vehicles. Given the emphasis on public transport, walking and cycling, are the number of licences issued also to be cut?

Page: [Policy T1 Strategic approach to transport](#)

Section: [10.1.4](#)

Not all journeys made are within London. Many go outside the boundary of greater London and in a significant number of instances use of public transport is not feasible due to, for example, logistics or expense.

Page: [Policy T2 Healthy streets](#)

Section: [T2](#)

Whilst there is a correlation between reducing the number of car journeys and reducing car ownership, it is not a linear relationship. For example, whilst I try to use public transport where possible I would not be prepared to give up my car as there will always be occasions when I need it eg when travelling longer distances outside of London; for the main supermarket shop; for visiting places which would be complex to reach by public transport etc. Walking and cycling are not an option for everyone!

Page: [Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding](#)

Section: [T3](#)

Not only does there need to be a good public transport network but it also needs to be reasonably priced.

Page: [Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding](#)

Section: [10.3.1](#)

Anyone squashed into a rush hour train would most likely dispute the 'improved customer experience statement'.

Page: [Policy T5 Cycling](#)

Section: [Table 10.2](#)

C3 - C4. This seems overprovision. Not everyone has a cycle and those with garages / garden sheds often keep them in there. They may also be chained up in a garden, hence the need for so many additional spaces appears unnecessary.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [T6](#)

Although I agree with the spirit of this paragraph, in practice I do not believe it will be fully workable. By not providing car parking spaces at new developments, residents will park their cars on nearby streets, causing problems to both the existing residents and the newcomers.

You are battling against human nature here. A major cultural shift needs to take place to get people to manage without a car; whereas I believe people would be prepared to move to electric cars (when they are in a position to change their current vehicle) given a reasonable provision of charging points and realistic pricing for electric cars. However this still requires the provision of parking spaces.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [T6](#)

As per a previous comment, unless you change the culture people will still rely on their cars and where new developments have insufficient parking people living there will simply park in the surrounding streets. As such these streets will become even more crowded and make for a less pleasant place to live.

The cost of public transport also means a car may be the cheaper alternative and taking this option away can disadvantage low income families. For example, a trip to my nearest large town is cheaper on the bus for one person but if two or more people are travelling the cost of the car park plus petrol works out cheaper.

My other objection is that political decisions are being used to tell people how they should live their lives.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [10.6.1](#)

Reduced parking provision will simply mean people park further away from their home.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [10.6.2](#)

By not assumning that some visitors to town centres will want to drive, lack of provision of parking spaces you are likely to be pushing them more towards internet shopping. This will result in less footfall in the town centres, prehaps leading to a downward spiral as retail businesses and cafes find it hard to survive there.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [10.6.2](#)

There is also more public transport provision in inner London eg access to the tube network, which does not extend across all outer boroughs.

Page: [Policy T6.1 Residential parking](#)

Section: [T6.1](#)

I support Policy T6.1 C

Page: [Policy T6.1 Residential parking](#)

Section: [10.6.9](#)

Not everyone who struggles to walk or cycle is in a position to qualify for a blue badge. How will these people be catered for?

Page: [Policy T9 Funding transport infrastructure through planning](#)

Section: [T9](#)

What happened to the Olympic Games levy, are we still paying it? If so can this not be used instead of charging us extra?

Page: [Chapter 12 Monitoring](#)

Section: [Table 12.1](#)

These measure are very 'loose' and most are not at all challenging. eg 'Increasing the supply' could be achieved by simply increasing by 1!
Hence the KPI could be met without making a real difference.

Further details are needed here.