

Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London) & London Plan Team

New London Plan, GLA City Hall

Post Point 18, FREEPOST RTJC-XBZZ-GJKZ

London SE1 2AA

Dear Mr Khan,

Re: The proposed changes to the London Plan; specifically, in regards to Kenley

I was shocked to see all of your proposed changes to the London plan in my home town, Kenley.

Kenley is a small, quiet, residential area located within the London Borough of Croydon, bordering Tandridge District Council, Surrey.

Although I can't speak for the rest of Croydon, I strongly object to the significant changes to the London Plan and how these will impact on Kenley and our home; Nirala (Peaceful).

1. Kenley has always been and ought to remain a quiet (er) buffer zone between Purley and greenbelt areas surrounding it on the south. Otherwise, according to the Croydon Plan, building and roadworks will eventually have a negative effect on the flora and fauna in the Green Belt. Not to mention an eyesore, as in the recent application of double yellow lines everywhere. What a waste of tax payer's money. Would have preferred more pavements.
2. This plan burdens all of London with a very high proportion of the housing supply needed for southeast England. This burden should be spread out amongst Surrey, Kent and other counties in the Southeast.
3. And why does everybody have to live in London anyway. There are huge areas of housing in other areas of the country that have been allowed to go to ruin, while you try to make London bigger and more prosperous. I don't doubt that your desires come from a sincere place of wanting to help Londoners, but I suggest that you are only thinking of central area Londoners, not some of us others. What about our wants?
4. Kenley is a nice quiet, safe, residential area that welcomes home city workers. If Kenley is comprehensively urbanised, then the people who chose to live here will have no escape from the city style landscape, building, pollution and noise.
5. Because Croydon does not have the capacity to meet your extreme requirements, the Croydon Council will have no alternative but to rape the countryside to meet your demands.

6. Kenley has no infrastructure to sustain these changes, and in fact already suffers from the current rate of building and increased population.
7. Kenley is an area that has been well known for its trees; many of which are protected. These changes will create significant damage to the character of the area, and could even be dangerous. Building near tall trees can damage their roots, resulting in trees falling during storms, etc. With dense population, this could create a disaster. 2 huge cedars fell down in my neighbour's garden during the October storm. If they had built houses in their garden, those people would have been crushed. Back gardens should be protected; not only for the aforementioned reason, but also to prevent flooding and provide homes to wildlife. This area is one of the attributes that make London special.
8. The changes you propose are not aligned with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There is no reason to remove the back-garden protection that is provided in the NPPF.
9. Parking in the area has already changed dramatically in Kenley. The current plan is having a detrimental effect on the area, by not requiring enough parking, and you want to lower this.
10. Kenley is in a valley, and contains many narrow, twisty and steep roads which don't even contain footpaths. This rules out cycling and carrying shopping, groceries, etc., including disabled and children's access from our poor bus service. But how could we even squish a bus service into this area? (We don't even have a post box in our area.) This makes a car almost mandatory for anyone that is not house-bound in our area. Big houses here mean a large number of cars per house, by the time teenagers grow up. The current standards are already set too low for the area.
11. I personally have arthritis in my knees, which meant that for several years, I was unable to walk up to my home from the train/bus station. Luckily, I am OK now and I do use the train whenever I can. However, neither my former nor my current place of work have a good bus service to them. It would have taken me 1½ hours to take the bus (including several changes) to go 8 miles to work. This is simply not reasonable.
12. Lowering the on-site parking standards further, will serve to make it more dangerous for the elderly, disabled and children; the blood will be on your hands.
13. There are already problems with flooding in the area. This property has already flooded once, due to blocked drains further down. Covering up front and back gardens with high density housing plans will result in more flooding, and put current homes in an increased risk of flooding. Thank you very much.
14. Wow. What a mess you want to make.
15. Wouldn't it make more sense to outlaw the herding of London properties for profit?

Although your proposals would probably raise the value of our property, I strongly object.

Tamar Cavett