

Dear Sir/Madam

First, it has to be pointed out that it is incredibly hard for ordinary people to provide detailed responses to plans of this kind. Detailed amendments of policies are difficult to word as so often the specific definitions used make it hard to understand what is meant. For example the use of the term 'affordable' housing has lost all meaning. Consultations of this kind frequently fail to enable ordinary people to participate.

Second, priority should be given to protecting existing open or green space. You see immediately an issue arises over the possible difference of definition between open and green space. In my case I am referring to green spaces. However, there are many spaces which are not particularly green but nevertheless are spaces for recreation and enjoyment.

Third, not only should existing green spaces be protected but there is also a need to expand existing green spaces and create new green spaces.

Fourth, particular attention should be paid to the protection of parks and to preventing organisations running parks from selling off parts of their parkland, even if they claim the land is not a 'green' space. If it is part of their parkland it should be treated as a green space and if in need of being upgraded it should be upgraded to being a green space.

Fifth, there should be a ban on conversion of Metropolitan Open Land to any other use. MOL needs to be protected.

Sixth, particular requirements should be placed on authorities like the Lea Valley Regional Park Authority to prevent them selling off land or converting MOL to allow development. Authorities of this kind have a particular mission to safeguard their green spaces and this should be rigorously enforced without exception.

Seventh, as stated above 'affordable' housing no longer has meaning. Affordable should be replaced by the term social housing and the term social housing should only be used when it applies to housing at Council rent levels.

Eighth, policies on 'affordable' or under the new definition of 'social housing' should be strengthened to ensure that schemes include at least 50% social housing. If there are other intermediate schemes or just higher rent 'affordable' housing these should be on top of the 50% requirement.

Ninth, I consider it is desirable to build schemes which are 100% social housing. Social housing has been incorrectly dismissed as undesirable in itself. The reality is that mixed housing has simply been used as a means of demolishing social or council housing. The new 'mixed' schemes often include undesirable elements such as poor doors and other discriminatory elements which simply continue the same process of rendering social or '(un)affordable' housing second rate and undesirable.

Tenth, sadly I don't think making a contribution to this plan will make any difference! I have recently observed the Mayor carrying on with a scheme at Fish Island where his Mayoral Corporation, the LLDC, has insisted on building two bridges which will do serious damage to Fish Island. The Mayor has refused to act to prevent this project, which will create a rat run from one bridge and will demolish genuinely affordable work spaces for another completely unnecessary bridge. The Mayor of Tower Hamlets, of which Fish Island is part, has denounced

both bridges as severely damaging Fish Island. He declared the second bridge, H16, which will demolish work spaces, was "utterly unnecessary". Massive local community opposition has been dismissed. The Mayor has breached his own policies on reducing traffic and on air pollution and on fostering the creative sector by agreeing to allow these bridges to proceed. It is claimed these plans cannot be changed. This is nonsense, the LLDC has changed all sorts of projects. This is the Mayor's Corporation. It is hard to take anything the Mayor says seriously after witnessing this stupidity.

Yours sincerely

Julian Cheyne