

# Mrs Susan Deans comments

Page: [Policy GG1 Building strong and inclusive communities](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The New London Plan, unlike previous versions does not appear to encompass community involvement on the numerous development proposals. The scale of the changes proposed in this plan are huge and it would seem likely that there will be many aspects that communities find unacceptable. This would be difficult to manage and could be avoided if local residents were engaged in the process at the outset.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I object to Policy H1 as it applies to the London Borough of Ealing. Although London clearly needs new housing, the target is much greater than for other boroughs and if adopted will destroy neighbourhoods, already damaged by badly planned redevelopment, will have a negative environmental impact and will erode the quality of life both for existing and new inhabitants. Development on this scale is comparable to the creation of a new town which requires cohesive planning. At an occupancy rate of 3 people per unit, the population of the Borough would increase by around 25% and there are no plans for new infrastructure and services. In fact the hospital and police stations are scheduled for closure, the library is being downsized, civic buildings are being sold off, green spaces are being infilled and schools cannot keep pace with the current demand.

I also object to the suggested need for tall buildings across the whole of London which seems to be based on no strong evidence. Previous versions of the London Plan have made it clear that increasing residential densities does not necessarily require tall buildings and there is no evidence that this long-standing policy needs to change.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I am very concerned about the likely impact of policy H2 and object to it strongly. The Borough has already singularly failed to manage the numerous unauthorised beds in sheds and a policy to intensify residential uses will lead to a proliferation of substandard housing and high density development often in residential back gardens further eroding the ever decreasing amount of green space. The presumption in favour of development within the curtilage of a dwelling house is not in accordance with the safeguards against garden grabbing that Greg Clark introduced in 2010. The reversal of this policy will be to increase the loss of family accommodation through conversion of family homes into houses of multiple occupancy. This trend has accelerated recently and this has driven up house prices as developers compete for available sites.

Again the targets for Ealing are much higher than for nearby boroughs which have similar densities of developments and I question the justification for Ealing to evolve so much more drastically than its neighbours.

Page: [Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Although the policies are praiseworthy and similar to the policies in the existing London Plan, the existing policies are not applied in Ealing where there are many examples of developments that conflict with the Plan's heritage policies. The policy therefore needs to be much more tightly drawn to prevent this.

I also strongly support the policy to support London's existing cultural venues and to develop new outlets in town centres and places like Ealing with good public transport. However, my concern is that as with similar policies in previous plans, the drive to provide additional housing on every available site will mean that no effort will be made to implement the cultural policies which should in my view be given greater priority.