

# Mr Chris Gannaway comments

Page: [Foreword](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I believe that steady increase in population predicted 1) should not be encouraged as growth cannot be infinite 2) in the light of BREXIT are the predictions to be believed. Consider that no population limit or control has been considered and an assumption that London can take whatever numbers of people it can fit in.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Generally support the ethos of it though do not believe the population growth forecast

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Yes support the wording of this

Page: [Policy GG2 Making the best use of land](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Do not accept the prediction for population growth for reason already mentioned.

would note that some of brownfield sites can be if left for a period of time become extremely biodiverse and surveys of such sites should be carried out.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Yes strongly support this

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

Section: [1.4.3](#)

Market forces dictate the availability and ultimately the affordability of housing reduce the demand by lobbying Central government for new satellite towns outside of the Green belt. ie more expansion to the new towns. We can not have infinite expansion of London

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

Section: [1.4.4](#)

Redbridge has recently gone through its 2015-2030 plan and public enquiry it struggled to meet the level of the last London Plan having to dedesignate two green belt sites & introduce more highrise development. The increase demanded by this plan will mean more green field site or inappropriate highrise development will takeplace.

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

Section: [1.4.5](#)

Some designated brownfield sites have biodiversity value

Page: [Policy GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience](#)

Section: [1.5.2](#)

Adiquate provision of greenspaces, green roofs/green walls, water features will help local areas cope with climate change

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [2.0.2](#)

strongly agree

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [2.0.3](#)

disagree strongly, outer London should blend into the greenbelt not have a hard development with the surrounding countryside there is no place for intensive development ie High rise/high density development in these areas

Page: [Policy SD2 Collaboration in the Wider South East](#)

Section: [SD2](#)

The Mayor should also have a duty to look at the wider biodiversity sites such that there is linkage maintained throughout the South East and through London they are crucial to maintaining green infrastructure

Page: [Policy D1 London's form and characteristics](#)

Section: [3.1.3](#)

Strongly agree

Page: [Policy D1 London's form and characteristics](#)

Section: [3.1.4](#)

strongly agree

Page: [Policy G1 Green infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly agree with this policy and the strengthening of guidance relating to All london Green Grid in Redbridge we have already lost Green grid Sites to development due to the lack of strength in the existing guidance

Page: [Policy G2 London's Green Belt](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly agree with this policy but would note that boroughs have been taking advantage to deregulate Green belt to meet the housing conditions of the current London plan many Biodiverse sites may be lost to housing due to this.

Page: [Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly agree with policy

Page: [Policy G4 Local green and open space](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly agree with this policy but should it be linked to the All London Green Grid? and have a strong linkage to linear connections between sites

Page: [Policy G5 Urban greening](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly agree with this policy

Page: [Policy G6 Biodiversity and access to nature](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy but with the proviso that site linkage should be enhanced via the All London Green grid and development of all SINC's should only be considered at a last resort in national interest.

Page: [Policy G8 Food growing](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy but would like to see more detail including orchard cover

Page: [Policy G9 Geodiversity](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Think there is not enough strength in this policy we are losing potential geodiversity sites to gravel extraction and landfill, if more pits were left showing the faces with the strata intact then we would have educational resources

Page: [Policy SI1 Improving air quality](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI2 Minimising greenhouse gas emissions](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy



Page: [Policy SI3 Energy Infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy, though would note that ground heat pumps and heat stores could be a possible possible solution for London along with tapping into the heat generated on the LUG system

Page: [Policy SI4 Managing heat risk](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI5 Water infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy, though expected more on SUDs systems

Page: [Policy SI7 Reducing waste and supporting the circular economy](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI8 Waste capacity and net waste self sufficiency](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI9 Safeguarded waste sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI10 Aggregates](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I would note that Redbridge is intent on extracting as much as possible from Fairlop Plain for their revenue stream and landbanking will only takeplace where it is currently impossible to extract.

Page: [Policy SI11 Hydraulic fracturing \(fracking\)](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI12 Flood risk management](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI13 Sustainable drainage](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Policy SI14 Waterways - strategic role](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy would note more linkage to Biodiversity should be included

Page: [Policy SI16 Waterways - use and enjoyment](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Needs more linkage to biodiversity

Page: [Policy SI17 Protecting London's waterways](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support this policy

Page: [Chapter 12 Monitoring](#)

Section: [G6](#)

Would like to see loss & damage to SINC's as an environmental indicator

Page: [Annex Three Glossary](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

though SINC is in the abbreviations, it is not in the glossary as Site of Importance for Nature Conservation