

MS J GELLER comments

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

Section: [1.0.1](#)

For every development that is built to be car free there will always be those that still wish to own vehicles. This pushes on-site parking back to street level making our narrow streets more congested with parked cars than ever before. Public transport is expensive, overcrowded, very time consuming and not at all nice, tubes and buses being in the main quite dirty and at times littered with rubbish. Most women, if they can drive will never take public transport in the hours of darkness instead of using their car. It is just too dangerous to take public transport and then have to walk home alone along the streets. Families and older people cannot carry their shopping without using a car. I cannot see how any development could be constructed to be without parking provision and be viable.

Affordable housing can never be affordable for those living in London, with prices rising and wages staying static there is no such thing as affordable housing especially when a mortgage of 30% of the value of the property is required and a rental payment per month is also to be made. Those on average salaries can simply not afford this. Added to that the end result is not property ownership but an option where the 'buyer' owns just one third of the property. Financially they would be better of just renting and saving as much as possible to buy a truly affordable property, one where there is no shared ownership and the property price is truly affordable. When they sell these affordable homes the equity is not enough to purchase a dwelling.

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

Section: [GG1](#)

When budgets to London Boroughs have been cut to the core and the number of police stations and bobbies on the beat has been cut how can the individual boroughs support plans for improvement, including the vital updating of all energy, water, gas and sewage services and provide access to good quality services and amenities to create safe and secure places? The number of police in our borough is being cut, the streets are not safe and crime, both violent and burglaries are rising as the perpetrators know there is not enough manpower to catch the culprits.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

High density housing creates tomorrows slums. The beauty of the outer London suburbs is the fact that there is 'space' and many green areas. Don't destroy our suburbs. People will move out and you will change our thriving outer boroughs into high rise developments that in 10 years time will be dens of eniquity. Small spaces between high rise buildings provide cover for night-time muggings and stabbings.

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

Section: [1.3.2](#)

The difference in life expectancy between the rich and the poor is nothing to do with planning and building more compact developments, it is purely a life-style choice in that the rich can afford better sustenance and a higher quality of life and do not seek pleasure in over-indulgence of alcohol, tobacco and drugs. Life expectancy is linked in the main to ones social standing. Building to turn our suburbs into congested, high density zones will only hinder not help and instead of improving people's lives, it will play a big part in deterioration of lives.

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

Section: [1.3.3](#)

Again this has nothing to do with planning and building high density environments, it is a life-style choice. No matter how many developments are built to be car-free, there will always be people who do not feel safe using public transport or walking the streets and the more high density the zone is, the more nervous they will be. People will always find spaces to park cars, build enough car free developments and there will be people fighting on the narrow streets for parking spaces. Building car free developments is outrageous. People are busy. They want to do all their shopping in one place and they need a car to transport it. Older people cannot be expected to carry shopping and they depend on their cars so they can get out. Car-free developments are for the young and predominantly males of our society only.

Page: [Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas](#)

Section: [2.1.5](#)

This can only be successful if public transport itself is made affordable. Our public transport costs are one of the highest in the world and unaffordable to those that have to live far from the center of London to afford a place they can call home.

Page: [Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents](#)

Section: [2.8.1](#)

I agree that Town centers should be vibrant and full to the brim with retail and office space. BUT transport links need to be improved and if the town centers are to be served with many more buses then roads need to be widened to stop congestion which causes more pollution. All this talk of more public transportbut the roads are not wide enough to accomodate it, the fares are far too high and when one goes by public transport one cannot carry the same quantity of goods as when travelling in a car so the elderly cannot get everything they need by using a bus.

The more housing built in town centers, the more congested they will be, the more people will want to relocate out of town and the town centers will empty out again. High density housing is not good. It creates a feeling of unacceptable enclosure. Too many people living in too close proximity to each other creates too much noise making peoples lives a misery.

Page: [Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents](#)

Section: [2.8.2](#)

Large retail stores in town centers create too much traffic and make the town centers congested. Whomever goes to a large retail store will want their own transport with them to take goods home. Large retail developments should be placed firmly out of town centers leaving town centers for vibrant independent small shops and cafes/restaurants where diversity of offer is key.

Page: [Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents](#)

Section: [2.8.3](#)

By all means encourage a mix of uses at these out of town centers and encourage more diverse retail offers and add in some housing. People will always wish to drive to one easy to get to location, buy everything they need and take it home. This mentality is not going to change due to the convenience of it. No one wants to pay delivery charges and then have to sit and wait for the delivery to arrive, usually meaning a two hour wait during a delivery slot allocation time. I firmly believe that large retail outlets should be out of town and smaller independents in town.

Page: [Policy SD8 Town centres: development principles and Development Plan Documents](#)

Section: [2.8.4](#)

Retail outlets will only be quickly occupied if rents are lowered. Town center retail unit rents are far too high and cause most independent retail businesses to fail. It is no good advocating 'town center first' approaches when space is so expensive to occupy. Unless something is done about the price of rents this new approach will see the construction of just more empty retail space and exacerbate the current problem of more than 50% of retail space being underoccupied. Sort out the cause first and then you can look at increasing the retail space and density of retail space in town centers.

Building many homes alongside retail space is not a good idea. Too many stores stay open late and destroy family life due to the interruption of noisy shoppers and deliveries late in the day. Youths tend to group where shops are open causing more noise and disturbance and making people feel unsafe.

Page: [Policy SD9 Town centres: Local partnerships and implementation](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Object -

People, ie families and older generations do not want to live alongside retail and late opening restaurants, cafes and take-away outlets as they do not want noise disturbance in the evening or throughout the night. Town centers should be for retail and food outlet use alongside office space with limited housing alongside.

Page: [Policy SD10 Strategic and local regeneration](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Regeneration of areas should be discussed with a diverse range of local people and the needs of the community MUST be taken into account. People MUST be listened to and action taken to provide their needs. People first, planning needs later.

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

Section: [3.1.12](#)

I would have thought composting should be near the top of the list-composting green unwanted material produces a valuable resource that feeds the earth

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree that existing buildings should be as far as possible retained, refurbished and reused.

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

Section: [3.1.7](#)

Out of hours deliveries to town centers, where you are now proposing to intensify housing, will always cause noise nuisance to the immediate and surrounding residential properties when deliveries are made evening and during the night. Noise from heavy goods vehicles, noise from truck drivers, noise from staff unloading and noise from the vehicle pulling away. None of this makes any sense whatsoever. Keeping large scale retail in out of town areas alleviates this problem.

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

Section: [3.2.1](#)

Neutral - A clause should be added saying that overdevelopment of sites should be avoided to maintain the light and airy feel of the outer London Boroughs and to avoid tightly packing one development alongside the next.

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

Section: [3.2.9](#)

Support - Thoroughly agree that design should be part of the planning process and design changes for both buildings and landscaping should be kept to an absolute minimum once planning permission has been given.

Page: [Policy D4 Housing quality and standards](#)

Section: [3.4.2](#)

When housing is now so expensive to buy, I cannot think of anything worse than having all new homes designed as small rectangular boxes with uninteresting square/rectangular rooms. The beauty of our older larger housing is the space available and sometimes quirky layouts that these properties have. Why not make all new properties of a regimented standard size and all the same layout? Small, small, small, no one wants to buy a very small property for an extortionate price. Using this philosophy will ensure that housing targets are met but it remains to be seen if the properties are attractive to buyers.

Page: [Policy D4 Housing quality and standards](#)

Section: [3.4.4](#)

Agree totally with this point.

Page: [Policy D4 Housing quality and standards](#)

Section: [3.4.5](#)

Single aspect dwellings should not be allowed due to the ensuing condensation that will be caused. Mechanical air ventilation systems are noisy and bad for ones health and use excessive energy.

Page: [Policy D4 Housing quality and standards](#)

Section: [3.4.6](#)

Outdoor amenity areas minimum of 5m² : This is tiny and creates an unacceptable feeling of enclosure as no doubt other properties will abut the outdoor amenity space. Private minimum outdoor amenity areas should be set to at least double this area giving children space to play and run. In this age where one can no longer allow ones children to play safely in the park or other shared green space it is vital that private outdoor areas have a greater minimum space standard set.

Page: [Policy D4 Housing quality and standards](#)

Section: [3.4.10](#)

There is no point in having a lovely bay window when the outlook is of another building or even worse overlooking into some one else's bay window or having them overlook into yours. High density builds should be avoided at all costs to maintain our leafy green and spacious suburbs.

Page: [Policy D6 Optimising housing density](#)

Section: [3.6.4](#)

I wonder who is going to pay for the modernising of the infrastructure-us, the poor hard working tax payers?

Page: [Policy D8 Tall buildings](#)

Section: [3.8.2](#)

In the Greater London Suburbs where most residential buildings are a mostly 2 storey then classifying a tall building as only a 'Tall Building' when over 30m in height is not acceptable. A tall building should be classified as such for anything over 4 storeys in the suburbs. We like our suburban sprawl, we do not want many buildings over 3-4 storeys in height, they ruin the street scene, overpopulate areas and spaces around and in between tall buildings are great places for crime to occur due to lack of surveillance.

Page: [Policy D9 Basement development](#)

Section: [3.9.3](#)

Small scale basement construction in residential properties must never accepted as permitted development and must always require planning permission so that neighbours have a chance to comment.

Page: [Policy D9 Basement development](#)

Section: [3.9.5](#)

Boroughs must restrict small scale basement developments as well as large scale to contain the effects of subsidence of and flooding into neighbouring homes.

Page: [Policy D12 Agent of Change](#)

Section: [3.12.2](#)

excellent idea.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [H2](#)

This is truly war on the leafy green suburbs. We have all worked hard and long to buy our homes and have chosen to live in suburbs where there is space to move and lots of nice green spaces dotted around the area including inbetween houses. Infill housing and extensions to current houses should only be allowed where it is not detrimental to the amenity of current occupiers and current planning rules should be kept and reinforced. Privacy and amenity should be taken into account when planning applications are submitted and on no account should there be compulsory purchase of existing gardens in order to increase housing stock. Demolition of lovely old Edwardian and Victorian houses should be discouraged. It is destruction of our heritage and changes the face of our outer London boroughs so dramatically. New modern boxy houses are so ugly. High rise blocks of flats should all be situated in one designated area away from current residential housing stock so as not to destroy current residential areas and amenity, bringing the prices of existing properties down and creating a feeling of enclosure.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [4.2.2](#)

Diversifying locations should not include building on back gardens or knocking down beautiful Edwardian or Victorian houses and building blocks of flats in their place. This ruins the amenity value currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [4.2.5](#)

I do not agree. Current well designed housing should be preserved at all costs. Infill development to current residential streets where it destroys the amenity value enjoyed by current residents should be avoided at all costs.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [4.2.9](#)

Green roofs cannot be accessed by frogs, newts, slo-worms and so forth. Trees are of no use to these creatures plus many other insects that are valuable to our planet. Replacing existing green space with permeable landscaping material is not acceptable. Our bird populations are already declining due to our overdevelopment of land. This downward trend cannot continue. We are, along with many other countries, destroying our planet by overdevelopment. The key is to have less people and less development.

Page: [Policy H4 Meanwhile use](#)

Section: [4.4.2](#)

Object -

This amounts to temporary accommodation which people do not like as they do not wish to move from place to place. Better to spend valuable money constructing permanent housing rather than spending money on that which is temporary.

Page: [Policy H5 Delivering affordable housing](#)

Section: [4.5.1](#)

Even at 80% of the average local rent, housing in London will never be affordable. Shared ownership schemes are quite ridiculous as a mortgage has to be available and rent and mortgage paid at the same time. How can most normal hard working people on low salaries afford this when in the end they do not own really anything, just 30% of the value of the property.

Page: [Policy H5 Delivering affordable housing](#)

Section: [4.5.5](#)

I do not believe that people want mixed use and all inclusive community developments. We all strive to live alongside others that are like ourselves. The mention of affordable housing within a development immediately brings to mind crime, rubbish on the streets and noise. Having these inclusive developments could make some people decide not to buy property within a development like this. We all want to live amongst like-minded folk. Better to have separate developments for affordable accomodation. Trying to mix people from different walks of life will not work. Social integration does not work. The mayor only has to look at the extreme behaviour of some religious groups against others to see that social integration will never happen.

Page: [Policy H7 Affordable housing tenure](#)

Section: [4.7.8](#)

The salary level is unattainable for most normal hard working people meaning that those with an average salary of £25000 would struggle to participate in any of these schemes.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Longer tenancy agreements give renters peace of mind and security yet they can give landlords 1 months notice to leave after the initial 6 months when they need to move home due to work or whatever. This is good.

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

Section: [5.1.2](#)

Social integration is never something that can be achieved. Like will always want to mix with and have subjects and activities in common with like minded people.

Page: [Policy S2 Health and social care facilities](#)

Section: [5.2.5](#)

Bigger practices, less Doctors and more patients all leading to an even longer wait for an appointment than there is now. The situation now is at bursting point with non-emergency appointments only being available with a delay of 3 or 4 weeks. Most ailments have either killed people or gone away by the time the patient gets to see a GP. What we need is more practices in separate locations with parking onsite so patients who are ill do not have to walk or take public transport to attend an appointment, making themselves deteriorate during a cold walk/ride to see the GP and even worse giving whatever they have to everyone on the shared public transport.

Page: [Policy S5 Sports and recreation facilities](#)

Section: [5.5.2](#)

Where new facilities are provided there should be enough onsite parking to cater for the development so that users are not taking up valuable parking spaces in residential streets.

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

Section: [7.1.11](#)

Developments **MUST** avoid harm to significant archaeological assets. Our heritage should be preserved at all costs.

Page: [Policy HC5 Supporting London's culture and creative industries](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Support - Culture

I agree totally that places for artists and designs should be more readily available at a more affordable price.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

All loss of green spaces should be resisted in ALL areas, not only deprived ones. Not all green spaces should be managed and tidied up. Some should be left as they are, wild and untamed to let nature take its course and for species or insects and mammals to thrive. Human access should be resisted and boroughs should categorise some areas as rich in biodiversity and human intervention should be resisted in these areas. Likewise building on back gardens and compulsory purchase of back gardens to build upon should not be allowed.

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

Section: [G6](#)

SINC's should be fully protected and should not come to any 'unavoidable harm'. They should have FULL protection. Causing harm to a small part and then another small part and so on and so forth, and before we know it, the whole area has been destroyed.

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

Section: [8.6.1](#)

There should be no reasons for European or national sites of importance to be built upon. It just should not be allowed in any circumstances. By destroying our nature we are in effect destroying human life by way of the consequences.

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

Section: [8.6.2](#)

Green corridors must have full protection and never be built upon.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Has it not come to anyone's notice that despite car use being discouraged that families now own even more cars than ever before. This is due to the convenience of car transport for getting from A to B quickly and with no inconvenience or waiting time ie having to walk to public transport, wait for the transport, change service, wait again and then walk at the end of the trip. Purchase some heavy items and then struggle to get them home. Car usage and ownership will never be discouraged. People will need places to park their vehicles and space to drive them on the already congested roads. With salaries staying the same for some people for about 10 years it is impossible for public transport to be affordable unless it is offered for free and only then will car usage fall a little. All this is just unrealistic. For most cycling to work is not suitable unless there are shower and changing facilities in the work environment.

Page: [Policy T2 Healthy streets](#)

Section: [10.2.6](#)

Not many will wish to live right near a station due to the noise of the trains. Not many will want to walk or cycle during the freezing cold months of Winter. If our island was situated in the Mediterranean then walking and cycling all year round would be a pleasure but in the cold, wind, rain and snow of the UK it is not something that most people want to do. I cannot see how this mindset can be changed.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The less parking provision there is, the more crowded current narrow residential streets will become due to an increase of cars wanting to park. Most streets are already at near breaking point with buses trying to travel down narrow over-parked streets causing accidents and clogging up the capitals arteries, creating more pollution as they try and get through narrow gaps. I can envisage street fights where people are arguing over parking spaces. This in turn will make more people pave over their front gardens so they have a permanent place to park. This is unwanted and is bad for wildlife and humans.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [10.6.1](#)

These measures will just mean that anyone who has a front garden large enough for on site parking will pave it over so they can park and possibly rent the space to others when they are out. Where there is a will people will always find a way to keep the convenience of life and keep their cars.

Page: [Policy T6.3 Retail parking](#)

Section: [10.6.15](#)

How ridiculous that one would visit a retail park with the idea of purchasing a large amount of goods and then not be able to get them home using a vehicle as there was nowhere on site to park it. This concept is going to lower the amount that people spend in shops and more retailers will go bankrupt.

A lot of shopping is impulse buy. One drives past and decides on impulse to visit. If there are no parking spaces on site and it is too difficult to find one nearby then the retailer loses out.

Page: [Policy T7 Freight and servicing](#)

Section: [10.7.1](#)

Costing companies more money to employ staff to work overtime or having to employ additional staff and making sleepless nights for those residing in the path of deliveries or adjacent to a distribution centre.