

Mr Quentin Given comments

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I strongly support the aim to shift towards sustainable modes of transport.

I support the need to make better use of land. In London we have seen single-storey retail sheds with accompanying large car-parks built even in recent years in eg the Greenwich Peninsula. We also see large expanses of land in West London and Surrey used as parking for Heathrow and Gatwick. We should discourage people from driving to airports, and if their flights are as necessary as they say they will be willing to use public transport.

Sites like these should instead have

- a) any necessary parking provided in multi-storey units
- b) multiple use of land so that there is housing above retail and parking.

We should not build on any greenfield sites and we should also conserve brownfield sites that have important wildlife.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this but find that the mayor is proposing to build more roads eg the Silvertown tunnel which will worsen air pollution and encourage more car use. The Plan should be consistent. No more roads.

Page: [Policy GG5 Growing a good economy](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

A good economy needs to be a green and sustainable economy - that needs to be spelt out in this section.

Page: [Policy G1 Green infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

London needs a bolder plan for green space and natural habitat, to create viable wildlife corridors through our city, connecting existing parks, nature reserves and informal open space. In places this will conflict with the understandable desire to build dense housing everywhere. But the point of a plan like this is precisely to take difficult decisions.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Strongly support protection of Green Belt and improvement of its habitat value.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

We need tougher action to protect and improve MOL. For example, in Haringey the Hornsey Filter Beds site MOL is under threat. This was once an important habitat feature, its rich invertebrate fauna providing food for many bats and birds. The filter beds have been decommissioned. Instead of proposing to re-create a wetland feature, Haringey in the current draft Wood Green Area Action Plan, is proposing to designate the whole site for dense housing. Not even leaving a percentage for nature. This is how, despite apparent good intentions, wildlife is declining.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this policy. I suggest that a register should be drawn up showing all the green space that has been lost in London since, say, 1965 when the current boroughs were formed, to act as a baseline. For example, the building of the A1055 in the early 1990s destroyed 10% of Tottenham marshes (about 4 hectares). We should be aiming to restore the area London once had.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this policy. We should be much tougher about proposed development that encroaches on green space and natural habitat.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this but think that the policy itself should be strengthened, by incorporating para 9.2.3 in to the policy. Too often, zero carbon and offset payments are being "traded away" by boroughs for affordable housing. The Plan should make it clear that affordable housing and zero carbon are both priorities and that one cannot be traded for another.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support this, but find it at odds with the Mayor's support for new roadbuilding eg the Silvertown Tunnel.

Page: [Policy T3 Transport capacity, connectivity and safeguarding](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I object to building new roads, eg East London and Gallions Reach, and new Heathrow access routes. These completely contradict the otherwise good aspirations on the Plan, increasing air pollution and carbon emissions and encouraging car use.

Page: [Policy T8 Aviation](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The mayor says he supports the case for increased airport capacity. But what is this case? A high proportion of flights are made by a tiny minority of people on repeat leisure trips. People do this because it is cheap and easy.

Instead, let's have a Frequent Flyer Levy instead, increasing steeply with every flight. People will be able to make eg annual trips to visit relatives, but will be penalised for indulgence.

Let's have a special levy on flights to nearby Europe, routes that could easily be done by Eurostar, and if necessary let's up Eurostar trains to every 30 minutes or less to both Paris and Brussels.

Then let's see what demand is like for more flying.

The Mayor says he supports expansion if it can be done without environmental harm. The truth is there is the vast majority of flights will be made in fossil-fuelled planes for decades to come, and efficiency gains are likely to be small. You can't have aviation expansion without environmental harm. Let's stop kidding ourselves and face reality. And therefore oppose all aviation expansion.