

Mr Simon Hunt comments

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

Section: [N/A](#)

There's scant regard for maintaining or enhancing the existing characteristics of London's existing communities. This is an agenda for change, as though change is of itself a stated aim. I believe we can achieve increased housing stock without compromising the existing local and regional character.

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

Section: [1.2.2](#)

what's an "appropriate location"?

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

Section: [GG2](#)

"high-density" does not have to be an aim. Increasing housing stock can be done more sensitively; the guidelines around density that have existed for so many years are a key contribution to the allure and character of London and its suburbs.

I do not accept that "high density" is a natural consequence of increasing the housing stock

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

Section: [GG2](#)

"high-density" does not have to be an aim. Increasing housing stock can be done more sensitively; the guidelines around density that have existed for so many years are a key contribution to the allure and character of London and its suburbs.

I do not accept that "high density" is a natural consequence of increasing the housing stock

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [2.0.3](#)

The salient phrase is "over time". Any intensification of housing stock in outer London should be done gradually, in a phased approach with impact assessment at agreed deliverables/time periods.

It is bad planning to increase expectations dramatically in one 'hit'.

Page: [Thames Estuary](#)

Section: [2.1.41](#)

I think the inclusion of additional river crossings has been long debated and local views made known, especially with regard to already over-burdened road infrastructure.

Is the Mayor impervious to previous findings? Or is the Mayor "one guy" who disagrees, and who was elected to represent the views of Londoners? Are we really destined to have these previously debated and rejected plans continually resurface until they "just happen" - that's not democracy.

Page: [Policy SD6 Town centres](#)

Section: [SD6](#)

Once again, housing-led intensification, this time around town centres. This is something of a manic obsession, a one-goal design proposal.

It would make better sense to preserve the non-housing aspects of town centres to encourage the local economy, and thereby encourage development in the outlying areas of the town centre. This fixation on housing intensification is a one-dimensional view of how to enhance London and singularly neglects the need to increase services and commercial enterprises around a newly intensified population.

I also contend - once again - that there is a dangerous implication to a high population density. Ghettos. High quality affordable housing is better achieved by lower/medium density that does not blot out the sun.

Page: [Policy SD7 Town centre network](#)

Section: [Figure 2.17](#)

Object - I think it is naive almost beyond belief to suggest a lack of parking and more cycling/walking routes will remove the need for more parking where population density is forcefully increased. It is clearly an impact on existing parking spaces.

We are seeing that in our neighbourhood already.

Page: [Policy D8 Tall buildings](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

One consideration with tall buildings that seems to be missing is the outlook from the building itself. Here in Bexleyeath we are musing over a proposal for a tall building over 2 and a half times the nearest building that has car parks on three sides. Did no-one think this is hardly going to create a sought-after view for the occupants? Is that not a material consideration in itself?

Page: [Policy D10 Safety, security and resilience to emergency](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

With this rush to intensify the population density can we put to bed the bizarre notion of closing more police stations?

We'll need more police presence, right, with these new ghettos?

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

Section: [Table 4.1](#)

These targets are preposterous.

It's not easy to find much redeemable here. What should have happened is a review after a period of a few years, not a ten year target that aggressive with a yearly total exactly even.

If the Mayor wants to experiment with creating tower blocks in all our town centres then he should at least take the time to see how that worked out in 2-3 years.