

---

**From:**  
**Sent:**  
**To:**  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:**

Dear Mayor,

I am sending this e-mail objecting to the proposed changes to the London Plan on behalf of both my wife Mrs. Doris K. Parker and myself.

We are residents of Kenley and our reasons for objecting to the Plan are as follows:-

- (1) The proposal that the London boroughs should bear such an increase in the supply of new housing for southeast England is excessive and disproportionate. Surrey and the other counties in the southeast commuter belt should be required to take a much higher share of new housing to reduce the need for more housing other than that already planned within the already overcrowded London area.
- (2) In particular, the proposal to increase Croydon's target of new housing units from 14,348 to 29,490 is again excessive and unrealistic as the Croydon area does not have the capacity to meet such an increase without urbanising large areas such as Kenley which would no doubt involve the demolition of existing housing stock which consists mainly of three/four bedroom family housing to be replaced by blocks of flats with only single or two bedrooms. Also, as there is already a dire shortage of family homes in the London area the removal of targets for family homes is totally unacceptable.
- (3) Kenley does not have the necessary infrastructure to support such urbanisation as evidenced by the daily congestion caused by heavy traffic flowing along the Brighton and Godstone roads from the M23 and M25 motorways through the Purley and Kenley area which causes additional congestion in side roads when trying to access main roads.
- (4) Kenley is located at the outer edge of the London area and includes a large area of Greenbelt land and Kenley acts as a welcoming green gateway between town and countryside. Any increased housing intensity would inevitably have a detrimental impact not only on the overall village character of Kenley itself with the loss of trees but also on the flora and fauna and overall biodiversity of the Greenbelt areas.
- (5) Whilst the Plan claims to increase Green belt protection, all the measures announced already exist and the Plan does not therefore provide any additional Greenbelt protection.
- (6) The existing protection of Back Gardens from development should also be maintained in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). There is no justification whatsoever to remove this protection.
- (7) Kenley is located in a valley with residential housing extending up the valley sides. The hills are very steep and can prove too difficult for many to walk up particularly when carrying groceries or other shopping. Many of the roads lack pavements or have narrow pavements which discourages walking due to the fear of accident particularly at night. Most residents therefore require a car to enable them to access shops and move safely around the area.

The existing on-site parking standards provided in the London Plan are already set too low for houses of at least two bedrooms and any further lowering in those standards will result in a greater demand for on-street parking in the area. In many cases there is no capacity for any further on-street parking as the road network is narrow, lacks pavements or the current amount of limited on-street parking is already fully utilised particularly around Kenley station. Any further lowering of existing on-site parking standards will simply make local roads even more congested with unsafe parking thereby increasing the danger of accidents occurring.

(8) With regard to improving public transport to accommodate such excessive urbanisation, in forming the latest Croydon Plan, the Council had been unable to identify any viable ways of significantly increasing the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of the area even over the 20-year duration of their plan so the car remains an important means of transport for local residents.

We would therefore urge you to give due consideration to the above objections, withdraw the New London Plan and enter into positive negotiations with Surrey and the other counties in the southeast to encourage them to take a much higher share of the much needed housing required for the southeast.

Yours sincerely,

(3)

---

This message has been scanned for viruses by the Greater London Authority.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

---