

# Mr Bob Phillips comments

Page: [Policy SD4 The Central Activities Zone \(CAZ\)](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The Plan seems to advocate too much of a divide between central London and the outer suburbs. It seems to be tending towards putting all the housing growth in the outer suburbs, with mostly office development, and advocating the concentration of many of the attractive aspects of the city into the CAZ. That is a retrograde step. For one thing, it will tend to increasing the amount of travel into the CAZ at a time when all transport modes are under heavy pressure. It also diminishes the attractiveness of the suburbs. Rather, we should be planning for mixed development in the suburbs and encouraging a situation where people do not travel so much because they find what they want locally.

Page: [Policy SD6 Town centres](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The plan for greatly increased development of housing in the suburbs is necessary. Without careful attention to making those places viable and attractive, we will just create chaos and misery. That is why the development of vital town centres is so important. There is one particular, dramatic, example of this - Tolworth in the Borough of Kingston - an Opportunity Zone. This place, right now, is a cross-roads of the A3 and A240: with no real town centre, and what there is is cut in two by a dual carriageway. There is scope for a large amount of development here - of housing and office space, strategically positioned. But the growth of this suburb will be unsustainable unless a proper town centre is created. The GLA (and the Borough) must not allow development to do ahead without the town centre being developed at the same time. Let me put it positively: there is great opportunity for growth now in Tolworth, but only if the opportunity is taken at the same time to make the town centre.

Page: [Chapter 4 Housing](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I applaud the intention to raise the targets for building housing, even though my Borough, and, I guess, all of the other outer London boroughs, are complaining that the targets are too high. London desperately needs more family housing. It needs more genuinely affordable housing, yes; but over and above that, the housing supply must grow.

In compensation for making Boroughs like mine - Kingston - cram more housing into the available space, the Mayor and the Government must expropriate all the completely dysfunctional housing that has been built in central London for rich investors who now do not want to invest. This must be taken away from all those greedy financiers who only built them for their personal gain, and converted to use for people who really need housing.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The term "affordable housing" was introduced by Grant Shapps and the Tories in a blithe reenactment of the manipulation of language at the "Ministry of Truth" in George Orwell's 1984. The term "affordable housing" in current use means unaffordable housing in London - housing that is hugely less affordable than the Council houses that were part of an equitable fabric of Britain. We must stop using the term. There is social housing and there is expensive housing priced by the market.

Page: [Policy H12 Housing size mix](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

There are far too many one bedroom flats being built, and many of them are far too small. When single people form couples and have babies, they will totally outgrow these rabbit hutches, and we will have a huge shortage of houses in which healthy people can grow. The legacy of bad planning for housing is bad health and bad behaviour, and appalling consequences for society. We cannot let the short-term desire to make a buck on an artificially inflated property market be the force that drives us to build up huge problems and huge costs in the future. We can study the demographics. We know roughly what family sizes there will be in the future. Let us build for those families to have a healthy living space.

Page: [Policy E8 Sector growth opportunities and clusters](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The proposals on tech and digital sector focus on property - making office and other facilities available to entrepreneurs. The creation of infrastructure to promote high tech growth in London needs to include more than just physical facilities, though. Availability of and access to a wealth of patents will be just as important in making London a hub of high tech business growth. Along with the patents themselves, timely access to expertise and services is also critical to start-ups. The Mayor of London should think about channels for making this sort of service available - that would make London a uniquely favourable location for high tech start-ups.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The previous Mayor made plans to tackle some air quality black spots by containing the problem in a tunnel and then pumping out and purifying the exhaust air. The current administration seems to have rejected this approach. That is a pity - it is an approach that could be effective in some circumstances. The A3 underpass at Tolworth is a particularly beneficial example. This is an air quality black spot, no doubt. The traffic generating the air pollution is already contained in an underpass. Decking over the underpass is a solution that is relatively inexpensive, compared to tunnelling. And in the case of Tolworth there are two huge additional planning gains. The Tolworth Cap would reunite south Tolworth with the town centre, and provide essential support to the development of Tolworth by ceating a viable town centre. If the underpass were "capped" substantially, like Broadgate, in the City, or Hackney; then there would be new "land" created for developing Tolworth into a vibrant commercial centre, half-way between Heathrow and Gatwick, on crossRail2, and with fast access to the M25 (via the A3).

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

Section: [N/A](#)

We have to reduce the number of vehicle - on the road and parked by the side of the road. Our grandchildren will not believe that we were stupid enough for each of us to desire to own one or two big lumps of steel that would sit at the side of the road for 90% of the time, so that for 10% of the time they could sit stationary in a traffic jam. They will not understand why we did not share these enormously expensive objects. There are huge opportunities for developing intelligent transport services - applications that put to individuals' use a mixture of car sharing, car clubs. taxis amd public transport. We must encourage this to take over from the ridiculous notion of having to own a car.