

Mrs Sarah Witney comments

Page: [Policy GG4 Delivering the homes Londoners need](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

GG4 - London Plan looks across the city to plan for housing needs & the IMPOSITION of housing targets on boroughs. I object to this. Out & Inner London borough have different needs and drivers and this lumps all of them together. If a Borough is responsible for its finances with minimal central funding, it should be responsible for all decisions.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

An excellent example of overlooking the needs of outer London & producing a plan that is inappropriate & irrelevant - there will be no 24 hour train travel to Central London in my lifetime of that I can be sure. I do not even have a single 24 hour BUS service & it is not feasible to cycle 15 miles into London.

Page: [Policy GG6 Increasing efficiency and resilience](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I am not certain I agree that building more houses in London is a driver for long term growth an efficiency - pouring money into transport & growth for the rest of the UK would do this far better e.g. houses stand empty & derelict in Northern Towns whist I stand packed like a sardine in a train for 40 minutes to get to work. This Plan is shortsighted and appears to be looking to a temporary solution - London will be full one day as the entire population of UK / the World will not fit and no through is given to "what then".

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Although I agree with the sentiments of protecting open spaces, 2.0.3 is unacceptable. You are saying "destroy the character and essence of our suburbs missfortunate enough to be London Boroughs so we can continue to squash more people in". Outer London with it's heavily overcrowded East/ West train lines and gridlocked buses "scrapes by" at current housing density. With average journey's to work exceeding an hour and fairs 10% of income for lower paid workers going in fairs I disagree strongly with this sentiment.

Page: [Introduction to Chapter 2](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Although the sentiment of this is admirable, no such infrastructure exists for communities far larger than this in Outer London now so I am afraid I feel very inclined to ignore it.

1. The value of land for building flats far exceeds the return from Leisure Centres, Cinema's & supermarkets
2. Local Councils can not force loss making business in to an area & since the public transport only runs to Central London & you dismiss the need for cars, it is likely that these businesses WILL FAIL.

I currently live 40 minutes by polluting bus from a Cinema and although I have a Council subsidised leisure centre, the public swimming times do not work for me and all classes I might attend are fully booked & wait listed.

Page: [Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas](#)

Section: [Thames Estuary \(10\)](#)

I agree whole heartedly with the statement "Others are dependent on the development of infrastructure schemes in order to unlock their full potential, such as Bexley Riverside", I also agree that river crossings must be improved as the road gridlock in our borough caused by it being the access route to both the Blackwall tunnel & Dartford Crossing damages the local economy daily with the traffic gridlock. Sadly, the Plan says only that "the Mayor will assist boroughs to extend the Elizabeth line through Bexley to North Kent". So, there is a commitment to BUILD but none to improve transport. Excuse me for NOT agreeing with your proposals to build.

Page: [Policy SD1 Opportunity Areas](#)

Section: [Bakerloo Line extension \(11\)](#)

This pitches the Bakerloo Line extension to the South East as making real improvements to Transport by connecting areas such as Lewisham & New Cross served by the DLR & London Overground respectively. Even Catford has two train lines serving a good range of locations.

This is giving more to those who have without making any commitment to improve transport links to those areas with total reliance on their East West train lines. IF there was commitment to extend it to join less well served areas to Bromley and Beckenham (hence the Croyden tram system) this would really improve transport and make the first step to cutting car journeys.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support te sentiments of 3.2.2 but there is plenty in this plan that makes it clear that nothing overrides the need to knock it down & build there, especially if the site is within 800m of a station - bye bye all local character, hello every station surrounded by high rises.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I do not support the suggestion that small developments are ignored in infrastructure considerations, these have significant cumulative impact at the levels proposed in the plan. This is especially the case since that infrastructure is creaking in every London area before there is additional building.

Page: [Policy D7 Public realm](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I barely know what is the most annoying about this section - that a plan contains all these words on an area it has no control, that the quality of street furnishing & the provision of seats gets a mention, or that we have to have free water but there is no requirement (in legislation) to offer any public toilet facilities at all (coming from a borough where these are close to zero).

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree completely with this section

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Although O think boroughd should be able to set their own targets based on local circumstances, I do not think these targets are unreasonable.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I do not agree with emphasis on demotion to increase density as an overriding principle within 800m of station. This may destroy the entire character of an area.

Above all, I do not think infill should be presumed to be acceptable in a Conservation area - this may occassionally be acceptable but these hard won areas need protection NOT destruction.

I the small site targets are too high. This means that areas close to stations will have their existing communities destroyed to accomodate this extensive building and the train services from those stations opperate well over capacity in peak times WITHOUT the building.

The figures for Bexley do not add up. The Area of Opportunity will add 12000 homes to the borough. The 10 year target in the target in 4.2.7 is 8650 of which 865 are by smaller development.

Small sites avoid affordable housing and contributions to infrastructure and benefite the builder not the community.

Page: [Policy H3 Monitoring housing targets](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I can see no rationale for shared living schemes to contribute 1 for 3 to targets. This is a very efficient form of living and each occupant makes full use of transport, infrastructure etc.

Page: [Policy H4 Meanwhile use](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

In principle I agree with this as long as they do not become the slums of tomorrow

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree in principle with this but am very concerned that "affordable housing" means starter small flats and that there are no affordable/accessible family homes being built.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

None of this housing is actually affordable - in most cases the only way people will be able to afford the rent is to give up work & get the state to pay. Affordable rents are needed for people whose family income is £30K.

Page: [Policy H11 Ensuring the best use of stock](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The Mayor should be pressing for legislation to

- double the rateable value of empty property
- increase the rateable value of short term let properties
- Shortening the period planning permission lasts to encourage quicker building

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I am afraid this sound very victorian - it seems to say it is fine for family's to live with many children cammed into a bedroom. This was the cause of many social problems gradually eradicated in the 50's & 60's and you seem to be heading us back there.

Page: [Policy H14 Supported and specialised accommodation](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Noble sentiments - how are our local authorities going to fund this?

Page: [Policy H16 Gypsy and Traveller accomodation](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree with this policy

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree with the sentiments but every one who lives in london will tell you tis isn't good enough currently & it is one of the main reasons Londoners don't support housing growth. Do something, don't just talk about it.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Yep, you have spotted the issues - no suggestions to resolve them though??

Page: [Policy S6 Public toilets](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Again you have spotted the issue but make no suggestions - I belive their should be new legislation forcing councils to provide facilities for

- all opens spaces were sport take place

- all open spaces over a certain size with children's play areas

- town centers with heavy bus dependancy

I was informed by an elderly relative that the reason she does not go out is the local shopping area she would visit is 45 minutes each way on the bus and no public tiolet facilities are provided.

No wonder car journeys to large retail sites are preferred.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

There seems to be a noted absence of the skills needed to keep London working i.e. plumbers, builders, electricians etc etc. Not very glamorous but vital to growth

Page: [Policy HC6 Supporting the night-time economy](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Again the needs of outer London is not considered. We have no night buses to/ from central London & no trains past 12.30am. it is clear that the plan regards Outer London as a dumping ground for excess people and nothing more.

Page: [Policy G1 Green infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I agree with the importance put on open spaces and the need for green infrastructure

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I support the approach to Green belt. It does however offer nothing to stop Council's agreeing any planning applications to build on it as they see fit.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The objective of maintaining and increasing provision and access. However due to the rather fluffy nature of this "wish list" I see no incentive for Councils to do this.

Some areas have good provision but there is no protection for park land in this situation and once it is gone it is gone. They are also able to state black is white and grant permission to build when ever they like e.g. doing a survey in a freezing cold wet week in October to prove a park is not used.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

This approach is not acceptable - SINCS should be protected. This makes it clear that it's houses first nature second.

Councils have no money to write plans, improve greening etc making these empty words

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The only ways to improve air quality are to

- improve public transport
- ban deisel
- reduce population

No sign of any of these in this plan

Page: [Policy SI5 Water infrastructure](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

- when properties suffer sewage flooding this is left for them to deal with under private insurance. There needs to be a process by which Councils sue the water companies

Misconnection of drains- I agree this is important but no action is proposed here to address it.

- it is not possible to access Thames Waters drain plans without paying a hefty charge to a 3rd party or going to the Council offices and making a drawing of their copy. This means that it impossible for residents to check that their building work has been done correctly. FORCE Thames Water to make this information public.

- Councils trust external companies to sign off connection and never check it - no wonder it goes wrong

Page: [Policy SI13 Sustainable drainage](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I live in an area that suffers regular rain & sewage flooding. This plan acknowledges the issue but does nothing to address it.

Incidents go unrecorded i.e. there can be an insurance claim for flooding but the area comes back in surveys as no flood risk

This covers up the problem and allows land owners to build for profit causing suffering to others.

Legislation is needed to ban non permeable drives and car parks.

Building is still agreed at local level where there is flood impact and Council just say it does not exist.

Page: [Policy T6 Car parking](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

I do not agree that developments should be approved without adequate parking just so more units can be squeezed in.

This indicates an "ivory tower" which assumes every one works in an office or does some other nice clean middle class job.

Accommodation without parking reduces the opportunities for employment, and ultimately will cause the crash of the economy. Parking is a prerequisite of working as a plumber, electrician, roofer, gardener, alarm engineer, pizza delivery driver, contract cleaner, cab driver, repair engineer, parcel delivery driver, district nurse, window cleaner (I could go on all day) all of whom will be excluded from earning a living and from the accommodation where their services are most needed.

In London today, if you drive and own a vehicle you will never be unemployed. Clearly you wish to stifle that industry. In doing so, only the rich will be able to park and service roles will remain unfilled whilst we all blame every one else for our lack of trades people when really it is our own stupidity. We can all join the ranks of the unemployed and sit proudly in our tiny high rise boxes all because this plan removes the need to provide parking.

Page: [Chapter 11 Funding the London Plan](#)

Section: [Enabling Infrastructure \(175\)](#)

This section recognises the issues but again, does not offer anything constructive to address them. Our parks & open spaces are being neglected to the point that they resemble waste ground.

Private developers can find more lucrative uses for sites than Pubs etc.

No solutions???