

Miss. Emma Smith comments

Page: [Policy HC1 Heritage conservation and growth](#)

Section: [7.1.2](#)

I think it is important that heritage assets are protected and conservation areas respected. I am not convinced this always occurs. There was a recent case in Islington (Regents Wharf) which although rejected by the committee, had progressed a long way without consultation with Historic England even though the site was 'large' and half of it was in a conservation area. When consulted, Historic England had numerous, forceful objections to the plans. But they should have been consulted far earlier in the process. Perhaps this was a one-off error but there should be a process for dealing with sites that have heritage assets which is recognised across all boroughs

Page: [Policy SI17 Protecting London's waterways](#)

Section: [SI17](#)

London's canals are a crucial 'green space' for millions of Londoners and visitors and are well used. However they have come under attack from greedy developers looking to erect tall buildings which are out of context to their environment, often destroying public access to the water. Recent planning applications along stretches of the Regents Canal, which although sometimes rejected, have sought to build buildings that are way too tall creating a canyon effect along the canal; destroying the historical context; significantly reducing the daylight to the canal and to residents adjacent and on the opposite side of the water; and significantly increasing the light pollution over the canal harming the wildlife and neighbouring residents. The London Plan should consider and respect these issues accordingly. The Mayor should not support developments which harm the canal in this way (which has not always been the case to date eg Regents Wharf in Islington)