

Mr David Thompson comments

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

Section: [N/A](#)

I live in the London Borough of Barnet. Whilst greater housing densities may be achievable without wider adverse consequences in Inner London, where travel distances are typically lower and there is a denser network of public transport, so that a lower level of car ownership is sustainable, in Outer London greater distances have to be travelled and there is poorer public transport. Communications links, particularly East-West are thinner and already congested. Denser development will generate more traffic and should not take place without prior provision of improved communications links of all types.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

With regards to para. G, making step free access mandatory, whilst the sentiment is appreciated, this is wrong. It is unnecessarily restrictive as in effect it will make compulsory something which should be left to individual authorities to assess on a case by case basis. Such a compulsory standard will have the consequence that some sites that might otherwise be available for housing cannot be so used because the levels of the site are such that step free access cannot actually be safely provided. It must be right that a house which has stepped access is better than no house at all.

Page: [Policy T6.1 Residential parking](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Whilst the political desire to reduce private car usage is noted, the policies that are adopted should recognise that public transport/cycles/walking are not always practicable options and that for many people, particularly in Outer London, cars are essential. When used cars have to be parked at their destination. It thus follows that adequate visitor parking must be available, and that in many places this must be on-street. Consequently, new development should actually have sufficient on-site parking for the long term parking of residents' cars, without reliance on over-flow parking on the streets. "Sufficient" on-site parking provision should be by reference to actual levels of ownership, and not set at levels so as to "bear down" on ownership- that just makes life harder for all citizens as the streets are clogged with long term parking. On-street parking capacity is a scarce and precious resource which must be preserved for use by short term parking, not long term parking.

Page: [Policy T6.1 Residential parking](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Maximum levels of car parking provision should be set in line with typical levels of car ownership for the area and type of dwelling concerned. Further these levels should recognise that over time the level of ownership of cars within a family will change and there should be sufficient provision within any scheme to accommodate typical maximum levels, not merely mean levels.

Additionally, to avoid developers merely "exporting" parking arising from a development to on-street parking, realistic minimum levels of car parking provision should be required at all developments.

Maximum and minimum levels of parking provision should be at the discretion of Councils as they are best placed to assess local circumstances, not the GLA.