
From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Sirs

Below are my comments on the London Plan consultation. They are slightly amended to the comments I included in my comments on the London plan.

Hiding access to submissions behind a registration makes it very difficult for those without familiarity of such systems or patience. The password process was not automatic (I presume there needed to be a database update as it came through 12 hours later, around 10pm). You also did not send any kind of registration to my Council email address [REDACTED] which is highly suspicious.

Furthermore, it was highly disappointing that out of the large team participating at the consultation event in Bexley (and I assume the same for others), none deemed to take notes to feed into the consultation process. This is highly unusual, and somewhat disappointing for residents who turned out.

Regards

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

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

N/A comments

Page: [Draft New London Plan](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Dear Sirs

I am a Councillor in the London Borough of Bexley and have lived in Bexley all my life. I have read the Mayor of London's proposals for a London Plan and attended the "consultation" hosted by the London Borough of Bexley. I wish to register my strong objections to some of the proposals.

The housing target has been increased nearly three-fold, from 446 units a year to 1,245 but with NO additional infrastructure promised. Bexley does not have any underground tube stations or DLR. Its bus network is not as developed as other parts of London (no connections direct to central London and poor night services). There is also no additional funding allocated for public amenities such as schools, GP surgeries or hospitals. Such a huge demand in the increase in "contribution" to the housing solution, with a removal of checks and balances which would consider the impact on the community, simply cannot be demanded by the Mayor without first implementing a massive step change in our transport, school and healthcare capacity.

The amount of housing coming from small sites has increased eight-fold from around 110 sites to 865, the highest increase as a percentage of total supply in London. These small sites will be predominantly in residential areas up to 800m from town centre boundaries and railway stations which in Bexley will include areas with relatively poor accessibility.

Density ranges for housing have been removed this will lead more intense developments on small plots with little parking. Zero parking will be sought on developments. Bexley does not have any underground tube stations or DLR nor direct railway links that connect key local employment locations in this part of suburban London such as Bexleyheath, Sidcup and Bromley. This will mean that it will be extremely difficult for these residents to get to work without private transport. Even if residents travel by train for their work, they need cars to socialise, shop and enjoy family lives. The Mayor needs to consider the transport links in this part of the city he serves before even considering disrupting residents' lives.

The plan restricts building on underused industrial areas. Bexley has identified some of these areas for new housing. The industrial areas simply will never be brought back into use as they have been used in the past. These are prime areas for residential development, mixed with some light industry/business use. The plan is confused over whether the Mayor wants housing for commuters (the suggestion of over-densification around train stations) or whether industrial land should be brought back into use for jobs (in which case the Mayor needs to develop, with local Councils, plans for business development areas, not focus on housing).

The removal of the ban on back land development will see residential provision packed tight, and with a presumption in favour of small housing developments (up to 25 units) this will end up with the loss of green space. Towns in Bexley originated around railway stations – the family homes that were built in the 1930s are close to town centres and the railways. GLA planners believe that small flats, converted from three bedroom semi detached houses, are suitable family homes. This means streets and streets of semi-detached housing can be converted into – or knocked down and built on for – flats. One street I am Councillor for has seen applications (rejected) for such conversions – meaning the number of dwellings would increase from c170 (approx. 500 to 600 residents) to between 300 to potentially 1000 or more dwellings.

It will change completely the face of the areas around towns and railway stations and will remove badly needed green spaces (gardens). Despite the reassurances of GLA planners, this will not be a piecemeal process given the significant numbers of new housing demanded. However, it WILL be a hotchpotch of developments – and neighbourly contention - without a joined-up plan and using spaces in need of regeneration (as opposed to a couple of good quality houses which can be brought for less than £1 million, knocked down and 25 flats put up). A joined-up plan takes more effort but for the sake of getting it right, the Mayor and GLA team need to be obliged to put the local situation over easy wins resulting in massive change in the local amenity.

Families stay, indeed move, to Bexley for good quality family housing. Removing this choice for Londoners will result in a monotonous, uniform London rather than providing the variety of housing Londoners want and the unique, interesting communities the Mayor seeks to achieve.

Finally, I would like to comment on the consultation process. Hiding access to submissions behind a registration makes it very difficult for those without familiarity of such systems or patience. The password process was not automatic (I presume there needed to be a database update as it came through 12 hours later, around 10pm). Furthermore, it was highly disappointing that out of the large team participating at the consultation event in Bexley (and I assume the same for others), none deemed to take notes to feed into the consultation process. This is highly unusual, and somewhat disappointing for residents who turned out.

I hope my concerns and objections will be taken into consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Cllr Caroline Newton

Page: [Draft New London Plan](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

Hiding access to submissions behind a registration makes it very difficult for those without familiarity of such systems or patience. The password process was not automatic (I presume there needed to be a database update as it came through 12 hours later, around 10pm). You also did not send any kind of registration to my Council email address (caroline.newton@bexley.gov.uk) which is highly suspicious.

Furthermore, it was highly disappointing that out of the large team participating at the consultation event in Bexley (and I assume the same for others), none deemed to take notes to feed into the consultation process. This is highly unusual, and somewhat disappointing for residents who turned out.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

Density ranges for housing have been removed this will lead more intense developments on small plots with little parking. Zero parking will be sought on developments. Bexley does not have any underground tube stations or DLR nor direct railway links that connect key local employment locations in this part of suburban London such as Bexleyheath, Sidcup and Bromley. This will mean that it will be extremely difficult for these residents to get to work without private transport. Even if residents travel by train for their work, they need cars to socialise, shop and enjoy family lives. The Mayor needs to consider the transport links in this part of the city he serves before even considering disrupting residents' lives.

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The housing target has been increased nearly three-fold, from 446 units a year to 1,245 but with NO additional infrastructure promised. Bexley does not have any underground tube stations or DLR. Its bus network is not as developed as other parts of London (no connections direct to central London and poor night services). There is also no additional funding allocated for public amenities such as schools, GP surgeries or hospitals. Such a huge demand in the increase in "contribution" to the housing solution, with a removal of checks and balances which would consider the impact on the community, simply cannot be demanded by the Mayor without first implementing a massive step change in our transport, school and healthcare capacity.

The amount of housing coming from small sites has increased eight-fold from around 110 sites to 865, the highest increase as a percentage of total supply in London. These small sites will be predominantly in residential areas up to 800m from town centre boundaries and railway stations which in Bexley will include areas with relatively poor accessibility

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

Section: [N/A](#)

The plan restricts building on underused industrial areas. Bexley has identified some of these areas for new housing. The industrial areas simply will never be brought back into use as they have been used in the past. These are prime areas for residential development, mixed with some light industry/business use. The plan is confused over whether the Mayor wants housing for commuters (the suggestion of over-densification around train stations) or whether industrial land should be brought back into use for jobs (in which case the Mayor needs to develop, with local Councils, plans for business development areas, not focus on housing).

The removal of the ban on back land development will see residential provision packed tight, and with a presumption in favour of small housing developments (up to 25 units) this will end up with the loss of green space. Towns in Bexley originated around railway stations – the family homes that were built in the 1930s are close to town centres and the railways. GLA planners believe that small flats, converted from three bedroom semi detached houses, are suitable family homes. This means streets and streets of semi-detached housing can be converted into – or knocked down and built on for – flats. One street I am Councillor for has seen applications (rejected) for such conversions – meaning the number of dwellings would increase from c170 (approx. 500 to 600 residents) to between 300 to potentially 1000 or more dwellings.

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The removal of the ban on back land development will see residential provision packed tight, and with a presumption in favour of small housing developments (up to 25 units) this will end up with the loss of green space. Towns in Bexley originated around railway stations – the family homes that were built in the 1930s are close to town centres and the railways. GLA planners believe that small flats, converted from three bedroom semi detached houses, are suitable family homes. This means streets and streets of semi-detached housing can be converted into – or knocked down and built on for – flats. One street I am Councillor for has seen applications (rejected) for such conversions – meaning the number of dwellings would increase from c170 (approx. 500 to 600 residents) to between 300 to potentially 1000 or more dwellings.

It will change completely the face of the areas around towns and railway stations and will remove badly needed green spaces (gardens). Despite the reassurances of GLA planners, this will not be a piecemeal process given the significant numbers of new housing demanded. However, it WILL be a hotchpotch of developments – and neighbourly contention - without a joined-up plan and using spaces in need of regeneration (as opposed to a couple of good quality houses which can be brought for less than £1 million, knocked down and 25 flats put up). A joined-up plan takes more effort but for the sake of getting it right, the Mayor and GLA team need to be obliged to put the local situation over easy wins resulting in massive change in the local amenity.

Families stay, indeed move, to Bexley for good quality family housing. Removing this choice for Londoners will result in a monotonous, uniform London rather than providing the variety of housing Londoners want and the unique, interesting communities the Mayor seeks to achieve.

Page: [Multi-policy response](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

See attached