

0. Generally the plan relies on policies to be determined by boroughs which would be fine if the boroughs employed the staff that used to be retained in the interregnum between the GLC and Ken.
1. Chapter 1 deals with the Mayors vision for an ever expanding city which is contained within the present green belt. This can only mean higher densities loss of historic character inadequate space for education open space etc.

We suggest that the plan has to start from the land and should set standards for development. This will at some point either lead to a brake on development or an expansion of London's boundaries.

2. The location of strategic provision for town centres, industry open space are merely diagrams and do not demonstrate how residents can work, shop and play in attractive surroundings, which connect up so that each part of the city provides for the needs of its residents.
3. Housing Targets are set without regard to the capacity of the land. Defining (a welcome proposal) space standards may put further pressure for higher densities.

The target for affordable housing are too flexible and are unlikely to be met. Rigid on site provision should be mandatory.

Space and finance for Healthcare provision should be a requirement for major developments.

Borough plans which do not allocate land for education related to planned population should not be approved

Standards should be set for sports provision and sites should be allocated.

We object to the omission of the table in the present London Plan relating density to public transport.

4. We object to the concentration of new office space in the CAZ and seek employment closer to residential areas.

We are concerned that the "managed" transfer of industrial land to other uses may not adequately protect employment opportunities for West London residents.

We look for more information on "London' Arcadia"

We look for positive proposals to prevent major retail centres from damaging the viability of small shops. Where major stores are granted consent S106

monies should be used to reduce the rent of small shops within their catchment area.

5. We support the measures to mitigate climate change. We endorse policies to require CHP on major schemes. We look for policies to reduce car travel by reducing parking on-site, by CPZs and by improving public transport and by locating work and leisure closer to residential areas.

As a canal side area we wish to see water borne freight and waste being positively encouraged and waterside sites needed for access, boat repair etc protected from other development.

6. We welcome policies to assess transport capacity before consenting development. We would ask that in critical situations development applications should be refused where capacity would be inadequate to sustain it.

We welcome the support for Crossrail.

We look for the phasing out of Heathrow as it is replaced by the Mayor's estuary airport and infrastructure.

We support the proposals for multi mode public transport which will need to increase capacity faster than population growth as car use is reduced. We note that Tramway proposals should follow best practice to avoid the problems which beset the West London tram route.

We support the proposed cycle network which should be fed by cycle lanes on roads. The "super highway" should be exclusively for cycles.

We welcome policies on walking. Development applications should include generous seating, wide footpaths street trees and clutter free signs,

We look for reduced maximum standards for on site parking related to TfLs. As public transport capacity improves parking maxima should be further reduced. All areas around sites with TfL of 3 or more should have CPZs.

Strategic sites for Freight interchanges should be identified where they have ready access to rail and/or canals.

7. We consider that the "public realm" includes all areas to which the public have access. We therefore note that the policies on "architecture" relate to all buildings with a public frontage. In our view these policies do not make it clear that designs must be judged on how they enhance an area, especially if it is protected. Far more emphasis should be placed on the need to respect the character of the immediate area and either to enhance it by fitting in well and/or by adding a new feature of exceptional merit.

Tall buildings should only be permitted in areas where the Council has prepared and adopted a tall buildings policy and plan.

Tall buildings should only be sited close to World Heritage Sites, CAs, listed buildings where shown in the Councils tall buildings plan.

We request the Mayor to designate the whole of the banks to the river Thames (and tributaries) as a Conservation Area extending inland as appropriate so as to give additional protection to the existing character of the river.

The whole of the Thames should be covered by “Thames Landscape Policies” which the Mayor should help to regularly update so they can provide effective policy contexts for development decisions

The Thames is still a working river. Slipways, repair yards and other facilities should be identified and protected.

Canal policies are welcome. They should include water borne freight, water borne waste and transfer stations.

We do not believe that the Mayor can contain London within its Green Belt if he does not introduce policies to slow development and population growth. Planning should start from the land and policies which allow or encourage over-development are not acceptable.

Far more investment is required in our existing parks so they can adapt to the increasing number of people who have no private gardens.

8. The Plan should set out guidance for S106 contributions. They should be used to ensure that the money is used to enhance the infrastructure in areas affected by new development. Pooling should only be encouraged where it is in the interest of all affected residents.