
From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Dear Mayor Khan and the London Plan team,

With reference to the London Plan consultation I wish to respond as follows.

In today's increasingly urbanised society trees hold an essential value, as detoxifiers, which for any major city is essential - much of the sudden push towards strict air standards, to save lives, wouldn't be as immediately essential if more trees were preserved, acting as natural cleansers. As habitat for a variety of urban wildlife and most importantly, in my opinion, as value to us as citizens. With an increase in mental health issues, most notably anxiety and depression it is vital to acknowledge the vast array of scientific evidence that trees, greenery and the natural environment, act as a reducer to these common problems. You can experience this by simply walking through a park, woods, a trip into the countryside or by simply hearing birdsong or the buzz of bees. I'm proud that our capital city has one of the largest and most diverse range of parkland and green spaces in the world, but we must be more ambitious. Singapore is currently setting the benchmark in which all successful cities will follow. I would like us to challenge that standard. Singapore is also using this green revolution as a way to lure in extra business and boost tourism, which in a post-Brexit world is invaluable. The planting of native trees along walkways and roads, the creation of new green spaces and the increase in green roofs/walls are areas in which we can pioneer. Creating a better standard of living, a healthier environment and stronger economy. A better world.

In the sections listed below (in the same order as they appear in the draft London Plan).

- Paragraph 1.3.3. Recommend an addition (in CAPS) to the following sentence: "Access to green and open spaces, including waterways AND TREES, can improve health, but access varies widely across the city."
- Paragraph 3.9.5. I support the inclusion of "Protection for trees" as an issue in the amplification of potential negative impacts of large-scale basement development beneath existing buildings.
- Policy H1. Increasing housing supply. I recommend that Sentence B2)d is clarified so that "public sector owned sites" will not include woodland, parks and open spaces.
- Paragraph 4.2.9. I support the principle of "no net loss of overall green cover" as a result of small housing developments, and support "off-site provision such as new street trees" in order to achieve this principle. I recommend an addition (in CAPS) to the following sentence: "Loss of existing biodiversity OR GREEN SPACE, as a result of small housing developments, should be mitigated through measures such as the installation of green roofs, the provision of landscaping that facilitates sustainable urban drainage, or off-site provision such as new street trees in order to achieve the principle of no net loss of overall green cover. Rainwater attenuation features should be incorporated to achieve greenfield run off rates. LOSS OF ANY PUBLIC GREEN SPACE WILL BE COMPENSATED FOR WITH ALTERNATIVE ACCESSIBLE SITES."
- Policy S4. Play and informal recreation. I support section B2)d, that residential development proposals for schemes that are likely to be used by children and young people should incorporate good-quality, accessible play provision for all ages, of at least 10 square metres per child that: "incorporates trees and/or other forms of greenery".
- Policy G1. Green infrastructure. I support this policy, and subsequent narrative that mentions the important role of trees.
- Policy G5. Urban greening. I support this policy, including the recommended Urban Green Space Factor, and subsequent narrative that mentions the important role of trees. I support the inclusion of the role and weighting for woodland and trees in Table 8.2 - Urban Greening Factors. I recommend including a reference to Residential Development and Trees (Woodland Trust, 2015, woodlandtrust.org.uk/residentialdevelopments).
- Policy G6. Biodiversity and access to nature. I support this policy. I recommend that Sites of Metropolitan Importance and

all ancient woodlands are added to the categories of planning applications that must be referred to the Mayor.
- Policy G7. Trees and woodlands. I support this policy. I recommend that Section B)1 is strengthened as follows (amendments in CAPS): "GIVE THE STRONGEST POSSIBLE protection TO 'veteran' trees and ancient woodland, ESPECIALLY where these are not already part of a protected site". I support the subsequent narrative on the role of trees, particularly paragraphs 8.71 – 8.73. I recommend referring London boroughs to guidance on ancient woodland and veteran trees: Planners' manual for ancient woodland and veteran trees(Woodland Trust, 2017, woodlandtrust.org.uk/plannersmanual).

Please accept this my formal response to the consultation. I will look forward to hearing from you as the Plan progresses.

Yours,

David Glover

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

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