
From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Dear Mayor of London,

Please take account of my two papers attached to this message, both about giving the tidal River Thames its proper place in the next edition of The London Plan. The current edition of The London Plan is defective in this respect - as my papers explain.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

----- Forwarded Message -----

Subject:Replacement London Plan.
Date:Fri, 08 Jan 2010 17:24:02 +0000
From:Peter Makower [REDACTED]
Reply-To:[REDACTED]
To:mayor@london.gov.uk

As invited in Andrew Barry-Pursell's letter to me enclosing a copy of the Draft replacement London Plan for comment, I am attaching my personal letter dated 8 JAN 10 and the two enclosures referred to in my letter. These are purely my personal comments, and are NOT sent on behalf of any other person or Group.

With best wishes.

P.S. My letter is refusing to attach itself. I will try to send it separately.

--

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 4518 of my spam emails to date.
Get the free SPAMfighter here: <http://www.spamfighter.com/len>

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan <http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen>

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

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

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Importance: High

Dear Mayor of London,

This is my paper dated 16 APR 12 about caring for the tidal River Thames, referred to in my recent message to you dated 28/02/2018 17:31. Please note well!

--

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 4518 of my spam emails to date.
Get the free SPAMfighter here: <http://www.spamfighter.com/len>

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan
<http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen>

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

Click
<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/uNcWxABSRaPGX2PQPOMvUrikelaf+VTnXdevFqeU!IMIIIB41f3FVjfb3kG28RxfNRMHGzZmJt6Bzr!jqbv!p6A==> to report this email as spam.

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:

Importance: High

Dear Mayor of London,

Please include in the next edition of The London Plan the appropriate provisions to take full account of the tidal River Thames as London's biggest public open space by a considerable margin - see my paper dated 27 DEC 16, being sent under separate cover.

Please also include the appropriate provisions to care for the tidal River Thames, as recommended in my paper dated 16 APR 12, also being sent under separate cover.

With best wishes.

--

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 4518 of my spam emails to date.
Get the free SPAMfighter here: <http://www.spamfighter.com/len>

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan
<http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen>

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

Click
<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/dksGyfRCSnGX2PQPOMvUtA0IxE6yMtzQb!NGqOaP393YkLYKq+DBfVPrCplvwaSRMHGzZmJt6Bzr!jqbv!p6A==> to report this email as spam.

From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Importance: High

Dear Mayor of London,

This is my paper on Areas of Open Space in London dated 27 DEC 16, as referred to in my recent message to you dated 28/02/2018 17:31. Please note well!

--

I am using the free version of SPAMfighter.
SPAMfighter has removed 4518 of my spam emails to date.
Get the free SPAMfighter here: <http://www.spamfighter.com/len>

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan
<http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen>

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

Click
<https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/C92+tsCzKGjGX2PQPomvUhkLFoJbzkFEV3K!cGs6UOvjLWQeJlwq8fB3kG28RxfNRMHGzZmJt6Bzr!jqbv!p6A==> to report this email as spam.

The **tidal River Thames** is the ‘back-bone’ of London in the widest sense; that on which the whole complex structure depends. It is the reason why London is where it is. It is the source of a huge range of resources which benefit London in a wide variety of ways, from purely physical, through practical and administrative, to aesthetic, psychological and spiritual. It is also by far the biggest of London’s open spaces (although not recognized as such because it is mostly water most of the time). But it has no one person or body to care for it.

Our **AIM** should be the maintenance and regeneration of the tidal Thames, as a navigational waterway for continuing River and River-related uses, and for general enjoyment in every sense. To achieve this, it is essential to provide the **coordinated protection and care under the planning system**, which the tidal Thames lacks at the moment.

The tidal Thames (and its tributaries) is already covered by the London Plan designation ‘**Thames Policy Area**’ and by the **Blue Ribbon Network** policies. It is also covered by each of the riparian Boroughs’ Development Plans, although in a piecemeal way. Some of the tidal River is designated by some of the riparian local planning authorities as ‘Metropolitan Open Land’, which is defined as the urban London equivalent of the Green Belt for the countryside around London. But as a whole, the tidal River Thames is dealt with by the planning system as a whole in a fragmented and uncoordinated way. **This world-class River currently lacks overall sustainable world-class protection and oversight for its tidal reaches.**

The Mayor’s ‘**Thames Policy Area**’ designation is sadly only an aspiration. Despite The London Plan’s repeated assertions that “The Mayor will and Boroughs should...”, in fact often the Mayor can’t (or occasionally won’t) and Boroughs don’t.....

What is needed is **one consistent protective designation for the tidal Thames**, just as the countryside around cities has, in a different context, in the Green Belts. For the purpose of discussion, the title “**Blue Belt**” is suggested. Where the Green Belt seeks to keep open, green countryside from being encroached upon by urban built development, the “Blue Belt” would seek to keep the **River itself and Riverside land** from being encroached upon by any urban built development that would damage or inhibit River uses and River-related uses (which by their nature have to have a Riverside location). This is made all the more urgent by the National Planning Policy Framework and its threat to Green Belt land. This is also a serious threat to “Blue Belt” Riverside land, which urgently needs specific identification and protection.

The **current situation on the tidal Thames** is one where there is plenty of protection, but in a complex, virtually random pattern of basically independent statutory and other bodies, all of whom do their respective jobs to the best of their ability, but without any general oversight (a bit like the situation I as a patient would find myself in if the medical profession consisted only of specialist consultants without any general practitioners). The Port of London Authority (PLA) controls navigation. The Environment Agency (EA) deals with water quality, bio-diversity and flood defenses. ‘Development’ in the town-planning sense is covered by the Mayor/Greater London Authority (GLA) and the riparian Boroughs in an interlocking pattern which includes parts for the PLA and the EA. In addition English Heritage/DCMS (with CABE), DEFRA/GOL, DCLG and Natural England all have parts depending on individual circumstances. At another level, the River Strategies (Thames Landscape Strategy – Hampton to Kew, Thames Strategy – Kew to Chelsea, Cross River Partnership, and Thames Estuary Partnership) all have vital roles to play. And there are voluntary bodies such as Thamesbank, the River Thames Society, the London Forum, Thames 21, and all the riparian local amenity societies and community associations. And of course there are all the River-users, both commercial (River transport, and support facilities such as boatyards) and recreational (sports clubs, and general private River use); including River User Group 9 (Tidal). And if that weren’t complex enough, over and around us all loom the Water Framework Directive, the River Basin Management Plans, the Marine and Coastal Access Act, the Marine Conservation Zones.....

The “**Blue Belt**” proposal is NOT a criticism of any of these individual bodies or groups, or of their policies. It is on the other hand an attempt to fill the gap in the current set-up. Just as the Green Belt says, “Keep it green if you can”, so the “Blue Belt” would say, “Keep it River-related if you can.” Individual cases would be the subject of individual decisions, but –

the presumption would be in favour of River and River-related uses,

which after all can only operate in Riverside locations. **The AIM of a “Blue Belt” designation is to provide the coordinated protection under the planning system which the tidal Thames lacks at the moment.**

AREAS OF OPEN SPACE INC. WATER SPACE IN LONDON

2 JAN 10

The following figures are of interest in considering the provision of open space of all kinds in Greater London.

The River Thames is NOT usually thought of as 'open space' as such. But it has many of the characteristics of open space in the more general town-planning sense. In particular it has that sense of spaciousness and freedom which is so rare and valuable in an urban and metropolitan setting.

The arithmetic is mine, and therefore highly approximate. But it does give an order of magnitude and scale to the subject. Until someone produces better figures, mine are the only ones I can offer:

1. The River Thames in the GLA area, from Hampton to Crayford Ness, inc. Tow Paths but NOT adjacent Parks.	APPROX. 3,014 ha. 7,448 acres.
2. Richmond Park.	985 ha. 2,434 acres.
3. The River from Kew to Chelsea inc. Tow Path, but NOT adjacent Parks.	287 ha. 709 acres.
4. Hyde Park and Kensington Gardens.	240 ha. 593 acres.
5. Regent's Park.	177 ha. 437 acres.
6. Kew Gardens.	127 ha. 314 acres.
7. Battersea Park.	86 ha. 213 acres.
8. Bishops Park, Fulham.	20 ha. 49 acres.

E&OE. NOT copyright. Corrections and additions welcomed.

Peter Makower.

[REDACTED]

2 JAN 10.

The tidal Thames in the Draft replacement London Plan (OCT 09) 31 DEC 09
compared with
The London Plan – Consolidated with Alterations since 2004 (FEB 08) (8)

LPCWA (FEB 08) Pages 267-285. 19 pages. DRLP (OCT 09) Pp. 193-202. 9 ½ pp.

1. Comparison of Contents:

Chapter 4C The Blue Ribbon Network	Blue Ribbon Network
1. The BRN Principles	+ para. 7.58
2. Defining the BRN	
Policy 4C.1 The strategic importance of the BRN	Policy 7.24 Blue Ribbon Network
<i>Natural resources and human heritage</i>	+ para. 7.59-60
Policy 4C.2 Context for sustainable growth	
<i>Biodiversity and Natural Heritage</i>	
Policy 4C.3 The natural value of the BRN	
Policy 4C.4 Natural Landscape	
Policy 4C.5 Impounding of Rivers	
<i>Sustainable Growth Priorities</i>	
Policy 4C.6 Sustainable growth priorities for the BRN	
Policy 4C.7 Passenger and tourism uses on the BRN	Policy 7.25 Increasing the use of the BRN for passengers and tourism + paras 7.61-62
Policy 4C.8 Freight uses on the BRN	Policy 7.26 Increasing the use of the BRN for freight transport + paras 7.63-67
Policy 4C.9 Safeguarded wharves on the BRN	
<i>Enjoying the BRN</i>	
Policy 4C.10 Increasing sport and leisure use on the BRN	Policy 7.27 BRN: supporting infrastructure and recreational use + paras 7.68-72
Policy 4C.11 Increasing access alongside and to the BRN	
Policy 4C.12 Support facilities and activities on the BRN	
Policy 4C.13 Mooring facilities on the BRN	
<i>Design and Safety</i>	
Policy 4C.14 Structures over and into the BRN	
Policy 4C.15 Safety on and near to the BRN	
<i>London's Water Spaces – Thames & tidal tributaries</i>	
Policy 4C.16 Importance of the Thames	Policy 7.28 Restoration of the BRN + paras 7.73-74
Policy 4C.17 Thames Policy Area	Policy 7.29 The River Thames + paras 7.75-86
Policy 4C.18 Appraisals of the Thames Policy Area	
Policy 4C.19 Green industries along the Thames	
Policy 4C.20 Development adjacent to canals	
Policy 4C.21 New canals and canal restoration	Policy 7.30 London's canals and other rivers and waterspaces + paras 7.87-90
<i>Rivers, brooks and streams</i>	
Policy 4C.22 Rivers, brooks and streams	
<i>Docks</i>	
Policy 4C.23 Docks	
<i>Links outside London</i>	
Policy 4C.24 Links outside London	

2. Comparison of Policies on River access:

Policies 4C.7 – 4C.13. Pages 273 – 279. 6 pages. Policies 7.25 – 27. Pp. 194 - 196. 2 ½ pages.
 Main River access reference - compare LP Policy 4C.11 with DRLP Policy 7.27.

3. Comparison of Policies on tall and large buildings:

Policies 4B.9 – 4B.10. Op. 252 – 254. 2 ½ pages. Policy 7.7. Pp. 175 – 176. 1 ½ pages.