

---

**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.

Please listen to the Woodland Trust and take into extreme consideration the importance of trees in our Capital city. Obviously not only are they a unique and cost affective resource to help combat air pollution but they are also very much underestimated in peoples well being and frame of mind. To live in a city made up mostly from concrete is not good for any human being. Its not natural and should never happen. People need nature around them to function and many people don't even realise this. If you want to talk financially, a leafy London creates a more attractive prospect for investors - everything is a knock on affect and as crazy as it sounds It really does all start with nature and trees. Less trees, more pollution, more angry people, unattractive city to live in. For proof, just go to any London Park at the weekend and see the number of people there - especially on a summers day. We need to keep a significant number of Trees in London and green spaces to make it a healthier and more attractive place to visit and live. Look at Singapore as an example and how they are renowned for their efforts to create a greener city - it's even been turned in to a tourist attraction. Please don't create a city where we live on top of each other any more then what we already do, with no trees and a rise in mental health issues.

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](http://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,

Rebecca Watret

---

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

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

---