

Noel Farrer

Immediate Past President, Landscape Institute

Thank you very much indeed. Yes, I nearly did entirely tear up my speech that I brought this morning on the basis that a lot of things that Dieter [Helm] has said and, in fact, everybody has said was basically nearly all the things that I wanted to say. I am not here to repeat a lot of the excellent things that have been said. Yes, of course, totally supportive of green belt, as have most of the people on the panels and in the room have been. Yet, of course, there are voices in the room, people who feel desperately under pressure and feel a need to challenge green belt.

This is interesting for me because I am a landscape architect and landscape architecture, for me, chimes exactly with the same agenda as green belt. Green belt's answers are long term. Green belt's answers are not that tangible. Come on, Dieter [Helm], keep working at that. London's green belt requirements in terms of what its future should be are complex. They are multifunctional. They are not sitting easily in any political silo. These are tangible aims of things that seem a long way away when I have a five-year political cycle, when I have a political imperative that is attacking me right now. I have travelled the country as a landscape architect to try to talk about landscape architecture. I had a letter from someone the other day, "Noel Farrer? No, Neil Furrow, landscape gardener." This is a problem of 25 years. In my industry landscape architecture is not very well recognised. There are not enough people coming on our courses. Landscape architecture designed the Olympic Park. Landscape architecture is the answer in the room. We are the guys on the ground. We are 5,500 members and we hold a lot of the answers, but we are recognised and we are not recognised by society, but we have some of the answers for you. That is my little pitch for landscape architecture.

Green belt. Everything has been said about this. I am going to skip through these slides because they are the same slides that have already been shown to you but, yes, conceived a long time ago, 1935. Really came together in [Patrick] Abercrombie's Plan [made up of the County of London Plan (1943) and the Greater London Plan (1944); two documents for the post-war improvement of London]. 1947 Town and Country Planning Act made it available to local authorities to, therefore, be able to designate green belt. From there it has been hugely successful. Effectively a policy that has never really changed. It has retained its same aims all the way through to 1995, Planning and Policy Guidance (PPG) 2. Finally into NPPF, 2012, where actually it is written in a slightly shorter set of words but then I think the major goal of NPPF was to try to fit it into as small a document as possible politically but, basically, it still enshrines effectively exactly the same policy that we have already had unchanged.

Interestingly, though, green belt had become hugely popular, if you like. The reality is you have here a number of lines - if you can see them - but the reality is that the GLA boundary is the red line, the MGB is now the present Metropolitan Green Belt, the Abercrombie Plan is the green line. This green belt has over doubled in size. It is very much liked and loved and it has been taken up not just in London but this is something that is now wrapping round the 14 green belts wrapping round all of our cities nationally. I thought I would take the trouble to see just how politically strong and important green belt is. This is Theresa May's [Prime

Minister of the United Kingdom] parliamentary constituency of Maidenhead. She is sitting under what looks like the best part of 70% of her constituency's green belt. I would argue Theresa May writing anything other than in her white paper that the Government supports green belt will be like turkeys voting for Christmas.

I think it is very compelling. We have had a number of conversations and worked very closely with the London Green Belt Council, we understand the CPRE and actually they have been incredibly effective in keeping green belt on the political agenda, being very much aware of being able to keep that voice very, very high and Government absolutely hear that. Here is one of their erosions of green belt that, therefore, is actually happening. Even though it is incredibly compelling, the CPRE are saying here 275,000 homes have been proposed on green belt by April 2016. What Dieter [Helm] is talking about this morning is about scale and is about the large, and we cannot start eating at the edges. It is happening, it is happening. Why is that? We have to dig into that because it is a real, real problem.

For me the world has profoundly changed since green belt policy took off in 1935. Less than 30% of the population lived in urban areas, there was only 38 million people in 1935 when it was first conceived. Look at what we are now dealing with here. Urban growth, more than 70% of people will be living in urban cities in 2027. We are, at the moment, at 65 million, we are going to go to 70. We have already seen huge amounts of rises and pressures. One of the real drivers also is that the whole notion, which never existed when green belt came in, was this whole notion of sustainability. The whole idea of sustainability is relatively new. It means different things to different people but it does underpin the NPPF planning document.

However, our world has changed in every way and sometimes we choose to ignore it, we certainly choose to ignore landscape and we sometimes choose to ignore some of these larger issues that are going on around us. The inconvenient truth as I might word it. Cedric Price [English architect] said in 1966, "Technology is the answer, but what is the question?" I certainly remember my parents assuming that everything would be powered by the sun and we all need not worry and it will all be fine. The reality is the questions are still there. Technology is at its best when it answers a really good question. It is not great at just a random scattergun approach. I read the text the other day, "Genetically modified (GM) crops can improve food production in the world by 15%." These are people sitting in laboratories. Is that a good idea? I do not know. Does it answer a question? What was the question?

What we see going on though is there are many clues to the other dramatic changes that are happening in the world that perhaps we ignore. This one is the World Wildlife Fund's (WWF) decline in total species on the planet. It is between 1970 and the present day. These are massive numbers. I am always amazed as to how we do not see more reaction and more change to what seems to me so profoundly clear and present.

Here is the political reality, where is the environment? When we talk about the green belt we are talking about trees and biodiversity and things like that. Where is environment on the political agenda? It is absolutely nowhere on the political agenda. The reality here is that these

are the three important issues of floating voters prior to the 2015 election. You will notice in the Labour Party, which is red, Conservative and Liberal Democrats. Environment only appears in the Liberal Democrats and last as an issue. That for me is a staggering concept in terms of what everyone has agreed and talked about here today in this room.

There are, though, for me some answers and people who are looking to change this. Scotland and Wales absolutely lead the way for us in terms of planning policy and planning thinking when it comes to this. The Welsh have just enacted in 2015 the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act, which means that they have taken the issues, the longer term profound changes that are going to be made in every department, in every silo of that government and they have said, "Let us say that anything that you do is not allowed to be detrimental to the future generations." How many people in here are aware that Wales have enacted this Act? That is, what, 10% to 15%. This is for me one of the profound pieces of legislation because what it is basically saying is these bigger issues, the sorts of things which are the reasons why green belt is important, come to the top of the agenda and something that certainly the GLA should be thinking about and the Government should be thinking about as an approach to setting a place for green belt. We move on.

There is, of course, the other side of the argument. These are the pressures that are actually under green belt here. I mean there are many, many. I do not know if anyone else read the Andrew Gilligan [British journalist] article that was in *The Times* the other weekend looking at the nature of the pressures, the stats, the academia and the so-called information that is actually being peddled in the marketplace. All these sorts of stats all nibbling at the edges, 1% of this or 2% of that, surely, surely that is a good thing to do. We have to be clear about green belt.

The housing white paper. We now see a real pressure culminating on the Government. The housing white paper talks quite considerably about the green belt. The housing white paper for me does three things and I think it is a great document. One, it sets out much good practice. It promotes the exhaustive exploration of brownfield and urban sites, which is great. It promotes realistic approaches to higher density and recognises higher density, therefore, good. Most importantly for me it promotes quality in place making. All of the answers that I have heard this morning around the issues of 13 tower blocks in Redbridge or all the key issues, they are not quantum issues. They are quality issues. I am aware of landscapes in very high densities where people have fantastic quality of life. I am aware of landscapes in very low densities where they do not. The issue is about quality and that, for me, is a landscape issue and it is embedded in quality of design, the right amount of money and a whole range of it. I have to say there are people nodding over there. These are my experiences.

Two, the housing white paper supports green belt, but, as I have suggested, I do not think it could politically have done otherwise. Three, it recognises in it - perhaps this is the tricky bit - exceptional circumstances, very special circumstances (VSC) as the grounds. It has not weakened that document - and, Janet [Askew], you said this - it has not weakened the status of green belt but the status of green belt is weak. Surely a VSC or an exceptional circumstance

is simply nothing more than a poor local authority with the pressures that are from on top bearing down on them to meet their housing needs with the pressures they have, with the limited, and ever-more limited, resources that they have pushing up. Who is the only game in town that is going to develop their housing? They do not have any money, therefore, they have a developer saying, "Here is my viability study and if you want that then this is what it is going to cost you." Is that not exceptional circumstances? If it is exceptional circumstances, those exceptional circumstances are going to get more common. Let us be clear about the nature of the pressure we are under on the white paper.

This is what we get though. Exceptional circumstances lead to a field on the side of low density housing. These are 17 Balmorals [Scottish holiday home to the Royal Family], 14 Chathams and 18 whatever else, 3-bed, 2-bath, 4-garage detached houses laid out in plots. Not designed. No architect. No landscape architect often. Absolute rubbish and making no contribution. That is what we end up with. It is a problem. The plans do not translate often into practice. This is Woking Borough Council absolutely setting out at the end of last year their pressures. Just have a little read of that.

What do I think needs to happen? What we need is a landscaping formed green belt reform. The green belt does need to be reformed. It is absolutely a muscle, which was mentioned earlier, that needs to work and deliver. If we are not going to build houses on it or if we are going to suggest that there is a conversation to be had about that, it has to do its own work and do it very, very well. My landscaping formed approach to green belt means we need to ask these seven quick questions. What is green belt? Identify what it has achieved and how it has achieved it. Set out its potential. What do we want it to do? Dieter's [Helm] had a lot of clues on that. Then we review it in relation to how it can meet our needs, the environmental needs and the societal needs. Then we are going to look at the future objectives for green belt land and then we are going to talk about its governance and the strategy for the administration of how we are going to take it forward. It is that important and it needs that level of interrogation.

When you actually look closely at what green belt actually is, which is the first point that I made, it is not necessarily bucolic. I watched the BBC last week. They flashed up a picture of green belt. It actually was not green belt, it was a national park. Nothing to do with green belt. It is not all woodland. Much of it is actually toxic. This is a piece of toxic land. To make that grow a monoculture crop you have to put nitrate on it. Nitrate, by the way, is a derivative of oil gas, therefore, it has to come from the oil industry. That is not written on recyclable. The reality is that you put that on there. One third of the nitrogen that you put on there turns into nitrous oxide, which is 300 times worse for the environment than carbon dioxide and is released into the environment. One third is held in the soil and will grow some plants for that year. The other third will find its way through leeching because all of the way between Bristol and Bath and between Bath and Brighton and all over the south of England is pretty free draining and is chalk-based. Basically, it will find its way into the water aquifers. 75% of the water that has come from the aquifers in the southeast of this country are blended. Why is it blended? Because the water is not fit for human consumption. Why is it not fit for human consumption?

It is because of the nitrates that are passing through these fields go into it, etc. You can draw your own string and your own chain around a whole range of different things. This is a piece of ordinary land in green belt. That piece of land must do better. That does not mean that it is vulnerable for housing, but it must do better and we need a policy for making that land do much more.

Therefore, looking at the potentials of green belt - I am on the wrong page, I have lost a page; I am going to have to look at my slide - these have been well-talked about this morning. Promoting biodiversity, flora, fauna, micro, miso, macro, help mitigate pollution, contribute to flood management, supply clean water, deliver local food production, health and wellbeing for the young, for the youth, for contemplation, for social cohesion, accessibility, all of these things. Profound large-scale outcomes. This is by no means exhaustive, you can add to this list enormously. What does this landscape have to achieve this? I have not taken nocturnal photographs but actually this landscape is lakes and reservoirs and they may look like fluffy little wonderful things but they are absolutely critical components, woods, forests, streams, parks, also other things, all need to happen effectively in green belt.

This I hope is not green belt. It should be because it is certainly the sort of outcome that I would like to think that we would see in green belt. Similarly, this. This is food production, this is child development. This is play, this is a walk to school. This is transportation. This is everything. That is how complex that is. You have to extract all of that and recognise all of that in that image. This is not an old orchard that could just have housing on it. This is den making. This is management training camp. This is whatever you want it to be. It is absolutely a role for green belt. The health component has been well covered. It is absolutely massive in terms of what we can achieve.

This is Norman. Norman lives in Flat 8 in Block A in the Peabody [housing association] estate that we worked on a long time ago - Mathew [Frith] will recognise Norman. The reality is he is a lonely man, really struggling in his block. Did not really get out much. We did a little landscape scheme in his courtyard, did some landscape architecture which was tough actually. When we got to the end of the scheme he got out more. He decided to plant some of the beds outside his flat, he did a lot of work, he started to engage with some of the local kids and he became a key component. He moved from a position of really not having much going on to a position of being happy to be alive, I can hear birdsong and life goes on. The loneliness in his life had gone and he won second prize in the Westminster In Bloom Competition in 2007 and it is one of the proudest prizes that our practice has. That human component. How do you measure that? Dieter [Helm], you have to keep trying. Thank you very much