

From: John Seeley |

Sent: 03 November 2011 08:37

To: LDF

Subject: Redesignation of the Pinkham Way area for industrial use

I strongly object to the redesignation of this area because developments will have a very substantial and negative impact on the Pinkham Wood site.

Pinkham Wood is a “site of importance for nature conservation” because of its biological diversity. Such islands of biodiversity – small though they may appear – have been established through scientific research as making major contributions to the ecology and biological wellbeing of neighbourhoods. It is not acceptable that the Council at one moment claims praise for its progressive approach to supporting the natural world and conservation and at the next moment – at convenience – abandons that support. As one might say: Conservation is for life, not just for Christmas.

Conservation is also for the life of citizens, not just for the species located at Pinkham Wood. Various research studies have established the relationship between physical proximity to the natural world and public health. The closer people live to even small open spaces, the lower their susceptibility to a variety of common diseases. Pinkham Wood and nearby parks (“the lungs of London”) make contributions to both the physical and mental health of the neighbourhood. Conversely, who, of those who have visited sprawling concrete developments in countries formerly behind the Iron Curtain, would wish to live in such places. Such areas in eastern Europe serve to illustrate the folly of sacrificing the long-term wellbeing of citizens to the immediate needs of planning.

The Council has returned to this issue of redesignation with nothing new to offer – no new arguments or evidence. In any decision-making process there can always be alternative ways of thinking and alternative solutions to a problem. None are given here. This year’s London Plan indicates that the “Mayor will work with all relevant partners to ensure a proactive approach to the protection, enhancement, creation, promotion and management of biodiversity.” It is very difficult to understand that the Council is acting in co-operation with both the Mayor and policy in this regard. Correspondingly, government policy on planning indicates how planning as an activity plays “a key role in supporting the Government’s wider economic, social and environmental objectives and for sustainable

communities" (Planning Policy Statement on Biodiversity).

I oppose the redesignation proposal. In doing so I take a progressive, long-term view of the long-term health and well-being of the neighbourhood that the Council disregards.

Dr John Seeley

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>
