

## Trees & Woodland Strategy – Summary of consultation responses and recommended response

Consultation took place between 30<sup>th</sup> January - 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2012. A total of 22 responses were received.

Respondent	Section	Comments	Response
1- LB Lambeth	2	Supports having a single strategy but believe needs to recognise different attitudes of public v private landowners	No change. Mayor is suggesting one approach boroughs are free to amend it to reflect local circumstances.
	3	Would like to see a standard approach used across London to valuing trees.	No change. So would the Mayor but he is not in the position to force a borough to use a specific valuation method.
	4	Would appreciate any estimates on likely cost of producing strategy for budgeting purposes.	Noted. Indicative resource allocation to be included.
2 – LB Hackney	2	LAs don't have resources to cover private as well as public trees	No change. One of the aims of the SPG is to encourage negotiation between landowners.
	4	LAs don't have resources to produce wide ranging strategy.	No change. SPG recognises funding issues thus promotes a modular approach so work can be undertaken as and when resources are available.
3 – Mrs D Love		SPG needs to emphasize protection/retention of existing trees	No change. London Plan policies 7.19 and 7.21 emphasizes these issues, role of SPG is to spell out how policy is implemented.
4 – Mr B Boggs		Objects to proposal for an incinerator in Sutton	No change. Not relevant to substance of SPG.
5 – LB Wandsworth		While highly supportive of strategy have concern about increasing density of development leaving little room for tree planting.	No change. London Plan policy 5.10 is referenced in SPG. This emphasizes importance of greening new development role of SPG is to spell out how policy is implemented.

6 – LB Tower Hamlets		While highly supportive of strategy feel it needs to place greater emphasis on biodiversity such as using non invasive species, species that help protected wildlife, avoiding inappropriate locations for trees.	Noted. Minor changes to text.
7 – London Tree Officers Association	Overall	Whilst welcoming document believe it needs to be more user friendly, clearer about who it is for and how it should be used – strong on public land weak on private land.	Noted. Executive summary produced to help set context and minor changes to text throughout. Document seeks to work with both sectors so approach can be applied equally.
	2	Needs to be more positive about multiple benefits trees provide and show great understanding of threats to trees	Noted. Text can be amended to reflect both of these issues.
	3	Doesn't address private trees nor consider value of wood products	Noted. Alterations to text to address this.
	4	Mayor needs to show high level support for trees to raise their profile within boroughs.	No change. Mayors Re:Leaf and Great Outdoors campaigns show his support for trees.
8 – LB Newham		Support production of guidance but feel approach suggested is overly prescriptive and resource intensive	No change. Mayor is suggesting modular approach boroughs are free to apply it how they see best in their local circumstances.
9 – LB Croydon		Support approach but would welcome more detailed guidance on local implementation.	No change. Mayor does not wish to be prescriptive in how local issues are addressed, this is a matter for local discretion.
10 – LB Southwark		Support approach but would like some minor wording changes.	Noted. Minor alterations made.
11 – English Heritage		Support approach but would like some	Noted. Minor alterations made.

		minor wording changes on protection of historic trees and appropriate location of trees within historic environments.	
12 – Trees Design Action Group		Support approach but would like to see more emphasis on community engagement, the wider roles of trees, its relationship to the national planning policy framework.	Noted. Minor alterations made.
13 – Transport for London		Support overall approach but would like the strategy to recognise that trees are in different ownerships and that trees often have to be removed by statutory undertakers.	No change. Purpose of SPG is to encourage boroughs to engage with all relevant stakeholders in their borough so the strategy is as comprehensive as possible. Strategy does not seek to prevent statutory undertakers from undertaking their statutory functions.
14 – LB Hillingdon		Support approach and freedom it offers to boroughs but are concerned over potential resource implications.	No change. SPG recognises funding issues thus promotes a modular approach so work can be undertaken as and when resources are available.
15 – Mr K Hobday		<p>Underplays importance of biodiversity and contribution of trees and woodland to biodiversity.</p> <p>Should have had more input from The Woodland Trust and London Wildlife Trust.</p> <p>Should have greater emphasis on planting native broadleaved species.</p> <p>Sceptical whether boroughs will</p>	<p>No change. Role of SPG is to provide detail on how policy is implemented. London Plan contains policies on importance of Biodiversity (7.19) and Urban Greening (5.10) as well as Trees (7.21).</p> <p>No change. This is a joint publication with the Forestry Commission, in turn they had extensive discussions with London Tree Officers Association.</p> <p>No change. Policy 7.21 supports principle of ‘right place, right tree’, this will often but not always be broadleaved natives. SPG cannot contradict LP policy.</p> <p>No change. Beyond control of Mayor.</p>

		implement the strategy.	
16 – Mr C Rose		Concerned about whether boroughs will make resources available to do this work, such as negotiation with private landowners Feel it would be better for the Mayor to commission GiGL to undertake London-wide study.	No change. SPG recognises funding issues thus promotes a modular approach so work can be undertaken as and when resources are available.  Mayor cannot force a borough to produce strategy if it does not want to – not all boroughs are members of GiGL.
17 – Bexley Nature Environment Forum		Concerned about resources available to undertake this work and cross-boundary co-ordination	No change. SPG recognises funding issues thus promotes a modular approach so work can be undertaken as and when resources are available. It is not for the Mayor to dictate how boroughs co-operate with each other.
18 – Westminster City Council		Concerned about resources available for this work and that strategic overview needs to be sensitive to local considerations	No change. SPG recognises funding issues thus promotes a modular approach so work can be undertaken as and when resources are available. It is for the borough to determine the balance between local v strategic in light of their local circumstances.
19 – Greenspace Information Greater London (GiGL)		Much of the data required by local authorities to undertake this work is held by GiGL. Document should signpost where GiGL can be of assistance. Document needs to place greater emphasis on biodiversity.	Agreed.  No change. Role of SPG is to provide detail on how policy is implemented. London Plan contains policies on importance of Biodiversity (7.19) and Urban Greening (5.10) as well as the Tree policy (7.21).
20 – London Wildlife Trust		Document does not do justice to woodlands focussing mainly on trees.	Noted. The balance in each borough strategy will vary depending on the amount woodland each has. Minor changes to text to increase emphasis on role

		Need to refer to Biodiversity Action Plan targets. Suggest a number of detailed wording changes.	of woodlands.  No change. This is a choice for the borough to make not the Mayor to enforce. Noted.
21 – Mr H Booth	3	Comments on details of application of an asset management approach  Seeks clarifications of specific terms and statements.	Noted. Changes made to text.  Noted. Changes made to text.
22 – The Woodland Trust		Support purpose of SPG but feel it should be more positive about planting and woodland creation.  Establish register of Trees of Special Interest  Valuation systems often downplay value of older trees, implies older trees can be a liability  Every wood should have a management plan  Should plan now to replace current veteran trees	Noted.  No change. Mayor sees no need to create a specific designation. Integral to a Tree and Woodland Strategy is the identification of the most valuable trees, which might be ancient or veteran.  Noted. SPG amended.  Noted. Issue to be addressed by borough strategy.  Noted. Issue to be addressed by boroughs.
	Para 2.2	Should acknowledge role in flooding and	Noted. Will amend para 2.2

	Para 4.3	education  Should acknowledge work done by ancient tree hunt.	Noted. This does not provide a comprehensive database of veteran trees.
--	----------	---	---