

## Jinder Ubhi

---

**From:** Laurie Baker [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 February 2018 19:38  
**To:** Londonplan  
**Cc:** Peter Heath  
**Subject:** New draft London Plan

Dear Sadiq Khan,

I have consulted with members of the London Geodiversity Partnership (LGP) and these are the comments of the Partnership on the geodiversity aspects of the draft London Plan:

### Comments on Policy G9 Geodiversity

In general there is an improvement on this section of the previous London Plan. Policy G9 is divided into two parts. On Development Plans, Part A, 1) and 2) are identical to the previous wording; do you see the previous reference to London's Foundations as superfluous in the policy. For development proposals, Part B says "where relevant" but this is unnecessary. In B 2), developments should also protect SSSIs.

In paragraph 8.9.2, when referring to SSSIs it should say "Interest" not "Importance" The paragraph states that "London's geodiversity Sites are shown in Figure 8.1". However, it says "National/Regional Geodiversity Importance" and the LGP would like SSSIs to be shown. (**Peter:** Does the map layer I sent you from Natural England work for you?)

As they are part of the Plan, LGP would like LIGS also to appear (with correct LF numbers) on figure 8.1.

On Figure 8.1, although it says the reference numbers come from SPG 2012, they bear no relation to London's Foundations. The numbering of sites in LF should be used. In the table below, I have tried to allocate the number given in figure 8.1 to show the problem.

I have tabulated the sites below, with the new sites 60-72 marked with red numbers. When we agreed the four-stage system, "Recommended" sites would be those agreed in the London Plan process. Therefore those up to GLA59 got through the previous LP process and are therefore all "Recommended". Sites GLA60 to 72 will be "Candidate" sites if they go into this LP process and will become "Recommended" if agreed.

<b>Planning status of geological sites in London (note all adopted development plans will need checking to see which sites have adopted status)</b>				
<b>LF Site number</b>	<b>Figure 8.1 number</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Status (Dev Plans need checking)</b>	<b>Borough</b>
<b>National (SSSI)</b>				
GLA 01		Abbey Wood		Bexley
GLA 14		Gilbert's Pit		Greenwich
GLA 18		Harrow Weald		Harrow
GLA 19		Hornchurch Cutting		Havering
GLA 33		Elmstead Pit		Bromley
GLA 34		Harefield Pit		Hillingdon
GLA 35		Wansunt Pit		Bexley
<b>Regional (RIGS)</b>				
GLA 03	3	Beckenham Place Park	Recommended	Lewisham
GLA 04	8	Chelsfield Gravel	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 06	5	Croham Hurst	Recommended	Croydon
GLA 07	2	Crystal Palace Geological Illustrations	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 08	14	Dog Rocks	Adopted	Greenwich
GLA 17	9	Happy Valley	Recommended	Croydon
GLA 20	13	Horsenden Hill	Recommended	Ealing
GLA 22	6	Keston Common	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 26	10	Riddlesdown Quarry (formerly Rose & Crown Pit)	Recommended	Croydon
GLA 29	11	The Gravel Pits, Northwood	Recommended	Hillingdon
GLA 30	4	Cray Valley Golf Course Sand Pit	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 31	1	North End Pit (in Erith Park housing development)	Adopted	Bexley
GLA 32	7	High Elms Dene Hole	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 36	12	Pinner Chalk Mines	Recommended	Harrow
GLA 37	21	Marks Warren Farm, Romford	Recommended	Barking & Dagenham
GLA 38	23	Chalky Dell, Lesnes Abbey Woods	Recommended	Bexley
GLA 39	26	Erith Submerged Forest and Saltings	Recommended	Bexley
GLA 40	27	Chislehurst Caves	Recommended	Bromley

**Planning status of geological sites in London (note all adopted development plans will need checking to see which sites have adopted status)**

LF Site number	Figure 8.1 number	Site Name	Status (Dev Plans need checking)	Borough
GLA 41	28	Klinger Pit, Foots Cray	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 42	16	Kenwood House Quarry	Recommended	Camden
GLA 43	18	Springfield Park	Recommended	Hackney
GLA 44	17	Highgate Wood & Queens Wood	Recommended	Haringey
GLA 45	22	Bedfords Park, Havering Ridge	Recommended	Havering
GLA 46	24	Rainham Submerged Forest	Recommended	Havering
GLA 47	25	South Hall Farm/Spring Farm Complex	Recommended	Havering
GLA 48	15	Thames Foreshore, Isleworth	Recommended	Hounslow
GLA 49	20	Fairlop Quarry Complex (Hainault Quarry)	Recommended	Redbridge
GLA 50	19	Knighton Wood	Recommended	Redbridge
GLA 60		Bourne Wood Thanet Sand Quarry	Candidate	Bromley
GLA 61		Spring Park, Threepenny Wood, Sparrows Den	Candidate	Bromley
GLA 62		Sipson Lane complex	Candidate	Hillingdon
<b>Local (LIGS)</b>				
GLA 02		Avenue House	Recommended	Barnet
GLA 05		Chingford Hatch	Recommended	Waltham Forest
GLA 12		Finsbury Gravel	Recommended	Islington
GLA 15		Hainault Forest Country Park	Recommended	Redbridge
GLA 24		Old Gravel Pit, Blackheath (Eliot Pit)	Recommended	Lewisham
GLA 25		Putney Heath	Recommended	Wandsworth
GLA 51		Parish's Pit, Erith	Recommended	Bexley
GLA 52		Bromley Palace Park, Pulhamite & St. Blaise's Well	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 53		Charmwood Farm Chalk Mine	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 54		Sundridge Park Manor Pulhamite grotto	Recommended	Bromley
GLA 55		Trent Park	Recommended	Enfield
GLA 56		Bleak Hill Sandpit	Adopted	Greenwich
GLA 57		Wickham Lane Brick works Complex	Adopted	Greenwich

<b>Planning status of geological sites in London (note all adopted development plans will need checking to see which sites have adopted status)</b>				
<b>LF Site number</b>	<b>Figure 8.1 number</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Status (Dev Plans need checking)</b>	<b>Borough</b>
GLA 58		Coldfall Wood	Recommended	Haringey
GLA 59		Pole Hill	Recommended	Waltham Forest
GLA 63		Barn Hill, Wembley	Candidate	Brent
GLA 64		Waterlow Park	Candidate	Camden
GLA 65		Blackheath Pits (Vanbrugh Pit)	Candidate	Greenwich
GLA 66		Tripcock Ness	Candidate	Greenwich
GLA 67		Summerhouse Lane Chalk Pit	Candidate	Hillingdon
GLA 68		Bedfont Lakes	Candidate	Hounslow
GLA 69		Wanstead Flats	Candidate	Redbridge
GLA 70		Richmond Park	Candidate	Richmond
GLA 71		Hollow Ponds, Leyton Flats (Snaresbrook Park)	Candidate	Waltham Forest
GLA 72		Monken Hadley Common	Candidate	Barnet

I am not sure what paragraph 8.9.3 adds to this section as it is currently drafted. It should be elaborated as part of access to greenspace and how that enriches life, enhancing an understanding of natural heritage by the public visiting geological sites.

Paragraph 8.9.4 says access should be provided although not always desirable. It would be better to say: "... access for all should be provided to geodiversity sites, although it may be restricted for reasons of sensitivity or ownership of the site."

As far as London's Foundations is concerned, there is considerable updating that LGP would like to do so I propose we do this over the next six months and issue SPG for consultation in October. We shall proceed on that basis, unless you think otherwise. We meet on Tuesday, where we will agree a work programme.

I hope these comments will be taken into account and amendments made. Please contact me if you require any clarification.

Kind regards,



Laurie Baker  
Chair of Sites Working Group,  
London Geodiversity Partnership  
020 8850 0577

---

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

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

---