

Review of: "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion"

Fred Krüger¹

¹ University of Erlangen-Nuremberg

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

A thought-inspiring paper highlighting the need to stress the importance of including greenspaces in urban planning towards more sustainable and just (mega) cities. I do have a few concerns, though, regarding some statements in the text, and there are some minor formal flaws which should be omitted.

In the first line of your introduction, you are talking of "natural" areas. This is a very problematic term in the urban context - there are simply no natural areas in and around cities.

The reference "Mokhtarzadeh and Ramachandra 2017" is missing in the list of references.

On page 3, or later in the text, you should definitely cite OECD (2015): Green Growth in Bangkok, Thailand.

In this section of your paper, one very important factor is missing: urban gardening, urban horticulture, urban agriculture as essential means to enhance food security in the city - in Bangkok in particular. These "productive" urban green spaces should be mentioned and referenced, at least in the intro chapter of this paper.

When you talk of "increasing the vulnerability to flooding" on page 5, could you provide specific examples or references for the severe recent flooding events you mentioned?

Further down in that para: Although Bang Kachao is not officially part of the BMA, it serves as one of the most important greenspaces in the metropolitan area. This should at least be mentioned, and reasons should be given for not including it in your assessment. There is a risk of data, findings, and interpretation being distorted by the omission of Bang Kachao if you do not provide sound reasons, or explain how you were dealing with this.

In chapter 3.2.2., please provide a reference for your remarks on the NDBI.

In 3.2.4., is it THB per sq. metre? Please clarify.

In the same chapter, you say: "It was supposed that the areas having the more valuable land should be avoided and the land having less land value should be promoted for green space development." This, in my view, is a very problematic statement and should be justified in more depth. If this simple logic were to be deployed, then areas most in need of new greenspaces would have to be entirely omitted from greening. They wouldn't

stand a chance of receiving new greenspaces - a very neo-liberal approach already widely practised in Bangkok and elsewhere, leading to a considerable lack of greenspaces, especially in inner cities. I am sure this is not what the authors had in mind when drafting this paper? Maybe you could elaborate on this? E.g., can you suggest alternative approaches for integrating greenspaces in high land value areas to ensure equitable access for inner-city residents?

3.2.7.: "<0.5m" etc. - km, surely? Further down: "1.0 metres" - kilometres, surely?

3.2.11: "<20m" etc. - again, km, surely? Please doublecheck all values in the text and tables!

p. 23: "priority should be given to all available open public land in close proximity to densely populated areas by avoiding farmlands." Please see my comment on urban agriculture (UA) above - you should justify why you excluded (small-scale) "productive" greenspaces from your assessment.

4.4.: "...utilization of Google Earth imagery and data collection via regular field surveys in the study area." This is unclear: was this a proper ground truthing, i.e., did you actually visit the sites? If so, please verify; if not, then please give reasons for not doing so.

Final para in the Discussion: I believe that you should probably elaborate on the contested interpretations of your indices and weightings, cf. my comment on land value above.

General: Please harmonise spelling throughout the text: greenspace vs. green space

I do hope my comments are of help. Thank you for providing these nice insights into greenspace opportunities in Bangkok - a city with so much potential to do more in terms of urban green infrastructure. Do not forget the food security issues, though - a productive greenspace is also green! ;)