

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

No.	Name/ Organisation	Address	Interest in the Order Land	Summary of Objection	Council response (relevant paragraph(s) in Statement of Case)
1	Marta Hinestroza	Oasis Unisex Salon, Unit 49, Seven Sisters Market, 231 High Road	Tenant of a business within the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • viable and sustainable alternative (HGY/2014/0575), which has planning permission, will restore the historic Wards Corner Building ("the Building"), result in less disruption for local businesses and will retain the entire market; • oppose demolition of a historic building and replacement with buildings of little historic merit; • no social housing; • massive and sustained local objection; • despite being offered alternative premises; Seven Sisters Market at risk of being priced out of future developments; • Grainger has refused to move any market stallholders in Seven Sisters Market to a new site except the original licence holders, which will result in the decimation of the Market and render it unviable; • WCC plan is more sustainable; • lack of proper public participation; • the demolition of the Building will erase the history of Tottenham, which is important for civic pride. The proposal for gated flats and chain stores is not of high quality, will not contribute towards civic pride and is not for the use/ownership of the community; • prominent organisations object to the proposals (English Heritage, Planning Aid for London, Tottenham Traders, London Forum of Civic and Amenities Groups, Save Britain's Heritage, Tottenham CAAC, Tottenham Civic Society, Haringey Federations of Residents Associations and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.19; 18.20(i)-(vii) • 18.7; 18.8 • 18.9-18.10 • Section 18 • 18.35 • 18.36 • 18.19; 18.20(i)-(vii) • 18.24 -18.25 • 18.7; 18.8 • no objections have been received from these organisations.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>Princes Regeneration Trust);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure to publish viability information (despite requests); • questions the use of circa £2 million from the New Deal for Communities programme for the delivery of the proposals; • damage to the economy (replacing skilled small businesses with unskilled retail work); • harm caused by the proposals would be substantial and would not be outweighed by any benefits to the local area; • failure of the Council and TfL to engage with enquiries from parties interested in restoring and using the Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.23 • 11.5; 18.23 • 18.11 • 18.12 • 18.27
2	Kiranbhai Madhavbhai Patel and Shaktikumar Madhavbhai Patel (objection drafted by Savills)	Freehold owners of 9 – 11 West Green Road, London, N15 5BX (property is occupied by Tropical Foods and Fair Deal Cash and Carry)	Freehold owners of Plot 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no objection to the principle of development within the vicinity; • insufficient consultation to justify inclusion of this property within the Order. Limited opportunity for the client to make meaningful representations to influence the design of the proposed scheme; • based on the limited information provided, there is no supporting evidence to demonstrate the benefits of using their client's land in this location, compared with alternative or as to whether alternative methods could have been considered to avoid disrupting their interests; • land is on the fringe of the proposed scheme and there may, therefore, be alternative options to its compulsory acquisition; • the Council has failed to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest to justify compulsory acquisition of their client's land and livelihood or the business and the staff employed at the property; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comment noted. • 18.8; 18.22; 18.24-1825 • 18.12; 18.13; 18.21; 18.22 • 18.21; 18.22 • 18.13

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the property could be brought forward for development naturally, negating the reasons to use CPO powers; their clients could bring forward the improvement of the property without the CPO. Exclusion would not impact on the wider regeneration aspirations. Inclusion creates needless expenditure; contrary to the Guidance, the Council has not sufficiently attempted to negotiate reasonably with their clients in advance of obtaining the CPO; their client's land should be removed from the CPO. It serves no fundamental purpose or wider public benefit; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18;13; 18.21; 18.22 18;13; 18.21; 18.22 18.26 18.21; 18.22 18.13
3	London Underground Limited ("LUL") (objection drafted by Eversheds)	See 'Interest in the Order Land'	<p>Plot 28 (227-249 High Street, including the Seven Sisters Market) (freehold);</p> <p>Plots 7 and 8 (freehold) – land on Suffield Road, including that used for the parking of LUL employees' cars;</p> <p>Plots 1-6 inclusive, 7-11 inclusive, 13, 14 and 21 (combination of freehold interests and permanent easements) other land through which pass the tunnels and infrastructure associated with the Victoria Line;</p> <p>Freehold of the Building</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in principle support of the regeneration of Wards Corner; potential impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the underground. An agreement is required to ensure LUL's statutory undertaking is not prejudiced by the scheme. Until such agreement is in place, LUL must object; any development works must not take support from the underground structures and place burden on them. Ventilation arrangements must be protected; proposed development works at ground level have the potential to impact on LUL's assets and will need to be designed and carried out carefully and in accordance with the approvals and protections in the proposed agreement. The agreement will deal with the structure and mechanism for the grant of a lease to the promoters which contains controls, a protective zone around 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> support noted 18.14 18.14 18.14

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

			<p>housing Seven Sisters Market, including the Seven Sisters Underground Station (with ticket office and Victoria line tunnels) located at a relatively shallow depth below ground level</p> <p>Possible that other LUL interests in the Order Land come to light</p>	<p>the assets and an undertaking by the Council not to exercise any powers under the Order in respect of the LUL's interests;</p>	
4	<p>London Underground Limited ("LUL") (representation drafted by Eversheds)</p>	As above	As statutory undertaker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • representation under Section 16 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981. Will be withdrawn once the proposed agreement has been entered into; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.14
5	<p>Sainsbury's Supermarket Limited (objection drafted by Montague Evans)</p>	<p>Basement and ground floors, 3-7 West Green Road, London, N15 5BX</p>	Interest in Plot 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adverse economic, social and environmental impacts for the town centre; • the store employs locally based staff and makes a significant contribution to the local retail offer. There is no guarantee that these jobs/retail offer will be retained in this location; • the company's significant capital investment in the property (made in 2013) will be lost; • the Order boundary ought to be revised to exclude the property. Or, the Order ought not be confirmed until the company's trading position in the locality has been secured; • the company is prepared to consider a trading position in the new scheme. As this is likely to take 2 years to deliver following 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.11; 18.15 • 18.18 • 18.28 • 18.21; 18.22; 18.26; 18.28 • position noted.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>the closure of the property, temporary provision ought to be made so as not to materially and adversely affect the retail offer during construction;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uncertainty over the delivery of the scheme underlying the Order; • progress has been slow and uncertain. The SOR sets out impediments to the scheme (i.e. implementation of the planning permission, agreement with LUL, no substantive information regarding sources and timing of funding and viability); • insufficient information to demonstrate that the scheme can be delivered. Publication of the Order is premature; • insufficient evidence of reasonable efforts made by the Council to acquire the company's interest by agreement; • not satisfied that the Council/developer have demonstrated that they have taken reasonable steps to acquire land and rights by agreement; • initial discussions with the company have not progressed so as to give the company certainty over the future of its trading position both during and after the proposed works. The Order should not be confirmed until the future trading position has been guaranteed; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.23 • 18.23 • 18.23 • 18.26 • 18.26 • 18.26
6	Beauty Power (drafted by George Anthony Andrews)		255 to 259 High Road, London N15 (within the Order Land)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Order is not supported by the development plan policies, which are (for the most part) out of date; • scheme not deliverable in the timescale (on or before 11 July 2017); • better alternative benefitting from planning permission that will secure the Council's objective for regeneration of the area, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.6 • 18.23 • 18.19; 18.20(i)-(vii)

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>better protect existing businesses and jobs, protect and maintain the diverse social fabric of the area and sense of community and more effectively protect and enhance the Conservation Area. It is viable and deliverable and more sustainable development that enjoys support from the local community;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Council has failed to demonstrate that the scheme is viable (it is not). • No compelling reason to exercise compulsory purchase powers; • serious and demonstrable harm to the social, economic and environmental fabric of the area. Businesses will be uprooted, jobs lost, strong and diverse community will be disrupted and displaced; • the scheme is unsustainable development; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.23 • 18.13 • 18.15;18.18; 18.37
7	Airmoss Limited (trading as Tottenham Wine)(drafted by Montague Evans)	1A and 1B West Green Road, London N15	Freehold interest in Plot 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol of the ECHR – the family run business of the objector is an aspect of family life. There is not a compelling case in the public interest that justifies interference with private interests; • Council has not taken reasonable steps to negotiate to acquire the freehold of the property by agreement. Compensation offered by Grainger is significantly short of enabling the objector to acquire a replacement property and relocate. The offers, therefore, are not in accordance with the principle of equivalence; • it is unreasonable to not offer funds sufficient to enable relocation. In any case, it is not for Grainger to satisfy the Circular, it is for the Council, which has made no attempt to acquire or engage with the objector. The test that the Order is only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.13; 18.29-18.30 • 18.26; 18.28 • 18.26; 18.28

				<p>made as a last resort is not met;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no meaningful or certain protection offered to local businesses, traders and residents by the s106 agreement; • will displace local retailers and destroy local character. The property is a locally listed building of merit and demolition of it would be an environmental dis-benefit; • paragraph 11 to Schedule 4 of the s106 offers no protection to local and independent retailers. Grainger will seek market rent irrespective of whether independent traders can afford to meet competition from national retailers; • if confirmed, the objector requests that they are treated on an equal basis to the market traders by being able to return to the completed development with a freehold retail unit of equivalent size; • there is no absolute requirement in the s106 agreement to re-provide the market (it is subject to the market condition) or for the ACV to be replaced; • there is a real chance that the market traders will suffer when temporarily located such that they will no longer be trading and be able to return to the newly provided market or, even if they are able to return, as the rent will revert to market rent after the 18 months discount, the ability to continue trading in the new market area appears unlikely; • proposal is contrary to policy 3.9 of the London Plan (mixed and balanced communities) and policy 3.1 (ensuring equal life chances for all) as it only provides private housing and new retail at 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.18 • 18.7; 18.18 • 18.18 • request noted • 18.32 • 18.32 • 18.6; 18.9-18.10; 18.18
--	--	--	--	--	---

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>full market rent that will displace existing local businesses and residents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • request that the Council confirms the current estimated market value of the flats to establish if they will be affordable to the majority of local people; • request that the Council release details of the viability of the scheme; • no evidence that the developer will deliver the development. Nothing in the section 106 agreement to prevent a developer making a further application for development that is untested in CPO terms (see Future Development clause); • The WCC plan for restoration of the Building will result in less disruption for local businesses and keep the entire market on site. It is a more sustainable plan protecting the public interest and existing local community and securing the history of the Wards Corner site; • significant economic, social and environmental dis-benefits in terms of existing businesses; • does not meet the social well-being test; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.9-18.10 • 18.23 • 18.23 • 18.20(i)-(vii); 18.32 • 18.15; • 18.13; 18.15
8	Nicholas Amayo	14 Gaydon House, W2 5TG	Proprietor of Genesis Money Transfer Seven Sisters Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • business is located on the High Road and is dependent on passing trade. Relocation will result in the loss of this trade, which will undermine the business; • Market has a unique place in the community with diversity, providing an opportunity for many to provide services to the community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.18 • 18.33 – 18.34
9	Alvaro Molina	10 Suffield Road, N15 5JX	Resident of the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • despite being offered alternative premises; Seven Sisters market is at risk of being priced out; • Grainger has refused to move any market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.35 • 18.38

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>stallholders in Seven Sisters to a new site except original licence holders leading to the decimation of the Market;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demolition will erase history of Tottenham; • in the event of eviction, he would not be able to find similar houses given house prices and he needs to live near transport to his work; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7 • 18.39-18.40
10	Luis Enrique Segura Garcia	10 Suffield Road, N15 5JX	Resident of the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • largely restates the comments made in the objection of Alvaro Molina at 9 above; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Council response to objector 9 above.
11	Wilson Patino	10 Suffield Road, N15 5JX	Resident of the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • largely restates the comments made in the objection of Alvaro Moline at 9 above. In addition: • has a teenage daughter living with him; • uses TfL every day, which he would not be able to do if evicted; • housing is expensive. Unable to afford the rent. Likely to become homeless; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Council response to objector 9 above.
12	Laura Patino	10 Suffield Road, N15 5JX (teenage daughter of Wilson Patino)	Resident of the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • largely restates the comments made by Wilson Patino at 11 above. In addition: • attends Our Lady's Convent School in Stamford Hill and would have to find a new school to continue GCSEs, currently can access transport to school, house prices mean her and her father are likely to become homeless; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Council response to objector 9 above.
13	Mrs Prathibha Sreenivasan	9-11 West Green Road, N15 5BX	Tenant of Plot 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of residence; • loss of affordable rented residence for myself, family, friends and neighbours; • risk of being priced-out and forced to move away, children changing schools; • there is a viable and sustainable alternative that will regenerate the area without the family hardship; • Market at risk of being priced-out for local residents who depend on it for shopping, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.43, 18.44 • 18.43, 18.44 • 18.43, 18.44 • 18.20(iv) • 18.34-18.35

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> eating out and for affordable services; no social/affordable housing; loss of historic identity and iconic Building; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.9-18.10 18.7
14	Awlad Hussain	16 Suffield Road, N15 5JX	Freehold owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bought property as buy to let for future income for himself and family. As a result of CPO, he and his family will suffer hardship on his retirement; injustice that the Council selected only the even houses on Suffield Road. Only the Market needs demolishing to achieve the regeneration project; Grainger is paying 2 property agents to buy properties at 25% below market price; after refurbishment of my property, obtained three valuations. Union Land and CBRE valued it at £125,000 below market value given by 3 reputable agents at £450,000; objection attaches 3 valuations and that of Grainger; Grainger's conduct is immoral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.28 18.21; 18.22 18.26 18.26 18.26 18.26
15	Mrs Pamela Margaret Myall (Sherwoods Property Management)	16 West Green Road, N15	Freeholder (property is let to Mr Gulfray Taj on full repairing and insuring lease) who is in negotiation regarding loss of light	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> right to light claim for loss of light due to proposed development; compensation figure has been reached but further negotiations have taken place as to timing for payment; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> position noted. position noted.
16	Sher Afgan	255-259 High Road, N15 5BT	Leaseholder	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contravenes 6a and 6b of the SPG; listed building should be restored and not demolished; livelihood depends on the shop (has a stock value of £300k) no one has offered me relocation or compensation; unfair not to give stakeholders a choice; Grainger claims there would be affordable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.6 18.7 18.26; 18.28 18.26; 18.28 18.24-18.25 18.9-18.10

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				housing, which I believe to be untrue;	
17	Mrs Shefika Mustafa and Mrs Fatima Houloussi (written by Hilmi + Partners LLP)	18 and 20 West Green Road, N15 5NN	Freehold owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rights of light; use and enjoyment of commercial and residential premises will be adversely affected by the proposals to CPO their rights to light and, as a result, the value of their property will be materially reduced; clients in consultation with developer regarding the acquisition of their rights to light. Grainger has been slow progressing this matter and their client's dispute that Grainger has used best endeavours to negotiate a commercial settlement with the proprietors of properties that are subject to CPO; dispute assertion that there is no other means of delivering the development when Grainger has neither reasonably attempted nor exhausted alternative means of doing so; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> position noted. 18.26 18.26 18.21
18	Narendra Patel	1 West Green Road	Tenant, Cosmos News	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinstroza at 1 above (proforma). In addition: would lose business and home (since 1984), would lose community; people come from other Boroughs to buy special greeting cards for ethnic communities; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Council response to objector 1 above. 18.18; 18.26; 18.37
19	The Eye Practice	715 Seven Sisters Road	Tenant (opticians)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinstroza at 1 above (proforma). In addition: employees 3 people, providing community/family eye care; have 5,000+ patients, providing an essential service; if forced to leave, would have to pay higher rents elsewhere; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Council response to objector 1 above. position noted. position noted. 18.28

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

20	Samuel Ludmir	24 Overlea Road, London E5 9BG	Freehold owner of 8 Suffield Road, London, N15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no satisfactory offer has been made in respect of the purchase of the property, nor has compensation has been agreed for the Order; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.26; 18.28
21	Mrs Prajida Sukamaran	3 West Green Road London N15 5BX	Freehold Owner of 3-7 West Green road N15 5BX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed redevelopment is out of context with ground floor of wards Corner Building as Asset of Community Value It would be wrong to confirm the Order in the absence of a detailed and binding undertaking from LBH as to the terms of re accommodation for existing traders so as to preserve the present atmosphere, its diversity and importance to the local community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.20(vi)-(vii) 18.16; 18.18
22	Libia Victoria Alvarez Martinez	231-243 High Road, N15 5BT	Market trader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> destruction of community. The Market makes a massive social and community contribution made up of Latinos, Africans and Europeans; unclear what will happen to the Market. Temporary market does not have the facilities needed to operate and will lead to loss of income; traders and members of the public are a registered charity and hold fundraising events for charitable causes, provide advice and counselling; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33 – 18.34; 18.37 18.32; position noted.
23	Jorge <i>Eliecer</i> Alvarez Martinez- (NB: objection letter in Spanish and translated into	Seven Sisters Market	Market trader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> job provides income for my family which they depend upon; the Market allows the Latin community to integrate and enjoy the typical dishes of our Latin American countries. It provides Latin American culture in this country so that our children can get to know about our country and (their roots). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.18; 18.32 18.33 – 18.34

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

	English)				
24	Patrick Rey	Seven Sisters Market	Market trader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPO will destroy community of the Market; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33 – 18.34
25	Theresa Brema	Unit 16 Seven Sisters Market	Owner of Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma). In addition: trader for 10 years selling special African fabrics (including to people who travel from outside London); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Council response to objector 1 above. Interest noted.
26	Objections by Latin Elephant (one pro forma objection signed by the parties below)				
	10 Signatories – Mirca Morera Carlos Burgos Vicky Alvarez Cllr Natalia Perez Cesar F. Yunda Palaquibay Marta Hinestroza Fabian Catano		Businesses, organisations and consumers (Latin Elephant is a charity that promotes participation and engagement and inclusion of Migrant and Ethnic Groups currently working to support businesses in Elephant and Castle)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> letter prepared by Dr. Patria Roman-Velazquez notes; impact of regeneration programmes on migrant and ethnic businesses (MEB), their supply chains and the communities they serve; cites extracts from a report on the Latin Quarter and alleges that the measures and mechanisms to mitigate the impact of regeneration on existing MEBs in the site are not enough to warrant a CPO; CPO will result in the displacement of MEBs in Seven Sisters and the communities they serve. The impact of such displacement for communities that depend on affordable food and the support mechanisms provided by these businesses have not been fully explored; EQIA does not consider the need of specialist services to strengthen the position of traders when relocating and seeking a return to new premises; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> report noted; 18.12; 18.13; 18.37 18.18; 18.32-18.33; 18.37 18.33; 18.37; 18.38; 18.32; 18.38

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

	<p>Fenya Fishchler</p> <p>Illary Valenzuela</p> <p>Aleksandra Stankova</p> <p>(not clear whether these are statutory or non-statutory)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under the S106 licence holders will not be entitled to compensation but financial assistance fund but where relocation is not possible, the loss of jobs and, in the case of family run businesses, the only source of income and subsistence for entire families here and in the country of origin is not accounted for; nor is the impact on the supply chains upon which these businesses rely upon for importation of goods; • EQIA does not consider the extent to which engagement and participation of MEBs will be sought on consultations for new retail strategies in the area, nor in negotiations and or forums on affordable business provision; • No indication as to how the 30% discount on market value for 18 months (and thereafter market rent) was reached. Could hamper MEBs' ability to remain sustainable after a prolonged period of instability provoked by relocation and return. Consequences of transitional arrangements have not been considered by the EQIA; • EQIA does not account for loss of jobs, businesses, community services, valued heritage assets and ethnic and cultural diversity. Role of MEBs in community cohesion and the areas economic contribution has not been assessed; • MEBs are meeting places for social networking. MEBs are part of the identity of the Seven Sisters. Market is an ACV and the CPO does not take this into account when considering the duty of care and public benefit case. The public benefit case 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.18; 18.37; 18.38 • 18.32; 18.33-18.34; 18.38 • 18.18; 18.32-18.34; 18.37-18.38 • 18.37-18.38 • 18.13; 18.20(vi);18.33
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>set out to justify CPO is not valid because it does not take into account the value of the site currently, thus invalidating the implementation of the CPO;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Community Plan is dismissed as not viable. Council has public duty to support the community plan. Supporting Grainger's plan forces traders out and contributes to community tensions, anxiety and sense of disregard of local community groups; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(i)-(vi); 18.32-18.36
27	Objections by Pueblito Paisa (one proforma objection signed by the parties below – names and addresses are not clear)				
	127 signatories. Separate document with 36 signatories		Customers, business owners and workers at the Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma). In addition: the Latin American Community at Seven Sisters Market is one of the things that makes Tottenham unique and is one of the only places in London for this community; it is important; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above. 18.33-18.34; 18.37
28	Objections by the Talentos Group (separate proforma objections signed by the individuals below)				
	Fredy Martinez	Colthurst Crescent, N4 2DT	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma). In addition state: <i>'I am part of Talentos, a Latin American folk dancing group. We have had many events and functions at the Pueblito Paisa, the Latin American traders group at Seven Sisters Market. We consider that it is a unique place that reunites many Latinos, that gives knowledge of their heritage. We also think it a very important place that allows other cultures knowledge and insight into the vibrant latino culture.'</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above. 18.33-18.34

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

Betty Gomez Rosero	Flat 27 Hensley Point, Gasgoyne, 41 Bradstock, London, E9 5BE	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> signed the objection of Fredy Martinez above;
[Illegible]	917 Hensley Road, E9 5BE	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Denise Molina	7 Eresby Place, NW6 4JT	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
John William Ramirez Quebrada	E9 6BJ	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> signed the objection of Denise Molina above;
Johanna Ariza	19 Colthurst Crescent	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Juan [Illegible]	[Illegible]	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> signed the objection of Johanna Ariza above;
Karen Rodriguez	19 Colthurst Crescent, N4 2DT	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Tatiana [Illegible]	18 Cameron Terrace, N15 4FG	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Maria Hurtado	4 Hubbart House, SW10 0HD	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Ludwila Safarova	39 Westside	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);
Rodrigo [Illegible]	19 Colthurst Crescent, N4 2DT	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma);

	Fernando Merchan	27 Yew House, SE14 6RX	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Fredy Martinex above (proforma); 	
29	Objections by Wards Corner Community Coalition				
	69 signatures	Various	Mixture of statutory and non-statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); also various refer to the Market; several handwritten notes are included 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 28 above.
30	Objection by Cesar Francisco Yunda Palaquibay and Mirca Morera, Unit 56, Seven Sisters Market (online petition of 1,600 signatories)				
	1,600 signatories. Includes 4 letters from the Traders' children	Various		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> in addition to the petition, personally wish to challenge the CPO by defending Latin American community's human rights to private life, social and economic relations which are violated by the CPO; wish to defend right to culture, which means that as individuals we should have the right to present evidence concerning traditions that are important for maintenance of cultural identity; cites the following statutory provisions that afford protection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (guarantees the right to culture); (ii) Article 30 of the Convention of the Right of the Child (children of immigrants and their grandchildren should also have the benefit of cultural rights. The Market (or village) is considered a second home to many can could be afforded protections in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.29-18.31; 18.37 18.29-18.31; 18.37

				<p>(iii) Article 8 of the HR Act; Article 8 of the HR Act (no affordable alternative is offered, will give rise to displacing vulnerable communities and their livelihoods);</p> <p>(iv) Council of Europe Framework Convention on National Minorities (Article 5) (Latin American community is a minority and the UK has signed the Framework undertaking to maintain and develop their culture and preserve essential elements of their identity);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CPO is not necessary, there is an alternative that does not involve forceful evictions and violation of human rights as the CPO does and would promote conditions to enable the community to maintain and develop culture; • Overriding public interest in promoting social cohesion (riots of 2011 and 1985). Market has thrived. Displacement of community will affect Latin American people disproportionately. It is discriminatory, notwithstanding that it was not specifically aimed at the group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.12-18.13; 18.21-18.22; 18.29-18.31; 18.33-18.34 18.37 • 18.13; 18.37
31	Carta de objecion – proforma signed by customers, business owners and friends of the Market				

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

	52 signatories (NB: objection letter in Spanish and translated into English)	Customers, business owners and friends of the Market	Potentially a mix of statutory and non-statutory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market provided cultural identity to the Latin American community and surrounding There is a viable alternative plan Grainger's proposal does not show public benefit Grainger 's proposals lack technical, social and economic argument Grainger is just a private enterprise keen to make the highest profit with the minimum investment Employment needs, the families and the amount of users affected in terms of equal conditions and importance need to be considered Public funds should be invested to make this work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33-18.34 18.19; 18.20(iii) 18.13 18.15 18.15 18.13; 18.15; 18.37-18.38 18.23
32	Peter N Kelly	109 Armadale Close London, N17 9PL	Urban designer, local resident (objection sent in capacity as Senior Planner (Urban Design, Regeneration and Planning), London Borough of Camden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
33	Illary Valenzuela Oblitas	20 Jansons Road, N15 4JU	Project Co-ordinator, Latin American Women's Rights Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> largely restates the objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
34	Dr David Roberts	99b Forest Road, E8 3BH	Concerned citizen (writing from his account at the Bartlett School of Architecture UCL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
35	Myfanwy Taylor	Ground Floor Flat, 5 Langham Place, N15 3Na	Local resident, customer of Market and other businesses, member of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> alternative scheme has planning permission, does not require CPO and would delivery social and economic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(vi)-(vii)

			<p>WCC and PhD researcher in an area relevant to this case [appends research note]</p>	<p>benefits. Council accepted the social and public contribution of the Building when listing it as an ACV;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> attaches a summary of initial research findings from interviews carried out by traders and small businesses in March 2013 to highlight economic and community value of Wards Corner (success in providing space for start-ups and entrepreneurs, supporting livelihood of traders and families, specialised role in providing goods and services for ethnically diverse and low-income populations, wide-ranging community advice services and actual and potential role as a site of holistic and economic development); broad economic and social value of Wards Corner has not been taken into account through the CPO, or efforts to compensate/relocate traders and local businesses; Grainger not fulfilled obligations under the section 106 agreement. Proposal to re-provide the Market does not provide appropriate workspace nor affordable rents and not take into account the community value of the Market. The Council's argument that the Market is justified (in part) because of the proposed re-provision of the Market is not valid; CPO does not take into consideration the experience and commitment of market traders, small business owners, residents etc to deliver the community plan. WCC, the Prince's Regeneration Trust, Pueblito Paisa, Latin Corner and their supporters have significant social capital; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> summary of research noted. 18.11; 18.13; 18.18; 18.33-18.34 18.18; 18.32-18.35 18.19
--	--	--	--	--	---

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant planning and policy support for an alternative approach at Wards Corner; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.19
36	Michael Edwards	8 Eade Road, N4 1DH	Resident of Haringey (writing in capacity as an economist and planner)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scheme not in the public interest. The community asset and economy that has grown around it ought to be nurtured to serve local clientele (including specialist Latin American clientele). Proposals from the developer for reinstatement would be too costly; • wishes to appear at the Inquiry and make a fuller statement; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.13; 18.33-18.35
37	Elizabeth Thomas	48 Hanover Road, N15 4DL	Member of Tynemouth Area Residents Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • risk of the Market being priced-out of the area; • do not want to lose independent business to big chains; • demolition of historical and interesting building with poor replacement; • viable alternative; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.35 • 18.16-18.18 • 18.7-18.8; • 18.19
38	Candy Amsden	14 Nelson Road, N15 4LE	Founder member of WCC, local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • viable and sustainable alternative; • Market is an ACV; • no social housing; flats too expensive for local people; • predominantly Latin American market is a cultural centre, traders have little security of tenure and will only receive a small amount of compensation for loss of trade; • fear that Grainger will move the Market 'across the road' housed in a building with no ambience and rising rents, likely to result in disappearance of the Market; • small businesses/residents around the Market will not have enough compensation to start businesses elsewhere; • inadequate consultation; not sought public opinion; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.19 • 18.20(vi)-(vii) • 18.9-18.10 • 18.15; 18.32-18.35 • 18.32 • 18.26; 18.28 • 18.24-18.25

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • harm would be substantial and not outweighed by the benefits. It will result in low-skilled jobs and loss of thriving local businesses; • loss of historic building and replacement with that of little architectural merit; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.11-18.12; 18.18 • 18.7-18.8
39	Roy Jose	14 Nelson Road, N15 4LE	Local resident (founder member of the WCC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights – Market offers livelihood for South American Latinos (many who have escaped persecution). It is cultural hub; • Project will destroy the livelihood of the stallholders/local business on periphery of the Order Land, who would receive little compensation, without opportunity to create a fresh start for themselves. Denying proper compensation for lost livelihoods and homes breaches Human Rights; • concern Grainger will introduce prohibitive rents, resulting in demise of the Market; • funding and a sound business plan exist for WCC's proposals; • no social housing; concern flats will be buy-to-let for overseas investment and not enhance the community; • no or minimal consultation with local community; • failure to provide CPO in Spanish; • TfL has raised concerns for the integrity of its infrastructure, which is susceptible to damage; engineering costs likely to be prohibitive and raise doubts over deliverability; • WCC scheme would not disturb a fragile environment; • no social gain; loss of sense of place; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.29-18.31; 18.33-18.34; 18.37 • 18.18; 18.26; 18.28; 18.29-18.32; • 18.35 • 18.20(iii) • 18.9-18.10 • 18.24-18.25 • 18.1-18.3 • 18.14; 18.23 • 18.19; 18.20(iv) • 18.8; 18.13;

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

40	David Schmitz	88 Falkland Road, N8 0NP	Haringey resident (former member of Haringey's planning sub-committee when planning permission was granted (reused himself from sitting at that time))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SOR adopts a restrictive definition of Tottenham excluding Haringey ward and West Green Ward; • Grainger has only provided sketchy material to support its assertion that WCC scheme is unviable. Council cannot demonstrate that there is a compelling case in the public interest to grant CPO it (as it appears) without the CPO, the greater part of the Order Land can still be developed and provide substantial housing and retail space, ensures the Market continues, benefits conservation area and has public support; • queries Grainger's (and the Council's) approach to viability, which takes into account the purchase price of the Order Land, which is simply what the developer was prepared to pay, it has no objective truth to it; • WCC scheme preserve the Building; Council has not considered that the Building is locally listed; paragraph 132 of the NPPF is engaged; reference is made to Inspector's comments in relation to an earlier appeal where the Building was considered to make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and loss amounts to substantial harm to the heritage asset. A such, the Council cannot dismiss the harm as minor; • Haringey Design Panel has previously criticised the height of the scheme and its impact on the conservation area; • S106 agreement does not provide comfort; there is no absolute obligation to enter into the Market Lease; no 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comment noted. • 18.13; 18.19-18.22; • 18.23 • 18.7; 18.20(i) • 18.6-18.7 • 18.18; 18.35
----	---------------	--------------------------	--	--	---

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> guarantee traders could afford the new rents; the EQIA does not consider the extent to which market rents will rise or whether the existing traders would be able to afford them; even in the 18 month 30% reduction in rent, traders will be expected to pay 70% of an unknown quantity. EQIA at the time of the application said rents for stallholders were likely to rise from £31 per sqft to £90 per sqft; EQIA makes no attempt to consider the portion of the population that use the Market (contrary to s149 of the Equalities Act 2010). Aaffordability is relevant <i>Horada v SoSCLG</i> [2016] EWCA Civ 169; threatens existence of distinctive retail outlets; not satisfied the compelling public interest test; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.35; 18.38 18.16 18.13
41	Dr Sara Gonzalez	University of Leeds	An expert on traditional retail markets and their community value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community value of Market; impacts on equality (EQIA identifies residual negative impacts); unaffordable rents (not clear the s106 measures will mitigate the negative effects identified in the EQIA); displacement of customers and Market users; worsening of community cohesion; Contrary to Local Plan policy 2.9 (enhance 'distinct environment') and 3.1. ('Ensuring equal chance for all'). London Plan does not support loss of facilities; support for renovation of existing buildings; comparisons with Shepherd's Bush CPO, which was quashed – new unaffordable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33 18.37 18.18; 18.35;18.37 18.32 18.15; 18.33 18.6 18.7-18.8 18.9-18.10; 18.18

				housing, low-income and disadvantaged customers and users;	
42	Susan Penny	15, Grove Park Road, N15 4SW	Local resident; uses Market (objection on behalf of Clyde Area Residents Association)	<p>Contrary to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> London Plan (policies 2.6 (vision and strategy), policy 2.14 (areas for regeneration), policy 2.15 (requires developments should sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the town centre), policy 3.1 (ensuring equal life chances for all), policy 4.7 (retail and town centre development), policy 2.7 (opportunities for maximising economic growth and supporting viable local communities), policy 7.8 (heritage assets); NPPF (land use principles), (section 2 'retail'), (section 8 (promoting healthy communities), (section 12 'Heritage'); Haringey Local Plan (strategic policies 'opportunity for ensuring that the Seven Sisters area provides landmarks/gateways through redevelopment and renewal), policy SP10 (retail); SP12 (conservation), CSV 7 (demolition in conservation areas); to reduce deprivation, the Council should work with the Seven Sisters/West Green Development Trust of local businesses and residents to deliver a valuable community plan; not necessary to demolish heritage assets and dislocate the community; restoration is more sustainable; not justified on economic (loss of shops, market, jobs, displacement of businesses and replacement with unaffordable housing and chain shops), social (loss of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.6 18.6 18.6 18.9-18.20(ii); 18.20(iv) 18.7; 18.19; 18.20(i) 18.7; 18.9-18.11; 18.13; 18.15-18.18; 18.29-18.30; 18.32

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				home, family and community of the Market) and environmental (demolition of valued heritage) grounds;	
43	Antonella Di Carlo	N15 4QL	Local resident, visit café Paisa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of cultural heritage; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33-18.34
44	Bethany Marchant	105 Rutland Gardens, N4 1JW	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viable and sustainable alternative plan; Seven Sisters Market 'priced out', and loss of long standing independent businesses; no social housing; demolition of historic buildings and replacement with a block of little architectural merit; considerable local objection; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.9-18.10 18.7-18.8
45	Daniel Stone	55 Cranleigh Road, N15 3AH	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition of historic buildings and replacement with a block of little architectural merit; viable and sustainable alternative plan; Seven Sisters Market 'priced out', and loss of long standing independent businesses; no social housing; loss of cultural quarter; considerable local objection; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7-18.8 18.19 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.9-18.10 18.32-18.33
46	James Holland	18 Sanderling Court, SE8 5TE	Does not live in the area; concerned it may set a precedent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> superior plan developed by the local community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19
47	Joanna Bornat	27 Albany road, N4 4RL	Not stated (assume local resident)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> homogenising development across Haringey; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.18
48	Lara Schroder	51 Summer hill Road, N15 4HF	Local member of community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition of outstanding piece of heritage architecture in a Conservation Area; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC's alternative plan sustainably restores the architecture and aims to unite the community; • allegations of corruption; • considerable local objection; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.20(i); 18.20(vi)-18.20(vii)
49	Lydia Rivlin	26 Muswell Avenue, N10 2EG	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is a viable alternative to the demolition of the historic town centre; • independent businesses with close down; • no affordable housing; • considerable local objection; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.19-18.20(i) • 18.16; 18.18 • 18.9-18.10
50	Summers Magnus	74A Southgate Road, N1 3JF	Regularly visit the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local buildings bring life to the community; small businesses stimulate growth of the local economy; • oppose demolition of historic buildings – funds ought to be used to improve the Building and its businesses; • lack of affordable housing; • Seven Sisters Market 'priced out'; • considerable local objections; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.11 • 18.7 • 18.9-18.10 • 18.32; 18.35
51	Mary Glenwright	24a Ferndale Road, N15 6UE	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • proposed demolition of the Building and replacement with ugly, over-sized, soulless buildings would be out of character with the local area; • local businesses 'priced out' in favour of chain stores; • there is a need for social housing; • community would be destroyed; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7-18.8 • 18.11; 18.16-18.18 • 18.9-18.10 • 18.13; 18.15
52	Matthew Stiles	3 Keightley Drive, SE9 2HF	Wife (Marta Hinestroza) runs a hairdressing business in Seven Sisters Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wife runs a hairdressers within the Seven Sisters Market; • viable and sustainable alternative plan proposed by the community; • demolition of historic buildings and replacement with a block of little 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • interest noted. • 18.19 • 18.7-18.8

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> architectural merit; Seven Sisters Market at risk of being 'priced out'; no social housing; considerable local objection; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.32; 18.35 18.9-18.10
53	Nick Darke	79 Clyde Road, N15 4JZ	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> bloated and anachronistic monstrosity, with total disregard for local heritage and the local community; exists a more appropriate and viable alternative plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7-18.8 18.19
54	Stanley Knill	10 Bedford Road, N15 4HA	Lives approx. 800m from the Building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> local community will be destroyed and a historic building demolished; soulless development with no social housing; loss of established local businesses/jobs; considerable local objections; alternative plan is viable and sustainable; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.13; 18.15 18.8-18.10 18.11; 18.16-18.18 18.19
55	Stephen Grange	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> opposed to loss of buildings that could be restored; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7
56	Barbara Costa	105 Stamford Road, N15 4PH	Local resident and member of South American Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above.
57	Deirdre Maguire	Seaford Road, N15 5DS	Member of local community groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition of beautiful historic buildings; work has been done by the local community (objector is a member of the Fountain Area Residents Association (FARA) to enhance the local area. Work done with charities Groundwork & Sustrans to develop pocket parks and cycle ways would be trampled by adding development not in keeping with the local area; Market is unique in London and stall 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7 18.6; 18.15 18.18; 18.32-18.35

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>holders have been given no assurances about their rents;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the plan put forward by the WCC does not seem to have received real consideration; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19-18.20
58	Howard Phillips	Unit 7B, The High Cross Centre, Fountayne Road	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
59	Dave Buchan	Godre'r Coed, Aberhosan, Machynlleth, Powys SY20 8RA	Part of my history	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma). In addition: the site is decaying and the alternative schemes would restore the building and maintain the character of the area; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
60	Ingrid Guyon	114a Brownhill Road SE6 2DH	Member of Latin American Community, supporter, client and friend of Pueblito Paisa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
61	Jamie Maxted	Unit 10b, Imperial Works N15 4QL	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
62	Leah Jennings	7 Cunningham Road, N15 4DS	Wishes for the Order Land to remain the same	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
63	Louis Rutherford	Unit 5, 5 Fountayne Road, N15 4QL	Concerned member of the local community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
64	Neil Simmons	53 Fairfax Road, N8 0NH	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma). In addition: every effort should be made to preserve the historic buildings of Haringey and update them sympathetically. There is a viable plan to do this; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above. 18.7; 18.20(i)
65	Olivier	73s St John's	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

	Rodriguez	Road, N15 6QJ			
66	Samuel Bellamy	Unit 12, 5 Fountayne Road, N15 4QL	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
67	Santiago Peluffo	4 Gleneagle Road, SW16 6AB	Frequent the Seven Sisters Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
68	Suman Joshi	54 Grove Park Road, N15 4SN	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
69	Carolina Velasquez Correa	30 Knights Hill, SE27 0HY	Interest in preservation of the current use of the Order Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
70	Holly Creighton-hird	99 Stanhope Gardens, N4 1HZ	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
71	Dr Jo Ram	99 Stanhope Gardens, N4 1HZ	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
72	Clementine Boucher	NW2	Common good interest	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
73	Anna Milada Grossi	Unit K3 Arena Design Centre, 71 Ashfield Road	Local resident. Use public space frequently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
74	Anna Naylor	11 Overbury Road, N15 6RH	My local area, town centre, shopping area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

75	Holly Harrison-Mullane	130 Stapleton Hall Road	Local resident, social connections to the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma). In addition: <i>'it is very difficult to see how this is going to be anything but another attack on this already marginalized economy.'</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
76	Janey Stephenson	35 Bedford Road, N15 4HA	Local resident (commute from Seven Sisters daily)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
77	Sophie Wolchover	Not stated	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
78	Frances Holloway	18 Townsend Road, N15 4NT	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
79	Margaret Burr	107 Wargrave Avenue, N15 6TU	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
80	Gemma Seddon	Imperial Works, Fountayne Road, N15 4QL	Local resident and business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> largely restates the objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
81	Aleksandra Stankova	20 Jansons Road, N15 4JU	Community member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
82	Ligaya Salazar	49 Kitchen Road, N17 6DU	Local resident, commutes from Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> largely restates the objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); Criticises the lack of consideration given to the historic architecture; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above. 18.7
83	Marie Kristensen	Black Boy Lane	Public/community cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
84	Simona Simon	28A Jade Close, E16 3TY	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

85	Karolina Maroszek	221 Tottenham Gardens Rd, N17 7NX	Frequent user of the Order Land/client of existing businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
86	Lucie Kinchin	29 Roslyn Road	Concerned local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
87	Juuso Sallinen	103 Belmont Road, N17 6AT	Central part of my living space. Use it almost every day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma);; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
88	Dr Chris Rossdale	79 Dovetail Place, N15 4FX	Local resident/Order Land is at the heart of community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
89	Joe Kuper	1 Culvert Road, N15 5HP	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> objects to the loss of Market, which provides an anchor for the Colombian community, and the loss of the Building; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.32-18.34
90	Mark Brearley	Kayment, 52 Ossory Road, SE1 5AN	Regular visitor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Daniel Stone at 45 above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 45 above.
91	Sarah East	93 Clonmell Road, N17 6JT	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> oppose demolition and replacement of buildings of no architectural or community merit; substantial objection has been ignored; no proper consultation; alternative plans will restore the historic and iconic Building; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7-18.8 18.24-18.25 18.24-18.25 18.20(i)
92	Saskia Edwards	9 Latitude Apartments, 77a Manor Road, N16 5NZ	Customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no social housing; despite being offered alternative premises; Seven Sisters market is at risk of being priced out; Latin American Community at the market should be treasured; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.9-18.10 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.33-18.34

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition will erase the history of Tottenham that it needs for sense of place/community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.13
93	Stefan Chojnicki	18a Wakefield Road, N15 4NL	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> damage to community life; the alternative scheme and refurbishment of the market is a better way of bringing new investment into the area and create new jobs whilst protecting the community use; childcare arrangements would suffer as the childcare provision is on Suffield Road; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.13; 18.15 18.19; 18.20(ii); 18.20(iv)-(vii) 18.13
94	Charlotte Sullivan	13A Marlborough Road	Haringey resident and customer of the market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no affordable housing; Latin American market is important both economically and as a community centre. Unlikely that many existing traders will be able to afford the new rents and businesses will be disrupted during the move; alternative plan would improve use of the space without damaging existing shops; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.9-18.10 18.32-18.35 18.19; 18.20(ii); 19.20(iv)-19.20(v)
95	Andrea Prieto	Not stated	Resident of Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development does not take into account the link between the market and the community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33
96	Azadeh Fani	159 Dowsett Road, N17 9DN	Resident of Haringey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> social cleansing of the area. Loss of a part of history; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.12-18.13; 18.15; 18.37
97	John Townsend	88 Seymour Road	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> want to use the land in a way that benefits the local community and helps existing businesses; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.13; 18.16-18.18

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

98	Veronica Restrepo Fisk	65 Mayola Road, E5 0RF	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not stated; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">
99	Pamela Carr	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> heritage; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7
100	Zaynab Dena Ziari	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no guarantee that existing community/businesses will not be ostracised/out-priced; demolish of historic Building and replacement with generic infrastructure of no architectural merit; cannot see how the diverse local community would remain intact; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.7; 18.8 18.15; 18.33-18.34; 18.37
101	Ruddy Justiniano	177 Hughenden Road, HP13 5PL	Attends market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Market is the only place to get descent Latin American food; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33
102	Denise Searle	63 Willes Road	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wards Corner is an essential resource for the local community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33
103	Fenya Fischler	20 Jansons Road	Local resident and neighbour of Pueblito Paisa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viable and sustainable alternative (HGY/2014/0575), which has planning permission, will restore the Building; massive and sustained local objection; despite being offered alternative premises; Seven Sisters Market at risk of being priced out of future developments; any building on the Site must be for use and ownership by the community, private flats and chain stores will not do this; harm not outweighed by benefits; Market is a treasure, important part of local community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(i)-(vii) 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.6; 18.12; 18.33
104	Dr Fiona English	56 Seaford Road, N15 5DT	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building is a locally listed building of architectural interest, which could be restored and is a community hub created 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.20(i); 18.33

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> by Latin American residents and businesses; site offers small shops and a thriving centre for the Latin American community and provides services for wider community; real asset to the community, missed if the CPO approved; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33 18.33-34
105	Jaabir Ramlugon	28 Spondon Road, N15 4DX	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above.
106	Julian Cheyne	15 Tollet Street, E1 4EE	London resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> failed to consider a viable and sustainable alternative plan to safeguard local businesses and community interests. WCC plan meets needs of local people and businesses and protects local jobs; lack of adequate consultation and significant objection; pricing out of Market; no social housing; demolition of historic building; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(ii); 18.20(iv)-(vii); 18.24-18.25 18.18; 18.32; 18.35 18.9-18.10 18.7
107	Shakir McClean	12 Seaford Road, N15 5DY	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sustainable alternative scheme exists with benefits to residents and local businesses; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(ii); 18.20(iv)-(vii);
108	Emmet Haverty-Stacke	257C High Road, N15 5BT	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for Latin American community it is a hub of national importance (important also for African and Irish communities); no social housing. Likely overseas investors with no interest in developing the community; backs the community plan; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33-18.34 18.9-18.10 18.19
109	Francesca Taylor	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viable alternative plan that will retain an iconic building; no social housing; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19-18.20(i) 18.9-18.10

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

110	Helen Quinn [appears to have been sent from a law firm's email address]	23 Bedford Road, N15	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will destroy buildings of valuable historic interest, vibrant and ethnically diverse community, businesses that provide valuable employment, social cohesion; • negative architectural merit of the proposals; • no social housing; • Council has not justified the basis for the CPO (i.e. how the public interest test is met); • Disproportionate effect on diverse ethnic minorities who will be displaced so Equality Act considerations come into play 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.15-18.18; 18.33-34; 18.37; • 18.8 • 18.7 • 18.13 • 18.37
111	Kat Hobbs	Lawrence Road, N15 4FX	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • largely restates objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see Council response to objector 1 above.
112	Louise Story	30 Roslyn Road	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • replacement buildings are of no architectural merit; • interference with Human Rights and private rights to the land; • long-standing independent businesses threatened in favour of corporate entities; • debateable whether there are regeneration benefits; • viable and sustainable alternative plan that would preserve the Market and existing businesses; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.8; • 18.29-18.30 • 18.16-18.18 • 18.13 • 18.19-18.20(vii)
113	Patrick Gray	15 Essex Lodge, N10 1QE	Local resident and worker in Tottenham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • largely restates objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma). In addition: • states that there is precedent for refusing CPO of sites for overbearing and damaging developments (Aylesbury Estate in Southwark) on the grounds that the scheme had not taken into account 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see Council response to objector 1 above. • 18.13; 18.29-18.30

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				either the material needs or human rights of four existing leaseholders. Argues that the disruption in this case would be much greater;	
114	Victoria Guy	Hackney Wick	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site is a unique example of multi-culturalism in north London; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.37
115	Tuck Nelson	135 Fairview Road, N15 6TS	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.15; 18.33-34
116	Giota Alevizou	The Circle, Queen Elizabeth Street, SE1 2JL	Visitor, customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> viable alternative plan, informed by the community to support economic and cultural fabric of the wider area; detailed comments on the progression and research that informed WCC's plan; otherwise, restates comments of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(i)-18.20(vii) 18.20(iii) see Council response to objector 1 above.
117	Jenny Imhoff	Not stated	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impacts on viability of traders; development not in the public interest; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.18;18.32; 18.35 18.24-18.25
118	Dr Patrick Hunt	4 Westerfield Road	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> largely restates objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
119	Sara Hall	146 Arnold Road, N15 4JH	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> credible alternatives not been considered; destruction of part of a conservation area; loss of long-standing SMEs; loss of approximately 288 jobs; displacement of people without adequate compensation; environmental and social impact of building above a tube; agrees that development is necessary but not that this needs to involve demolition of the whole block – the alternative plan is preferable; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.21 18.7 18.11; 18.16; 18,18; 18.32 18.15 18.28-18.30; 18.37 18.14-18.15 18.7; 18.12; 18.19

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

120	Peter Corley	41 Granville Road, N22 5LP	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see Council response to objector 27 above.
121	Katerina Alexiou	325 Sussex Way, London N19 4BH	Architect, academic, north London resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detrimental for social, cultural and sustainable economic development of the area; • viable community plan; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.15 • 18.19: 18.20(iii)
122	Andre Sacharow	54 Black Boy Lane, N15 3AR	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market is unique and defines area; • Development is of no benefit to the community • otherwise, see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.33-34 • 18.12-18,13 • see Council response to objector 1 above.
123	Diane Beddoes	36 Grove Park, N15 4SN	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WCC plan superior and retains the Building; • no social housing; stallholders will be removed resulting in the decimation of the Market; akin to ethnic cleansing; destroy history of area; non-local businesses will replaced those that are locally owned; scheme has received sustained opposition; • WCC plan is more sustainable; less disruptive both to the physical fabric of the area and commercial and social make-up of the community; consistent with direction of regeneration in the area; developed and funded by the community to meet the needs of the community; • lack of consultation, viability information not published; • Council refused to interact with community; Grainger has been under-prepared to answer questions; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.19-18.20(i) • 18.9-18.11; 18.18-18.19 18.32; 18.37; • 18.19-18.20(i)-(vii) • 18.23-18.25 • 18.24-18.25

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

124	Gary Mustard	4 Woodside Gardens, N17 6UY	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity should be taken to retain a handsome, historic building. Alternative scheme is more sympathetic to historic character and architecture of Tottenham; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.20(i)
125	Martyn Platt	Arnold Road	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market is a hub for the Latin American community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.33-34
126	Daniel Fraser	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latin American community of traders are a focal point and the project would result in demolition of livelihood; • lack of consultation; absence of any desire to bring value to the community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.35 • 18.24-18.25
127	Finn Lewis	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opposes loss of Pueblito Paisa; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.33
128	Teresa Couceiro	5 Dwight Court, SW6 4NJ	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • keep Order Land for the community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.13
129	Tom Devine	220 Hermitage Road, N4 1NN	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • viable and sustainable alternative plan; • demolition and replacement with block of little architectural merit; • no social housing; • massive local objection; • Market at risk of being priced-out; • no realistic provision for Latin American people; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.19; 18.20(iii) • 18.7-18.8 • 18.9-18.10 • 18.35 • 18.33-18.34; 18.37
130	Ann Walsh	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of Market; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.36
131	Chiara Contrino	51 Gedeney Road, N17 7DY	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restore buildings for community uses and keep independent buildings that reflect cultural diversity and variety; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.37

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

132	Chloe Slocombe	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of historical identity; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7-18.8
133	Chris Morris	Unit 37, 5 Fountayne Road, N15 4QL	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • damage to community and architectural history; • community will be alienated; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7; 18.12-18.13; 18.15 • 18.15; 18.37
134	Pablo Melchor	7 Markfield Road	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market is a community, important cultural landmark and makes place safer by linking people of diverse backgrounds; corporate cleansing; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.33-18.34; 18.37
135	Patricia McKechnie	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knocking the life out of this once vibrant fantastic city 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.6; 18.13; 18.15
136	Paula Orr	12B Therapia Road, SE22 0SE	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market is the heart of the Latin American community, who have made it an expression of their own, if lost it will be very difficult to re-create; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.34; 18.37
137	Peter Bailey	43 Elmar Road, N15 5DH	Local market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market is a hugely popular resource, which will be replaced with a bland shopping mall; • current Building is historic and beautiful; • WCC plan is viable and sustainable and will preserve and build upon the existing buildings and culture for the community; • significant objection and lack of regard for community needs; • housing is private and gates with no social housing to meet local needs; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.35 • 18.7 • 18.19-18.20(i) • 18.24-18.25 • 18.9-18.10
138	Paul Carroll	55 Clyde Road, N15 4IS	Resident of Haringey (claims to own several properties on the Order Land, including one shop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no proven regeneration benefits (the economic impact study supporting the scheme is out of date). The area has regenerated by itself; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.12-18.13; 18.15

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

			and two domestic houses via my local council so will suffer loss of income as well as loss of an asset)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Order Land is not in an area of economic need or deprivation (this is opposite the Order Land); information underpinning CPO is not valid; • financial/ job loss for people, which is not outweighed by the gains of the section 106 agreement. Developer is allowed to purchase the community asset (together with other buildings) at a subsidised rate and benefits from a NDC grant; • not in the public interest of residents, market stallholders, shop workers/owners and those offering local services or deliveries to the Market; • viable and sustainable alternative; • demolition of historic building and replacement of little architectural merit; • no social housing; no balance; • Market at risk of being priced-out; • the Order Land is not a 'gateway'; • other objections replicate Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.13 • 18.12-18.13; 18.16-18.18 • 18.13 • 18.19 • 18.7-18.8 • 18.9-18.10 • 18.35 • 18.6 • see Council response to objector 1 above.
139	JJ Best	32 Morrison Avenue, N17 6TU	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AfroTrinidadian-French, mixed heritage and attracted by diversity of area, range of local shops; • associate with strong sense of community amongst small businesses in Wards Corner, which is under threat from proposals; • WCC scheme will bring benefits to regenerate Tottenham and preserve the heritage and jobs/community and sense of inclusiveness; • 2004 Development Brief states '<i>a development scheme should reflect and retain the architectural features of the store, if at all possible</i>'. the generic new- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.15; 18.33-18.34 • 18.19-18.20(i)-18.20(vii) • 18.6; 18.8

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<p>build scheme will not provide a gateway;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at the planning stage, English Heritage disagreed with Grainger's conservation advisors (see letter 11 June 2012, the proposals will change the character of the area to resemble so many others; • proposals will also result in the loss of the locally listed Lucky Wines building and old bank building on the corner of West Green and High Road; • no need to displace unique shops that cater specifically to the local community, other proposals for improve shopping facilities are being brought forward; the increase of 610 square metres of retail floorspace is not worth the damage it will cause; • Appendix D to the SOR sets out the Council's engagement with the local community. There is no mention of the hostility to the proposals and that businesses have already closed due to blight and uncertainty; • the public realm benefits could be realised without the scheme; • net increase in housing is marginal and could be achieved with a better scheme; • Grainger state that additional jobs will be created but without any indication of whether these will be permanent or of high quality. Even so, this must be weighed against the blight and disruption for years of building work; • the re-provision of the Market will not provide the same ambience and no doubt rental levels will be higher and it will not survive; • disagree that the benefits will outweigh 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7-18.8 • 18.7 • 18.12; 18.16-18.18; 18.32-18.33 • 18.15: 18.24-18.25 • 18.13 • 18.6; 18.13; 18.21 • 18.12-18.13 • 18.32 – 18.35 • 18.7; 18.12-18.13; 18.15
--	--	--	--	---	---

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the human and social harm as well as the irreplaceable loss of heritage assets; gains can be achieved without total demolition that would bring tangible regeneration benefits; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.12; 18.21
140	Noel Treacy	107 Wargrave Avenue, London N15 6TU	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above.
141	Sean Rowlands	15 Norberts Road, London	Former local resident; frequents the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> used to visit the shops regularly because they were unique for the people running the business and the service they provide; now goes back to visit and feels it is one of the best parts of Haringey; buildings are interesting in their own right; alternative restoration project has planning permission; demolition would be to the detriment of the area and Haringey's community; there has not been full engagement with the local population; process is being managed negligently in terms of what should be the main priority of the local government which is the local population; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7 18.19-18.21(i) 18.7: 18.12 18.24-18.25 18.13
142	Sami Wannell	29 Eagle Heights, Waterside Way, N17 9PU	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there is a far better and far more public-spirited alternative plan; opposition to the Grainger plan; demolishing the existing complex will uproot the residents, the history and the sense of community; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19-18,20(vi)-(vii) 18.6 18.7; 18.15
143	Abigail Stevenson	Unit 12, Imperial Works, Fountayne	Local resident and architectural designer of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the scheme would achieve a larger development with arguably greater disruption and upheaval to the local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(vii)

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

		Road, N15 4QL	the Alternative Plan	<p>community while they have a valid plan in front of them that works with the community to grow what is there;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Plan achieves the development aims in the Development Brief for the area, champions equalities and supports and encourages local businesses and does not displace householders or businesses; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.19; 18.20(ii); 18.20(iv)-18.20(vii)
144	Audrey Droisen	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> far better to renovate and restore the buildings that are unique and historical assets; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7: 18.12
145	Di Gardiner	3 Foyle Road, N17 0NL	Local resident and patron of the Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
146	Jonathan Maris	Not stated	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community value that the Market brings to communities and particular value for Latin American community; very unlikely that the intangible benefits can be translated to a new site when the community of users and traders is not at the heart of change; Community Plan arises out of the community needs and developed through consultation; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33-18.34 18.18; 18.24-18.25; 18.32-18.37 18.19
147	Laura Hill	11A Grove Park Road, N15 4SW	Resident of Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> scheme does not meet the required heritage standards (per paragraphs 132 – 134 of the NPPF) and the applicant has not demonstrated that they have exhausted all possible alternative options in developing their proposals; significant adverse impact on character of Tottenham High Road/Page Green Conservation Area; fails to meet the Council's statutory duty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7; 18.21 18.7 18.7-18.8

				<p>to sustain or enhance the special character of the character areas. Proposed building will not mitigate the impact in heritage terms, employing a design that relates poorly to the surrounding context;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eradicate the history and character of the area (see the Character Appraisal for Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor); • paragraph 133 of the NPPF is engaged, the public benefits of the development do not outweigh the loss of the heritage asset; • removal of shops and reduction in market will erode culture. Businesses provide lifeline and community to many families as well as welfare support; • no affordable housing – unacceptable in terms of wider public benefits, particularly when weighed against the degree of harm to heritage values and locally important buildings and heritage values of the conservation designation; • the alternative has not been considered by Grainger and the Council has not responded to enquiries regarding the restoration and use of the current buildings from the wider community; • alternative plan restores and preserves and allows existing people and businesses to remain in the area. The plan proves the viability of using and improving the existing heritage site, whilst the West Green Road and Seven Sisters Development Trust have demonstrated their ability to raise funds to develop and manage the existing site; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7 • 18.7; 18.12 • 18.11; 18.15; 18.18; 18.32-18.34 • 18,7; 18.9-18.10; 18.13 • 18.19; 18.21; 18.24-18.25; 18.27 • 18.19: 18.20(i)-18.20(v)
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

148	Mary Yacoob	76A Ranelagh Road, N17 6XU	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bland and generic, glass-fronted building that is too high for the area; • long-standing, independent Tottenham business owners at Seven Sisters Market are at risk of being priced-out, which will break up a community; • no social housing – local people will be priced out of the area; • Community Plan is a viable and sustainable alternative that will restore the building and keep the indoor Market and the community it supports; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.6; 18.8 • 18.35; 18.37 • 18.9-18.10 • 18.19; 18.20(i); 18.20(iv)-18.20(v)
149	Miriam Sedacca	45 Heysham Road, N15 6HL	Resident of Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • closure of Pueblit Paisa and cause loss of the means to earn a living to small business owners and employees and destruction of valuable community resource and local asset; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.32-18.34
150	Ruth Gordon	158 Dowsett Road	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • objects to scheme (gated flats and chain stores); • alternatives the Council ought to consider; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.6 • 18.21
151	Shirley Hanazawa	17 Ramelagh Road, N17 6XY	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disagree that it is in the public interest. Alternative plan has planning permission that does not require CPO and will enable organic growth and meet the needs of the local community. Plan would deliver social and economic benefits. As an ACV is provides unique goods and services, serves Latin American community; • iconic Building should be saved as it is unique; • development will destroy the vibrancy and diversity of Seven Sisters/West Green Road small business shops and services which provide unique services (especially 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.13; 18.19-19.20(ii); 19.20(vi)-18.20(vii) • 18.7 • 18.11; 18.16; 18.33-18.34; 18.37

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to the BME community); gated development with chain stores does not meet the housing, social or retail/service needs of the people living here; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.6; 18.12-18.13
152	Vincent Guermond	11A Grove Park Road, N15 4SW	Resident in Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Laura Hill at 147 above; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 147 above.
153	Mark Wolff	125 Seaford Road, N15 5DX	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> preserve the existing architecture and space; support local businesses and provide amenities that help our community – cannot see how the community will gain from the proposed new commercial space or benefit those who need it most. Even if 39% of the housing is 'affordable', the price will be too high so the regeneration project will not benefit the area; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.7 18.9-18.11; 18.13; 18.18
154	Melanie Powell	Unit 10C Imperial Works, Fountayne Road, N15 4QL	Not stated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Pueblito Paisa at 27 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 27 above.
155	Pam Isherwood	19a Pembroke Road, London, N15 4NW	Neighbour of the Market and customer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shops and local businesses bring trade to the area and provide an important service. If the Council is serious about equality, those customers matter; the Market cannot be re-provided in a new block. Council and TfL have purposefully neglected the Market; the traders have transformed the space, it is home to London's large (circa 1 million) Iberian community. Many of the traders and customers have come to the UK as refugees and many see it as their home. The Council cannot see the social impact; truly multi-cultural site; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.37 18.32-18.34 18.33-18.34; 18.37

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in the replacement Market rents will shoot up and traders will not have the sense of ownership that is an essential part of the existing set-up; • acknowledges rents will rise with the WCC plan but users will have in-put into the management of the site and will have real investment in its continuing success; • viable plan that has planning permission and will restore the Building and bring improvements to the Market; • harm caused by the Grainger will be substantial and is not outweighed by benefits to the local area; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.35 • 18.19; 18.20(i) • 18.12
156	Rose Baldwin	39 Talbot Road, N15 4DF	Resident of Seven Sisters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • scheme does not support local businesses and the interests of the community; • WCC plan better reflects the needs of Seven Sisters and the numerous small businesses that make up the Market. It would be less disruptive; • oppose demolition. Keeping the historical Building would enhance the architectural and community centre point within Seven Sisters; • Market is an important community hub for the Latin American community. Significant destination for certain communities; • Grainger's plan does not appreciate the social and economic viability of the Market or Wards Corner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.11; 18.13; 18.18; • 18.19; 18.20(ii)-18.20(vii) • 18.7 • 18.33-18.34 • 18.13; 18.20(iii)
157	Ruth Allen	16 Collingwood Road, N15 4LD	Local resident (uses the site)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see Council response to objector 1 above.

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

158	David Williams	16 Collingwood Road, N15 4LD	Local resident (uses the site)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above.
159	Colin Hobbs	113 Antill Road, N15 4BB	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see objection of Marta Hinestroza at 1 above (proforma); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 1 above.
160	Susana Rocha	20 Amhurst Park, N16 5AA	Resident (and South American)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> regularly shop and meet friends at the Market; there is nowhere like this market Market could not be replaced with a new building; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18.33-18.34 18.7
161	Lucas Tome (NB: English and then Spanish version in their objection immediately below each other.)	98 Armadale Close, N16 9PL	Resident (and South American)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carta de objection proforma (per Susana Rocha at 160 above); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 160 above
162	Giovani Dadalt NB: English and then Spanish version in their objection immediately below each other.)	20 Almhurst Park, N16 5AA	Resident (and South American)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carta de objection proforma (per Susana Rocha at 160 above) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> see Council response to objector 160 above

Appendix D – Schedule of Objections

163	Matt Derham	68 Beaconsfield Road N15 4SJ	Local resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed demolition of an Historic Building and replacement with building of little architectural merit • Needs to show case diversity not adding chain stores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18.7-18.8 • 18.16; 18.37
-----	-------------	------------------------------	----------------	--	---