

HARINGEY CORE STRATEGY, May 2010

11) 167, 168, 187, 188, 189

**Comments on the Council's Proposed Submission**

From **Colin Marr** – comments made in an individual capacity as a resident concerned about conservation and the quality of the environment. These are in addition to other points in my name on behalf of community groups.

**The following points are given in the order of the Core Strategy:**

**POINT 1**

Section/ chapter/ policy	Sustainable Enviro
Page/ paragraph	106/ SP7
Intention: support/ object	Qualified support
Soundness/ legality	Possibly unsound

10/1/4.4  
107

**Comment:**

The Policy Statement on page 106 includes a list of transport related actions on climate change. The statements here are relatively vague and should be more specific.

The Council should prioritise the benign modes of transport (walking and cycling) in decisions relating to transport and the public realm. More specifically, it is suggested there should be an additional bullet point near the top of the list on page 106, to be worded:

- **Promoting a hierarchy of favoured road users: Pedestrians - Cyclists - Public transport users - Freight distribution (local) - Car users (multi-occupancy) - Car users (local) - Car users (non-local);**

**POINT 2**

Section/ chapter/ policy	Economic Vitality/ 5.3/ Town Centres
Page/ paragraph	125/ SP10
Intention: support/ object	Qualified support
Soundness/ legality	Possibly unsound

10/2/5.3  
108

**Comment:**

Under the heading "Protecting and enhancing Haringey's Town Centres", the second point advocates Wood Green as a "vibrant" centre. I object to the word vibrant and would prefer 'welcoming' or 'inclusive', or simply omit it.

I share concerns about the continuing viability of 'District' and 'Local' shopping centres, which could be at risk from the development of Wood Green and Tottenham Hale. At the end of the fourth point (under the same heading as above) I suggest an additional sentence, to be worded:

**The Council will help ensure the viability of established centres by supporting sensitive renovation and where possible to use heritage led regeneration.**

**POINT 3**

Section/ chapter/ policy	Safer for all/ 6.1/ Design
Page/ paragraph	138/ SP11
Intention: support/ object	Object
Soundness/ legality	Unsound

**Comment:**

Under the heading "SCS Priorities" there are additional points that need to be made with regard to sustainability. **I would like to an additional bullet point:**

- **In historic areas to make greater use of heritage led regeneration particularly by re-using and adapting buildings to save embedded energy.**

Also on page 138, the overall Policy Statement SP11 has in its first line the word "new" - this is ambiguous and it would be better left as "All development". **I would like the word "new" to be deleted.**

The second line of the same sentence endorses buildings that are "high quality" – this term has little real meaning without it being defined. **I would like the term "high quality" deleted, or defined.**

**POINT 4**

Section/ chapter/ policy	Safer for all/ 6.1/ Design
Page/ paragraph	139/ SP11
Intention: support/ object	Object
Soundness/ legality	Unsound

**Comment:**

As in Point 2 above, the same term “High quality” is used again on page 139 (4<sup>th</sup> bullet point). **Again it should be deleted or defined.**

Similarly, the first line of 6.1.4 says the Council will insist on “high quality” design. **I would prefer this to be reworded along the lines: “The Council will refuse permission for developments that are inadequate or inappropriate....”**

In 6.1.5 the first line reads “Development schemes should...” This is unnecessarily restrictive and it should apply to all development and not just schemes. The draft acknowledges the relevance here to the street environment, where relatively small changes to historic shop fronts can have seriously negative impacts. **I would prefer this to be reworded as: “All developments, large or small should improve the quality....”**

#### POINT 5

18/6/10  
18/6/10  
18/6/10

Section/ chapter/ policy	Safer for all/ 6.2/ Conservation
Page/ paragraph	142/ SP12
Intention: support/ object	Object
Soundness/ legality	Unsound

#### Comment:

The first line of the Policy Statement SP12 refers to “All new development...”. As in Point 2 above, there are good reasons to object to the word “new”. In the context of conservation, even small development proposals, such as replacement windows, front porches or shop fronts, can have a seriously negative impact on the area. **I would like the word “new” to be deleted.**

Colin Marr

18 June 2010

