

Dear Mr Seaman,

Thank you for your careful deliberations on the Haringey Council Core Strategy. May I make the following observations.

While I support the modification to SP8 made by you, it does not entirely remove the uncertainty associated with the status of the land at Pinkham Way. The Council gave evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is 'not an established industrial site'. I wonder if you might reflect this important statement, by Haringey Council, in your report so that the situation can be finalised following the significant muddying of the waters by vested interests who, without your clarification, will continue to exploit any continuing ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would also welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is 'not brownfield/previously developed land' because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of "previously developed land". Evidence was produced to support that point at the Inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

My previous submissions to you have expressed consideration concern about the way the Council was unreasonably seeking to remove the protection of the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site, by simple omission. In the UDP it originally stated that development would be allowed on the site **provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site**. This protection has been unreasonably weakened and reworded in the Core Strategy without any justification or explanation.

In the circumstances it is reasonable for me to suggest that there should be unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy, rather than in the narrative to this policy. I fully support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc in the policy box, a fourth bullet point should be added to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCS and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

I would also like to support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that a further minor amendment be made to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads

"SINCS within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park."

Since these first four SINC's adjoin each other and together represent an important open space within the community, it seems completely inappropriate not to mention them together.

Further, it is my recent experience that simple inconsistencies are being exploited as significant facts by the vested interests in the Pinkham Way debate. I have recently had need to admonish a senior officer in Haringey Council because of his careless and inappropriate terminology in a briefing about Pinkham Way that he gave to the Haringey Council Cabinet in February 2011. For your information I have attached three documents:

(a) A record of the transactions on the "What do They Know" website which facilitates questions under the Freedom of Information Regulations. This document demonstrates the extent to which my simple and reasonable question was initially ignored and subsequently treated to inappropriate responses. There was more obfuscation to follow, evidence of which is not included in this letter.

(b) A copy of an email from Haringey Council which purports to set out the requested justification of the material contained in the briefing.

(c) A copy of my formal complaint to the Council about the previous treatment of my questions and a detailed reasoning why the explanations offered so far are unacceptable.

The point of sending you these documents is to demonstrate that vested interests in the Pinkham Way site will exploit any missing detail in your report. When reading these documents, you will appreciate that some of the points being made about LSIS presumed acceptance in the Core Strategy but had previously been dismissed by you in the Core Strategy Hearing.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely

Barry James