To whom it may concern,

Re: Consultation on Haringey Local Plan – Strategic Policies

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if the report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, ie that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site and stated clearly that the site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would 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 at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I consider that the protection of the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site has been weakened. In the UDP it stated that development would be allowed on the site **provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site.** This direct proviso has been delinked in the new strategy and reworded.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to that policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

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

The rest of the modification, ie "in such circumstances …" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment 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. I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect the Inspector's decision not to permit the re-designation of Pinkham Way to LSIS.

I look forwards to your response.

Many thanks and kind regards,

Pavel Pachovsky