

**Re: Haringey Local Development Strategy**

Dear Council,

I am writing in response to your letter sent to me on the 31<sup>st</sup> of August regarding the modifications to the Haringey LDF. I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. Could the council also be more specific in stating that the Pinkham Way site is not an established Industrial Site as this was clearly established at the hearing I attended in February. There needs to be a statement from the council in there report confirming that the site is currently open space and 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. The land has quite obviously been naturalised over a period of 50 years. This was also discussed and was not challenged by the council at the public hearing.

It would be most helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way 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 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 this 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 and LNRs 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. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Yours faithfully,

Alan Peacock