Consultation on the inspector's Main Modifications (REF PE-28) to Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies

I wish to comment in response to the consultation on the Inspector's modifications (ref: PE-28) to Haringey's core strategy/Strategic Policies. My comments concern the designation of the Pinkham Way site for planning purposes, and also the protection of its nature conservation (SINC) status.

My first comment relates to the Inspector's modification to SP8. I support this modification. Indeed, I believe that the wording of your report should be altered to match the evidence given by the Council at the hearing, which made it clear that the site at Pinkham Way is not an established industrial site. Please could the Report be amended to reflect this fact?

Closely related to that first point: it appears that, according to the London Plan and the NPPF, the site is definitely open space, not previously developed land, or 'brownfield' land. This was discussed at the inquiry and I understand the Council agreed then that the site is open space. Could a statement that the Pinkham Way site is open space be added to your report?

Third, I am very concerned that the wording in relation to the protection of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) status of the site has been changed from the wording in the UDP. The proviso that any development permitted at the site must have no impact on the nature conservation value of the site has been reworded and weakened.

The Biodiversity Policy should provide explicit and unambiguous protection for Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation and for Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) in the Borough. I understand that some residents have proposed the following revisions to the text of the report, which I also support.

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 should remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

A further suggested minor amendment relates to paragraph 6.3.23. It is suggested that the last sentence should read "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."

That final wording amendment is suggested because the first four SINCs listed are directly geographically linked to each other, so should be mentioned together as a collective entity.

Finally, Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need to be amended to reflect your decision not to permit the re-designation of the Pinkham Way site to Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS).

Many thanks for your attention in this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Carolyn Whitehead