

Consultation on the Inspector's Main Modifications - Ref PE-28

I have been a local resident for the past 14 years and I am committed to fighting to retain the strong conservation status of the Pinkham Way Site. It is a non industrial site that is rich in biodiversity and provides a much needed green space for the local communities of Barnet Enfield and Haringey. The conservation status of the site is extremely important to me. I have 3 children who attend local primary and secondary schools. As a family we work, sleep and play in the area and are proud of the small amount of green recreation space that we have. We are totally opposed to any reduction or compromise of such recreational and educational green space sites.

Following the consultation in November 11 I would like to add further comments as I don't feel that the wording of the report following the consultation reflects the evidence given at the hearing and some of the wording is not specific enough to achieve its intentions.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the inspector, but I would like the report to reflect the evidence given by the council that the Pinkham Way Site is not an established industrial site. This would remove ambiguity as to the status of this employment land site.

I would like the report to include a statement that the site is open space and 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 enquiry and this was not disputed by the council.

I am concerned that the SINC Status of the Pinkham Way Site has been weakened. The UDP stated that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. This proviso has been delinked and reworded in the new strategy.

I would like an unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than the narrative to this policy). e.g. in the policy box, after the statement "all development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation, etc, add a 4th 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 i.e. "in such circumstance" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I would also suggest a further amendment to 6.3.23 – the last sentence reads "SINCS within the borough to include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." The first 4 SINCS are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together/ Dropping any of them is inappropriate.

Proposal Maps 7.16 and 24 need to change to reflect your decision not to permit the re designation to LSIS.

This is such an important issue to the residents of 3 boroughs – it is vital that all processes and their consequence are properly understood by by policy and decision makers.

Yours faithfully

Rebecca Whitehouse