CHAPTER 03
CONSULTATION METHODOLOGY

Overview

Varied and large groups of stakeholders are linked to Wood Green’s Future in many different ways. For Stage 3A of the consultation, a comprehensive process has been designed to raise awareness and then capture views and concerns of the widest possible group. This was made possible by using a series of both broad and focused communications, consultation means and events.

This chapter presents the local stakeholder map to date, the communication approach, the events timeline, the consultation means used and finally the involvement results.

Between February and April 2016, there were 30 different events including workshops, pop-ups and drop-in sessions at the consultation space.

Multiple stakeholders have been met and heard. They range from ward councillors to hard-to-reach groups and from businesses and residents potentially impacted by the options to council officers.

In total, more than 1100 people have been involved and at least 1500 people verbally informed about the regeneration plan. They filled in more than 300 forms - themselves or with the help of the team, took more than 100 online surveys, completed about 100 short-term projects cards and gave a total of 130 different comments during the workshops.

Getting such a broad feedback on the options has been very useful to understand the special needs and feedback of everyone with an interest in the future of Wood Green and to test the options.
**Stakeholder mapping**

Through past events, forms filled and further desk-research, the stakeholder database started in June 2016 has expanded and currently includes over 1200 contact details of people who have an active interest in, or are impacted by Wood Green regeneration. They are kept informed and invited to the different events organised throughout the process, generally via email.

**An evolving map**

The mapping presented here shows the local groups and organisations who we are in touch with. This is not an exhaustive list, but aims to show a good cross-section of local groups within approximately one mile of the plan site. This boundary is flexible and groups from the wider area who have a particular interest are also involved.

**Give us an hand**

The mapping is always growing. Please let us know if there are any additional or missing groups you believe should be represented.
WOOD GREEN’S FUTURE

Stakeholder map
A EDUCATION - NURSERY
A1 ABC 123 Nursery
A2 The Co-operative Childcare
A3 Alexandra Nursery

B EDUCATION - PRIMARY
B1 Alexandra Primary School
B2 Noel Park Primary School
B3 St Pauls Catholic Primary School
B4 St Michaels C of E Primary School
B5 Trinity Primary Academy

C EDUCATION - SECONDARY
C1 Heartlands High School
C2 Greek Secondary School of London
C3 Woodside High School
C4 Greig City Academy

D EDUCATION - SPECIAL SCHOOLS
D1 ESLT English Language School
D2 Faith Turkish School
D3 The John Dewey Independent Specialist College (Area 51 Education)
D4 Polish School (Czestochowa Devonia)

E YOUNG PEOPLE
E1 Wood Green Hall of Residence
E2 Campsbourne Play Centre
E3 First Class Learning Centre for Maths and English
E4 Koi Community Youth Charity
E5 Sandbunker Youth Club
E6 Mountview Academy of Theatre Arts
E7 Big Green Bookshop Education
E8 Kidz Adventure Playzone
E9 First Alexandra Park Guides & Brownies
E10 Haringey District Scouts
E11 Haringey Youth Council
E12 Woodside Children’s Centre
E13 Wood Green Skills Hub
E14 Action for Kids Charitable Trust
E15 Noel Park Childrens Centre
E16 YMCA Haringey Club
E17 African Children and Youth Centre (ACYC)

F ELDERLY AND DISABLED
F1 Bracknell Close Supported Block
F2 Winkfield Resource Centre, Haringey Phoenix Group and Age UK Haringey
F3 Alfred Findley House
F4 John Aldis House
F5 Louise Court
F6 Raj Kunj
F7 Rosecroft
F8 Sylvia Lawla Court
F9 Haringey Disability First Consortium
F10 Haringey Forum for Older People
F11 Haringey Pensioners Action Group

G LEISURE AND ARTS
G1 Wood Green Central Library
G2 Collage Arts
G3 Big Green Bookshop
G4 Karamel Cafe
G5 Studio 306 Collective
G6 Turnpike Arts Group (TAG)
G7 Green Rooms / Mill Co
G8 Cineworld
G9 Vue Cinema
G10 Martial Arts Academy
G11 EasyGym Wood Green
G12 Urban Krav Maga NE London
G13 Chapmans Green Bowling Club
G14 Everyone’s Climbing Tree
G15 Zone Gym
G16 Alexandra Park & Palace Charitable Trust Committee
G17 Alexandra Park Cricket and Football Club
G18 Alexandra Park Library
G19 Friends of Alexandra Palace Theatre
G20 New River Stadium Sports Centre
G21 North London Boxing Club

H COMMUNITY GROUPS AND FACILITIES
H1 Asian Centre
H2 Haringey Chinese Centre
H3 The Jobcentre Plus
H4 West Indian Cultural Centre
H5 Sandbunker Community Centre
H6 Civic Centre Haringey
H7 Wood Green Customer Service Centre
H8 African & Caribbean Leadership Co Ltd
H9 Asian Action Group
H10 Greek Parents Association (GPA)
H11 Greek Cypriot Women’s Organisation (GCWO)
H12 Tumpike Lane Citizen Advice
H13 Haringey Association of Voluntary and Community (HAVCO)
H14 Groundwork UK
H15 Parklife
H16 Haringey Migrant Support Centre
H17 Haringey Solidarity Group
H18 Haringey Housing Action Group
H19 Kolkata
H20 Bangladesh Women’s Association
H21 Turkish Cypriot Community Association
H22 Embrace UK Community Support Centre
H23 Cypriot Community Centre

I LOCAL INTEREST GROUPS
I1 Wood Green The Animals Charity
I2 Guardians of Wood Green Common
I3 Friends of Nightingale Gardens
I4 Noel Park Big Local
I5 Noel Park CA*
I6 Team Noel Park
I7 Friends of Ducketts Common
I8 Friends of Russell Park
I9 Hornsey Water Works and Filter Beds CA*
I10 Trinity Gardens CA*
I11 Friends of the Earth (Tottenham & Wood Green)
I12 Haringey Allotments Forum
I13 Haringey Cycling Campaign
I14 Haringey Friends of Parks Forum
I15 Haringey Living Streets
I16 Haringey Online
I17 New River Path Action Group
I18 North London LETS
I19 Sustainable Haringey
I20 Tree Trust for Haringey

J TENANTS AND RESIDENTS
J1 Bracknell Close & Winkfield Road RA*
J2 Burghley Road RA*
J3 Campsbourne RA*
J4 New River Village RA*
J5 Parkside Malvern RA*
J6 Sky City Community Association
J7 Travellers Site (No RA*)
J8 Westpoint Appartements RA*
J9 The Sandlings RA*
J10 West Green RA*
J11 Commerce Road TRA**
J12 Three Avenues RA*
J13 Milton Road, Willow Walk and West Green RA*
J14 Raleigh Road RA*
J15 Sydney Road RA*
J16 Noel Park North Avenue RA*
J17 Crown Close RA*
J18 Haringey Federation for RA*
J19 Haringey Leaseholders Campaign Group
J20 Alexandra RA*
J21 Avenue Gardens RA*
J22 Bedale House RA*
J23 Beresford Road RA*
J24 Birkbeck Road RA*
J25 Bounds Green & District RA*
J26 Bowes Park RA*
J27 Campsbourne RA*
J28 Chitts Hill RA*
J29 Fairfax Road RA*
J30 Falkland RA*
J31 Hornsey N8 RA*
J32 Hornsey Mews RA*
J33 Nightingale Mews RA*
J34 North View Road RA*
J35 Northumberland Park RA*
J36 Palace & Park RA*
J37 Palace Gates RA*
J38 Palace View RA*
J39 Park Avenue North RA*
J40 Partridge Way RA*
J41 Spanswich Lodge RA*
J42 Station Mansions RA*
J43 Stokley Court RA*

Urban Harvest
Alexandra Park and Palace CAAC**
Bowes Park Community Association
Campsbourne CA*
Community Use For the Old Station (CUFOS)
Friends of Alexandra Palace
Friends of Alexandra Park
Friends of Belmont Recreation Park
Friends of Fairland Park
Friends of Palace Gates Embankment
Nature Reserve
Friends of Wood Green Cemetery
Friends of Woodside Park
Friends of Lordsip Recreation Grounds
Hillfield CA*
Hornsey High Street CA*
Hornsey Historical Society
Crouch End Neighbourhood Forum
* CA = Conservation Association
** CAAC = Conservation Area Advisory

PCIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K SAFETY
- Metropolitan Police - Fishmongers Arms
- Alexandra Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Bounds Green Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Haringey Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Hornsey Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Noel Park Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Woodside Safer Neighbourhood Team
- Ladder Community Safety Partnership
- Haringey Association Of Neighbourhood Watches
- Hornsey and Wood Green Association Of Neighbourhood Watches

### L FAITH GROUPS
- Wood Green Christian Centre
- Faith Miracle Centre
- Dominion Centre
- St Michael's Church
- Victory international Church
- St Barnabas - Greek Orthodox Church
- Salvation Army
- St Mark's Church, Noel Park
- Bittern Place
- Eritrean Church
- Wightman Road Mosque
- Hornsey and Wood Green Association Of Neighbourhood Watches
- Woodside Baptist Church
- Burnley Baptist Church
- The Gospel Centre
- London Diyanet Mosque

### M BUSINESS AND ENTERPRISE GROUPS
- Retailers at the Library
- The Mall Tenants Association
- Retailers in the Indoor Market
- Retailers at the Morrisons and Vue Cinema
- Wood Green Business Forum
- Business Lounge at the Library
- Urban Futures
- Harringay 4 Shops

### N OFFICES / CO-WORKING SPACES
- Chocolate Factory 1 / Workspace Group
- Guillerot Place
- Chocolate Factory 2
- Parma House
- Cypress House
- Bittern Place
- Olympia Industrial Estate
- 57-77 Coburg Road

### O HOUSING ASSOCIATIONS
- St Ignatius Housing Association
- Metropolitan Housing
- Sanctuary Housing Association
- Homes for Haringey
- Notting Hill Housing
- London & Quadrant Housing
- Causeway Irish Housing Trust
- Newlon Housing Trust
- Circle 33 Housing Trust
- Hornsey Housing Trust Ltd
- Family Mosaic
- Southern Housing Group

### P WARD COUNCILLORS & POLITICIANS
- Alexandra Ward Councillors
- Bracknell Close Ward Councillors
- Bounds Green Ward Councillors
- Campsbourne Ward Councillors
- Haringey Ward Councillors
- Hornsey Ward Councillors
- Muswell Hill Ward Councillors
- Noel Park Ward Councillors
- Seven Sisters Ward Councillors
- Stroud Green Ward Councillors
- West Green Ward Councillors
- Woodside Ward Councillors
- Catherine West MP
- Haringey Liberal Democrats

### Q STATUTORY AND PUBLIC STAKEHOLDERS
- the Environment Agency
- Historic England
- Natural England
- the Mayor of London (GLA)
- the Civil Aviation Authority
- the Homes and Communities Agency
- NHS
- the Office of Rail Regulation
- Transport for London
- Integrated Transport Authority
- Highways England
- the Marine Management Organisation
- Sport England
- Thames Water
- London Cycling Campaign
- MET Police

### SA SITES ALLOCATION - LANDOWNERS
- Clarendon Square - mix
- LBH Civic Centre - public (LBH)
- Green Ridings House - private
- Wood Green Bus Garage - public (GLA)
- Station Rd Offices - mix
- Mecca Bingo - private
- Morrison's Wood Green - private
- Wood Green Library - mix
- The Mall / Sky City - private
- Bury Rd Car Park / Page High - public
- 16-54 Wood Green High Rd - mix
- L/b Westbury & Whytham Av. - private
- Turnpike Lane Triangle - private
- Wood Green Cultural Quarter (north) - mix
- Wood Green Cult. Quarter (south) - private
- Wood Green Cult. Quarter (east) - private
- Clarendon Square Gateway - mix
- Clarendon Rd South - mix
- NW of Clarendon Square - private
- Land Adjacent to Coronation Sidings - public
- Hornsey Water Treatment Works - private

### KEY
- Located off the map
- Overarching group / multiple locations
Communications
A comprehensive communication strategy was used to reach both the broad public and target specific groups.

Information letters
Prior to the main consultation, Soundings ran two door-to-door sessions to make sure impacted residents, traders and businesses were made aware about the development of the plans, the potential impact of the options on their homes, properties and businesses and how to get involved and have their say.
Approximately 620 letters have been handed out individually (when the occupier was available) in the Sky City and Page High estates, in the Caxton Road area, within the Mall/Shopping City, the Market, at the library, Morrisons, in the Cultural Quarter and on a section of the High Road.

Formal council letters / invitations
A formal notice setting out the proposals matters and representations procedure was placed in the ‘Haringey Independent’ newspaper on 5th February 2016. In addition, on 8th January, a total of 1,582 notifications were sent by post or email to all contacts on the Haringey’s consultation database including all appropriate general consultation bodies. Additionally 429 properties within Site Allocation boundaries were notified by letter. Addresses outside Site Allocation boundaries were not notified directly, but site notices were placed outside sites.

Flyer drops and business cards
About 18,700 event flyers detailing the public exhibition, workshop and online survey were delivered to households and businesses surrounding the site, alongside several ‘bundles’ to local centres. (See distribution map opposite)
The flyers advertised the public exhibition and workshop and explained how to take the formal (statutory) and informal consultation survey.
During the different events about 100 business cards were handed out to maintain a link with attendees.

Vinyls, posters and banners
The council invested in a vacant shop on the High Road to hold a series of consultation events and to be as present, visible and central as possible in Wood Green. Vinlys were placed on the windows and black boards placed on the pavement to catch the attention of passersby and to promote the series of events.
In addition more than 100 posters were placed in Wood Green and three banners at key locations on railings around Turnpike Lane station and on the River Park House building in front of Wood Green station to maximise promotion.

Pop-up cargo-bike
A branded cargo-bike was used to raise awareness in Sky City and Page High estates during two pre-exhibition pop-ups. Later on it was used as a sign-in spot at the consultation hub.

Consultation hub
The exhibition space was designed to be friendly and inviting, and the materials provided clear and accessible information with interactive elements to engage people. The boards provided a distilled version of the AAP Issues & Options document that was also available in the space to view.

Website and digital media
The project page on Haringey’s website is regularly updated to keep people informed about the project and how to get involved. It provides access to online surveys, information and consultation material and other key documents relating to the project.
Haringey published several posts about the consultation on Haringey council’s facebook and twitter accounts (1,178 followers in facebook and 8,943 followers on twitter). A total of 34 re-tweets and 10 likes have been received.
Also there have been posts and events created on popular local networks such as Harringay Online and Team Noel Park facebook page.
Soundings ran four email campaigns to inform the stakeholder database about the consultation.

Press releases
In the local press, there were articles in Haringey People and the team Noel Park newsletter published in February.

Graphic identity
Wood Green’s Future graphic mark has been established since the beginning of the process and has been used consistently and creatively to provide a strong and recognisable identity to all communications and media.
Entertainment of the consultation hub
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Flyers and letters distribution map
Events timeline and consultation activities

Below is the consultation plan showing all activities held during Stage 3A of the consultation, followed by a description of each event and the method of capturing feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1 FEB</th>
<th>15 FEB</th>
<th>1 MAR</th>
<th>15 MAR</th>
<th>1 APR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Stakeholders

**Public (all)**
- **Online survey**
- **Public exhibition**
- **Public workshop**

**Residents and Community**
- **Community Liaison Group meeting**
- **Impacted residents drop-in**
- **Impacted residents drop-in**
- **Transport and movement workshop**
- **Hard-to-reach groups session**

**Retailers and Businesses**
- **Business forum meeting**
- **Cultural Quarter businesses drop-in and door-to-door**
- **Impacted traders and organisations drop-in and door-to-door**

**Ward Cllrs and Council Officers**
- **Ward Councillors preview**
- **Council officers drop-in**

**Public Bodies and Landowners**
- **Ward Councillors and statutory meetings and formal consult.**

### Type of Consultation Event

- **AAP Documents available**
- **Online survey**
- **Public exhibition**
- **Public workshop**
- **Community Liaison Group meeting**
- **Impacted residents drop-in**
- **Impacted residents drop-in**
- **Transport and movement workshop**
- **Hard-to-reach groups session**
- **Business forum meeting**
- **Cultural Quarter businesses drop-in and door-to-door**
- **Impacted traders and organisations drop-in and door-to-door**
- **Ward Councillors preview**
- **Council officers drop-in**
- **Landowners and statutory meetings and formal consult.**
Community Liaison Group (CLG) Preview meeting
31 participants attended a meeting at the Wood Green Library on 2nd February 2016. Representatives of the council, Fluid and Soundings were there to provide an update, present the findings from the consultation to-date and give a preview of the four regeneration options for Wood Green’s Future and AAP and to be consulted on with the public from 22nd February. They were invited to note down any additional information they felt should be considered, either in their individual feedback forms or verbally for discussion.

Residents door-to-door session
Before the start of the public exhibition and main consultation, potentially impacted residents were made aware about the development of a regeneration plan. Door knocking was carried out to over 400 homes at Sky City and Page High estates and the area around Caxton Road and Mayes Road. 400 letters were directly handed out or door dropped inviting residents to join dedicated pop-ups in their estate or to book an appointment with the project team to find out more about the plan. Several targeted posters, including translations were also placed in communal areas. During this session, approximately 150 people were directly spoken to by the team.

Dedicated pop-ups / drop-in
At two pop-ups which took place in the Sky City and Page High estates, 32 interested residents came to find out more despite the bad weather.

Residents 121 meeting
Two residents from Caxton Road took up the offer of a one 2 one meeting with the council and Fluid to discuss the regeneration plan and its impact of their property.
Consultation hub
A consultation hub on the High Road was located in a vacant shop at a very central and accessible location in Wood Green. It was open between the 22nd February and the 19th March and welcomed more than 800 people.

The hub was divided into two distinctive spaces: the exhibition/survey area and the workshop area. Refreshments and a sofa were provided to give the participants the chance to take the time they needed to complete cards, forms and questionnaires.

Members of Soundings, Fluid (design team) and council officers were present to take people through the boards, give extra information, answer questions and help them to fill in cards, forms and surveys.

Public exhibition
The ward councillors from the Wood Green area and surroundings were invited to preview the exhibition that consisted of 15 boards.

These presented the context of the regeneration plan, the latest findings from the consultation to-date (turned into a set of goals) and a ‘FAQ’ - Frequently Asked Questions - booklet responding to the questions raised during the previous consultation stage. It also showed the spatial vision and strategy for Wood Green explaining how the goals have been integrated into the spatial plan.

Then visitors could discover the four broad options for a long-term plan - based on different priorities. Attached to each board was a booklet providing more detail for those who wanted to dig deeper. Information was provided on heritage, heights, uses and routes.

Finally visitors could contribute their ideas about short-term projects.

Consultation forms on the options
Hard copies and digital versions of a survey - on computers and tablets - were available to gather people’s views and comments. More than 260 forms and surveys have been completed during eleven manned sessions.

Participants could tell us how well each option was doing against the common goals, what they liked within each option, what could be improved or better detailed and how. Please find a copy of the forms in the appendix about the consultation material.

There was also a more formal questionnaire available on Haringey’s website and at the Haringey Civic Centre, the Planning Reception at River Park House, and at all public libraries across the Borough.
**Community cards**
Visitors could choose examples of short-term projects amongst the 250 examples and tell us how it could improve Wood Green and where it could be located. People could also describe their own projects and give their details to connect with other interested participants. About 100 projects were chosen and described. 36 people have given their details to connect with other participants interested in starting community-led projects. These are means to improve Wood Green before the completion of the long-term plan. Discover a few of these projects on page 14 and 15 and find all of them in the appendix about the short-term projects.

**Kids drawings**
Kids could also express their views for the future of Wood Green by drawing their ideas on special cards. These were displayed during the whole period of consultation.

**Online surveys**
A public online survey was open from the 2nd February to the 31st March. Through the survey, all elements from the public exhibition were presented. All images and booklets were made available to download as well. 87 people have completed this survey. A special survey for Haringey’s officers was facilitated and 25 officers have taken this survey.
Public workshop
During the exhibition, one public workshop was held on the 10th March, and the 20 people that attended were able to exchange views and ideas with other community members.
The group included a resident of Sky City, council officers, an art curator, students, traders and representatives of residents associations and local interest groups such as Sustainable Haringey.
They were first presented with the options and the vision and strategy behind them and were given the chance to ask questions.
Then they could discuss and develop common responses within round table groups - facilitated by a project team representative.

Their responses were given by option and were about what they:
• like,
• would like to improve,
• would like to see better defined,
• would like to suggest by option.
They wrote their comments on post-it notes that were displayed on boards summarising all of the workshop findings at the end.

Workshop on transport and movement
During the consultation, many consultees gave comments on issues relating to transport (such as traffic, parking, public transport, cycling, pedestrianised areas, etc.). Due to the particular interest, a focus session was held to bring together key stakeholders to share views and ideas on this important theme.
A mix of 12 professional stakeholders, council officers and community members attended and were invited to give their views on varying approaches to transport strategies linked to each option. These were mostly showing variables about where the traffic could go, be diverted or distributed.
Beside giving their comments on the proposed options, attendees also made interesting suggestions. You will find them under the topic transport and parking on page 52.
Businesses door-to-door session
To make sure a diverse range of consultees would attend the exhibition - including the impacted traders and residents - we invited different groups to manned special drop-in sessions where they could ask and get answers to more specific issues and have individual help to fill in forms or surveys.

Several targeted groups were invited through door-to-door outreach on the High Road and at the Cultural Quarter. As a result over 250 people were directly informed about the plans, process and consultation.

Special posters were also placed at relevant locations in Wood Green and at the consultation hub for each of the targeted manned sessions.

Manned focus sessions at the hub
Special sessions were organised for the following groups: the Alexandra Palace Trust, impacted traders, Business Forum Members, Sky City residents, Turkish-speaking residents, the Asian Centre and Mosque, Cultural Quarter users, youth representatives and disabled residents in Wood Green.

In total, 125 people have attended the focus sessions, the Cultural Quarter users group being the largest.

Dedicated forms
As a complement to the general forms, focus forms were available during the focus sessions to get to know the more specific needs and requirements of these groups.
Community involvement

Local attendance mapping
To the right is a mapping of known event attendees and people who have given us their feedback. This gives a broad indication of where those engaged parties are geographically located in relation to the site. It is worth noting that contact details could not always be collected.

Demographics
To check we were speaking with a representative cross-section of the local community, the team kept an observational record of broad age group, ethnicity and gender. To the right is a table summarising the profiles we were able to record. This provides a base indication of the groups that have been engaged with. It was not possible to record the profile of all attendees.

Consultation gaps
Soundings have noted that despite all efforts made, there are people living in certain areas impacted by the plans and people under the age of 25 that have not engaged well in the process. Impacted areas include residents and landlords of the area around Caxton Road, residents of Page High estate, certain traders on the High Road and in the Mall.
In the next stage of consultation these groups will be targeted and appropriate means used to engage them.

Formal representations
Haringey has received 25 formal written representations (responses) from mainly public bodies and large landowners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 3a Attendance’s Demographics</th>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Borough data taken from the 2011 Census.
** Disability visible by the team or disability communicated on the forms.
*** Ethnicity percentages calculated for 733 participants.

All figures rounded to the nearest one decimal place, main analysis for 874 participants who took the online survey and/or attended a staffed session during the exhibition.
**WOOD GREEN’S FUTURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENTS</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>LOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLG (Community Liaison Group) Preview options meeting</td>
<td>2 February</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wood Green Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Door 2 door sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacted residents</td>
<td>6 February</td>
<td>over 150*</td>
<td>Page High, around Caxton Road, Sky City High Road, Mall, Market, Library, Morrisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacted traders</td>
<td>5, 7, 9 March</td>
<td>over 200*</td>
<td>Cultural Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Quarter users</td>
<td>19 March</td>
<td>over 50*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement pop-ups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Page High</td>
<td>17 February</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Page High outdoor communal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sky City</td>
<td>18 February</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sky City outdoor communal areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public exhibition Preview session Ward Councillors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public exhibition</td>
<td>22 February</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consultation Hub (vacant shop on High Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open manned sessions</td>
<td>22 February</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Consultation Hub (vacant shop on High Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25 February</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 March</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 March</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 March</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7 March</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 9 March</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11 March</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 15 March</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 17 March</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 19 March</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public exhibition Focused manned sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Hub (vacant shop on High Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council officers</td>
<td>4 March</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Alexandra Palace Trust</td>
<td>9 March</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacted traders</td>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business Forum members</td>
<td>22 March</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impacted residents Caxton Road</td>
<td>24 March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sky City residents</td>
<td>26 March</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turkish-speaking residents</td>
<td>29 March</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Asian Centre &amp; Mosque</td>
<td>30 March</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Quarter users</td>
<td>30 March</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth</td>
<td>31 March</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Disabled residents</td>
<td>31 March</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public workshop on the four options</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Hub (vacant shop on High Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public workshop on Transport and Movement</td>
<td>10 March</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 14 March</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public online survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 22 February to 31 March</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Officers online survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• date? (LBH)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL** 1588*  

* Number of people that have been spoken to  
** To note, some people have participated in several events or surveys (estimation: a maximum of 100 people with an average of 2 times).
Facts and figures - Stage 3A

100+

event
posters
banners
vinyls

20,000+
event
flyers
& letters
delivered locally

2000+
digital messages

2 Preview Sessions

2 Estate Pop-ups

2 Workshops

11 Public exhibition Manned sessions

2 Door-to-door Sessions

11 Focus exhibition Manned sessions
1100+ people engaged in total

about 100 short-term projects

300+ forms filled-in

100+ surveys taken
CHAPTER 03
FINDINGS ON THE OPTIONS FOR A LONG-TERM PLAN FROM STATUTORY STAKEHOLDERS & LANDOWNERS

Introduction

Landowners (including freeholders and long leaseholders) of the area and statutory consultees (including major public bodies) are key partners for the plan as their agendas, policies, plans or recommendations can either accelerate or limit the regeneration of Wood Green.

The council received 22 written representations in response to the consultation on Wood Green planning document (AAP - Area Action Plan - Issues and Options - Regulation 18). These comprise 13 statutory consultees and 9 major local landowners.

The following findings report are separated into these two categories of respondents. A further four written representations from local people (local residents and artists from the Chocolate Factory) were received and these have been data based and analysed as part of the public consultation findings reported on in this document.

Responses from statutory stakeholders


Stakeholders have mostly focused on certain topics only. Please find the details of their responses in Appendix 7.

Options and redevelopment process

With over 13 comments from 6 bodies, there was general support for the objectives of the AAP. Options 3 & 4 were seen to be best placed to deliver environmental improvements as well as to reach the target for homes, jobs and economic growth. TfL noted that they had no preference between Option 3 & 4 with regards to one or two Crossrail stations and will continue to explore both options.

Flexibility in the plan was noted as key as well as assurances on deliverability. A concern was mentioned over potential disruption and how this is managed.
WHICH LANDOWNERS AND STATUTORY STAKEH. HAVE RESPONDED TO THE FORMAL CONSULTATION?

**LOCAL OVERARCHING STAKEHOLDERS**
- Catherine West Memb. Parl.
- Haringey Liberal Dems

**FREEHOLDERS AND LONG LEASEHOLDERS**
- Safestore - private
- The Mall - private
- Bittern & Guillemot Places - private
- Choc. Factories - private
- Hornsey Water TW - private
- Clarendon Gas Works - mix
- Crouch End Neighb. Forum
- West Indian Cult. Center - mix
- Railway Approach - private

**BROADER OVERARCHING STAKEHOLDERS**
- GLA & TfL
- London Cycling Camp.
- Environment Agency
- Sport England
- Thames Water Utilities Ltd
- Natural England
- NHS London Healthy UDU
- MET Police Service
- Highways England

Location of land and areas object of interest of the statutory consultation respondents
Transport, connectivity and accessibility

Five respondents commented regarding transport with 12 comments. There was agreement that increased transport connectivity to central London and other employment areas resulting from Crossrail 2 will drive significant regeneration and housing benefits for the town centre. There was also support for improved east-west connectivity. Some suggested that further consideration needs to be given to: capacity and connectivity of the bus network; a suitable location for a reprovided Arriva bus garage, additional bus standing space; and the prioritisation of sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling. One stakeholder mentioned that two Crossrail 2 stations would benefit a larger number of people. A borough wide Transport Strategy was recommended.

Housing

Three stakeholders commented on this subject. The GLA considered that the growth envisaged is in line with the council’s projections and the London Plan (statutory spatial development strategy for the Greater London area). Other comments related to the need to rehouse and provide genuinely affordable homes. Some said that population projections are required.

Retail

Concerns were expressed by two stakeholders over viability especially in relation to other North London centres and the need to safeguard other nearby district centres such as Crouch End. Also mentioned was the need to take account of changing shopping habits.

Employment

It has been said by one respondent that there is a need to protect the community and cultural legacy by promoting the Cultural Quarter for affordable workspace and creativity.

Building density and height

Four public bodies commented with regards to this topic. The GLA agreed in principle that Wood Green is an appropriate location for tall buildings. Concerns related to the impact of tall buildings on heritage assets, views of Alexandra Palace and to potential over development. A tall building validation study was recommended by one participant.

Community infrastructure

This was the most commented topic with 13 comments from 8 consultees. It was noted that the council may wish to revise its CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy, planning tool for local authorities to help deliver infrastructure to support the development of their area) to reflect the uplift in values for public benefit and coordinate requirements per development.

It is questioned whether Crossrail 2 funding will impact on the ability to deliver social infrastructure. It was mentioned that commitments should be made regarding the provision of GP services and health care infrastructure and to ensure no net loss of playing fields, sports facilities and existing green spaces. These should be preserved and improved some said.

Finally one consultee noted disappointment that no commitment was made for the provision of a swimming pool.

Environment

19 comments linked to natural resources, health & wellbeing and environmental sustainability from 5 consultees with the following recommendations were received.

There should be a greater focus on water courses that could be brought to life, offer public access and have their water quality improved (with quality objectives). An idea put forward was that the Moselle river is de-culverted wherever possible.

The plan should consider the Thames River Basin Management Plan. It was also noted there is a critical drainage area in the northern part of the plan area and that Sustainable urban Drainage systems (SuDs) should be promoted.

It was said there is a need for Level 2 Flood Risk assessments for new sites and to update the SWOT (Strengths - Weaknesses - Opportunities & Threats) analysis to take account of critical water issues.

Finally, it was noted that a net increase in water demand should be taken in account.

Some respondents said there should be some measures to address the predictable increase of nitrogen emissions and pollution caused by traffic.

One respondent advised embedding the principle of active design into the plan to encourage active/healthy lifestyles.
Responses from landowners

The summary below is of the representations made by some of the key landowners (composed of freeholders and long leaseholders) in Wood Green. Comments were particularly related to the following sites (please look at the map page 36): The Mall, The Chocolate Factory 1 & 2, Clarendon Road Gas Works Site and Olympia Trading Estate, West Indian Cultural Centre, Hornsey Water Treatment Works, Safestore Site, Railway Approach / Hampden Road, Guillemot Place and Bittern Place.

Options and redevelopment process

The ambitions presented in the AAP for Wood Green were positively received by all 13 respondents, with some stating specific support for the single Wood Green Crossrail 2 station and four respondents for Options 3 or 4 (1 or 2 Crossrail stations). Reasons included the potential that a single Crossrail 2 station would have to maximise connectivity and assist in delivering high levels of housing and workspace. There was a willingness generally to cooperate and work with the council to explore options as part of the plan development.

Flexibility

A number of responses questioned either the existing or proposed boundaries for the Town Centre and the Cultural Quarter defining the areas for retail and employment. A proposal from two landowners was made to extend the Cultural Quarter boundary to include the Metropolitan Police compound on Western Road and clarification was requested on its location along Coburg Road.

Some concerns were raised over the plan being too prescriptive and a risk to development. Flexibility was suggested with regards to the mix of affordable housing and workspace on one hand and economic and business growth on the other hand. It was suggested that the mechanism and form of achieving flexibility should be explained in the AAP.

Some respondents suggested changes within the SWOT (Strengths - Weaknesses - Opportunities - Threats) Analysis. Also a few stated that there appeared to be inconsistencies in land use references within the document. It was said there was need for clarification in the Site Allocations document on the bus garage re-location.

Connectivity and accessibility

There was general support for improving access to businesses, especially the east-west connectivity and the improved link to the Cultural Quarter proposed. This was considered as a positive ambition that would help attract high quality employers as well as improve links to Alexandra Palace. A number suggested that improvements were needed to the Penstock tunnel (going under the railway and linking Wood Green to Hornsey and Alexandra Palace). They also said that consideration should be given to the opportunity to link through the Thames Water Treatment Works, directly into the Park.

Housing

Three landowners expressed their wish to protect their development opportunities and suggested that housing and employment targets should be a minimum. The landowner of the Thames Water Treatment Works wished to affirm the suitability of this site for housing development, subject to Thames Water’s operational clearance.
Employment
This was recognised as a key issue for the success of Wood Green. Stakeholders said generally that increasing housing and workspace provision would help delivering quality employment, economic prosperity and achieve Haringey’s growth ambitions on employment and residential density. A number of respondents recognised the benefits of SME (Small and Medium-sized Enterprises) workspaces, the demand within Haringey for artist studios and the currently limited number of flexible workspaces within the area. They said that given its location and accessibility, Wood Green could become a more sought after location for SME workspace.
However it was also noted that viability and delivery should not be restricted by development control or capped rents nor current demand for SME workspace. It was also noted that SME workspace development needed to be funded through the intensification of sites and greater residential densities. One respondent raised concern over “workspace” being identified as the only proposed land use for the Cultural Quarter in terms of employment generating uses.

Building density and height
Ten comments on heights and density were made. It is noted that to deliver quality and additional workspace, this would require an increase in residential densities to the level identified in Table 3.2 of the London Plan. Some said they would like a more flexible and design-led approach that would take consideration of local context, character, proximity to public spaces and connection hubs. They also noted that height can be used to create markers and wayfinding devices.
A specific comment was made regarding the need for a landmark building to replace the historic gasholder (44m high). Others would like to see the density and heights on their sites increased to reflect the ambition for Wood Green to become an Opportunity Area and to deliver the quantum of new homes needed, including the area around the West Indian Cultural Centre and Hampden Road.
A number of comments noted the need to reconcile the AAP with the Local Plan Policy about views (DM5) that locates significant local views which cross Wood Green and could restrict the council’s ability to deliver the quantity of development required.

Community infrastructure
A couple of consultees noted the need for a review of the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) to meet the aspirations of the AAP in terms of infrastructure and to undertake household projections. This is to ensure sufficient growth. Also it has been said that there was a need for further testing in terms of infrastructure requirements, quantum and mix of development, and viability.

Environment
Opportunities for environmental and ecological enhancement far and above any retention of the filter beds on the Thames Water Treatment Works site is recommended along with positive support for the New River Path and green network.
options
Response to the options

Of the four broad options, the community was generally the happiest with Option 4 that was proposing the most significant transformation for Wood Green. The idea behind this option is to make it a remarkable centre in Haringey and an important hub in North London.

However the preferred option being currently developed by the project team is taking into account the comments made for all four options.

What participants liked the most in Option 4 was:

- An ambitious project responding to a need for change;
- The town square, the new library and central Crossrail 2 station;
- The redeveloped town centre including the removal of the current Mall, with quality public spaces and an extension toward the Cultural Quarter;
- The green link and connection with Alexandra Palace and Park;
- The better mix of uses and retail offer.

There were also a few questions and suggestions about Option 4.

Several participants were very curious to see how such a renewed centre would look like and what the atmosphere would be. A few thought it would be good to keep or rebuild an indoor sheltered shopping area. A few had concerns about where the traffic would go if the High Road was made more pedestrian friendly.

Finally some participants asked where and how impacted residents and traders were going to be relocated. Also a few concerns were raised about the vertical combination of retail + housing uses and its impact on the residents quality of life.
Response to the options versus the goals

On the online survey and feedback forms, participants could tell us how well each of the four options were doing against the four goals that bring the community’s needs and the council’s aspirations together.

As you can see below, of the 120 people who took this part of the survey, more felt that Option 4 matched each common goal better than the others.

Goal 1. Improving the uses of the town centre (68% of support for Option 4),
Goal 2. Making unique places for people (66% of support for Option 4),
Goal 3. Creating a well connected place (66% of support for Option 4),
Goal 4. Developing Haringey’s sustainable capital (60% of support for Option 4).

This reflects the community members’ interest in an ambitious plan and ‘readiness’ for a significant change to improve Wood Green.

Goal 1 - How well did people say the options improve the uses of Wood Green town centre?

Goal 2 - How well did people say the options make unique places for people in Wood Green?
GOAL 3 - HOW WELL DID PEOPLE SAY THE OPTIONS MAKE WOOD GREEN WELL CONNECTED?

CREATING A WELL CONNECTED PLACE

Option 1
- Support: 35%
- Neutral: 31%
- Concern: 33%

Option 2
- Support: 40%
- Neutral: 32%
- Concern: 27%

Option 3
- Support: 57%
- Neutral: 20%
- Concern: 21%

Option 4
- Support: 66%
- Neutral: 14%
- Concern: 19%

Options scoring by the community in terms of connections (out of 113 responses)

GOAL 4 - HOW WELL DID PEOPLE SAY THE OPT. MAKE W.G. THE SUSTAINABLE CAPITAL OF HARINGEY?

DEVELOPING HARINGEY’S SUSTAINABLE CAPITAL

Option 1
- Support: 29%
- Neutral: 38%
- Concern: 33%

Option 2
- Support: 31%
- Neutral: 35%
- Concern: 33%

Option 3
- Support: 55%
- Neutral: 24%
- Concern: 22%

Option 4
- Support: 60%
- Neutral: 21%
- Concern: 19%

Options scoring by the community in terms of social and environmental facilities (out of 114 responses)
Comments on the redevelopment process

The bar chart below shows the most talked about topics in connection with the redevelopment process.

There were some interesting questions about the plan’s development and consultation’s process. See over for more information.

An FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) booklet was available at the exhibition and online. Some questions were about aspects of the plan that are being developed in the next stage such as around delivery and phasing.

These elements will be subject to consultation in Stage 3B of the process. The FAQ will be updated as the process continues.

WHAT ARE THE MOST DISCUSSED TOPICS ABOUT THE PROCESS?

Process topics most discussed by the community / Stage 3A (out of 348 comments)
Initiative, ambition, intention, vision, mission
122 comments

+ SUPPORT
A large majority of people supported the intention, aspirations and ambitions of the plans (49) and said Wood Green is in desperate need of improvement. Most people liked Option 4 (30) because it showed the highest ambition however some people thought Options 1 and 2 were better as they would be recession proof and less disruptive (9), and others liked Option 3 as a balance between disruption and change (7).

- CONCERNS
A number of residents raised concerns about demolishing the Mall and bridge (8).
Of the 4 options, Options 1 and 2 were the ones which most people felt lacked ambition (16).
A few felt that Option 4 does not provide enough certainty and may be too ambitious (3).

Goals & objectives
49 comments

+ SUPPORT
Overall, people agreed with the common goals of the plans (39), describing them as ambitious (3), studied and deliberate (1), and offering the chance for investment (1).

- CONCERNS
People worried about congestion and overcrowding (3), whilst others were concerned about the focus on public transport and traffic - either too little, or too much (2).

Community engagement & benefits in general
48 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many participants were in favour of short-term community-led projects and were ready to help deliver them (36).

- CONCERNS
There was concern that the plans would attract more corporate companies, rather than ‘community-led’ initiatives or ethical companies (5).
Some respondents were also concerned that there were few specific community benefits for the old and young in the plan (4).
There was also concern over how people who are relocated out of Wood Green could benefit from the changes (3).
+ SUPPORT
Some were supportive of relocation as an opportunity to have new housing tuned specially to their needs - e.g. disabled access (3).

- CONCERNS
There was some concern at the lack of clear information in the proposals as to how and what housing, retail and work space relocations and provisions would be made (21).
Sky City residents were worried about being relocated outside of the borough (2) and thus being separated from neighbours and communities (5).
Representatives of impacted facilities such as the Asian Centre were concerned about the future accessibility of their premises as easy access is currently a major incentive for their members (2).
SA resident from the Caxton Road area was worried that the council wouldn’t buy the properties that need to be demolished for the plan for a fair price and would unfairly use its CPO - Compulsory Purchase Order powers (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some suggested that people living above the Mall - in Page High and Sky City estates - should be provided with accommodation within the area (2), and that this should be ‘like-for-like’ (5) and if possible with better outdoor areas.
There were also suggestions that reasonable alternative accommodation for Cultural Quarter artists should be offered as part of the plan (3).

This public consultation
34 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many commented that the information presented at the public consultation was useful (11), and that staff were helpful (8).

? SUGGESTIONS
A few suggestions were made to simplify the understanding of the options for instance with a comparison chart for the 4 different options, photos and 3D views (9).
Also some expressed the need for a project website (3).
A couple of comments described the consultation materials as being too detailed or not detailed enough (3).

Timescale, implementation & meanwhile projects
28 comments

- CONCERNS
The main concern was the disruption during the construction works (12) for instance about how Arriva would continue to deliver bus services or the decrease of income for shops.
Some participants were surprised that there was no indication about the timescale for each option (9).
A few suggested the regeneration should happen as fast as possible to quickly improve the area and prevent too long disruptions (4).

? SUGGESTIONS
There should be more short-term projects shown on the plan as quick wins for the area (2).
Someone said that the plan should be broken into smaller doable projects in case there are no investors interested or no Crossrail 2 stations coming (1).
**Funding & feasibility**
19 comments

+ SUPPORT
There was support for one Crossrail station, instead of two, if this would lower the cost of the development (2).

- CONCERNS
There was a fair amount of concern over the very large scale of the project, the cost and the long term implementation (7).

? SUGGESTIONS
Many people wanted to know more about how the regeneration scheme will be funded (10).

**Partnerships**
6 comments

- CONCERNS
Many people expressed concerns about the dependency of the plans on TFL decisions - e.g. for Crossrail 2 (5).

? SUGGESTIONS
There was one suggestion that TfL could change Wood Green to zone 2/3, as they have at Stratford (1).

**Boundaries & policies**
4 comments

- CONCERNS
Someone was unclear how the boundaries of the plan had been chosen (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some thought that boundaries of the plan should stretch further than Turnpike Lane (2).
There was a suggestion that there should be policies created to ensure there are enough affordable homes in the plan (1).

**Maintenance & monitoring**
3 comments

- CONCERNS
There were concerns that the current level of maintenance of the High Road and surrounding areas will not be enough to maintain the proposed Green Link and other new public spaces (3).
### What Are the Hottest Topics About the Redevelopment Process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Groupings of Community Comments on the Process / Stage 3A (out of 348 Comments)</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious intentions of improvement</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term community-led projects</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious common goals and plans (Option 3 &amp; 4)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful public consultation and helpful staff</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not too disruptive plan (Options 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Support
- 104 comments

#### Suggestions
- 36 comments
  - Ongoing project website
  - Space for community-led and ethical projects/companies
  - More information about the funding strategy
  - Simplifying the understanding of the consultation material
  - Like-for-like reprovisions
  - Large scale of the project, its funding & implementation

#### Concerns
- 114 comments
  - Benefits for the community - incl. elderly and youth
  - No indication about the timescale of each option
  - Disruption during construction work
  - Lack of ambition of Options 1 and 2
  - Relocation and space reprovision for residents, traders and artists

Top groupings of community comments on the process / Stage 3A (out of 348 comments)
town centre uses
Comments by uses

In this part of the report, we have grouped comments on all options by use or function, to inform the next stage of developing the preferred option.

The table below shows that the uses most discussed were about transport and parking, public spaces, housing and retail.

On transport and parking most comments were about Crossrail 2.

On public spaces there were mostly comments about the new town square and the linear park.

For housing, comments were generally about the new housing provision that should take in account the needs of existing residents.

Regarding retail, most of the comments were about the need for an improved mix of retail and views concerning the redevelopment of the Mall.

**WHAT USE HAVE THE COMMUNITY MOST DISCUSSED?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; parking</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spaces</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; nature</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; culture</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community use &amp; facilities</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport &amp; leisure</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; work space</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; drink</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; training</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services / infrastructure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Uses most discussed by the community / Stage 3A (out of a total of 1050 comments)*
Transport & parking
303 comments

+ SUPPORT
Nearly double the amount of people favoured the one central Crossrail station because they felt it would better serve local people (41). 25 people, particularly those living around Turnpike Lane, preferred the two stations option (one at Alexandra Palace and one at Turnpike Lane).
Many felt that the plans supported more efficient transport networks and connections across Wood Green (25). Plans to improve the connectivity between Alexandra Palace, the Cultural Quarter and the High Road were popular with many residents (30).
A few people supported an increase in bus garage capacity either through redevelopment or relocation (8).

- CONCERNS
A lot of concerns focused around the possibility of the area becoming too dense and congested (16).
Concerns raised related to Crossrail 2. These included the decreased connection between Wood Green and Alexandra Palace with one Crossrail station (9); dependency on TfL decisions (4); and disruption during Crossrail 2 construction (1).
Some were concerned about the lack of parking provisions shown in the plans (11). Whilst others focused on the lack of traffic and cycling provision (7) and the risks of restricting traffic causing more problems (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
Almost half of the suggestions around transport were based on improving traffic management - on High Road, Hornsey Park Road and Bounds Green Road (37) and implementing cycling lanes and facilities (13).
A few respondents suggested that new and existing stations in the area need step free access (6), as well as more general improvements and expansions (4). Some recommended integrating the bus garage and new Crossrail station (6).
There were a handful of suggestions to increase East-West links to and from Alexandra Palace (6).
There was one suggestion of a Park and Ride for the area (1).

Public spaces
196 comments

+ SUPPORT
Most people support the idea of a new green, pedestrian friendly and well located town square (34), including places to sit, meet and relax (19).
The majority of those viewing the public exhibition supported Option 4 as the best proposal for improving the use of the town centre, and creating unique spaces for people (74).
Many people supported the idea of having a market (14), and most people wanted this to be outdoor (10).

- CONCERNS
A small number of participants highlighted that anti-social behaviour in new and existing public spaces needs to be addressed (3).
A few people mentioned that they do not want a market (5).
There were also a handful of comments expressing concerns about the design of the public spaces within the town centre - e.g. not enough emphasis on public areas, design not very distinct (4).

? SUGGESTIONS
There were suggestions that these public spaces should be kept clean and well maintained (8), and perhaps be sheltered (9).
Generally, people suggested public spaces with particular street features (15) such as water installations, street furniture, playgrounds, and new iconic landmarks.
There was a suggestion that there should be toilets at Ducketts Common (1).

Retail
143 comments

+ SUPPORT
For the most part, we saw support for replacing Shopping City with an entirely new structure, including the Mall bridge (29). A few people explicitly favoured a street based retail environment (5).
People generally wanted a broader range of shops including markets (17) and small independent businesses (2).
People also supported the rejuvenation and development of the High Road as seen in Options 1 and 2 (13).

- CONCERNS
Others expressed concerns about the plans being too retail-led (4); retail spreading beyond the High Road (1); or Wood Green becoming like Westfield in nature (2).
There was concern over the process of changing the retail offer, such as loss of profit for shop owners (3) and loss of jobs and workplaces in the area (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
Many suggestions we received about retail, proposing a better balanced mix of use and higher quality shops (27) and retail premises (5). Many comments also suggested a more creative industry with more independent shops (14) and for Wood Green to keep its unique character (4).

I STATEMENTS
Statements about the current state of Wood Green were mostly about the high amounts of low quality shops (17) and partly concerned with the area looking unattractive (3).
Housing 106 comments

+SUPPORT
There was popular support for the building of new housing proposed in the plans, including the opportunity to re-house existing residents (31).
Some support came for housing within mixed use areas (3), such as with the Civic Centre and retail (3).
Overall, there was a good response to the housing plans with a number of responses linking the plans to improving Wood Green as a place to live either through quality of life (2), or being affordable and value for money (4).

- CONCERNS
The most frequent concerns around housing were based around housing becoming unaffordable (26).

? SUGGESTIONS
There were some comments that rehousing should be within the local area only (7). Additionally, people suggested that houses should be both affordable, and good quality (8).

Environment & nature 62 comments

+SUPPORT
Overwhelmingly, there was support for the Linear Park and link (23), as well as more green public areas in Wood Green generally (24).

- CONCERNS
There was concern over the capacity of options 1 and 2 to improve and increase green space (2). There was also concern over the lack of focus on improving existing green spaces, not just new ones (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some suggestions were made for implementation of community gardens and pocket parks (6), as well as more greenery along the High Road (3).
Other suggestions included green roofs on new buildings (1), and relating the Green Link to the hidden Moselle River (1).

Arts & culture 58 comments

+SUPPORT
Many supported improving accessibility to Alexandra Palace (14).
Others mentioned that they supported more arts spaces and cultural venues within the plans (9), including the inclusion of the Cultural Quarter in the redevelopment plans to make Wood Green a distinctive culture destination (10).

- CONCERNS
The main overall concern was the risk of Wood Green losing its cultural diversity (2) including the fear of losing two cinemas (1); no reference to the artist community in the plans (1), and no solid plan for a theatre (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
There was consensus from participants that rent rates in the Cultural Quarter should be affordable (4), and available to local artists and performers as coworking spaces (3).
Some people said that it would be good to have a large communal space at the library available for indoor markets, public performances and community-led projects (5).
Similarly, it was suggested there should be increased council support in supplying suitable spaces for artists from the Cultural Quarter (4).
One suggestion was to use containers as temporary work spaces (1), whilst others recommended setting up an open access print studio (2).
Someone also suggested that the new library could be a cultural one-stop shop in Wood Green combining the library with a museum containing the archives of Haringey. (1)
Community uses & facilities  
51 comments

+ SUPPORT
There was general support for a new library and the main council offices being moved to the centre of Wood Green (17).

- CONCERNS
There was strong concern for the lack of service provision to cope with the increased population in the area (16).

? SUGGESTIONS
There were some comments suggesting that more youth services are needed (6). Similarly, people suggested more provision for older people (4).

Specific suggestions included creating an information centre in the area (2), facilitating a community land trust/co-op in the area (1), and combining the library and Civic Centre (1).

A couple of people were interested in the idea of having a large multigenerational cultural centre that would be used at different times of the day and the week (2).

Sports & leisure  
48 comments

+ SUPPORT
In this area, we saw support for more space for outdoor activities built within the Linear Park (5). We also saw a number of supportive comments for the development of the Mecca Bingo and Vue Cinema land for a leisure centre (4).

? SUGGESTIONS
Many suggestions pointed towards a swimming pool and leisure centre (19). There were also suggestions for building of public space which could encourage leisure activities such as park gyms (3), as well as spaces for activities for children (3).

Specifically, suggestions for a theatre (2), festival (1), and skateboarding park (1), were mentioned.

Business & work space  
26 comments

+ SUPPORT
Frequent comments showed support for the creation of more office space in Wood Green (2), including shared workspaces (2), to bring more employees into the area (2). Some supported a general increase in investment in the area for work spaces (2), and others supported new workspaces being clustered at Wood Green and Turnpike Lane (2).

- CONCERNS
The main concerns raised were based around the envisioned gaps in the plans. These included lack of business opportunities including engineering and manufacturing (2); lack of balanced uses (1); and benefits to local people, rather than external companies (1). High price of work space (3) and relocation during the development (1) was a concern for a few participants.

? SUGGESTIONS
Suggestions were mainly made on the role the council could play in the creation of work spaces in the regeneration. These included keeping rents at current prices (4); using planning tools to keep current studios intact (1); providing support for artists seeking suitable studios (2) and offering alternative accommodation to business who have to vacate (1).
**Food & drinks**

**25 comments**

**+ SUPPORT**
Some people supported the plan’s better provision of restaurants and places to meet (2), including a market (3). Others, liked the improved evening economy provision (3).

**- CONCERNS**
A small number of people showed concern that a more active evening economy could cause more anti-social behaviour (3). One respondent pointed to Option 1 as an example of a plan without enough cafe provision (1).

**? SUGGESTIONS**
Notably, most people suggested the need for an improved diversity of restaurants, cafes and bars (13).

**Education & training**

**20 comments**

**- CONCERNS**
There were a number of respondents who expressed the opinion that there was no need for a new library building (5). A couple of other comments were concerned about the possible Civic Centre demolition (2).

**? SUGGESTIONS**
Notable suggestions to improve the education and training prospects in the area included hosting a university or college campus in the area (3), opening up Crossrail 2 apprenticeships to Wood Green’s youth (2), and adding a cafe to the library to make it a more appealing work space (1).

**Technical services & infrastructure**

**7 comments**

**- CONCERNS**
Mainly, respondents expressed concerns around litter and rubbish disposal services (4). Others were concerned with drainage and sewage provisions (2).

**? SUGGESTIONS**
There was one suggestion of using waste to create cleaner energy (1).
WHAT ARE THE HOTTEST TOPICS ABOUT THE TOWN CENTRE USES?

SUPPORT
606 comments

One central Crossrail 2 station 41
Friendly and permeable town square 34
Opportunity to re-house existing residents 31
New street-based retail structure instead of the Mall 29
Two Crossrail 2 stations 25
More efficient transport networks and connections 25
Green public areas 24
Green link as new natural area 23
A broader range of shops including markets 17
A new library and the main council offices in the centre 17

SUGGESTIONS
260 comments

Improving traffic management 13
A leisure centre including a swimming-pool 19
More quality & independent shops 43
Implementing cycling lanes and facilities 29
Improved diversity of restaurants, cafes and bars 13

CONCERNS
198 comments

Density and traffic congestion 16
Lack of service provision to cope with increased population 16
Housing becoming unaffordable 26

Top groupings of community comments on uses (out of 1074 comments)
Implementing cycling lanes and facilities

More quality & independent shops

Improved diversity of restaurants, cafes and bars
town centre areas
Comments by areas

Different areas in Wood Green have been the subject of discussion. On the next pages you will find a description of the views of the community for each of the areas.

The areas most discussed were:

1. Wood Green Central Area
   • New town square and library,
   • New shopping and High Road,
   • The link to Alexandra Park,
   • The Cultural Quarter

2. Area around Turnpike Lane Station

3. North High Road
   • River park House,
   • Arriva bus garage,
   • Mecca Bingo hall,
   • Vue cinema
   • Civic Centre
**Around the new town square & library**

188 comments

*+ SUPPORT*

The consensus from respondents was that Option 4 was the best option to develop Wood Green as Haringey’s capital (68).

There was a strong indication that most people support a Crossrail 2 station in the middle of Wood Green (24).

A lot of responses also strongly supported having a proper, opened up town centre (30) that is green (6) and with the chance for a market (7) or evening activities (4).

Many also liked the redevelopment of the library in a central location (16) and combined with a new Civic Centre / Haringey’s customer service (1).

*— CONCERNS*

Concerns were centred around tall buildings creating a dark and over-dense place (6).

There were a handful of comments which rejected proposals for a central Crossrail station (8). Some also were concerned about Sky City being removed (3).

Representatives of the Asian Centre expressed their need to stay central in Wood Green (2).

*? SUGGESTIONS*

There were a few suggestions that there should be more places to sit and socialise in the town centre (7).

People also wanted to see more greenery along the High Road (3).

Concerning the library, people suggested keeping it on the ground floor (1) and creating more community spaces inside (2).

**The new shopping centre & the High Road**

120 comments

*+ SUPPORT*

Many supported the idea of replacing Shopping City with a new structure (32).

Lots of residents also supported the proposal of a broader range of shops and restaurants on the High Road (13), and improving the High Street environment more generally (14).

Many supported traffic and road provisions shown in the plan, including wider streets (2), more cycling lanes (2), and The High Road being at least part pedestrianised (2).

A few comments supported the chance for independent retailers (5), markets (4) and improved evening economy (1).

*— CONCERNS*

Some people did show concerns over loosing the Mall completely (14).

A few responses were concerned about having residential areas near the High Road or Mall (5).

*? SUGGESTIONS*

Many people recommended better quality shops in the changes (15).

There were a few suggestions to keep a variation on the mall, either refurbished (1), or a new more modern mall (1).

There were also ideas about putting Crossrail 2 inside the mall (1) and keeping the Mall’s market Hall (1).

A few suggested creating more cycling facilities and lanes on the High Road (4), as well as zebra crossings and more traffic lights (2).

A few people focused their suggestions on keeping Wood Green’s retail/High Road character (5).

**The link to Alexandra Palace**

71 comments

*+ SUPPORT*

The vast majority of people supported the idea of a new link towards Alexandra Palace (37), and many liked its linear design and park like qualities (9).

In general, people supported a better connection to Alexandra Palace either through sightlines (7), Crossrail 2 (3) or a bridge (3).

*— CONCERNS*

A few people were concerned by the proposed bridge above Hornsey reservoir as it would be expensive and the access to the Palace from there would still be difficult because the land is very steep (3).

There was a small amount of concern that the linear link vision seemed unlikely to be achieved because of the blocks that would need to be demolished to deliver it (1).

One person didn’t want to see better links between Wood Green and Alexandra Park as it would diminish the character of each area (1).

*? SUGGESTIONS*

Some people suggested that the link should be pedestrianised (2), or that there should be better transport towards the Palace (1).

There were a couple of suggestions for a cycling path between the Palace and Wood Green (2), as well as more innovative solutions such as a cable car or electric vehicles (2).
The Cultural Quarter
57 comments

+ SUPPORT
A large amount of support came for better access between Wood Green and the Cultural Quarter (14). Alongside this, many also supported the redevelopment and improvement of the Cultural Quarter and Chocolate Factory (10).

- CONCERNS
There were concerns about the redevelopment of the Cultural Quarter, namely around the price of rents increasing (8), possibly causing vulnerable groups to be priced out (4). There was also concern that there would be an overall loss of studio space in the Cultural Quarter (9).

? SUGGESTIONS
The main suggestion for this area was the work spaces should be affordable (7). Specific suggestions included using containers as temporary work spaces (2 comment); improving cycling access in the cultural quarter (1) and more public art and sculpture in the area (1).

STATEMENTS
The Cultural Quarter was cited as a unique space for artists and musicians (1).

Bus garage, River Park House, Vue Cinema area, Civic Centre
43 comments

+ SUPPORT
There was some support for the idea of moving the bus garage (6) and increasing its capacity (1). A little support for the redevelopment of the Civic Centre was seen (1), as well as the notion of housing on this site (1).

- CONCERNS
Mainly, concerns focused around housing being built above the bus garage, as it would be very noisy for residents (6). There were also some concerns that the height of buildings proposed on this site and garage area were too tall (7). There was concern about the parking provision for River Park House (1). A number of people were against demolishing the Civic Centre (4), and using some of the area for housing developments (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
We also saw a number of supportive comments for the development of the Mecca Bingo and Vue Cinema land for a leisure centre (4). A few suggestions were made to demolish River Park House (3). Suggestions about the bus station included that it should be easily accessible (2) and perhaps integrated into the Crossrail station (1). Two people suggested replacing the Vue cinema by, for instance, a swimming pool as the cinema is not using land in an optimal way (2). Some people suggested it would be a good idea to relocate, improve or redevelop the travellers’s site next to the Civic Centre (5).

Around Turnpike Lane station
32 comments

+ SUPPORT
Support in this area was focused around the prospect of a Crossrail 2 station here, linking to Alexandra Palace (18).

- CONCERNS
A number of people expressed concerns that without a Crossrail 2 station at Turnpike Lane, this area would become further run down, especially with activity focused more on the centre of Wood Green (4). People also were concerned at Turnpike Lane’s lack of a landmark (3).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some respondents wanted to see cleaning and enhancing of Turnpike Lane facades in the plans (4). Similarly, some also wanted to see more investment in the evening economy around Turnpike Lane station (5). Additionally, there was suggestions of further activities available on Duckett’s Common (2).
**SUPPORT**
There was a small amount of support for the plans’ integration of Wood Green and Clarendon Road (1).

**CONCERNS**
The main concerns from residents were around the impact changes to Clarendon Road would have on traffic and the movement of people in the area (2).

**SUGGESTIONS**
Someone pointed to the need for a clear road layout along Clarendon Road (1).
WHAT ARE THE HOTTEST TOPICS ABOUT THE TOWN CENTRE AREAS?

**A new Green Link running towards Alexandra Palace**
- 37

**Replacing the Shopping City**
- 32

**A proper and opened up town centre**
- 30

**One central Crossrail 2 station**
- 24

**Crossrail 2 at Turnpike Lane station**
- 18

**A new library at a central location**
- 16

**Cleaning and enhancing of Turnpike Lane facades**
- 4

**More places to sit and socialise in the town centre**
- 7

**Quality shops in the centre**
- 15

**Affordable work spaces in the Cultural Quarter**
- 7

**Demolition of River Park House**
- 3

**Noise for residents living above the bus garage**
- 6

**Central tall buildings creating a dark and over-dense place**
- 6

**Buildings around the current bus garage area too tall**
- 7

**One central Crossrail station**
- 8

**Loosing the Mall completely**
- 14

**Loss of studio space and increase of rent in the Cult. Quarter**
- 17

Top groupings of community comments out of 516 comments on areas
Comments by placemaking qualities

During Stage 3A of the consultation, the four options showed a high-level of possible plans for Wood Green’s future. Already at this scale, it was possible to distinguish if the plans were creating placemaking qualities.

What is placemaking?
That is the ability - mostly through design - to create places that are good for people, the environment, the economics and the identity/culture of an area.

We are listing here what people have said about each of the qualities that are needed to make a good place (reference: matrix of spatial qualities - Werkpartners).

These are very important for the next stage of development of the plan which is called the ‘preferred option’. This will show a more detailed option plan for the area.

WHAT ARE THE TOP 3 PLACEMAKING QUALITIES MOST DISCUSSED?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People’s Well-being</th>
<th>Economic Vitality</th>
<th>Environment Friendliness</th>
<th>Local Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>423 comments on social qualities</td>
<td>271 comments on economic qualities</td>
<td>233 comments on environmental qualities</td>
<td>179 comments on cultural qualities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Walkability & accessibility**
   - Support for the green link, concern about overcrowding, suggestions about disabled and elderly access.

2. **Human scale & slow city**
   - Support for the new town square, concern about tall buildings, suggestions about public spaces and features.

3. **Health**
   - Concern about pollution and flytipping, suggestions about maintenance and bins provision.

### People’s Well-being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walkability &amp; accessibility</strong></td>
<td><strong>Human scale &amp; slow city</strong></td>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Vitality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mix of uses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community-based economy &amp; affordability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Generators &amp; flows distributions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environment Friendliness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource management &amp; clean environment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Flexible design</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Character

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Room for local initiatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Distinctiveness, innovation &amp; wayfinding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Visual harmony</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualities most discussed by the community / Stage 3A (out of 1097 comments)
**WB1. Walkability, area permeability & accessibility for all**
136 comments

**+ SUPPORT**
Strong support came for the linear park that would very much open, give depth to the town centre (34) and create a better route to the Cultural Quarter (9).
Many people liked the town square idea that would provide a central public space accessible for all - especially combined with a new Crossrail 2 station (23).
A large number of participants supported the rearranged street pattern (11) and part pedestrianisation of the area (13), making it easier to access amenities and move around (6).
Several people said that it was good to move the bus garage somewhere else to give more space and safety to pedestrians (4).
Someone liked the new paths such as the one along the railway (1).

**- CONCERNS**
A number of people were concerned about overcrowding that would probably occur with the arrival of Crossrail 2 and the densification of the area (14).
A few people worried about the unclear or 'non-existant' traffic management strategy (5).

**? SUGGESTIONS**
Some people said that the town centre should be more accessible to the disabled and elderly (12) by avoiding steps, narrow openings and alleyways, short traffic light timings, by providing more benches, drop-in/drop-off areas and lifts, by keeping community facilities central in Wood Green.
There were a few suggestions about creating routes through the existing Mail (2) to make it more permeable and about well maintained streets at the back to make is safer (1).

**WB2. Human scale & places to experience, slow down & rest**
95 comments

**+ SUPPORT**
A large number of participants liked the idea of a green open town square to relax, sit and socialize (25) and the green link to do outdoor activities (8).
Some people said that having generally more leisure, recreational and cultural facilities for all - combined with more greenery and public spaces would improve the experience of Wood Green for its residents and visitors (18).
A number of people liked the new pattern of streets that are more human-scale and easy to get around (10).

**- CONCERNS**
A few people were concerned about the height of certain buildings and worried about them being oppressive (11).

**? SUGGESTIONS**
Several people said there should more features to slow down people's rhythm and block out things like noise pollution such as water features, seating areas and outdoor cafes (8).
Some said that there should be even more parks and public spaces (8) and the existing spaces should be better maintained, furnished and equipped (2).
It has been said that the library should contain an indoor public space for different community activities (5).

**WB3. Health**
56 comments

**? SUGGESTIONS**
Many made suggestions on how to have cleaner streets by organising cleaning days, by having better maintenance services or by providing more (recycling) bins (20).
Lots of people liked public places and means of transport that would encourage a more active lifestyle in the area (18).
Even more people had an interest in the provision of healthier food in Wood Green (30) through for instance, a farmers market, a community kitchen, a new food corner or space to grow food locally.

**- CONCERNS**
A few people were concerned about the way to prevent flytipping (1), and more pollution because of the traffic that would increase with the developments (5).
WB4. Functionality
53 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many supported the creation of better and clearer links to make the area more functional (7), public spaces to meet and socialize (8) and a town square to refer to (20) with a main station, a library, a market and a central council presence.

- CONCERNS
Some people said that they found the Mall quite convenient as it was grouping several uses under one roof and that they would miss it if it had to go (3). A couple of people were afraid of loosing the two cinemas (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
A small number of participants said there should be more public outdoor facilities that would create interactions such as Boris bikes, a large TV screen, a speakers corner or an outside gym (7).

Others said there should be more amenities spread throughout the residential developments such as GP’s, schools and children’s centres (4) and a large multigenerational cultural centre that would be used at different times of the day and the week (2).

WB5. People’s security on the street
32 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many liked the idea of making the centre more pedestrian and cyclist friendly (8).

- CONCERNS
Some people had concerns about how to make the area more people friendly with the traffic that would increase with the development of the area (13).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some suggested that pedestrians should be given priority on the streets though improved crossings, street surfaces, railings and optimal pavement widths (6).

The idea to remove parking from the streets and provide more private parking spaces was mentioned (3).

A couple of participants said they liked the idea of a car-free High Road on Sundays (2).

WB6. People & weather
19 comments

- CONCERNS
Some consultees found it a pity to remove totally the Mall as it offers a practical shelter from the weather and a comfortable environment for shopping (3).

There was concern about the fact that tall buildings could overshadow public places and prevent people from enjoying the sun (13).

? SUGGESTIONS
A few suggested to either keep a part of the Mall or to create sheltered arcades, or to place canopies on the High Road (3).

WB7. People’s sense of safety
16 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many liked to see the Mall and Sky City gone as they create unwelcoming, dark, dangerous and unaccessible spaces (5).

- CONCERNS
A number of consultees thought that new uses such as the outdoor market and evening venues would encourage anti-social behaviour (2)

? SUGGESTIONS
Several participants thought there should be better crime prevention supported by a police station in the centre of Wood Green (5).

A few said that the plan should address the dealers and gangs affecting the area around Turnpike Lane (3).

Someone said that there was space missing for an helicopter / air ambulance to land in case of emergency (1).

WB8. Peace & calm
16 comments

+ SUPPORT
Some people said they would like the area free from the noise caused by the traffic, the bus garage and delivery trucks (5).

- CONCERNS
A small number of people said that they were concerned about the combination of uses such as housing above the bus garage or above shops (5).

Others said the new developments would bring even more noise, traffic and pollution to the area (4). So would the construction works some said (2).
Economic Vitality

EV1. Balanced mix of uses
99 comments

+ SUPPORT
People agree that providing the centre with more uses than retail would improve the economy (35). In particular they would like to see a leisure centre, a cultural centre, the market, work spaces as well as food & drink premises including in the evening.

There is a recognition that the redevelopment could bring the desired for improvement to the quality of shops (11).

- CONCERNS
A few people thought the focus was too much on retail (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some people said the mix could be even better if it would include the following: crafts and independent shops, a garden centre, more youth and leisure facilities, large department stores and a theatre (44).

EV2. Community-based economy & affordability
97 comments

+ SUPPORT
Lots of people said they would support truly affordable housing developments for local residents (21) and work space for the local community (8).

Someone said they like the new market space where the community could organise events (1).

- CONCERNS
Many participants said that they were worried that neither the new nor the existing homes and work spaces would be affordable for the local community (19) and that the area would be gentrified (8) and spaces would be sold for investment (3).

? SUGGESTIONS
People feel strongly that local artists and businesses should be helped to remain in Wood Green by providing them affordable studios and retail spaces (26). It was also suggested that the council should help locals create jobs and develop businesses rather than trying to attract developers and large employers (10).

Someone named alternative means of development such as community land trusts and cohousing or coworking places that would make it possible to keep the rent low (1).

EV3. Generators & flows of movement
53 comments

+ SUPPORT
Several participants said that a new Crossrail 2 station either in central Wood Green or at Turnpike Lane station would act as a magnet generate flows of people that would support the local economy (15).

Some people also said that the newly created connections such the linear park would encourage people to visit Wood Green (3) and facilitate the flows through the area (1).

Two consultees said that the library will play the role of a hub and reference point in the area (2).

Someone said that having a Crossrail 2 station at Alexandra Palace would bring more visitors to the venue (1).

- CONCERNS
Some people had concerns about how large flows of cars and people would be managed in such a dense area (27).

? SUGGESTIONS
A few people proposed the council should bring back department stores that would function as generators in the area and would be beneficial to smaller shops (4).

EV4. Ground floor life & activity
16 comments

+ SUPPORT
Some people said an open outdoor market would make the area livelier (4). Others said a new library with openings on the town square would also activate the centre (2). It was also mentioned that a street-based development with shops brought back on the ground level would bring more activity to the area (2). Someone said the better mix of services with more restaurants and bars open in the evening would increase activity and improve safety on the street (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
A few people suggested that there should be even more outdoor leisure activities in the plan (7) such as cafes in park and a street gym.

EV5. Uses clustering & consolidation
6 comments

+ SUPPORT
A number of people liked the idea of combining different uses around the library (5) such as cafes in park, and customer services.

? SUGGESTIONS
There was an idea put forward that shops should be organised by theme with a few specialised areas for food with restaurants near to each other, or a beauty corner with some beauty shops all together (1).
EF1. Resources management & clean environment
74 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many people supported the several proposals to make the air and the streets cleaner such as planting trees (35), improving waste management (12), decreasing the traffic (27).

- CONCERNS
Lots of participants had concern about the fact that the new development would actually create an increase of traffic (28).

? SUGGESTIONS
A number of people said that there was a need of upgrading the sewage, drainage utilities and water management systems in Wood Green (3).
A few consultees suggested that the recycling depot should stay at a walking distance from the town centre (2).

EF2. Biodiversity
70 comments

+ SUPPORT
A large number of participants liked the new green spaces provided by the plans and the project of greening the streets (35).

- CONCERNS
Some said that it was not clear enough how the existing parks would be improved (7).
There was concern about how the green space could be increased in the area is pace must be used for Crossrail stations (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
A number of people said that there should even be more greenery throughout the area (9). Examples ranged from community gardens to pockets parks via little green links and edible landscapes.
Someone said that Ducketts Common could be improved by creating wildflower meadows in the northern area and by implementing café in the park (1).

EF3. Flexible design
57 comments

+ SUPPORT
A large number of people liked the idea of multipurpose facilities such as the cultural centre, leisure centre and modern library that could offer spaces for community-led projects at different times and for different groups (26).
Also the new public spaces such as the town square and green link were seen by many as places where different activities could take place (14).

? SUGGESTIONS
Some participants said that the new retail or housing units should be flexible enough to host different kind of retailers or residents (8), including the disabled (7).
A couple of people said alternative means of transport such as cable cars to Alexandra Palace would be interesting and a low impact on the environment (2).

EF4. Bioclimatic design
32 comments

+ SUPPORT
Many people said that opening up the High Road including removing the Mall’s bridge would bring more light to Wood Green (8).

- CONCERNS
Tall buildings will overshadow the area and public places such as the town square said a number of people (13) which could lower the capacity of new buildings to passively warm up.

? SUGGESTIONS
Some participants said they would like to have a sheltered open space to meet such as shopping arcades or a large open space in the library (8).
A few suggested that environmental friendly solutions such solar panels should be more often used (2).
Someone said that the 4600 homes needed should be eco-friendly buildings (1).
LC1. Room for local initiatives

53 comments

- CONCERNS
A couple of consultees said there was evidence that community-led regeneration plans were best at delivering successful long-term improvements and that the current options were not community led (2).

? SUGGESTIONS
It has been said several times that the new plan should offer space for the existing community of residents and artists to harness local talents and develop bottom up initiatives (13). Examples raised were: an enterprises incubator, a community land trust for artists, coworking, exhibition and performance spaces, community rooms at the library and public art.

It has also been said empty spaces should be made available to the community (2).

A large number of people had an interest in the short-term projects displayed at the public exhibition. 99 different projects have been picked up or described. 36 people have given their contact details to get involved in the development of such community-led projects (36).

LC2. Distinctiveness, innovation & wayfinding

45 comments

+ SUPPORT
Several consultees said that particular elements such as the green link, a new Crossrail 2 station, new public spaces, markets, cultural facilities - such as The Green Rooms - will make Wood Green a new attractive destination in London and a unique place residents are proud of (13).

Some participants said that the new urban structure replacing the Shopping City presented in Options 3 and 4 would provide Wood Green with a new distinctive identity (6).

It was mentioned that the plans would offer better views to the Alexandra Palace (3), that landmarks would make it easier to move around the place (4) and that removing the bridge would clear the view on the High Road (1).

- CONCERNS
A small number of individuals were concerned about big changes - such as the Mall being knocked down - which would significantly change the look and character of Wood Green (3).

? SUGGESTIONS
A number of people told us that there should be bolder and more special elements in the plan such as public art and iconic landmarks (8).

Some people said that besides landmarks / tall buildings, public art such as murals and sculptures would help provide local reference points as well (6).

Someone said the new shopping centre should be as attractive as before where people were travelling miles to come to Wood Green (1).

LC3. Visual harmony

39 comments

+ SUPPORT
Lots of people said that they were happy to see the outdated and oppressive Mall go and facades on High Road cleaned of clutter and improved (29).

- CONCERNS
There were a few concerns about the tall buildings proposed opposite Turnpike Lane station as it would be oppressive and out-of-place (1).

There was also someone worried about a totally new-built centre that might look very clinical. Retaining part of the Mall would resolve this (1).

? SUGGESTIONS
Suggestions about new buildings were that there should be a certain standard of quality (4) and that they should be well integrated with the existing (1) for instance, by gradually increasing the height toward the centre.

A few people said that planting trees, improving pavement surfaces and installing special features such as fountains would help very much to improve the visual appearance of public spaces and residential streets (3).
LC4. Integration with the existing & heritage-enhancement
29 comments

+ SUPPORT
People often said that it was good that historic facades on the High Road and listed buildings - such as the stations - would be kept and improved (9).

- CONCERNS
A couple of participants were concerned about distinctive buildings - such as the Mall, the Mall’s bridge, some Victorian houses, the library and the gas works being demolished because these give character and are historical elements of Wood Green (15).

? SUGGESTIONS
A few people said that it would be better to restore the old buildings and protect the heritage, even from the 20th century (5).

LC5. Variety & serendipity
13 comments

+ SUPPORT
Some people said the new (or better promoted) varied mix of uses (7) - including (existing) cultural and makers activities - combined with new remarkable spaces (4) such as the linear park, pocket parks and green roofs in the Cultural Quarter would improve the experience of Wood Green.

- CONCERNS
A few people were afraid that the new buildings and uses would not offer enough variety as it looks like the plan offers mainly space for large chain stores and not independent or multicultural shops and spaces (2).
CHAPTER 05
FINDINGS ON SHORT-TERM PROJECTS IDEAS

As many of the participants had expressed an interest in short-term projects at the public exhibition in 2015, we had allocated a space for these during the second exhibition in spring 2016 which was about testing four broad options for Wood Green’s Future plan.

Short-term projects brochure
A brochure (see in appendices) has been developed to show the projects that people chose as either an ‘initiator’, a person who suggested a project or a ‘supporter’, a person who backs a proposed project.

The intention is that these participants and others come together to form Wood Green LAB (Local Actions Band). In the spirit of exchange and with permission from participants, we have included contact details with each of the groups projects on page xx of the brochure.

The ideas that you will find in the brochure are often small-scale, quick-to-realise, low-budget, community-led projects.

For clarity we have grouped the projects into the following headings:
• Sustainable transport (38 interested)
• Incredible food (34 interested)
• Extraordinary events (33 interested)
• Cultural activities (32 interested)
• Distinctive retail (28 interested)
• Making & sharing economy (28 interested)
• Community socials (27 interested)
• Creative links & movement (27 interested)
• Active lifestyle (26 interested)
• Placemaking initiatives (23 interested)
• Attractive landmarks (21 interested)
• Playful spaces (20 interested)
• Housing for all (14 interested)

Please find a selection of the most popular ideas on the next pages.
Most popular short-term projects ideas
Quick tips to go further
Below you can find a list of local groups and other kind of organisations that are able to help Wood Green communities to take their short-term project ideas further. These provide expertise, funding, material, networks, volunteers and/or land.

Organisations in or around Wood Green
- Big Green Bookshop Education biggreeneducation.co.uk
- Collage Arts collage-arts.org
- Friends of Ducketts Common duckettscommonhome.blogspot.co.uk
- Haringey 4020 haringey4020.org.uk
- Haringey Allotments Forum haringeyallotmentforum.org.uk
- Haringey Cycling Campaign haringeycyclists.org
- Haringey Federation of Residents Associations haringeyresidents.org
- Haringey Friends of Parks Forum haringeyfriendsofparks.org.uk
- Haringey Solidarity Group haringey.org.uk
- Harringay Online harringayonline.com
- HAVCO - Haringey Association of Voluntary and Community Organisations havcoharingey.org.uk
- Noel Park Team and Network noelparknet.ning.com
- Park Malvern Residents Association pmra.co.uk
- Sustainable Haringey Wikispace sustainable-haringey.wikispaces.com
- The Business Lounge haringey.gov.uk/business/advice-and-support/business-lounge
- Tree Trust for Haringey ttfh.org.uk
- Turnpike Arts Group (TAG) turnpikeartgroup.co.uk/
- Wood Green Business Forum haringey.gov.uk/regeneration/wood-green/boosting-local-business
- Wood Green Central Library Groups goo.gl/PAFfhg
- Your own organisation!

Organisations beyond Wood Green
- Alec Dickson Trust aledicksontrust.org.uk
- Bags for Help Grants groundwork.org.uk/Sites/tescocommunityscheme
- Better Block betterblock.org
- Big Lottery Fund & Awards for All biglotteryfund.org.uk
- B&Q Waste Donation Scheme diy.com/corporate/community/wastedonation
- Crowdfinder crowdfunder.co.uk
- Ford Britain Trust ford.co.uk/fbtrust
- Freecycle freecycle.org
- Good Gym goodgym.org
- Groundwork groundwork.org.uk
- Incredible Edible Network incredibleediblenetwork.org.uk
- Living streets UK livingstreets.org.uk
- Locality locality.org.uk
- Morrisons Fondation morrisonsfoundation.com
- National Community Land Trust communitylandtrusts.org.uk
- O2 Think Big o2thinkbig.co.uk
- Park(ing) Day parkingday.org
- Prince’s Foundation princes-foundation.org
- Small World Urbanism smallworldurbanism.com
- Social Landscapes sociallandscapes.co.uk
- Spacehive crowdfunding spacehive.com/Initiatives/mayoroflondon
- Sustrans sustrans.org.uk
- The Edible Bus Stop theediblebusstop.org
- The Tudor Trust tudortrust.org.uk
- Transition Towns Network transitionnetwork.org
- UK Cohousing Network cohousing.org.uk
- YouthBank youthbank.org/Grants

Get involved
If you are interested in taking part in such community-led projects, connect with people that you can find in the Short-term projects brochure (appendix to this report) on page xx or contact Soundings on:

- 020 7729 1705
- WoodGreensFuture@soundingsoffice.com
- Wood Green’s Future
  at Soundings
  148 Curtain Road
  London EC2A 3AT
CHAPTER 06
NEXT STEPS

Wood Green LAB kick-off
Soundings is in contact with the 36 community members that are interested in initiating or supporting short-term projects. There will be an event organised this summer to launch the start of the Wood Green LAB (Local Actions Band). Please let us know if you want to be part of the group.

Coproduction process
The project team is now analysing the findings and integrating the different stakeholder views into the plan. To make sure the ideas, concerns and potentials of major stakeholders are taken well into account in the plan, the project team is working in a coproduction mode by area and topic with several relevant representatives, including members of the Community Liaison Group (CLG) in place.

Public consultations
Consultation Stage 3B
Informed by the consultation findings on the broad scenarios, the preferred plan will be consulted in late summer/autumn 2016, after which a Statement of Consultation will be produced, showing how the views of local people and stakeholders have helped shape the plans for Wood Green’s Future.

Consultation Stage 4
The findings from the Stage 3 of the consultation process will be used to adapt and finalise the preferred plan. The plan will then be presented to the public and stakeholders in Stage 4. This will be the last stage of consultation on the wider Wood Green project. This last step will be only about the legal compliance of the document.

How to get involved
There are several ways of being involved in this long-term regeneration process:
- Become a member of your residents association or another specific local organisation that is part of Wood Green’s Future plan’s CLG - Community Liaison Group (see stakeholder map page 18);
- If your living area doesn’t have a residents association, form a group (even informal) and elect representatives to be able to join the CLG.
- Become a member of the Wood Green LAB (Local Actions Band) to develop short-term projects. If you want to be contacted by members of the LAB group, please send an email to Soundings (see email below);
- Take part in the next statutory consultation (Stage 3B).

Contact us
To ask any questions or to let us know you would like to be involved and receive future updates, please contact the Wood Green’s Future team at Soundings on:

020 7729 1705
WoodGreensFuture@soundingsoffice.com
Wood Green’s Future at Soundings
148 Curtain Road
London EC2A 3AT

You can also keep up to date on the web by visiting:

www.haringey.gov.uk/woodgreen
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