

ADDENDUM: ADDITIONAL APPENDIX

Submitted in response to the Wood Green Area Action Plan Regulation 18 Consultation 14 February – 30 April 2017. Submitted by and on behalf of affected residents.

We deal with two issues below:

- 1. Impact of our proposed improvements on the AAP's proposed deliverable goals**
- 2. Misrepresentation of 2016 consultation report during the current consultation**

#1. Impact of our proposed improvements on the AAP's proposed deliverable goals

The combined area of our homes (Caxton, Mayes and Coburg) is 0.67Ha (2sf) which constitutes 16% (2sf) of the 4.1Ha of WG SA9 (AAP, p124)

Therefore if our proposed 16% is preserved, 84% of "Indicative development capacity" would remain (p124), ie. in approximate terms:

- Net residential units would go from 825 to 693. A gross loss of 132 (whilst retaining our 65 homes*) = net loss of 67 homes
- Employment sqm would go from 11,655 to 9,790; a loss of 1,865 sqm
- Town Centre sqm would go from 23,311 to 19,581; a loss of 3,730 sqm

Considering the impact to the whole of AAP outcomes (p166):

- Overall Wood Green AAP residential unit growth impact = **less than 1%**
- Impact to 'Social Housing' (assuming social housing targets achieved) = **0.2%**
- Overall Wood Green AAP Employment growth impact = **less than 2%**
- Overall Wood Green AAP Town Centre growth impact = **5%** (this can of course easily be rebalanced by less 'removal of primary shopping area' as shown in fig.7.2 (AAP, p70)

This seems a more than reasonable compromise in the interests of saving our homes, community and historic buildings.

*Interestingly, using the LP density matrix of 405 dwellings per hectare from Table 3A.2 of the London plan (as the AAP does), our 0.67Ha of streets represent a potential of 271 homes; or, using 70 sqm per unit, a more reasonable 96 homes, ie. about 3 flats per large Victorian house. That is, retaining structures intact and allowing future reusing of existing housing efficiently and without environmental waste. (Many of these houses are already contain 3 flats and at least one of the properties contains 6 flats).

It is therefore reasonable to assert that:

- Net residential units would go from 825 to 693. A gross loss of 132 (whilst retaining our *potentially* 95 homes) = **a net loss of 37 homes.**
- Overall Wood Green AAP residential unit growth impact: **less than 0.5%**
 - **Insignificant 0.1% impact to 'social housing'** = 8 homes (assuming social housing targets are achieved). This is very similar to the social housing already available/provided on these streets. So **no net difference to social housing.**

Saving our homes, community and historic buildings therefore entails very

little (and entirely reasonable and justifiable) compromise to the AAP goals.

#2. Misrepresentation of 2016 consultation report during the current consultation

The Wood Green AAP is currently the “Regulation 18 Preferred Option Consultation Draft”. This ‘preference’ refers to the **Council’s ‘preferred Option 4’** (also known as ‘Option 4: Significant Transformation’) presented in the 2016 plans.

During the 14 February to 31 March 2017 consultations, Council officers and Councillors have made repeated reference to the “overwhelming public support” (and other assertions to that effect) for option 4 of the 2016 AAP. This, however, is **highly misleading**, as summarised below:

- Assertions of ‘overwhelming support’ are based on the 2016 consultation, the report of which is available here:
http://www.haringey.gov.uk/sites/haringeygovuk/files/wood_greens_future_issues_and_options_consultation_report_0.pdf

The report confirms (pp3 and 27) that there were **only 1,688 comments** submitted, with **only around 270 in support of Option 4**. About 80 were “concerned” and a further 65 “unsure”, making Option 4 only marginally more popular than Options 1, 2, or 3, and certainly **much less than a majority** (270 of 1,688 comments = 15%). **The claim of ‘overwhelming support’ is therefore unsustainable.**

- 1,688 comments collected from a population of approximately 267,541 (<http://www.haringey.gov.uk/local-democracy/about-council/facts-and-figures/statistics/population-estimates>) does not constitute extensive consultation.
- A local resident who attended the 2016 consultation reported:
 - “I attended the consultation at the high road shop. The four boards were on display and a nice lady offered to explain it all to me. She worked for Haringey and there were also workers from Fluid. She showed me the boards and was very much encouraging me to vote for 'the best' ie option 4. She was very dismissive of my comments that I liked the library and other features. I queried where the people in sky city would go and she said they would be rehoused somewhere. She had no details. She didn't show me that Caxton road would be demolished. When I asked about where the river would be, as pictured, she said that was Venice and just there to give an impression. The man from Fluid said the purpose was to make Wood Green like Kingston on Thames, as that was top of the metropolitan centres in London and Wood Green is bottom. The aim is to get in shops with large frontages, i think he called it footplates, so that people come to Wood Green from other boroughs to spend their money, whereas now local people travel out to other boroughs for the shops.” Polly

This suggests that **contrary to the aims of ‘consultation’** (assumed to be a neutral exercise in which the views of the public on a range of options are sought, and an objective decision on the outcome is based on those views), **the Council already had a preferred option** which they promoted during the consultation exercise. At the very least, it suggests that a

bias towards option 4 might be expected in the consultation results.

- Option 4 is the only option that included our homes.
- **Our petition** (currently standing at **1400+ signatories**) **represents over 5 times as many people specifically objecting to the destruction of our roads**, than were inclined or persuaded towards Option 4, and **over 7 times the net support for Option 4.**
- We contend **that no-one opted for supporting ‘Option 4: Significant Transformation’ with the understanding that it would entail the destruction of so many homes**, and with such adverse effects on family lives and communities. As noted in our previous submissions, even residents on the affected streets were not aware that the AAP would entail the destruction of their homes, as this information was buried in the documentation on Haringey’s web-page. It is unlikely, then, that those who responded to the 2016 consultation did so on an informed basis and in full knowledge of the implications of Option 4.
- Haringey Council have conceded that the 2016 consultations were inadequate and that it was not sufficiently viable, on the basis of the data in the 2016 consultation report, to proceed with the process of making Option 4 policy. This necessitated running a second round of consultation (the current Regulation 18 consultation of 2017), in which only one ‘preferred option’ is offered. As a result of public pressure, this consultation period was extended to the end of April. This is an implicit recognition that **those who would be most directly affected by the destruction of their homes did not feel they had had adequate information or time to respond.**
- In a meeting with residents of the affected streets, it was acknowledged that the 2016 consultations did not reach those who would be most directly affected: ie. the residents of Caxton, Mayes and Coburg Rds, in the sense that the Council received no submissions from this area. **Had those residents been aware of the implications of Option 4 at that stage, it is certain that they would have raised objections, making it highly unlikely that Option 4 would have attracted majority support.**
- During the Section 18 regulation consultation process, it has become abundantly clear that there are considerable objections to the scale of Option 4, with residents calling for a more ‘organic’, ‘human-scale’ and ‘incremental’ approach to development.

Taking all of the above into account, we again urge the Council to reformulate the AAP to avoid the unnecessary and unjustified destruction of our homes.

