

27 October 2010

Haringey Council

Dear Sir

Objection to change of use of the Pinkham Way site

I understand that you are currently consulting on the change of use for the Pincham Way site. As a local resident and council tax payer I would like to register that I do not agree with the proposal to change the use of the site from employment to industrial land.

I strongly object to this re-designation for the following reasons:

1. The loss of the caveat to protect the nature conservation is a major change to the protection this site would receive and, consequently, there is a likelihood of losing this ecologically rich and valuable site, which is one of only nine Haringey sites designated Grade 1 of Borough Importance for Nature Conservation.
2. It will widen the range of uses on the site to include heavy industrial uses, with all their potential for noise, pollution and traffic congestion. The environmental impact of using the site for industrial use will be too great, particularly when the site is very close to a built up residential area and local schools.
3. Re-designation will mean the site will become vulnerable to Policy 4.4 of the London Plan which directs local authorities in London to identify Locally Significant Industrial Sites that might be suitable for waste management and I do not agree with this.
4. The proposal is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and the re-consultation document (CSSD-3) has no new evidence. The updated Sustainability Appraisal which has been produced by Hyder Consulting UK Limited to provide further evidence in support of this re-consultation does not contain any new evidence to support this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site.
5. There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as Metropolitan Open Land designation, alternative Local Green Space designation (or local SLOL designation?) or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.
6. It is not consistent with national policy: PPS 9 is the overarching framework in which policies should be developed - particularly para

- 9, which states that networks of natural habitats provide a valuable resource.
7. It does not accord with Regional Policy: see The London Plan in particular
 8. It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation is removed or substantially compromised. The Council's own additional evidence points out in relation to the Friern Barnet site in particular that any development on the site has potential to have biodiversity impacts because it is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.
 9. Haringey Council have carried out limited consultation and has failed to adequately consult local people and inform them of the re-consultation.
 10. The loss of land for employment use and the impact this will have on creating new jobs

As a result I do not think the re-designation should be approved or go ahead.

Yours faithfully

Steve Eddy