

**From:**

**Sent:** 02 November 2011 10:12

**To:** LDF

**Cc:** Dorfman Marc

**Subject:** Objection to proposed redesignation of Pinkham Way (Core Strategy re-consultation)

Dear Sirs

I wish to object to the proposal for the redesignation of land in order to facilitate a recycling plant at Pinkham Way for the following reasons:

- 1) If you go forward with this redesignation you will be opening Haringey to a whole raft of applications for the redesignation of similar land. In effect you will be actively encouraging developers to use this decision as a legal precedent and thereby turn any remaining green spaces in Haringey into an industrial wasteland. This in turn could make Haringey vulnerable to legal action by the department responsible for safeguarding the London Plan (Policy 4.4) - a legal action which could reverse any decision taken and consume vast amounts of Haringey money. It also goes counter to your own avowed Core Strategy.
- 2) This redesignation of the land can only be made possible if the existing 'Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature' designation is removed or compromised. Therefore the plan cannot be implemented without action to change this listing.
- 3) There is no evidence that a proper consultation was held prior to the original change in the designation of this land. Where is the evidence that made Haringey change their mind over the original designation? If this change was made as a result of 'pre-application discussions', (as you have indicated) you must immediately reveal the specific parties to these discussions, the content of such discussions and the cost-benefit formulae applied. No action can be taken before this information has been publicly aired and reacted to.
- 4) The proposal does not conform to either Regional Policy (ie the London Plan) or National Policy which specifically countermands this type of change.
- 5) Haringey has not supplied any evidence as to whether they have actually considered the validity of this strategy and compared it to the many alternatives available. If alternatives exist - as we know they do - these must be submitted in evidence and details concerning the viability of alternative sites must be made public.
- 6) No credible evidence for this proposal was made available to the public during the first consultation. And as things stand the reconsultation document provides no new evidence on the matter. Does this mean that no actual evidence in favour of a redesignation exists? If it does exist, then it must be made public and available to all parties and reviewed in full before any redesignation can proceed. In short, both consultation processes were seriously flawed and must be immediately re-held with credible and peer-reviewed evidence.

Yours faithfully

Edward Graham MA (Oxon)

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---