From: MARIAN HONE Sent: 29 October 2011 13:58 To: LDF Cc:

**Subject:** Consultation on reclassification of he sse of Pinkham Way site Dear Sir/Madam, I am very concerned about the proposed reclassification of the Pinkham Way site in North London from employment to Industrial Use.

I think this is toally unsuitable, in terms of environmental impact, for a densely populated area like London given that it is close to residential population and schools.

The site has previously been listed as green space and should be protected as such for the benefit of the health of Londoners and to avoid additional pollution. London needs its "green lung". I am a city girl who has grown up near busy roads and when younger, unwittingly lived near to industrial pollution from industry in Liverpool. As a result I suffered from bronchitis in my 20s and again when I moved to London and lived on the Archway Road and again when I lived at my present location in N8 also on a busy road. Bronchitis is known to be caused by pollution (research has shown) and as a result of repeated infections I developed adult onset chronic asthma. I fear that another polluting industrial site (as it's known that a waste plant is proposed for the site ,and change of classification would make it difficult to prevent that), would further diminish my health and that of my fellow North Londoners shortening our lives.

Recent research has also shown that London is not meeting its agreed air pollution targets and much air pollution comes from Europe. How much worse it would be with a waste plant in our midst. It would probably mean the early death of me and other people with lung conditions already struggling with existing pollution levels.

Have health and equality/inequality impacts been taken into account? I note that George Osborne and Eric Pickles fought against having a waste plant in their constituencies. Is it assumed that it can then be foisted on poorer areas with less clout with the government?

The consultation that was first carried out was very limited and Haringey Council failed to adequately consult local people or inform them of the consultation.

Land for employment use will be lost with potential adverse inpact on the creation of new jobs.

Haringey council is meant to represent the best interests of all its people not just consider financial benefits on their own but in any case once the effects of pollution, continuing to miss European pollution targets and health impact are taken into account I'm sure the overall financial impact would be negative.

It could make lots of North London areas undesirable for young families and others to live resulting eventually in reduced rateable values and rates. It's not a far sighted policy. Councils

file:///S|/EN/PEP&P/BunF/AllF/Ch. Execs data/COMMON/Local Develo...ved/Duly made/Printed/Printed and on spreadsheet/Marian Hone.htm

should be looking after London not damaging its long term future.

I can't believe that this is seriously under consideration by intelligent politicians. It seems to display a total lack of vision and would go down as another failure by Haringey to add to the failure to monitor expenditure and value for money re Ally Pally in the 80s, the loss of council taxpayers money to Icelandic Banks and the failure of council IT systems resulting in a waste of money. Please strive to increase rather than diminish Haringey Council's reputation with Haringey residents.

(Unfortunately I am not able to use any formal forms to respond as I've had to eliminate certain software due to my low memory PC being almost on zero memory in spite of removal of nearly all saved documents, photos etc)

Yours worriedly Marian Hone

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