

**From:** mark jacobs

**Sent:** 01 November 2011 19:05

**To:** LDF

**Cc:**

**Subject:** Core Strategy re-consultation

I wish to object to Haringey's ongoing attempt to re-designate Pinkham Wood (the former Friern Barnet Sewage treatment site) as 'industrial', and thus diminish its conservation status.

I wish to do so due my belief that it is not based upon 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.

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 Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

Re-designation would not be 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.

Re-designation would not accord with Regional Policy: See The London Plan in particular [Policy 7 \(7.14 and 7.18-7.21\)](#)

Further 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 (p6 of [Hyder Addendum SA](#)). The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

In the Core Strategy pre-submission draft the site was designated Employment Land with supporting evidence for this designation. If this is correct why did the Haringey Council change the designation following consultation? What evidence has emerged for such a change of designation LSIS?

By the Councils own admission 'pre-application discussions' have influenced this re-designation. These discussions relate to the proposal by North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council to construct a massive MBT waste processing plant (to deal with up to 300,000 tonnes of waste per year) and Barnet Council's proposal to relocate its refuse vehicle depot (for vehicles it uses for waste collection and passenger transport and for parking space for Barnet Council's fleet of refuse/ recycling and staff vehicles, plus a small office/ storage building and a refuelling station). Such pre-application discussions' should not be allowed to have any such influence.

The re-designation is not is not soundly based upon robust or credible evidence and I object.

Mark Jacobs

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.