

# PINKHAM WAY ALLIANCE LIMITED

c/o Hollickwood School,  
Sydney Road,  
Muswell Hill  
N10 2NL

September 13, 2011

Mr Kevin Crompton  
Chief Executive  
London Borough of Haringey  
River Park House  
225 High Road  
London N22 8HQ

& by e-mail: [kevin.crompton@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:kevin.crompton@haringey.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Crompton,

## **Haringey Core Strategy – Further Regulation 27 Consultation on Fundamental Changes**

With reference to Sections **1.2** and **1.3** of LBH's letter to the Inspector of 28<sup>th</sup> July last, PWA Ltd makes the following observations.

The Council uses the phrase in Section **1.2** 'in the interests of fairness and natural justice' regarding the re-consultation. What were the principles which governed the Regulation 27 consultation in November 2010?

Section **1.3** states that the re-consultation 'will fully accord with...the Council's Statement of Community Involvement'. We understand the phrase 'fully accord' to mean acting in the spirit of the SCI as set out in Section 1.1-1.3, as well as observing the letter.

Having spoken to Mrs Whehelan yesterday, we note that the Council is limiting direct contact to their 'consultees' database'. Although we understand from Mrs Whehelan that this does, happily, include schools, the remainder of the list includes anyone who has responded to a council consultation, an inaccurate and random approach to an issue concentrated in one area of the borough. Residents in Haringey, Barnet and Enfield who live locally to the Pinkham Way site, who will be the most affected by the NLWA plans of which the redesignation of this site is the first step, and to whom a reading of the SCI would give a legitimate expectation of being consulted, are unreasonably omitted from direct contact.

Yet there is clear provision in Appendix 2 of the SCI for leafleting, as was clearly pointed out in Section 15 of our submission of June 1<sup>st</sup> 2011. This would seem ideal and desirable in this case. How does the Council reconcile this omission with the thrust of both the very front page of the SCI ('**who will it affect?**') and of Sections 1 and 2, especially Section **1.3** '...consulting the community in planning and development issues which affect **where they live..**'. In addition, how can the Council show that it is meeting

the aspirations of the first two bullet points of Section **2.4 –‘reaches more people....demonstrates to the community that their views are heard’?**

With 14 methods for Community Involvement listed in appendix 2 of the SCI – all of which are available in this case - why is the Council, having been found at significant fault in the previous consultation, using only those methods which accord with the Planning Regulations? The essence of an SCI is a commitment by an LPA to a proactive approach to achieve enhanced consultation, yet, having generated such a depth of local hostility for the secrecy of its approach in November 2010 – and having been found at fault in doing so - the Council is not seizing this partial opportunity to regain some ground with residents, who will draw their own conclusions.

While we are pleased to see that the length of the consultation has been restored to the required legal period of six weeks, we see little effective difference between this re-consultation and the original consultation of November 2010.

The Council's attitude to promulgation contrasts starkly with the consultation on a recent traffic calming scheme in the Bounds Green area, where questionnaires were sent by the Council to every household in the district. Everyone had their right to respond, even in a small local traffic scheme.

We would be interested to hear the Council's views on the contrast in its attitude to consultation on these two schemes, the first, as we say, a minor local traffic scheme, where the consultation has been both willing and transparent, and the secretive and minimal conduct of the second, a consultation about the most profound change in NW Haringey for more than a generation.

Pinkham Way Alliance Ltd anticipates an early reply to these very real concerns. In addition, since the Council has set a precedent by including residents in Barnet and Enfield in the consultations on the planning applications for Pinkham Way, are these residents' responses to be included in this consultation, and if not, why not?

Yours sincerely,

Stephen Brice  
Director

cc – Allison Ingham, PINS