

**Subject:** FW: Consultation on Wood Green AAP

**From:** Lukas Lehmann  
**Sent:** 31 March 2017 12:51  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** Consultation on Wood Green AAP

Dear Haringey Planning team,

I writing to you to raise my concerns about the proposed Wood Green AAP.

While I welcome the council's ambition to improve the area, I am deeply concerned that in its current form, it will not only not improve the area but actually make things worse.

My main reasons for this are:

1. Lack of suitable consultation in proportion to the scope of the scheme.

The scheme, presented on the scale that it currently is, is far beyond what ordinary members of the community can comment on. At public events, details such as those supplied in Chapter 8 were not really presented. Moreover covering all these details would have taken hours and hours and they should be conducted near those sites being discussed.

Proper consultation should be based on a site by site discussion with nothing confirmed until local challenges be taken into account.

Haringey should be devoting resources into promoting community involvement in this process, not just having consultants in shopping malls, but encouraging the creation of neighbourhood forums and neighbourhood plans. This will not only deliver better sites, but also more sustainable long term outcomes.

2. Insufficient resolution of or consideration of the traffic problem

Wood Green and the surrounding area are blighted by traffic. Recent "improvements" to the high street have had little positive effect and many people report they have made things worse. Certainly the money spent near Turnpike Lane station has been a near total waste. At present the only surviving improvements are 1 tree, 1 bench and one ornamental acorn. The ridiculous mis-installed bike parking remains in place.

Your own SWOT analysis highlights the challenge that traffic poses for the area, and some elements (such as more local office space) will help. However there should be a comprehensive analysis done of the impact of this scheme on traffic, both in the short term (during demolition and construction) and longer term once completed. Promoting alternate forms of transport (walking, cycling) needs to take centre stage, and the focus on creating experiences for local people that face away from busy roads.

A redevelopment of the high street has the potential to achieve this - shops could be oriented in such a way that they don't face out onto the high street but rather the avenues running in parallel to the West and East.

I am a big fan of pedestrianizing but this needs to happen at the same time of creating alternative flows of traffic that do not reduce the quality of life for local people.

### 3. Value for money

No consideration appears to be given to the value for money of certain aspects of the scheme. The compulsory purchase of leaseholders property will be expensive enough. Where, as appears to be the plan in Caxton road and surrounding area this extends out with current council land this will be extremely expensive and appears to add little to the scheme, certainly not in proportion to the likely cost. More affordable plans need to be explored including the possible retention of structures, particularly for historic buildings.

If the VFM calculations are only based on the increase in land value that the scheme will generate, this is a false saving as it will actually make life in the area less affordable and serve as a dampener on innovation and business growth.

### 4. Impact on local community

My final concern is the impact the proposed scheme, along with its sister schemes across Haringey will have on the local community. Demolition, relocation and redevelopment on this scale will blight people's lives, tear apart existing structures and unsettle the area for most likely a generation (certainly your proposed timescales are very unrealistic).

This has a real and practical cost, both in terms social infrastructure and social capital and ultimately well-being and health.

The redevelopment needs to be scaled down in such a way where one section is developed at a time, completed and resettled before another section can be worked on, if the community is to remain at all intact. The proposed timescales would make this impossible.

As such I propose that the decision is taken to include a provision in the area plan that clearly commits to working WITH local people to develop plans for the sites affected by this plan, taking into account local needs, value for money, traffic and community capacity to engage.

Kind regards,

Lukas Lehmann