<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Name</th>
<th>Unique Representor Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Unrepresentor</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CGMS/MOPA C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>Recommendation: The document can be made sound through recognition that policing facilities would be appropriate in Strategic Industrial Locations and Locally Significant Industrial Sites, ensuring consistency with national and regional policy.</td>
<td>In line with the NPPF and the London Plan, the Council accepts the further representation made by CGMS on behalf of the Police.</td>
<td><em>Policing and other community safety infrastructure proposed within the employment land hierarchy will be dealt with on an individual site basis and with due regard to the provisions of the London Plan. * In addition, we will revise the first sentence in para 5.1.10 to read as follows: * &quot;These are well established industrial areas and the aim is to retain them solely for uses that fall within B1 (a) to (d) or B2 or B8 uses or uses that share strong similarities to this use class for example policing and other community safety infrastructure</em>&quot;, in line with National and Regional guidance. This amendment means part of the last sentence in paragraph 5.1.10 should be deleted as follows: <em>but will not permit any change of use from those listed above</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGMS/MOPA C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The revisions set out to the Local Plan: Strategic Policies do not include any changes to policy SP8 Employment or its supporting text in respect of allowing uses similar in nature to B class uses, such as providing facilities, in Locally Significant Industrial Sites. Since the submission of our written statement to the Examination on behalf of the MOPAC/MPS in June 2011 on this issue, the London Plan (July 2011) and the NPPF (March 2012) have been published. It is considered that these combined with other material considerations justify such a change, and that the same change is now necessary in respect of Strategic Industrial Locations (SILs).</td>
<td>See Council’s response to ref 7/17/mmods</td>
<td>See Council’s response to ref 7/17/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The GLA’s view, expressed within the Mayor’s revised statement of general conformity dated 20th April 2011, and the subsequent statement of common ground between Haringey and Council and the GLA, dated 31st May 2011, is that Haringey Core Strategy is in general conformity with the London Plan. The modifications proposed do not affect this view.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THFC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>THFC objects to modification 28 and, specifically, the designation of High Road West, N17 (formerly DEA 9) and White Hart Lane, N17 (formerly DEA 17) as Locally Significant Industrial Sites, which it sees as a retrograde step in the regeneration of Tottenham. THFC continues to seek their designation, instead, as Local Employment Areas (Regeneration Area).</td>
<td>Objection noted. In previous consultations, the Council stated that it would apply flexibility, as encouraged by central government, in seeking ways through which development on these sites can be made viable especially in supporting Tottenham’s regeneration. Furthermore, the Council’s updated Employment Study (2012) supports additional flexibility and choice on these sites in order for future development proposals to be well integrated with wider initiatives being developed and implemented in Tottenham. THFC also notes that “the hierarchy of sites will be further reviewed to take account of economic circumstances and the advice from the Mayor of London through an additional planning document such as the intended Site Allocations DPD”, further detail on Modification 28 will be included in the Inspector’s Final Report.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>Thames Water welcomes the additional sentence on water saving targets.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>58 Unsound</td>
<td>Modification Ref: 17-114-09 Proposed Change Include text along the following lines in the sewage services paragraph: “Proposals for waste water treatment infrastructure development that are necessary to provide capacity to meet predicted demand and to meet environmental standards set by the Environment Agency, such as the Deephams Sewage Works Upgrade, will be supported in principle. LB Haringey will work with Thames Water and the Environment Agency to ensure that adequate and appropriate waste water treatment infrastructure is provided to meet environmental standards and planned demand and that new development takes place in tandem with the waste water treatment infrastructure necessary to accommodate it.”</td>
<td>Noted. The Council doesn’t consider this change is needed to ensure soundness of the Local Plan however, this change could be inserted as a factual update following receipt of the Inspector’s final Report.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Franks</td>
<td>71 Unsound</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Franks</td>
<td>71 Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further change required.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Franks</td>
<td>71 Unsound</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Franks</td>
<td>71 Unsound</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Franks</td>
<td>71 Unsound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy).

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate and appears misleading.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LIS.

Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy).

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LIS.

Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.
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Barry James 92 Unsound

Since these first four SINCs adjoin each other and together represent an important open space within the community, it seems completely inappropriate not to mention them together.

I would also like to support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc in the policy box, a fourth bullet point should be added to the effect:

"SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holloway Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified separately by the Council.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed

Barry James 92 Unsound

While I support the modification to SP8 made by you, it does not entirely remove the uncertainty associated with the status of the land at Pinkham Way. The Council gave evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. It hasn’t been used an industrial site for decades, and in reality had been used by the community as additional open space to play, walk dogs and generally enjoy the outdoors. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Barry James 92 Unsound

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. It hasn’t been used an industrial site for decades, and in reality had been used by the community as additional open space to play, walk dogs and generally enjoy the outdoors. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Barry James 92 Unsound

I would also like to support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc in the policy box, a fourth bullet point should be added to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

Barry James 92 Unsound

I would also like to support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc in the policy box, a fourth bullet point should be added to the effect:

"The Council considers the site to be brownfield.  The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed

Barry James 92 Unsound

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified separately by the Council.

No further action proposed

Chris Elser 94 Unsound

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

Chris Elser 94 Unsound

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

Chris Elser 94 Unsound

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

Chris Elser 94 Unsound

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

"The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representative Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Bound</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Elser</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Elser</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. I attended and spoke at the examination and most of the submissions were with regard to the proposed re-designation of the Pinkham Way site. It should be made clear that the site is an employment land site and not an industrial site. In fact, the evidence presented showed it should be defined as an open space and not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land.</td>
<td>The protection of the SINCs status has not altered.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Barry Rawlings</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LUS.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanassiou</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanassiou</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: 'SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.’ I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanassiou</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: 'SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.’ I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanassiou</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LUS.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Unique Repre. Number</td>
<td>Unsound/Boon d</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Council's Response</td>
<td>Council's proposed action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etore Romei</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I welcome the changes made by the Inspector to SP8. May I suggest that your report reflects the evidence submitted at the hearing by the Council that Pinkham Way is not an established industrial site. Highlighting this evidence would remove any doubt as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketan Shah</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketan Shah</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketan Shah</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads ‘SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollieswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming GM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketan Shah</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the hearing which was not disputed by the Council. Highlighting this evidence would remove any doubt as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Trivias</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Trivias</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Trivias</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads ‘SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollieswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming GM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Trivias</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the hearing which was not disputed by the Council. Highlighting this evidence would remove any doubt as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Name</th>
<th>Unique Representation Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Bound</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representation number/policy or section referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nick Trivies</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s Final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>131/7/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlon Housing Trust Savills</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The site for industrial use should be removed to allow flexibility so that market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities can be taken into account.</td>
<td>The emerging Local Plan Strategic Policies is sufficiently flexible to enable the regeneration of the Northumberland Park area. The Inspector’s Main Modification 28 does state that the Council can review the list of employment sites to take account of economic circumstances.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>132/6/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlon Housing Trust Savills</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The modification would be contrary to the Mayor of London’s proposal to remove the LSIS designation as identified within the draft Upper Lea Valley Opportunity Area Planning Framework, which is scheduled for adoption later this month.</td>
<td>The Mayor’s OAPF will be adopted as SPD and does not create new policy. The draft OAPF will need to be amended to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications and final Report.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>132/5/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlon Housing Trust Savills</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The site within the LSIS is clearly suitable for release. The retention of the site within the LSIS is therefore not justified and the retention of the LSIS allocation would not be effective. In accordance with para 22 the NPPF, the long term protection of the site for industrial use should be removed to allow flexibility so that market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities can be taken into account.</td>
<td>The Mayor’s OAPF also states that “the hierarchy of sites will be further reviewed to take account of economic circumstances and the advice from the Mayor of London through an additional planning document such as the intended Site Allocations SPD”.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>132/7/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newlon Housing Trust Savills</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>The site for industrial use should be removed to allow flexibility so that market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support sustainable local communities can be taken into account.</td>
<td>The emerging Local Plan Strategic Policies is sufficiently flexible to enable the regeneration of the Northumberland Park area. The Inspector’s Main Modification 28 does state that the Council can review the list of employment sites to take account of economic circumstances.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>132/4/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Ormel</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>I support the modification to SPD made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>133/7/mmods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Modifications November 2012

**Summary of Representation**

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

* "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and UNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

**Council's Response**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

I consider that the protection of the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site has been weakened. In the UDP it stated that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. This direct proviso has been deleted in the new strategy and replaced. I provided in my earlier response to the consultation on the re-designation of the site a long list of examples of how national and regional planning policy has been strengthened rather than weakened regarding the protection of London’s remaining green spaces and the increased recognition of the importance of green corridors and connected green spaces in helping adapt to climate change. This strengthening of policy since the existing Local Plan was adopted should imply a strengthening of the protection of this site, not a weakening of its protection that Haringey have managed to introduce if the plan remains with its current wording. It is again very clear that this change has been made not on the basis of evidence (I understand from the enquiry that Haringey have not carried out any recent assessment of the ecological value of the site), but again to ease a planning application for the site, rather than being based on sound evidence based planning.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site and provide in my earlier response to the consultation on the re-designation of the site a long list of examples of how national and regional planning policy has been strengthened rather than weakened regarding the protection of London’s remaining green spaces and the increased recognition of the importance of green corridors and connected green spaces in helping adapt to climate change. This strengthening of policy since the existing Local Plan was adopted should imply a strengthening of the protection of this site, not a weakening of its protection that Haringey have managed to introduce if the plan remains with its current wording. It is again very clear that this change has been made not on the basis of evidence (I understand from the enquiry that Haringey have not carried out any recent assessment of the ecological value of the site), but again to ease a planning application for the site, rather than being based on sound evidence based planning makes and could be challenged at judicial review.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy will be applied. No further change proposed.

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

* "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and UNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.
Miss Attenborough 134
zones I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 134/21/mmmods

Miss Attenborough 134
sound I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification. No further action proposed. 134/23/mmmods

Miss Attenborough 134
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 134/28/mmmods

Kimberley Pyper 135
The protection of the nature conservation value of the site should also reflect Haringey’s biodiversity action plan, which identifies the opportunity to de-culvert the stream that runs through the Pinkham Way site. I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The Inspector’s final Report will include further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 135/12/mmmods

Kimberley Pyper 135
The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 135/11/mmmods

Kimberley Pyper 135
I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 135/14/mmmods

Kimberley Pyper 135
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 135/14/mmmods

Earl Brown 141
I consider that the protection of the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site has been weakened. In the UDP it stated that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. This direct proviso has been deleted in the new strategy and replaced. I would like to see an unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 141/8/mmmods
### Summary of Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Name</th>
<th>Unique Representation Number</th>
<th>Unsound / Sound</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl Brown</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Menich</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Brown</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Menich</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Menich</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Davies</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Menich</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Menich</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Davies</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Davies</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Sound</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main Modifications November 2012

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

- **SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.**
- **The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site." The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.**
- **I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I would support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. It would be welcome if the Inspector’s final Report and Proposals Map reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.**
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site." The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.**
- **I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site." The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.**
- **The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the following DM Policies document.**
- **I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I would support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
- **I would support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.**
- **The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.**
Proposal Maps, 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

Council's proposed action

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Representer's Report</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason MacKay</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect the Inspector’s decision not to permit the re-designation to LSIS.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>165/12/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. &quot;in such circumstances&quot; etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>169/3/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads &quot;SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.&quot; I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>169/5/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Williams</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. &quot;in such circumstances&quot; etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>169/4/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jones</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>169/7/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jones</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. &quot;in such circumstances&quot; etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>170/5/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jones</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads &quot;SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.&quot; I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>170/7/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jones</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. &quot;in such circumstances&quot; etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>170/8/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representor Name</td>
<td>Unique Repres. Number</td>
<td>Council's Response</td>
<td>Unique Number this refers to the unique representor number/representation number/policy or section referred to.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Jones</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>170/6/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>170/9/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guy Veal</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>176/8/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>176/10/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further change proposed.</td>
<td>176/11/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>176/9/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>176/12/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Woodward</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>177/5/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>177/7/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further change proposed.</td>
<td>177/8/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

No further action proposed

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs site.”

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs site.”

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

- The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

- The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

- The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

- The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graham Wood</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Storey</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesleigh</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No further action proposed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Name</th>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances Heigham</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Heigham</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Evans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Evans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollingwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Evans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further change proposed.</td>
<td>The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Evans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Evans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anderson</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anderson</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: 4. “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anderson</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further change proposed.</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollingwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representor Name</td>
<td>Unique Representor Number</td>
<td>Dco&amp;Bound.</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Council's Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anderson</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7. 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LIS.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Whitehead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>A further suggested minor amendment relates to paragraph 6.3.23. It is suggested that the last sentence should read “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowick Wood, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.”</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kit all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Whitehead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Finally, Proposal Maps 7. 16 and 24 need to be amended to reflect your decision not to permit the re-designation of the Pinkham Way site to Locally Significant Industrial Site (LIS).</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Whitehead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>My first comment relates to the Inspector’s modification to SP6. I support this modification. Indeed, I believe that the wording of your report should be altered to match the evidence given by the Council at the hearing, which made it clear that the site at Pinkham Way is not an established industrial site. Please could the Report be amended to reflect this fact?</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Whitehead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>The raison d’être for this proposed amendment is unambiguous protection for sites of importance for Nature Conservation and for Local Nature Reserves (LNRs) in the Borough. I understand that some residents have proposed the following revisions to the text of the report, which I also support.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Whitehead</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Third, I am very concerned that the wording in relation to the protection of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) status of the site has been changed from the wording in the UDP. The proviso that any development permitted at the site must have no impact on the nature conservation value of the site has been recorded and weakened.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Assiter</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Assiter</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Representation

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs; they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs; they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs; they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs; they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
Chair: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Max Tomlinson: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Lynne Hurley: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Lynne Hurley: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Lynne Hurley: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Belinda Lawley: Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

Summary of Representation

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representation Number</th>
<th>Councillor/Board</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Tomlinson</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td>We would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (other than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRS unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Tomlinson</td>
<td>243</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, there are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>It would be most helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16, 24 and 22 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>No further change proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRS unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be a statement from the council in there report confirming that the site is currently open space and it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. The land has quite obviously been naturalised over a period of 50 years. This was also discussed and was not challenged by the council at the public hearing.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Peacock</td>
<td>260</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jacobs</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRS unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Modifications November 2012

Table: Summary of Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Name</th>
<th>Unique Representative Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Sound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Jacobs</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila Sifri</td>
<td>281</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Walker</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No further action proposed

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads: "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

No further action proposed

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.
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**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. 

No further action proposed.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

No further action proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting test simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting test simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

The purpose of the text sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed
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We would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 343/7/mmmod.

We would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. No further action proposed. 343/8/mmmod.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 343/5/mmmod.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. No further action proposed. 343/6/mmmod.

I support the modification to SP13 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 343/3/mmmod.

We would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/9/mmmod.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. No further action proposed. 343/7/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/8/mmmod.

We would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. No further action proposed. 343/9/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/10/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/4/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/5/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/6/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/7/mmmod.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to set out all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. 343/8/mmmod.
Modifications 28 and 41 must be read together. Pinkham Way should retain its dual designation of Employment Land and SINC No 1 Borough Importance, then my understanding from the Inspector’s letter of 24 August 2012 that this would mean the Pinkham Way site over from the Saved UDP (OS6) into the LDF Development Management Policies.

I welcome the Inspector’s decision to remove the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way) site from use definition of brownfield land/PDL in the London Plan and in the NPPF the site is Open Space the site has a nil condition of the site, the Inspector considers that the site is properly to be regarded as brownfield land/PDL or industrial site. Such a statement would remove any ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The proposal wording of the policy implies that the dual designation of a site is an appropriate approach to be taken in a development plan. I believe that such a designation is inappropriate because it creates a position of uncertainty as to the protection of sites which are designated and valued for their nature conservation/ ecological interest. Modification 41 conflicts with and is weaker than the existing policy DMP28 which is carried over from the Saved UDP (OS6) into the LDF Development Management Policies.

My understanding from the Inspector’s letter of 24 August 2012 that this would mean the Pinkham Way site classification would revert to the format in the Haringey Core Strategy Proposed Submission 2010 document, except with the additional modifications to SPB proposed by the Inspector. If the Inspector considers that Pinkham Way should retain its dual designation of Employment Land and SINC No 1 Borough Importance, then Modifications 28 and 41 must be read together.

I wish to suggest the following amendment to Main Modification 26: After “…..set out mitigating measures in line with the national guidance” add “in addition they will be required to provide evidence that demonstrates that these measures will be effective in the particular circumstances of the development”.

The Inspector’s Final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I welcome the Inspector’s decision to remove the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way) site from the list of LSIS designated sites on the grounds that there is no sound basis for including them.

The Inspector’s Final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I would ask the Inspector to consider the following amendment to Modification 41, page 158 para 6.3.23: delete 7th sentence beginning with the words “The Council will…” and add, after the last sentence of that paragraph which finishes “… and harmful development “…, the following additional sentence: “Further policy provision on protection of SINCs and LNRs is provided in Haringey’s Local Development Framework document Development Management Policies”. Any attempt to alter the carried over saved UDP policies in the DMP would be tantamount to pre-empting a proper and full public consultation and examination of the DMP policies relating to protection of SINCs.

The proposed modification is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan, but a reference can be made to the protection of SINCs in the emerging DM Policies.

Add new sentence at the end of para 6.3.23 to read: “Further policy provision on the protection of SINCs and LNRs will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document”.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list examples of SINCs that are not included on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Further policy provision on protection of SINCs and LNRs will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document.”

I wish to suggest the following amendment to Main Modification 26: After “…set out mitigating measures in line with the national guidance” add “in addition they will be required to provide evidence that demonstrates that these measures will be effective in the particular circumstances of the development”.

This modification is superfluous, all cases are dealt with on their merits and the Council will always ensure mitigation measures are relevant to the particular development. No further change.

Support notted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The Inspector’s Final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The proposed modification is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan, but a reference can be made to the protection of SINCs in the emerging DM Policies.

Add new sentence at the end of para 6.3.23 to read: “Further policy provision on the protection of SINCs and LNRs will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document”.

I would ask the Inspector to consider the following amendment to Modification 41, page 158 para 6.3.23: delete 7th sentence beginning with the words “The Council will…” and add, after the last sentence of that paragraph which finishes “… and harmful development “…, the following additional sentence: “Further policy provision on protection of SINCs and LNRs is provided in Haringey’s Local Development Framework document Development Management Policies”. Any attempt to alter the carried over saved UDP policies in the DMP would be tantamount to pre-empting a proper and full public consultation and examination of the DMP policies relating to protection of SINCs.

The proposed modification is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan, but a reference can be made to the protection of SINCs in the emerging DM Policies.

Add new sentence at the end of para 6.3.23 to read: “Further policy provision on the protection of SINCs and LNRs will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document”.

I wish to suggest the following amendment to Main Modification 26: After “…set out mitigating measures in line with the national guidance” add “in addition they will be required to provide evidence that demonstrates that these measures will be effective in the particular circumstances of the development”.

This modification is superfluous, all cases are dealt with on their merits and the Council will always ensure mitigation measures are relevant to the particular development. No further change.

Support notted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The Inspector’s Final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The Inspector’s Final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
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**Representor Name**

**Unique Representative Number**

**Unsound/Sound**

**Council’s Response**

**Council’s proposed action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Represen tor Name</th>
<th>Unique Representa tive Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Boun ded</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>The accompanying maps and schedules to the plan (including Maps No 7, 16 and 24) will need to be amended to show the Pinkham Way site accurately described and designated before the Strategic Plan is adopted. I would welcome an opportunity to comment on the revised plans before adoption if that were possible.</td>
<td>All maps and schedules will be amended as part of the adoption process.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noteworthy of the employment designation from the site would remove the anomaly and indeed the source of much confusion and misunderstandings surrounding the Pinkham Way site. I would therefore ask the Inspector to consider recommending that the Employment designation be removed but the SINC No 1 Borough Importance be retained.</td>
<td>The Inspector’s Final Report will include, in detail, reasons for Modification 28.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications November 2012, as recommended, will require when development takes place on site SSWS to enable its use for waste purposes and that the large numbers of residents who participated in the Core Strategy consultations and examination will be put to considerable inconvenience and costs in yet again having to oppose such an allocation in another development plan document. I do not believe that such an outcome would reflect the Government’s stated commitment to a Localism agenda.</td>
<td>The Inspector’s Final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.</td>
<td>Modification 41 will not affect the emerging GM policies. The emerging GM policy on nature conservation will provide further detail and guidance on how to implement SP13. No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Inspector’s Employment Study (2008) and Update (2012) recommends the continued protection of this DEA for employment uses. Dual designations are not uncommon; two policies protect this site and both will be taken into account when assessing any development.</td>
<td>The Inspector’s Final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site description of FFBSW (Pinkham Way) should be amended following the Inspector’s report to reflect accurately the outcome of his deliberations.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td>The suite of modifications put forward for consultation is inadequate and insufficient on its own to render the plan unsound and the Inspector is invited to conclude that this is the case. I am concerned that, without further modifications to the Core Strategy the Council will seek, at the earliest opportunity, to reclassify Pinkham Way / FFRWSW to enable its use for waste purposes and that the large numbers of residents who participated in the Core Strategy consultations and examination will be put to considerable inconvenience and costs in yet again having to oppose such an allocation in another development plan document. I do not believe that such an outcome would reflect the Government’s stated commitment to a Localism agenda.</td>
<td>The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the soundness of the Local Plan. They are purely indicative at this stage. His Final Report will include further detail and reasoning behind these modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>I would ask the Inspector to consider recommending that the SINC No 1 Borough Importance designation be retained, and that the Employment designation be removed from the Pinkham Way site until such time as a robust and proper assessment of the site can be carried out.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Ryan</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>The Inspector’s final Report will provide further detail and reasoning behind this Modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>I would ask the Inspector to reflect on the position where there is a dual designation on a site, as there is here, and perhaps offer some advice as to how the Council might go about ensuring the aims of both Policies SP8 and SP13 would be secured.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the robustness of the Local Plan. These issues are being dealt with separately by the Council.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>Dual designations are not uncommon; two policies protect the site and both will be taken into account when assessing any development. Modification 41 states what the Council will require when development takes place on a site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will provide further detail and reasoning for Modification 28.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Representation

Given the nature of these particular policies it is difficult to see how the aims of both could be secured at the same time. I would argue they are irreconcilable. Policy DMP28 (the policy applicable until such time as it has been replaced, see below) states “The Council will not permit development on or adjacent to … SINC No 1 Borough Importance Designation unless there will be no adverse effect on the … Value of the site and the importance of the development outweighs the value of the site.” Any development is likely to have some adverse effect on the site if it involves erection of structures, however small. In my view this demonstrates an irreconcilable conflict between two policies in the plan and this is in conflict with NPPF (paras 109 and 110). For these reasons the plan would be unsound.

There are alternative, previously developed sites which are more suitable for allocation for Employment use.

Dual designations are not uncommon; two policies protect the site and both will be taken into account when assessing any development. Modification 41 states what the Council will require when development takes place on a site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will provide further detail and reasoning for Modification 28.

Noted. The Inspector’s final Report will provide further reasoning behind this Modification.

Given the nature of these particular policies it is difficult to see how the aims of both could be secured at the same time. I would argue they are irreconcilable. Policy DMP28 (the policy applicable until such time as it has been replaced, see below) states “The Council will not permit development on or adjacent to … SINC No 1 Borough Importance Designation unless there will be no adverse effect on the … Value of the site and the importance of the development outweighs the value of the site.” Any development is likely to have some adverse effect on the site if it involves erection of structures, however small. In my view this demonstrates an irreconcilable conflict between two policies in the plan and this is in conflict with NPPF (paras 109 and 110). For these reasons the plan would be unsound.

There are alternative, previously developed sites which are more suitable for allocation for Employment use.

PWA is also concerned that, without further modifications to the Core Strategy the Council are seeking, at the earliest opportunity, to reclassify Pinkham Way / FFBSWS to enable its use for waste purposes, and that the PWA and the large numbers of residents who participated in the Core Strategy consultations and examination will be put to considerable inconvenience and costs in yet again having to oppose such an allocation in another development plan document. We do not believe that such an outcome would reflect the Government’s stated commitment to a Localism agenda.

The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the soundness of the Local Plan. They are purely indicative at this stage. His final Report will include further detail and reasoning behind these modifications.

Noted.

Dual designations are not uncommon; two policies protect the site and both will be taken into account when assessing any development. Modification 41 states what the Council will require when development takes place on a site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will provide further detail and reasoning for Modification 28.

Given the nature of these particular policies it is difficult to see how the aims of both could be secured at the same time. I would argue they are irreconcilable. Policy DMP28 (the policy applicable until such time as it has been replaced, see below) states “The Council will not permit development on or adjacent to … SINC No 1 Borough Importance Designation unless there will be no adverse effect on the … Value of the site and the importance of the development outweighs the value of the site.” Any development is likely to have some adverse effect on the site if it involves erection of structures, however small. In my view this demonstrates an irreconcilable conflict between two policies in the plan and this is in conflict with NPPF (paras 109 and 110). For these reasons the plan would be unsound.

There are alternative, previously developed sites which are more suitable for allocation for Employment use.

PWA supports the Inspector’s decision to remove the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way) and the Bounds Green Industrial Estate sites from the list of LSIS designated sites on the grounds that there is no sound basis for creating new Locally Significant Industrial Sites at this time.

The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the robustness of the Local Plan. They are purely indicative at this stage. His final Report will include further detail and reasoning behind these modifications.

PWA supports the Inspector’s decision to remove the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way) and the Bounds Green Industrial Estate sites from the list of LSIS designated sites on the grounds that there is no sound basis for creating new Locally Significant Industrial Sites at this time.

The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the robustness of the Local Plan. They are purely indicative at this stage. His final Report will include further detail and reasoning behind these modifications.

PWA supports the Inspector’s decision to remove the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way) and the Bounds Green Industrial Estate sites from the list of LSIS designated sites on the grounds that there is no sound basis for creating new Locally Significant Industrial Sites at this time.

The Inspector considers that the Main Modifications are recommended to ensure the robustness of the Local Plan. They are purely indicative at this stage. His final Report will include further detail and reasoning behind these modifications.
Main Modifications November 2012

Summary of Representation

1.1 PWA objects to Modification 41, in that Policy SP13, as proposed for modification, fails to give adequate protection to SINCs and other designated sites. In addition, the proposed wording of the policy implies that the dual designation of a site is an appropriate approach to be taken in a development plan. In PWA’s view such a designation is inappropriate because it creates a position of uncertainty as to the protection of sites which are designated and valued for their biological/ ecological interest.

Council’s Response

The Council’s Employment Study (2008) and Update (2012) recommends the continued protection of this DEA for employment uses. Dual designations are not uncommon; two policies protect this site and both will be taken into account when assessing any development. The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.2 Modification 41 conflicts with and is weaker than the existing policy DMP28 which is carried over from the Saved UDP (OS6) into the LDF Development Management Policies.

1.3 Our understanding is that the effect of Modification 28 would be to “return” Pinkham Way to the status of “Local Employment Area” and to put it within the “Employment Land” sub-category of that classification (with additional modifications suggested by the Inspector). In PWA’s view, the dual designation on this site has led to much confusion and misunderstanding within the Council and the local community, and we consider that this would continue to be the case even if Modification 28 is carried forward into the final plan. PWA therefore proposes that, if the dual designation is to be retained, further clarification is needed as to how this will operate. Without such further clarification, there will continue to be confusion and inconsistency within the Plan itself, making it unsound.

Modification 41 states what the Council will require when development takes place on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

Council’s Response

The Inspector will recall that during the course of the inquiry the Council made it clear that no extra cost or burden would be placed on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.4 On the designation that the Inspector has referred to in his summary of his reasoning for Modification 28 of the Development Management Policies document, PWA would refer to the Planning Evidence and Schedule (this refers to the unique representation number)/represen-
tation number/policy or section referred to.

1.5 Our understanding is that the effect of Modification 28 would be to “return” Pinkham Way to the status of “Local Employment Area” and to put it within the “Employment Land” sub-category of that classification (with additional modifications suggested by the Inspector). In PWA’s view, the dual designation on this site has led to much confusion and misunderstanding within the Council and the local community, and we consider that this would continue to be the case even if Modification 28 is carried forward into the final plan. PWA therefore proposes that, if the dual designation is to be retained, further clarification is needed as to how this will operate. Without such further clarification, there will continue to be confusion and inconsistency within the Plan itself, making it unsound.

Modification 41 states what the Council will require when development takes place on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

Council’s Response

The Inspector will recall that during the course of the inquiry the Council made it clear that no extra cost or burden would be placed on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

2. The Inspector will recall that during the course of the inquiry the Council made it clear that no extra cost or burden would be placed on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s Response

The Inspector will recall that during the course of the inquiry the Council made it clear that no extra cost or burden would be placed on site which has more than one designation. The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.6 On the assumption that no further modifications are proposed (over and above those which are the subject of this consultation) we make the following points on unsoundness:

1.6.1 The Pinkham Way site would effectively have been carried forward as an employment allocation from the UDP (which itself is very dated) without the necessary and required review of the site’s continued suitability for such an allocation having been carried out. As such the Core Strategy does not comply with the relevant national policy and guidance. This is important for this site in particular, because, unlike the others, it has no existing buildings, no infrastructure, is open space and is the only SINC of Borough No 1 Importance within this category of sites. Thus it is an anomaly; as such, it should be removed from the Plan.

1.6.2 The site does not meet the criteria for designation as a Local Employment Area as there is no existing or recent history of employment. New information about the planning history of this site has recently been disclosed by the Council as part of its objection to the recently lodged Village Green application. This confirms that the site was designated public open space immediately after the closure of the sewage works and remained so until 1982 when it was designated a DEA. It was never developed as a DEA and in 1998 it was designated SINC Borough No 1 Importance. To this day it has not been developed as a DEA but has continued to

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.7 In the Inspector’s letter of 24 August 2012, towards the end of paragraph 5, we note that the Inspector remained so until 1982 when it was designated a DEA. It was never developed as a DEA and in 1998 it was designated SINC Borough No 1 Importance. To this day it has not been developed as a DEA but has continued to

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.8 At Modification 40 there is a reference to “…review and upgrade or remove, as appropriate, existing open

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.9 At Modification 40 there is a reference to “…review and upgrade or remove, as appropriate, existing open

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.10 The Greenfield status of the site renders it inappropriate for any allocation for employment use given the

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.11 The allocation of the site for any built development is in direct conflict with its designation as a SINC of

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.12 The site does not meet the criteria for designation as a Local Employment Area as there is no existing or

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.13 The site does not meet the criteria for designation as a Local Employment Area as there is no existing or

Council’s Response

The Inspector’s final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.

Council’s proposed action

No further action proposed

1.14 The site does not meet the criteria for designation as a Local Employment Area as there is no existing or
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/section/policy number referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.3 The DMP policies have not yet completed the process of public consultation and have not been through an EIP where they can be properly and thoroughly examined for soundness. Until that process is completed there is no sound basis for changing that policy and it is our understanding that the saved UDP (OS6) should remain the prevailing policy for protection of SNICS.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/34/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2.4 We suggest the modification to Main Modification 26: 3.1 PWA suggests the following amendment to Main Modification 26: 3.2 Delete 4.4.8 and replace with the following: “The whole of the borough of Haringey is an air quality management area (AQMA) for the pollutants of NO2 (nitrogen dioxide) and PM10 particulates which are the most prominent air pollutants. The dominant source of NO2 and PM10 emissions in Haringey is road transport with a variety of other sources contribution to emissions. This has implications for air quality which is being addressed through the measures outlined in the council’s air quality action plan. Haringey is already taking action to reduce existing pollution and prevent new pollution. For example, monitoring has identified hot spots of poor air quality in the borough. As part of the requirements to control and reduce potential or actual pollution resulting from development in the borough, developers will be required to carry out relevant assessment and set out mitigating measures in line with the national guidance. “In addition they will be required to provide evidence that demonstrates that these measures will be effective in the particular circumstances of the development”. Further detail on the council’s approach to environmental protection is set out in the Development Management DPD and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/35/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.1 PWA suggests the following amendment to Main Modification 26: 3.2 Delete 4.4.8 and replace with the following: “The whole of the borough of Haringey is an air quality management area (AQMA) for the pollutants of NO2 (nitrogen dioxide) and PM10 particulates which are the most prominent air pollutants. The dominant source of NO2 and PM10 emissions in Haringey is road transport with a variety of other sources contribution to emissions. This has implications for air quality which is being addressed through the measures outlined in the council’s air quality action plan. Haringey is already taking action to reduce existing pollution and prevent new pollution. For example, monitoring has identified hot spots of poor air quality in the borough. As part of the requirements to control and reduce potential or actual pollution resulting from development in the borough, developers will be required to carry out relevant assessment and set out mitigating measures in line with the national guidance. “In addition they will be required to provide evidence that demonstrates that these measures will be effective in the particular circumstances of the development”. Further detail on the council’s approach to environmental protection is set out in the Development Management DPD and the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/38/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4. We believe a finding of fact on these matters would assist the Council as they are relevant matters which need to be taken into account when the Council carries out the robust review of the DEAs referred to in the Inspector’s letter. It would also instil confidence in the local community that the site will be fairly and properly assessed on its merits and the Council will always ensure mitigation measures are relevant to the particular development. No further change.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/40/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>5. Whether in view of the Inspector’s site visit and the evidence produced at the EIP as to the physical nature and condition of the site, the Inspector considers that:  (a) the site is properly to be regarded as brownfield land/POL or (b) the site is not brownfield land/POL, because it falls within the category of land which is excluded from the definition of brownfield land/POL in the London Plan and in the NPPF (c) the site is Open Space (d) the site has a nil use</td>
<td>These are issues for the Inspector’s final Report.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/41/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWA - Stephen Brice</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>In conclusion, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation is inadequate and insufficient on its own to render the plan unsound. PWA would make the Inspector to conclude that this is the case.</td>
<td>These is an issue for the Inspector’s final Report.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>384/42/mmods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In our view these matters do relate to the question of the soundness of the Plan. It is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the modifications without having a clear understanding of the Inspector’s findings on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient. It believes that an important part of the current examination should make a decision on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation to this modification.

No further action proposed.

The supporting text in para 6.3.23 clearly states that where development takes place on a site with more than one designation, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken into account.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

No further action proposed.

In our view, it is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the modifications without having a clear understanding of the Inspector’s findings on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient.

The supporting text in para 6.3.23 clearly states that where development takes place on a site with more than one designation, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken into account.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

No further action proposed.

In our view these matters do relate to the question of the soundness of the Plan. It is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the modifications without having a clear understanding of the Inspector’s findings on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient.

The supporting text in para 6.3.23 clearly states that where development takes place on a site with more than one designation, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken into account.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

No further action proposed.

In our view these matters do relate to the question of the soundness of the Plan. It is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the modifications without having a clear understanding of the Inspector’s findings on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient.

The supporting text in para 6.3.23 clearly states that where development takes place on a site with more than one designation, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken into account.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

No further action proposed.

In our view these matters do relate to the question of the soundness of the Plan. It is difficult to judge the appropriateness or adequacy of the modifications without having a clear understanding of the Inspector’s findings on these key matters. On the basis of the information we have before us, PWA considers that the suite of modifications put forward for consultation are inadequate and insufficient.

The supporting text in para 6.3.23 clearly states that where development takes place on a site with more than one designation, appropriate mitigation measures must be taken into account.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.

No further action proposed.
### Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representative Number</th>
<th>Outsound/Bound</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily O’Neil</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/prevously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>390/2/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily O’Neil</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>390/5/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bauss</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>391/1/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bauss</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>391/2/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bauss</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>391/4/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Bauss</td>
<td>391</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/prevously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>391/2/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wills</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>392/1/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wills</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>392/3/mmods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wills</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>392/4/mmods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Modifications November 2012

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.

No further action proposed

Name
Juliet Olerton

Unique Number
393

Summery of Representation
I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Rebecca ViHník

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.

No further action proposed

Name
Juliet Olerton

Unique Number
393

Summery of Representation
I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Rebecca ViHník

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.

No further action proposed

Name
Rebecca ViHník

Unique Number
394

Summery of Representation
I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Rebecca ViHník

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.

No further action proposed

Name
Rebecca ViHník

Unique Number
394

Summery of Representation
I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

Rebecca ViHník
I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. No further action proposed.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>401/2/mmods</td>
<td>Mary Behan</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400/5/mmods</td>
<td>Mary Behan</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/3/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/2/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Flavio Poli</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401/1/mmods</td>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Modifications November 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action</td>
<td>proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Representor Name**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Redler</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Representation**

- Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.
- Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

**Council’s Response**

- The Council considers the site to be brownfield.
- The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.
- SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.
Richard Simmons

404/1/mmods

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

404/1/mmods

Richard Simmons

404/2/mmods

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

404/3/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

403/1/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

403/2/mmods

Richard Simmons

404

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

404/1/mmods

Richard Simmons

404

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

404/3/mmods

Richard Simmons

404

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

404/4/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

403/1/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

403/2/mmods

Hannah Redler

402/2/mmods

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

402/2/mmods

Hannah Redler

402

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

402/5/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

403/5/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

403/1/mmods

Hannah Redler

402

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

402/5/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

403/1/mmods

Laura Lovejoy

403

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

403/1/mmods

Hannah Redler

402/2/mmods

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

402/2/mmods

Richard Simmons

404

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc., add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed

404/1/mmods
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

Council’s proposed action

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previouly developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed.
Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Ambrose</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera Ganatra</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Sim</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meera Ganatra</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.
Proposal Maps 17, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSI

Since the Council received the Inspector's final Report and prepared the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed. 410/2/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed. 410/5/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed. 411/2/mmods.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF's definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. 410/1/mmods.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 411/3/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 411/4/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy).

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed. 411/5/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed. 411/6/mmods.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 412/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 412/3/mmods.
Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veronica Doherty</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Doherty</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royet Veronica</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Kyle</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong Kyle</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.**

- Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposal Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

**No further action proposed.**

- The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

- Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

- The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollinwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNPs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence  reads “SINCs is applied. No further change proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNPs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs is applied. No further change proposed.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNPs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The Inspector considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that it was not disputed by the Council.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/ previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that it was not disputed by the Council.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

No further action proposed.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Council's proposed action: Since the Council receives the Inspector's final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications. No further action proposed.

Elisabeth Royston: I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

Elisabeth Royston: I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

Elisabeth Royston: I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence 6.3.23 reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holfordwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed.

Elisabeth Royston: I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.

Elisabeth Royston: I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence 6.3.23 reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holfordwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. No further action proposed.

No further action proposed.
The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed

422/5/mmods

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

423/2/mmods

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

Council's proposed action

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

423/3/mmods

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

422/1/mmods

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's LNRs, they are some examples. All of the LNRs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

423/1/mmods

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

423/4/mmods

The Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed

422/2/mmods

Once the Council receives the Inspector's final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed

423/5/mmods

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LNS.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications.

No further action proposed

422/5/mmods

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs that are within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed

423/3/mmods

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

423/4/mmods

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

Any change proposed.

423/4/mmods

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, there are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further change proposed.

423/1/mmods

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

422/1/mmods

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s LNRs, they are some examples. All of the LNRs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

423/2/mmods

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

422/2/mmods

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

422/3/mmods

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

422/4/mmods
### Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Insound/Bound</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representor number/representation number/policy or section referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Dudek</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>424/2/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Maclaine</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>425/3/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Maclaine</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>425/3/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Maclaine</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>425/3/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Maclaine</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>425/4/mmmods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/1/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/1/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/1/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/3/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/3/mmmods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:**

The summaries and responses provided by the representatives highlight a variety of concerns and suggestions for modifications to the policy. The proposals include changes to reflect decisions on redesignation, considerations of brownfield status, and protection of sites of biodiversity and nature conservation (SINCs). Each proposal is supported with specific references to paragraphs and sections of the policy, aiming to provide clearer protection for SINCs. The suggestions range from adding new bullet points to adjusting narrative sections, all with the goal of ensuring that development complies with biodiversity and nature conservation considerations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Simpson</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>426/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphine Cressent</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>427/3/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphine Cressent</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>427/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delphine Cressent</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>427/5/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane de Sausmarez</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>428/3/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane de Sausmarez</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>428/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Rep Number</th>
<th>Unique Number referred to</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane de Sausmarez</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Skinner</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard McDonagh</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard McDonagh</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Frien Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerard McDonagh</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane de Sausmarez</td>
<td>428</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Skinner</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Skinner</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Frien Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Council's Response

**Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSL.**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

---

**Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.**

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed.

---

**Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.**

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed.

---

**The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

---

**The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

---

**The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.**

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.
Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Name</th>
<th>Unique Represenator Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Support</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council’s proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representor number/representation number/policy or section referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Delherry</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>432/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Delherry</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>432/5/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Milordos</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>433/1/1/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Milordos</td>
<td>433</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>433/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Milordos</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 it not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in theforthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>433/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Milordos</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>433/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Kirkby</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>434/1/1/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Kirkby</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>434/3/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Kirkby</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Support noted</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 it not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in theforthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>434/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 434/2/mmods.

Council’s proposed action

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

No further action proposed

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. No further action proposed. 434/2/mmods.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 434/3/mmods.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/2/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 434/5/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 434/3/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed. 434/5/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed. 435/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. 435/3/mmods.
Main Modifications November 2012

**Representor Name** | **Unique Represenator Number** | **Unsound/Support** | **Summary of Representation** | **Council’s Response** | **Council’s proposed action** | **Unique Number this refers to the unique representor number/representation number/policy or section referred to.**
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
Ella Pays | 436 | | I would welcome a statement in your report that the site a open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. | No further action proposed | 436/1/mmods.
Ella Pays | 436 | | Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. | No further action proposed | 436/5/mmods.
Sue Jelley | 437 | | I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 437/1/mmods.
Sue Jelley | 437 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. | No further action proposed | 437/2/mmods.
Sue Jelley | 437 | | I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollilwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. | 437/4/mmods.
Sue Jelley | 437 | | I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 437/2/mmods.
Sue Jelley | 437 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. | No further action proposed | 437/5/mmods.
Harriet Whitbread | 438 | | I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 438/1/mmods.
Harriet Whitbread | 438 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. | No further action proposed | 438/3/mmods.
Harriet Whitbread | 438 | | I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollilwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed. | No further action proposed | 438/4/mmods.
Harriet Whitbread | 438 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed. | No further action proposed | 438/5/mmods.
Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representative Number</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriet Whitbread</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Davies</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Davies</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Davies</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hancock</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hancock</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Blakell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Hancock</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Blakell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollicwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
Paul Hancock 440

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed

440/2/mmods

Paul Hancock 440

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

No further action proposed

440/5/mmods

Gordon Lipton 441

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

441/1/mmods

Gordon Lipton 441

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

441/3/mmods

Gordon Lipton 441

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

441/2/mmods

Gordon Lipton 441

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

No further action proposed

441/2/mmods

Thomas Campbell 442

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed

442/1/mmods

Thomas Campbell 442

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

442/3/mmods

Thomas Campbell 442

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed

442/4/mmods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Company/Board</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representor name/section number/policy or section referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to suggest that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect “• The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>444/3/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brickwood</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/1/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brickwood</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect “• The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brickwood</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>444/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brickwood</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to suggest that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s Final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/2/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Brickwood</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s Final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/5/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>443</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s Final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>443/5/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>444/1/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect “• The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>444/3/mmods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthias Bauss</td>
<td>444</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>444/4/mmods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Modifications November 2012
I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previosly developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to make clear that the council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Matthias Bauss 444
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. 

No further action proposed.

Matthias Bauss 444
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Elliot Levey 445
I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollycroft Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.
Representor Name | Unique Representor Number | Unsound/Unique Number | Summary of Representation | Council’s Response | Council’s proposed action | Unique Number this refers to the unique representor number/representation number/policy or section referred to.
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Marilyn Taylor | 446 | | I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. | The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. | No further action proposed | 446/1/mmods.
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff | 447 | | I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site. | Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 447/1/mmods.
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff | 447 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc", add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."
The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 447/2/mmods.
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff | 447 | | I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. | Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 447/3/mmods.
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff | 447 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc", add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."
The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 447/4/mmods.
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff | 447 | | I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. | Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. | No further action proposed | 447/5/mmods.
Nushin Elahi | 448 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc", add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."
The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 448/1/mmods.
Nushin Elahi | 448 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc", add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."
The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 448/2/mmods.
Nushin Elahi | 448 | | I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 448/3/mmods.
Nushin Elahi | 448 | | I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc", add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."
The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative. | The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. | No further action proposed | 448/4/mmods.
Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

No further action proposed

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

448/5/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

449/3/mmods.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

449/1/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

449/3/mmods.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

450/3/mmods.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olga Astaniotis</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>450/2/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olga Astaniotis</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>450/5/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brown</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>451/1/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brown</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: e. “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>451/3/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brown</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Blakewell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>451/4/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brown</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>451/2/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Brown</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>451/3/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dale</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: e. “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>452/3/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dale</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Blakewell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>452/4/mmmds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Name</th>
<th>Unique Rep Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Sound Reason</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dale</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>452/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Silvestri</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>453/1/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Silvestri</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>453/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Glover</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>454/1/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Glover</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>454/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unique Rep Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Sound Reason</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dale</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previous developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>452/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Silvestri</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>453/1/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Silvestri</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>453/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Glover</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.” The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>454/1/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Glover</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>454/2/mmnds.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/variably developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council. The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is to provide further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

Adrian Weir 456

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
• “The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”

The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

Adrian Weir 456

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Mark Godfrey 455

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

Mark Godfrey 455

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollowood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

Mark Godfrey 455
### Council's Response

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. No further action proposed.

### Council's proposed action

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.

### Council's proposed action

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.

### Council's proposed action

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.

### Council's proposed action

Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications. No further action proposed.

### Representor Name

- **Adrian Weir**
- **Leslie Hargreaves**
- **Leslie Hargreaves**
- **Leslie Hargreaves**
- **Leslie Hargreaves**
- **Jennifer Ward**
- **Jennifer Ward**
- **Cllr Kate Cooper**

### Summary of Representation

- **Adrian Weir**: I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.
- **Leslie Hargreaves**: I want to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:
- **Leslie Hargreaves**: I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs and LNRs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.
- **Leslie Hargreaves**: I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.
- **Jennifer Ward**: I am writing wholeheartedly object to the proposal of Pinkham Wood being classified as an industrial site. I have lived in Bounds Green for 12 years and have two small children, one child is just starting school at Bowers Primary School. The area surrounding Pinkham wood is a great community and this will be destroyed if Pinkham Wood becomes an industrial site.
- **Jennifer Ward**: We already have to contend with the huge amount of traffic on the North Circular and noise and air pollution. We do not want any more development that will affect our health and that of our children. There also has been great regeneration of houses along the North Circular which has improved the area but all this will be in vain if Pinkham Wood does not remain a green space and buffer to all the traffic.
- **Cllr Kate Cooper**: London Council has always been at the forefront of conservation and green matters. I find it abhorrent that attempts are being made to ease the passage of making it possible for a massive waste disposal facility to be built on Pinkham way with all the negative impact for the local environment and residents.

### Notes

- **Unique Number**: 456/2
- **Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.**

- **Unique Number**: 456/3
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 456/4
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 457/1
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 457/2
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 457/3
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 457/4
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 457/5
- **Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 458/1
- **This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 458/2
- **This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation. No further action proposed.**

- **Unique Number**: 459/1
- **This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation. No further action proposed.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Representer Number</th>
<th>Case Bound</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Kate Salinger</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am extremely concerned regarding the future of the Pinkham Way site on the North Circular Road. In particular the fact that your UDP stated that development on the site would only be allowed provided that there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. It is obvious to me that this protection has been weakened and I think this is at odds with what you originally stated. In my view, the council should NOT permit development on SINCs or LNRs. Otherwise there is little point in having them in the first place. Haringey has always been at the forefront of green and conservation issues. I see no reason for it to alter now for purposes that will impact very badly on the locality.</td>
<td>Modification number 41 states that the Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site. In these cases, the Council will expect appropriate mitigation measures to be carried out.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr Kate Salinger</td>
<td>459</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pinkham Way is not a brownfield or an industrial site. It is open space. Haringey Council did not dispute this before and to attempt to redesignate it now is foolishly and wrong. I would consider it helpful if your report gave credence to the evidence the Council gave at the hearing: that Pinkham Way is not an established industrial site. I would consider this appropriate in order to remove any ambiguity concerning status.</td>
<td>The Inspector’s Modification 28 does remove Pinkham Way from the list of LLS. The SINCS designation still applies. The Inspector’s final report will include further explanation to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LLS. We support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report could explicitly include reference to the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site, as some confusion still seems to exist.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>The UDP stated that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. This direct proviso is no longer there. Its omission does not help, and indeed might hinder, the protection of the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>We support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report could explicitly include reference to the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site, as some confusion still seems to exist.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanations on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>We would like a further fact made explicit, to avoid confusion with the definition in the London Plan. That is that the site is open space and that it is not (as has sometimes been implied) brownfield/previously developed land. At the inquiry, the Council did not dispute this.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>The site is designated a SINC. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>We would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the text sentence “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Maxwell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollinswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” The first four or these SINCs are directly linked to each other and it would seem appropriate to include them all and to mention them together.</td>
<td>Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa Angela</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td>The purpose of the text sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sewell</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sewell</td>
<td>461</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. “in such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representor Name</td>
<td>Unique Representative Number</td>
<td>Unique Number (this refers to the unique representative number/representation number/policy or section referred to.)</td>
<td>Summary of Representation</td>
<td>Council’s Response</td>
<td>Council’s proposed action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sewell</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461/4/mmods</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads: &quot;SINCs within the borough include: Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.&quot; I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the text sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sewell</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461/2/mmods</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sewell</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461/5/mmods</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Jane Maxa</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>461/5/mmods</td>
<td>Just letting you know how I feel about this project. I have grown up in the area, it has always been a residential area - kids play out, people have BBQs, we walk dogs in this area, there’s a public park in this area, there is no way this can be changes. It’s a home for us. Please do not go ahead. Please! Listen to the people</td>
<td>This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Birte Twisselmann</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>461/2/mmods</td>
<td>I support the modification to SPB made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Birte Twisselmann</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>461/3/mmods</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement &quot;All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • &quot;The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.&quot; The rest of the modification, i.e. &quot;in such circumstances&quot; etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Birte Twisselmann</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>461/4/mmods</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads: &quot;SINCs within the borough include: Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.&quot; I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the text sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Birte Twisselmann</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>461/3/mmods</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Birte Twisselmann</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>461/2/mmods</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
<td>Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SPB Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Farías</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>461/5/mmods</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the Pinkham Way site is open space and that it is not brownfield. I would be grateful for an acknowledgement of this email and would appreciate any comments you make on this subject.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Dougall</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>461/4/mmods</td>
<td>I am following the Pinkham Way debate closely and apart from the pollution and even more traffic that would ensue around the already congested Cohey Hatch Lane (feeder roads to North Circular, Friern Barnet and local Tesco as well as the schools) I am concerned at the prospect of an industrialised former green space at Pinkham Way with industrial smells and a dirt on the already busy community.</td>
<td>This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Burt</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>461/5/mmods</td>
<td>I am concerned that the biodiversity of the area be protected.</td>
<td>The SYNC designation still applies to this site.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Council's Response | Council's proposed action | Unique Number
---|---|---
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/1/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/2/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/3/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/4/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/7/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/8/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/9/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 467/10/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 468/1/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 468/2/mmods
No further action proposed | No further action proposed | 468/3/mmods
Representation relates to the proposed modifications to policy SP11-Design and Supporting Paragraph 6.1.17: The proposed modifications require tall buildings to only be considered as part of an Area Action Plan (AAP) and associated Urban Characterisation Study. It is considered that the production of an AAP will not always be the appropriate vehicle to bring forward development sites where a tall building may be considered. Noted. The emerging DM Document will include a policy on tall buildings setting out design principles that applications for tall buildings should be determined against. No further action proposed 470/1/mmods.

There are individual site opportunities within the Borough, such as within Highbury Park, where an AAP would not be an appropriate policy vehicle and would not be necessary in order to guide development. An AAP by its very nature is used to provide specific planning policy guidance for an area where significant regeneration or investment needs to be managed. An AAP would therefore not be appropriate or necessary to guide individual site development. Noted. The emerging DM Document will include a policy on tall buildings setting out design principles that applications for tall buildings should be determined against. No further action proposed 470/2/mmods.

I would also request that paragraph 6.3.23 is amended along the following lines, both to emphasise the sentiment in the UDP, and also to take the opportunity explicitly to point out that Pinkham Way is an SINC (and is linked geographically with others): "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course and the former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park. The Council will not permit development on SINCs or LNRs unless the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site in question or, if it would have an adverse effect, then only in exceptional circumstances and if the importance of the development outweighed the nature conservation value of the site." The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed 471/2/mmods.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield land or previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the EiP which was not disputed by the Council. The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector's final report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification. No further action proposed 471/3/mmods.

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. While the Council receives the Inspector's final report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications. No further action proposed 471/4/mmods.

The UDP states that Pinkham Way is a Grade 1 Ecologically Valuable Site and thus a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. In Schedule 1, the UDP states that the site should be used only for "Employment generating uses subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site". This is a stricter test than for SINCs generally, and therefore general comments about development on SINCs will fail to take it into account. I would therefore request an addition to SP13 along the following lines: "The Council will permit development on SINCs and LNRs only if the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site in question or, if it would have an adverse effect, then only if the importance of the development outweighed the nature conservation value of the site. The exception to this is the site of the former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way): the Council has stated in the UDP that it will allow development on this site only if the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site." SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed 471/1/mmods.
I would also request that paragraph 6.3.23 is amended along the following lines, both to emphasise the sentiment in the UDP, and also to take the opportunity explicitly to point out that Pinkham Way is an SINC (and is linked geographically with others):

“SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course and the former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park. The Council will not permit development on SINCs or LNRs unless the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site in question or, if it would have an adverse effect, then only in exceptional circumstances and if the importance of the development outweighed the nature conservation value of the site.”

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Guy Abrahams

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield land or previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the EiP which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

No further action proposed.

Guy Abrahams

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.

No further action proposed.

Guy Abrahams

The UDP states that Pinkham Way is a Grade 1 Ecologically Valuable Site and thus a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. In Schedule 1, the UDP states that the site should be used only for “Employment generating uses subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site”.

This is a stricter test than for SINCs generally, and therefore general comments about development on SINCs will fail to take it into account. I would therefore request an addition to SP13 along the following lines:

“The Council will permit development on SINCs and LNRs only if the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site in question or, if it would have an adverse effect, then only if the importance of the development outweighed the nature conservation value of the site. The exception to this is the site of the former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way): the Council has stated in the UDP that it will allow development on this site only if the proposed development would have no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site”.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

Guy Abrahams

I wish to endorse the submission made by the PWA on behalf of the residents and businesses that would be affected by the construction of a waste processing plant on Pinkham Way. The Alliance has set out our views cogently and with authority and I fully support their statement on our behalf.

This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.

No further action proposed.

Marilyn Moggridge

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed.

Trish Silkin

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

* The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.*

The rest of the modification, i.e. “In such circumstances” etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

Trish Silkin

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Holliswood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed.

Trish Silkin

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield land or previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the EiP which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield.

No further action proposed.
Main Modifications November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Number</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trish Silkin</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Silkin</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Lever</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fanning</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Fanning</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod and Alianna</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site.

I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land.

I would like to see the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site unambiguously maintained by a provision that any development is subject to there being no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. There should be certainty about the level of protection.

I would welcome a finding of fact in your report that the Pinkham Way site is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Haringey Council admitted in evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial or employment site. Since you have heard the evidence, and visited the site, I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and not brownfield.

I observed the hearing into the above as a local resident, but have not seen your draft report. Therefore, I make these comments unaware of whether you have or have not accepted the following points.

1. I would welcome a finding of fact in your report that the Pinkham Way site is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Haringey Council admitted in evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial or employment site. Since you have heard the evidence, and visited the site, I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and not brownfield.

The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and appropriate mitigation measures are taken into account.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

SP13 clearly states how the Council will address any development proposals coming forward on SINCs and that appropriate mitigation measures are taken into account.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads SINCs, sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 clearly states how the Council will address any development proposals coming forward on SINCs and that appropriate mitigation measures are taken into account.

I would like to see the SINC status of the Pinkham Way site unambiguously maintained by a provision that any development is subject to there being no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. There should be certainty about the level of protection.

I would welcome a finding of fact in your report that the Pinkham Way site is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Haringey Council admitted in evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial or employment site. Since you have heard the evidence, and visited the site, I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and not brownfield.

I observed the hearing into the above as a local resident, but have not seen your draft report. Therefore, I make these comments unaware of whether you have or have not accepted the following points.

1. I would welcome a finding of fact in your report that the Pinkham Way site is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Haringey Council admitted in evidence at the hearing that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial or employment site. Since you have heard the evidence, and visited the site, I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and not brownfield.

The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and appropriate mitigation measures are taken into account.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads SINCs, sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

The purpose of the last sentence of paragraph 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads SINCs, sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

The purpose of the last sentence of paragraph 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified in the forthcoming GM Policies document.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.
I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and UNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further change proposed. 477/3/mmmds.

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that status at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed. 477/2/mmmds.

The Broomfield Association

The Broomfield Association supports the modification to SP8 recently made by the inspector.

Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.

No further action proposed. 478/1/mmmds.

The Broomfield Association

There needs to be unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy and not simply in the narrative to that policy. This protection should of course embrace the various other SINCS within the district, several of which are contiguous with each other.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 478/3/mmmds.

Catherine Bailey

I support the modification to SP6 made by the inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this employment land site.

SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCS. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCS and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.

No further action proposed. 479/1/mmmds.

Catherine Bailey

I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement "All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect:

- "The Council will not permit development on SINCs and UNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site."

The rest of the modification, i.e. "in such circumstances" etc to remain in 6.3.23 as narrative.

The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to kill all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.

No further action proposed. 479/1/mmmds.

Catherine Bailey

I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads "SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollinwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.

No further action proposed.

Catherine Bailey

I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.

The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.

No further action proposed. 479/2/mmmds.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representer Name</th>
<th>Unique Repres. Number</th>
<th>Concise/Boxed Statement</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
<th>Council's Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
<th>Unique Number (this refers to the unique representer number/representation number/policy or section referred to)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Bax</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIs.</td>
<td>Since the Council receives the Inspector’s final Report and prepares the Local Plan for adoption, all necessary changes will be made to the Proposals Map and SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>479/5/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Roche</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>480/1/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Roche</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>480/3/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Roche</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>480/4/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Roche</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>I would welcome a statement in your report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/variably developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land. Evidence was produced to support that at the inquiry which was not disputed by the Council.</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>480/2/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stickland</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if your report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site.</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>481/1/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stickland</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCs within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to this policy). For example, in the policy box, after the statement “All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc, add a fourth bullet point to the effect: • The Council will not permit development on SINCs and LNRs unless there are exceptional circumstances and where the importance of any development coming forward outweighs the nature conservation value of the site.”</td>
<td>SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINCs. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINCs and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>481/3/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Stickland</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads “SINCs within the borough include Bluebell Wood, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” I suggest this because these first four SINCs are directly geographically linked to each other and it would be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them seems inappropriate.</td>
<td>The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough’s SINCs, they are some examples. All of the SINCs will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document. No further action proposed</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
<td>481/4/mmods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Name</th>
<th>Unique Representative Number</th>
<th>Council’s Response</th>
<th>Council's proposed action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Stickland</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>Yes. Once the Council receives the Inspector’s final report, it will update the Proposals Map to reflect the Inspector’s Modifications.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Olivares</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>The Council considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laraine Feldin</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.</td>
<td>No further action proposed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>