

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
CGMS/MOPAC	7	Unsound	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.	In line with the NPPF and the London Plan, the Council accepts the further representation made by CGMS on behalf of the Police	<p>To ensure conformity, we will add the following to the end of paragraph 5.1.4 to read as follows:</p> <p><u>"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".</u></p> <p>In addition, we will revise the first sentence in para 5.1.10 to read as follows:</p> <p><u>"These are well established industrial areas and the aim is to retain them solely for uses that fall within B1 (b), (c) B2 or B8 uses or uses that share strong similarities to this use class for example policing and other community safety infrastructure",</u> in line with National and Regional guidance.</p> <p>This amendment means part of the last sentence in paragraph 5.1.10 should be deleted as follows: "but will not permit any change of use from those listed above"</p>	7/17/mmods
CGMS/MOPAC	7	Unsound	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)	See Council's response to ref 7/17/mmods	See Council's response to ref 7/17/mmods	7/15/mmods
CGMS/MOPAC	7	Unsound	When assessing policy SP8 against the NPPF, it is considered that it does not meet the requirements of soundness (NPPF paragraph 182) in that the policy is inconsistent with national policy. It is also not effective in terms of being flexible to ensure the delivery of infrastructure to meet changing needs. The delivery of non B use class employment generating uses, which are appropriate in SILs and LSISs is wrongly prohibited. It could result in the MOPAC/MPS having difficulty or being unable to deliver a facility where there is a need and is not considered to meet the requirements of the NPPF, as set out below.	See Council's response to ref 7/17/mmods	See Council's response to ref 7/17/mmods	7/16/mmods
GLA	22	Unsound	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.	Noted.	No further action proposed	22/59/mmods
Savills for THFC	53	Unsound	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).	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 should also note that the Inspector's Modification 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 DPD". Further detail on Modification 28 will be included in the Inspector's final Report.	No further action proposed	53/21/mmods
Thames Water	58	Unsound	Modification Ref: 16- 153 – 99 – 4.2.3 Thames Water welcomes the additional sentence on water saving targets.	Noted.	No further action proposed	58/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Thames Water	58	Unsound	Modification Ref: 17-154-99 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 of the waste water treatment infrastructure necessary to accommodate it."	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.	No further action proposed	58/5/mmods
Thames Water	58	Unsound	The sewage services paragraph should also be amended to identify that Deephams STW serves a large part of the Haringey Borough, that the Upgrade is required to accommodate population growth within Haringey and that the preferred option is currently to Upgrade the existing STW rather than construct a replacement on a new site.	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.	No further action proposed	58/6/mmods
Robert Franks	71	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. 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	71/5/mmods
Robert Franks	71	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." 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	71/7/mmods
Robert Franks	71	Unsound	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 change required.	No further action proposed	71/8/mmods
Robert Franks	71	Unsound	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	71/6 /mmods
Robert Franks	71	Unsound	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	71/9/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Mercedes Ros	83	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. 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	83/7/mmods
Mercedes Ros	83	Unsound	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.	No further action proposed	83/9/mmods
Mercedes Ros	83	Unsound	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	83/10/mmods
Mercedes Ros	83	Unsound	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	83/8/mmods
Mercedes Ros	83	Unsound	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	83/11/mmods
Tara Ryan	85	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. 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	85/3/mmods
Tara Ryan	85	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." 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	85/5/mmods
Tara Ryan	85	Unsound	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	85/6/mmods
Tara Ryan	85	Unsound	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	85/4/mmods
Tara Ryan	85	Unsound	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	85/7/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Barry James	92	Unsound	<p>Further, it is my recent experience that simple inconsistencies are being exploited as significant facts by the vested interests in the Pinkham Way debate. I have recently had need to admonish a senior officer in Haringey Council because of his careless and inappropriate terminology in a briefing about Pinkham Way that he gave to the Haringey Council Cabinet in February 2011. For your information I have attached three documents:</p> <p>(a) A record of the transactions on the "What do They Know" website which facilitates questions under the Freedom of Information Regulations. This document demonstrates the extent to which my simple and reasonable question was initially ignored and subsequently treated to inappropriate responses. There was more obfuscation to follow, evidence of which is not included in this letter.</p> <p>(b) A copy of an email from Haringey Council which purports to set out the requested justification of the material contained in the briefing.</p> <p>(c) A copy of my formal complaint to the Council about the previous treatment of my questions and a detailed reasoning why the explanations offered so far are unacceptable.</p> <p>The point of sending you these documents is to demonstrate that vested interests in the Pinkham Way site will exploit any missing detail in your report. When reading these documents, you will appreciate that some of the points being made about LSIIS presumed acceptance in the Core Strategy but had previously been dismissed by I would also like to support and endorse the Pinkham Way Alliance suggestion that a further minor amendment be made to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads</p>	This comment does not relate to the Main Modifications. These issues are being dealt with separately by the Council.	No further action proposed	92/39/mmods
Barry James	92	Unsound	<p>"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."</p> <p>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.</p>	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	92/38/mmods
Barry James	92	Unsound	I would also 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 point 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	92/36/mmods
Barry James	92	Unsound	There should be unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy, rather than in the narrative to this policy. I fully 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."	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	92/37/mmods
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'. I wonder if you might reflect this important statement, by Haringey Council, in your report so that the situation can be finalised following the significant muddying of the waters by vested interests who, without your clarification, will continue to exploit any continuing 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	92/35/mmods
Chris Elser	94	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	94/3/mmods
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." 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	94/5/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Chris Elser	94	Unsound	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	94/6/mmods
Chris Elser	94	Unsound	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	94/4/mmods
Chris Elser	94	Unsound	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	94/7/mmods
Cllr Barry Rawlings	95	Unsound	Also the protection of the SINC status should not have altered as the UDP statement that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conversation value of the site was a clear statement and provides better guidance than the new wording.	The protection of the SINC status has not altered.	No further action proposed	96/7/mmods
Cllr Barry Raw	95	Unsound	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 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.	Support noted. The Inspector’s final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	96/6/mmods
J. Athanassiou	97	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. 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	97/4/mmods
J. Athanassiou	97	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.” 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	97/6//mmods
J. Athanassiou	97	Unsound	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	97/7/mmods
J. Athanassiou	97	Unsound	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	97/5/mmods
J. Athanassiou	97	Unsound	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	97/8/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Ettore Romei	100	Unsound	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.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	100/3/mmods
Ketan Shah	107	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. 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	107/9/mmods
Ketan Shah	107	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." 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	107/11/mmods
Ketan Shah	107	Unsound	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	107/12/mmods
Ketan Shah	107	Unsound	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	107/10/mmods
Ketan Shah	107	Unsound	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	107/13/mmods
Nick Triviais	123	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. 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	123/11/mmods
Nick Triviais	123	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." 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	123/13/mmods
Nick Triviais	123	Unsound	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	123/14/mmods
Nick Triviais	123	Unsound	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	123/12/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Nick Triviais	123	Unsound	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	123/15/mmods
Newlon Housing Trust Savills	132		If the modification is accepted, the site will be retained within a Locally Significant Industrial site (LSIS). This Policy would be unsound because the designation would not be justified, would not be effective and would be inconsistent with national planning policy.	Noted. Modification 28 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 DPD".	No further action proposed	132/3/mmods
Newlon Housing Trust Savills	132		It would also result in a Plan that is not effective because it would potentially constrain the regeneration of the Northumbeland Park area as envisaged by the Mayor in the OAPF and also the Council in the emerging Local Plan.	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.	No further action proposed	132/6/mmods
Newlon Housing Trust Savills	132		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/next month.	The Mayor's OAPF will be adopted as SPG and does not create new policy. The draft OAPF will need to be amended to reflect the Inspector's Modifications and final Report.	No further action proposed	132/5/mmods
Newlon Housing Trust Savills	132		We, therefore, respectfully ask that the Inspector revokes this Modification and accepts that the site should be re-designed to provide flexibility in the release of the site to alternative sustainable uses that would better facilitate the regeneration of the area.	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 should also note that the Inspector's Modification 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 DPD". Further detail on Modification 28 will be included in the Inspector's final Report.	No further action proposed	132/7/mmods
Newlon Housing Trust Savills	132		When assessed against the criteria outlined within the mayor of London industry and transport SPG, the site 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.	Noted. Modification 28 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 DPD".	No further action proposed	132/4/mmods
Gert Ormel	133	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. 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	133/7/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Gert Ormel	133	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	133/9/mmods
Gert Ormel	133	Unsound	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	133/10/mmods
Gert Ormel	133	Unsound	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	133/8/mmods
Gert Ormel	133	Unsound	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	133/11/mmods
Miles Attenborough	134	Unsound	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 delinked in the new strategy and reworded. 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 which would certainly fail if this clause remained in place. Again this is not robust plan making 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.	No further action proposed	134/24/mmods
Miles Attenborough	134	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. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to the status of this Employment Land site and any confusion introduced by Haringey's attempts to re-designate it to industrial land at the request of NLWA. As I have made clear in my earlier response to the re-consultation on the fundamental changes to the Core Strategy, the attempt to re-designate the site was very obviously driven by a desire to ease a forthcoming planning application for the site, rather than being based on sound evidence based plan making. I am pleased the inspector has also recognised this.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	134/22/mmods
Miles Attenborough	134	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	134/26/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Miles Attenborough	134		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	134/27/mmods
Miles Attenborough	134	Unsound	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/mmods
Miles 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 SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications.	No further action proposed	134/28/mmods
Miles Attenborough	134		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 identifying this as one of few opportunities within Haringey to restore Haringey's waterways. This opportunity should be protected in the site's designation and the designation should state no development of the site will be permitted that would compromise the ability to de-culvert the stream that runs through the Pinkham Way site. Previous consultation responses by the EA on the core strategy have highlighted the need to protect this opportunity and it appears that these responses have been ignored both by Haringey and the inspector. I note that in a previous letter from NLWA to Haringey of 21 June 2010 (see page 10 of the attached) , NLWA asked that reference to this opportunity to de-culvert the stream be removed from the site's allocation. I would have thought the EA response would carry greater weight in this instance than a letter from the applicants for a forthcoming planning application, particularly as the applicants comment from page 10 of their letter re the North London Waste Plan is irrelevant as presumably the site could be developed in a way that allows de-culverting of the stream, but also because the NLWP was recently deemed unsound.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	134/25/mmods
Kimberley Pyper	135		As concerned resident of Coppetts Ward 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	135/11/mmods
Kimberley Pyper	135		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	135/12/mmods
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), 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	135/13/mmods
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 SP8 Employment to reflect the Inspector's Modifications.	No further action proposed	135/14/mmods
Karl 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 delinked in the new strategy and reworded. 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.	No further action proposed	141/8/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Karl Brown	141		I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. It would be welcome if the final report reflected that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. I believe a statement to this effect would remove ambiguity as to its status.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	141/6/mmods
Karl Brown	141		I would also welcome a statement in the report that the site is open space and that it is not brownfield/previously developed land. It is excluded from this definition under the London Plan and the NPPF definitions of previously developed land in submitted evidence I had the opportunity to read.	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	141/7/mmods
John Menich	146		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	146/6/mmods
John Menich	146		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	146/8/mmods
John Menich	146		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	146/9/mmods
John Menich	146		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	146/7/mmods
John Menich	146		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	146/10/mmods
David Davies	154		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	154/8/mmods
David Davies	154		The site is open space and not brownfield/previously developed land; 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. We would welcome a statement in your report that 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	154/5/mmods
David Davies	154		We 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 delinked in the new strategy and reworded. 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."	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	154/6/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
David Davies	154		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, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park.” We 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	154/7/mmods
David Davies	154		We 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. We 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	154/4/mmods
Janice o'Shea	161		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 the 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	161/2/mmods
Janice o'Shea	161		I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “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	161/4/mmods
Janice o'Shea	161		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	161/5/mmods
Janice o'Shea	161		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	161/3/mmods
Janice o'Shea	161		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	161/6/mmods
Jason MacKay	165		I support the modification to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be helpful if the report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, i.e. that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site and stated clearly that the 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	165/8/mmods
Jason MacKay	165		I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINCS within the Biodiversity Policy (rather than in the narrative to that 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The Council will not permit development on SINCS 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	165/10/mmods
Jason MacKay	165		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.	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	165/11/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Jason MacKay	165		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	165/9/mmods
Jason MacKay	165		Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect the Inspector's decision not to permit the re-designation of Pinkham Way 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	165/12/mmods
Howard Willia	169		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	169/3/mmods
Howard Willia	169		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	169/5/mmods
Howard Willia	169		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	169/6/mmods
Howard Willia	169		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	169/4/mmods
Howard Willia	169		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	169/7/mmods
Helen Jones	170		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	170/5/mmods
Helen Jones	170		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	170/7/mmods
Helen Jones	170		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	170/8/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Helen Jones	170		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	170/6/mmods
Helen Jones	170		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	170/9/mmods
Guy Veal	176		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	176/8/mmods
Guy Veal	176		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	176/10/mmods
Guy Veal	176		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	176/11/mmods
Guy Veal	176		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	176/9/mmods
Guy Veal	176		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	176/12/mmods
Graham Wood	177		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	177/5/mmods
Graham Wood	177		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	177/7/mmods
Graham Wood	177		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	177/8/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Graham Wood	177		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	177/6/mmods
Graham Wood	177		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	177/9/mmods
Peter Storey	180		Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need to be changed to reflect your decision not to permit the re-designation 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	180/15/mmods
Peter Storey	180		There needs to be 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. please would you 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	180/13/mmods
Peter Storey	180		We support the modifications to SP8 made by the Inspector. However, it would be extremely helpful if your report clearly reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. We believe a statement to this effect would remove any ambiguity as to the current status of this Employment Land site.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	180/11/mmods
Peter Storey	180		We would also suggest that your report clarifies that the site is currently open space and not brownfield/previously developed land as it is clearly 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 and this 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	180/12/mmods
Peter Storey	180		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, Muswell Hill Golf Course, Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works (Pinkham Way), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park." We suggest this because these first four SINCS are geographically linked to each other and it would therefore be appropriate to mention them together. Dropping any one of them is illogical and 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	180/14/mmods
Frances Heigham	182		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	182/4/mmods
Frances Heigham	182		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	183/6/mmods
Frances Heigham	182		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	184/7/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Frances Heigham	182		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	182/5/mmods
Frances Heigham	182		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	184/8/mmods
Dan Evans	200		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	200/5/mmods
Dan Evans	200		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	200/7/mmods
Dan Evans	200		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	200/8/mmods
Dan Evans	200		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	200/6/mmods
Dan Evans	200		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	200/9/mmods
Chris Anderson	208		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	208/6//mmods
Chris Anderson	208		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	208/8/mmods
Chris Anderson	208		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	208/9/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Chris Anderson	208		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	208/7/mmods
Chris Anderson	208		Proposal Maps 7, 16 and 24 need changing to reflect your decision not to permit the redesignation to LSIS. 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), Hollickwood Park, Tottenham Cemetery and Bruce Castle Park."	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	208/9/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		That final wording amendment is suggested because the first four SINCS listed are directly geographically linked to each other, so should be mentioned together as a collective entity.	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	214/11/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		Closely related to that first point: it appears that, according to the London Plan and the NPPF, the site is definitely open space, not previously developed land, or 'brownfield' land. This was discussed at the inquiry and I understand the Council agreed then that the site is open space. Could a statement that the Pinkham Way site is open space be added to your report?	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	214/8/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		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 (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	214/12/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		My first comment relates to the Inspector's modification to SP8. 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?	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	214/7/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		The Biodiversity Policy should provide explicit and 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. 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 should 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	214/10/mmods
Caroline Whitehead	214		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 reworded and weakened.	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	214/9/mmods
Alison Assiter	226		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	226/4/mmods
Alison Assiter	226		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	226/6/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Alison Assiter	226		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	226/7/mmods
Alison Assiter	226		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	226/5/mmods
Alison Assiter	226		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	226/8/mmods
Anna Blackburn	231		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	231/2/mmods
Anna Blackburn	231		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	231/4/mmods
Anna Blackburn	231		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	231/5/mmods
Anna Blackburn	231		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	231/3/mmods
Anna Blackburn	231		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	231/6/mmods
Belinda Lawley	233		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	233/3/mmods
Belinda Lawley	233		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	233/5/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Belinda Lawley	233		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	233/6/mmods
Belinda Lawley	233		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	233/4/mmods
Belinda Lawley	233		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	233/7/mmods
Lynne Hurley	242		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	242/2/mmods
Lynne Hurley	242		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	242/4/mmods
Lynne Hurley	242		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	242/5/mmods
Lynne Hurley	242		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	242/3/mmods
Lynne Hurley	242		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	242/6/mmods
Max Tomlinson	243		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	243/6/mmods
Max Tomlinson	243		We 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. We 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	243/3/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Max Tomlinson	243		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.	No further action proposed	243/4/mmods
Max Tomlinson	243		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, 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	243/5/mmods
Alan Peacock	260		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	260/10/mmods
Alan Peacock	260		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	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	260/8/mmods
Alan Peacock	260		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	260/9/mmods
Alan Peacock	260		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	260/11/mmods
Alan Peacock	260		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.	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	260/7/mmods
Mark Jacobs	265		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	265/7/mmods
Mark Jacobs	265		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	265/9/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Mark Jacobs	265		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	265/10/mmods
Mark Jacobs	265		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	265/8/mmods
Mark Jacobs	265		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	265/11/mmods
Leila Sifri	281		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	281/5/mmods
Leila Sifri	281		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	281/7/mmods
Leila Sifri	281		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	281/8/mmods
Leila Sifri	281		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	281/6/mmods
Leila Sifri	281		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	281/9/mmods
John Waller	282		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	282/3/mmods
John Waller	282		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	282/5/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
John Waller	282		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	282/6/mmods
John Waller	282		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	282/4/mmods
John Waller	282		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	282/7/mmods
Nick Jenkins	290		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	290/5/mmods
Nick Jenkins	290		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	290/7/mmods
Nick Jenkins	290		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	290/8/mmods
Nick Jenkins	290		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	290/6/mmods
Nick Jenkins	290		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	290/9/mmods
Pavel Pachovs	296		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	296/9/mmods
Pavel Pachovs	296		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	296/11/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Pavel Pachovs	296		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	296/12/mmods
Pavel Pachovs	296		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	296/10/mmods
Pavel Pachovs	296		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	296/13/mmods
Natural England	301		After careful consideration of the information supplied, Natural England does not wish to offer any substantive comments. The modifications are designed to ensure the document complied more fully with the National Planning Policy Framework.	Noted.	No further action proposed	301/15/mmods
Richard Smyth	311		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	311/6/mmods
Richard Smyth	311		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	311/8/mmods
Richard Smyth	311		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	311/9/mmods
Richard Smyth	311		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	311/7/mmods
Richard Smyth	311		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	311/10/mmods
Paul Collard	328		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	328/5/mmods
Paul Collard	328		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	328/7/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Paul Collard	328		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	328/8/mmods
Paul Collard	328		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	328/6/mmods#
Paul Collard	328		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	328/9/mmods
Susie Holdon	341		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	341/4/mmods
Susie Holdon	341		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	341/6/mmods
Susie Holdon	341		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	341/7/mmods
Susie Holdon	341		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	241/5/mmods
Susie Holdon	341		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	341/8/mmods
Sue Wagstaff	343		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	343/9/mmods
Sue Wagstaff	343		We 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/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Sue Wagstaff	343		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	343/7/mmods
Sue Wagstaff	343		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, 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	343/8/mmods
Sue Wagstaff	343		We 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	343/6/mmods
Erik Rochelme	374		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	374/2/mmods
Erik Rochelme	374		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	374/4/mmods
Erik Rochelme	374		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	374/5/mmods
Erik Rochelme	374		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	374/3/mmods
Erik Rochelme	374		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	374/6/mmods
Theresa Villiers MP	380		I also agree with the PWA suggestion that a fourth bullet point should be added after the statement 'All development shall protect and improve sites of biodiversity and nature conservation etc' along the following lines: '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 values 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	38010/mmods
Theresa Villiers MP	380		I would also like to see your report acknowledging that the site is 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. I am informed that evidence to support this was produced at the enquiry and 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	380/8/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Theresa Villiers MP	380		Like the PWA, I am concerned that the protection of the site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) status of the Pinkham Way site has been weakened. In the UDP it stated that that development would be allowed on the site provided there was no impact on the nature conservation value of the site. I note that this stipulation has been re-worded in the new strategy.	SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINC's. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINC's and how the policy will be applied. No further change proposed.	No further action proposed	380/9/mmods
Theresa Villiers MP	380		The PWA suggests one further amendment to para 6.3.23 - that the last sentence reads 'SINC's 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 note that their view is that because these first four SINC's are directly geographically linked to each other it would be appropriate to mention them together.	The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINC's, they are some examples. All of the SINC's will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.	No further action proposed	380/11/mmods
Theresa Villiers MP	380		With regard to the Pinkham Way site, I share the views of the PWA that it would be helpful for your report to reflect the evidence given at the hearing by the Council, that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site. Such a statement would remove any 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	380/7/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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 the correct basis. And it would remove the ambiguity and misunderstandings about the planning status of this site which have resulted, in our view, both in the misapplication of policies and the non application of appropriate policies to the site during the preparation of the Core Strategy. 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 the site is properly to be regarded as brownfield land/PDL or the site it is not brownfield land/PDL because it falls within the category of land which is excluded from the definition of brownfield land/PDL in the London Plan and in the NPPF the site is Open Space the site has a nil use	The Inspector's Final Report will include, in more detail, the reasons for his modifications.	No further action proposed	383/39/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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.	Noted.	No further action proposed	383/26/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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 SINC's and LNR's 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 SINC's.	The proposed modification is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan, but a reference can be made to the protection of SINC's 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 SINC's and LNR's will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document".	383/36/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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.	No further action proposed	383/37/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		Policy SP13, as proposed for modification, does not give proper protection to SINC's and other designated sites. 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. 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.	SP13 provides the protection of SINC's and LNR's. Modification 41 does not weaken the SINC protection, it clearly states what the Council will do should development come forward on a site where there is more than one designation. Further policy guidance on SINC's and LNR's will be brought forward in the Development Management Policies document.	No further action proposed	383/34/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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 SP8 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.	Noted.	No further action proposed	383/27/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Evelyn Ryan	383		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.	All maps and schedules will be amended as part of the adoption process.	No further action proposed	383/41/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		Removal 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.	The Inspector's Final Report will include, in detail, reasons for Modification 28.	No further action proposed	383/29/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		I would like to ask that the Inspector considers the benefit of clarifying a number of matters relating to the Pinkham Way site. The Inspector will recall that during the course of the EiP the Council made it clear on a number of occasions that it considered the Pinkham Way site was a brownfield "well established industrial area". Although the Council subsequently conceded, after appropriate and fair examination of the evidence by the Inspector, that it could not be considered a well established industrial area, there was no similar clarification about whether the site should be classified as brownfield land and/or as open space. Nor was there any clarification about the planning status of the site, i.e. that it has a nil use. Because of the lack of clarity on these matters, I believe there is confusion within the Council about which policies are relevant to the site. For example, in the Site Allocations DPD 2010 there are 8 policies listed as relevant against the Pinkham Way Site entry but SP13 is not one of them. This is probably the most important policy to apply to this site and should have been included. Brownfield sites are normally treated differently to Open Spaces. Yet the Inspector will recall the many references to the site being a brownfield site, including in	The Inspector's final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.	No further action proposed	383/38/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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. Therefore the saved UDP (OS6) should remain the prevailing policy for protection of SINC's.	Modification 41 will not affect the emerging DM policies. The emerging DM policy on nature conservation will provide further detail and guidance on how to implement SP13.	No further action proposed	383/35/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		The Pinkham Way site would have been carried forward as an employment allocation from the UDP but without an appropriately robust review of the site's continued suitability for this allocation. I would argue that in such a case the Core Strategy would not comply with the relevant national policy and guidance. Pinkham Way is unique among the DEA designated sites. It does not fit into the description given in the plan as to the characteristics of such sites. For example, there are no buildings on the site, no infrastructure, just verdant green space, covered in trees, shrubs and plants. Unlike the others, it has not been developed for over 45 years, it has no existing buildings, no infrastructure, and is the only SINC of Borough No 1 Importance within this category of sites. The site has all the characteristics of a SINC but none of the characteristics of Employment Land. It is the only SINC No 1 Importance that has a dual designation. In my view it is an anomaly and should have no place in the strategic plan.	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. 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 more detail around Modification 28.	No further action proposed	383/28/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		The site description of FFBSW (Pinkham Way) should be amended following the Inspector's report to reflect accurately the outcome of his deliberations.	Noted.	No further action proposed	383/41/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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 / FFBSWS 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. The dual designation, together with the proposed weakened SINC protection in Modification 41 leaves Pinkham way, the last undeveloped open space of any significant size in the borough of Haringey, which is also a designated SINC of high value (No 1 Borough Importance), unnecessarily vulnerable.	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.	No further action proposed	383/40/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Evelyn Ryan	383		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 a) 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 this 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.	No further action proposed	383/32/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		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. I believe would be unsound to allow the dual designation to remain in the plan whilst at the same time weakening the protection provided, see Modification 41 below.	The Inspector's final Report will provide further detail and reasoning behind this Modification.	No further action proposed	383/33/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		new information, in the form of a Councillors briefing note dated 1998, (not made available for the EIP) has been disclosed as an appendix to the Council's objections to the Village Green application relating to the Pinkham Way site. It sets out the planning history of the site from 1950 – 1995 and among the comments made in the document, the following are set out here to support my request that the designation of Employment Land be removed: "Middlesex Development Plan (1950-65) identified most of the site as Public Open Space plus orchard and nursery and Council Depot" "Employment uses on the site would be difficult to service by public transport and would be inaccessible to Tottenham workers ..." and that "arguably it would be more difficult to retain/conservate any elements of ecological value on the site if it were developed for employment uses" "factory or warehouse development would be likely to have greater adverse impact on the character and amenity of adjacent MOL on the South and West" "GLDP saw it as part of a larger area of MOL"	This comment does not relate to the Main Modifications. These issues are being dealt with separately by the Council.	No further action proposed	383/30/mmods
Evelyn Ryan	383		I believe the Council should have disclosed this information to the EIP rather than claim that the site had no I note the Inspector has pointed out to the Council (letter of 24 August 2012) that they might take an opportunity to robustly access the DEAs of the Borough and to alter their specific designation if warranted to ensure the aims of Policy SP8 are secured". 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 how the aims of both Policies SP8 and SP13 would be secured.	Noted. The Inspector's final Report will provide further reasoning behind this Modification.	No further action proposed	383/31/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		PWA is also concerned that, without further modifications to the Core Strategy the Council will seek, 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.	No further action proposed	384/43/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		1.1 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.	Support noted.	No further action proposed	384/27/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		1.12 In light of the fact that supporting evidence of the SINC No 1 Borough Importance designation was submitted to the EIP and agreed, we request the Inspector to consider recommending that that SINC designation be retained, and that the Employment designation be removed from the Pinkham Way site – or at least to recommend that the site should not be allocated for employment use - until such time as a robust and proper assessment can be carried out. 1.13 We consider it would be unsound to allow the dual designation to remain in the plan whilst at the same time weakening the protection provided, see our comments on Modification 41 below.	The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.	No further action proposed	384/31/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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 the 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.	No further action proposed	384/28/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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	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.	No further action proposed	384/29/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		1.7 In the Inspector's letter of 24 August 2012, towards the end of paragraph 5, we note that the Inspector points out that the "intended Sites Allocation DPD would provide a suitable opportunity to robustly access the DEAs of the Borough and to alter their specific designation if warranted to ensure the aims of Policy SP8 are secured". 1.8 At Modification 40 there is a reference to "...review and upgrade or remove, as appropriate, existing open land to or from MOL designation where there is evidence to support such a move". 1.9 However, nowhere in the Inspector's letters or in the proposed modifications is there any reference to robustly assessing sites which have dual designations to ensure the aims of both designations are secured. 1.10 The Greenfield status of the site renders it inappropriate for any allocation for employment use given the availability of alternative, previously developed sites which are suitable for allocation. 1.11 The allocation of the site for any built development is in direct conflict with its designation as a SINC of borough wide importance. As the two uses are incompatible and would lead to an internal conflict between 2 separate policies within the Core Strategy the allocation of the site for development would also put the plan in conflict with NPPF paragraphs 109 and 110. For these reasons the plan would be unsound.	The Inspector's final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.	No further action proposed	384/30/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		2.1 PWA objects to Modification 41, in that Policy SP13, as proposed for modification, fails to give adequate protection to SINC 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.	SP13 provides the protection of SINC and LNRs. Further policy guidance on SINC and LNRs will be brought forward in the Development Management Policies document.	No further action proposed	384/32/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		2. The Inspector will recall that during the course of the EiP the Council made it clear on a number of occasions that it considered the Pinkham Way site was a brownfield "well established industrial area". Although they subsequently conceded, after appropriate and fair examination of the evidence by the Inspector, that it could not be considered a well established industrial area, there was no similar clarification about whether the site should be classified as brownfield land and/or as open space. Nor was there any clarification about the planning status of the site, i.e. that it has a nil use.	The Inspector's final Report will include more detail around his reasoning for Modification 28.	No further action proposed	384/39/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		2.2 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.	SP13 provides the protection of SINC and LNRs. Further policy guidance on SINC and LNRs will be brought forward in the Development Management Policies. Modification 41 states what the Council will require should development take place on site which has more than one designation. The Council doesn't consider this weakens the SINC protection.	No further action proposed	384/33/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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 SINC's.	SP13 provides the protection of SINC's and LNR's. Further policy guidance on SINC's and LNR's will be brought forward in the Development Management Policies document.	No further action proposed	384/34//mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		2.4 We suggest the modification 41, page 158 para 6.3.23 should be amended as follows: 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 SINC's and LNR's is provided in Haringey's Local Development Framework document Development Management Policies".	The proposed modification is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan but a reference can be made to the protection of SINC's 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 SINC's and LNR's will be provided in the emerging Development Management Policies document".	384/35/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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.	This proposed modification is superfluous and does not add anything to the text. 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.	No further action proposed	384/38/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		about which policies are relevant to the site. For example, in the Site Allocations DPD 2010 there are 8 policies listed as relevant against the Pinkham Way Site entry but SP13 is not one of them. This is probably the most important policy to apply to this site and should have been included. Brownfield sites are normally treated differently to Open Spaces. Yet the Inspector will recall the many references to the site being a brownfield site, including in the Sustainability Appraisal supporting CSSD-3. 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 the correct basis. And it would remove the ambiguity and misunderstandings about the planning status of this site which have resulted, in our view, both in the misapplication of policies and the non application of appropriate policies to the site during the preparation of the Core Strategy.	Noted. The Council will make sure, when published for consultation, that the Site Allocations document includes the correct policies for all relevant sites.	No further action proposed	384/40/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		5. The issues we refer to are as follows: 6. 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/PDL or (b) the site is not brownfield land/PDL, because it falls within the category of land which is excluded from the definition of brownfield land/PDL in the London Plan and in the NPPF (c) the site is Open Space (d) the site has a nil use	These are issues for the Inspector's final Report.	No further action proposed	384/41/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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 invite the Inspector to conclude that this is the case.	This is an issue for the Inspector's final Report.	No further action proposed	384/42/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		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 on their own. In our view this renders the plan unsound and we would invite the Inspector to conclude that this is the case.	These are the Inspector's Main Modifications which he is minded to recommend to ensure the soundness of the Plan. His final Report will include more detail on these modifications.	No further action proposed	384/26/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		In the event that the Inspector is not minded to reject Modification 41, we would request that, after the underlined words "appropriate mitigation measures must be taken", the following be inserted: 'any mitigation proposals to be the subject of full public consultation'	These are the Inspector's Main Modifications which he is minded to recommend to ensure the soundness of the Plan. His final Report will include more detail on these modifications.	No further action proposed	384/37/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		1. 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. We would welcome an opportunity to comment on the revised plans before adoption if that were possible. 2. The site description of FFBSW (Pinkham Way) should be amended following the Inspector's report to reflect accurately the outcome of his deliberations.	The Proposals Map and any other maps within the Local Plan: Strategic Policies will be amended to reflect the Inspector's Report before the Council adopts the Plan.	No further action proposed	384/45/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		PWA is of the view that the inclusion of Modification 41 could be interpreted as an attempt to pre-empt the outcome of a proper and full public consultation and examination of the DMP policies relating to protection of SINC's.	Modification 41 will not affect the emerging DM policies. The emerging DM policy on nature conservation will provide further detail and guidance on how to implement SP13.	No further action proposed	384/36/mmods
PWA - Stephen Brice	384		The dual designation, together with the proposed weakened SINC protection in Modification 41 leaves Pinkham way, the last undeveloped open space of any significant size in the borough of Haringey, which is also a designated SINC of high value (No 1 Borough Importance), unnecessarily vulnerable.	SP13 provides the protection of SINC's and LNR's. 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.	No further action proposed	384/44/mmods
Freehold Community Association	385		Equally, there should be confirmation that this site is Greenfield land and afforded the protection given in the NPPF. Whilst convenient Haringey have added this site to their Open Green space credentials and this should now be formally recognised.	Pinkham Way is designated a SINC and this designation has not changed. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation to this modification.	No further action proposed	385/8/mods
Freehold Community Association	385		We believe that an important part of the current examination should make a decision on the continued designation of the site for employment as being inappropriate as it has existed throughout the entire life of the previous plan without result. This designation was being used as a tactic against development rather than an achievable aim and is contrary to Section 22 of the NPPF.	The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation around Modification 28.	No further action proposed	385/7/mmods
Emily O'Neil	390		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	390/1/mmods
Emily O'Neil	390		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 SINC's and LNR's 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 SINC's. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINC's and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.	No further action proposed	390/3/mmods
Emily O'Neil	390		I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINC's 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 SINC's 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 SINC's, they are some examples. All of the SINC's will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.	No further action proposed	390/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Emily O'Neil	390		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	390/2/mmods
Emily O'Neil	390		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	390/5/mmods
Kate Bauss	391		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	391/1/mmods
Kate Bauss	391		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	391/3/mmods
Kate Bauss	391		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	391/4/mmods
Kate Bauss	391		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	391/2/mmods
Kate Bauss	391		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	391/5/mmods
Tony Wills	392		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	392/1/mmods
Tony Wills	392		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	392/3/mmods
Tony Wills	392		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	392/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Tony Wills	392		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	392/2/mmods
Tony Wills	392		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	392/5/mmods
Juliet Oerton	393		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	393/1/mmods
Juliet Olerton	393		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	393/3/mmods
Juliet Olerton	393		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	393/4/mmods
v	393		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	393/2/mmods
Juliet Olerton	393		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	393/5/mmods
Rebecca White	394		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	394/1/mmods
Rebecca White	394		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	394/3/mmods
Rebecca White	394		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	394/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Rebecca White	394		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	394/2/mmods
Rebecca White	394		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	394/5/mmods
Leigh Warner	395		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	395/1/mmods
Leigh Warner	395		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	395/3/mmods
Leigh Warner	395		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	395/4/mmods
Leigh Warner	395		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	395/2/mmods
Leigh Warner	395		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	395/5/mmods
Robert Andrew	396		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	396/1/mmods
Robert Andrew	396		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	396/3/mmods
Robert Andrew	396		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	396/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Robert Andrew	396		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	396/2/mmods
Robert Andrew	396		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	395/5/mmods
Paula Symons	397		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	397/1/mmods
Paula Symons	397		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	397/3/mmods
Paula Symons	397		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	397/4/mmods
Paula Symons	397		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	397/2/mmods
Paula Symons	397		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	397/5/mmods
Jason Roche	398		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	398/1/mmods
Jason Roche	398		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	398/3/mmods
Jason Roche	398		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	398/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Jason Roche	398		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	398/2/mmods
Jason Roche	398		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	398/5/mmods
Dirk Plutz	399		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	399/1/mmods
Dirk Plutz	399		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	399/3/mmods
Dirk Plutz	399		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	399/4/mmods
Dirk Plutz	399		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	399/2/mmods
Dirk Plutz	399		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	399/5/mmods
Mary Behan	400		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	400/1/mmods
Mary Behan	400		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	400/3/mmods
Mary Behan	400		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	400/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Mary Behan	400		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	400/2/mmods
Mary Behan	400		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	400/5/mmods
Flavio Poli	401		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	401/1/mmods
Flavio Poli	401		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	401/3/mmods
Flavio Poli	401		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	401/4/mmods
Flavio Poli	401		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	401/2/mmods
Flavio Poli	401		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	401/5/mmods
Hannah Redley	402		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	402/1/mmods
Hannah Redley	402		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	402/3/mmods
Hannah Redley	402		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	402/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Hannah Redley	402		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	402/2/mmods
Hannah Redley	402		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	402/5/mmods
Laura Lovejoy	403		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	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	403/3/mods
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	403/4/mmods
Laura Lovejoy	403		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	403/2/mmods
Laura Lovejoy	403		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	403/5/mmods
Richard Gammons	404		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	404/1/mmods
Richard Gammons	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	404/3/mmods
Richard Gammons	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	404/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Richard Gammons	404		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	404/2/mmods
Richard Gammons	404		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	404/5/mmods
Paul Hancock	405		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	405/1//mmods
Paul Hancock	405		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	405/3/mmods
Paul Hancock	405		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	405/4/mmods
Paul Hancock	405		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	405/2/mmods
Paul Hancock	405		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	405/6/mmods
Linda Craig	406		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	406/1/mmods
Linda Craig	406		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	406/3/mmods
Linda Craig	406		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	406/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Linda Craig	406		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	406/2/mmods
Linda Craig	406		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	406/5/mmods
Josie Dobrin	407		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	407/1/mmods
Josie Dobrin	407		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	407/3/mmods
Josie Dobrin	407		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	407/4/mmods
Josie Dobrin	407		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	407/2/mmods
Josie Dobrin	407		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	407/5/mmods
Hank Sim	408		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	408/1/mmods
Hank Sim	408		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	408/3/mmods
Hank Sim	408		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	408/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Hank Sim	408		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	408/2/mmods
Hank Sim	408		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	408/5/mmods
Meera Ganatra	409		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	409/1/mmods
Meera Ganatra	409		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	409/3/mmods
Meera Ganatra	409		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	409/4/mmods
Meera Ganatra	409		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	409/2/mmods
Meera Ganatra	409		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	409/5/mmods
Tom Ambrose	410		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	410/1/mmods
Tom Ambrose	410		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	410/3/mmods
Tom Ambrose	410		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	410/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Tom Ambrose	410		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	410/2/mmods
Tom Ambrose	410		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	410/5/mmods
Mary Mohan	411		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	411/1/mmods
Mary Mohan	411		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	411/3/mmods
Mary Mohan	411		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	411/4/mmods
Mary Mohan	411		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	411/2/mmods
Mary Mohan	411		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	411/5/mmods
Veronica Royet	412		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	412/1/mods
Veronica Royet	412		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	412/3/mmods
Veronica Royet	412		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	412/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Veronica Royet	412		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	412/2/mmods
Veronica Royet	412		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	412/5/mmods
Karen Doherty	413		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	413/1/mmods
Karen Doherty	413		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	413/3/mmods
Karen Doherty	413		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	413/4/mmods
Karen Doherty	413		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	413/2/mmods
Karen Doherty	413		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	413/5/mmods
Kee Armstrong	414		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	414/1/mmods
Kee Armstrong	414		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	414/3/mmods
Kee Armstrong	414		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	414/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Kee Armstrong	414		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	414/2/mmods
Kee Armstrong	414		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	414/5/mmods
Jonathan Gordon	415		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	415/1/mmods
Jonathan Gordon	415		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	415/3/mmods
Jonathan Gordon	415		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	415/4/mmods
Jonathan Gordon	415		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	415/2/mmods
Jonathan Gordon	415		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	415/5/mmods
Stephen Middleton	416		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	416/1/mmods
Stephen Middleton	416		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	416/3/mmods
Stephen Middleton	416		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	416/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Stephen Middleton	416		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	416/2/mmods
Stephen Middleton	416		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	416/5/mmods
Carmen Harris	417		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	417/1/mmods
Carmen Harris	417		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	417/3/mmods
Carmen Harris	417		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	417/4/mmods
Carmen Harris	417		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	417/2/mmods
Carmen Harris	417		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	417/5/mmods
Filipa Maia	418		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	418/1/mmods
Filipa Maia	418		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	418/3/mmods
Filipa Maia	418		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	418/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Filipa Maia	418		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	418/2/mmods
Filipa Maia	418		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	418/5/mmods
Philip Chard	419		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	419/1/mmods
Philip Chard	419		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	419/3/mmods
Philip Chard	419		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	419/4/mmods
Philip Chard	419		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	419/2/mmods
Philip Chard	419		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	419/5/mmods
M Sotery and A Terroni	420		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	420/1/mmods
M Sotery and A Terroni	420		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	420/3/mmods
M Sotery and A Terroni	420		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	420/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
M Sotery and A Terroni	420		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	420/2/mmods
M Sotery and A Terroni	420		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	420/5/mmods
Elizabeth Royston	421		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	421/1/mmods
Elizabeth Royston	421		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	421/3/mmods
Elizabeth Royston	421		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	421/4/mmods
Elizabeth Royston	421		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	421/2/mmods
Elizabeth Royston	421		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	421/5/mmods
Annie Clough	422		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	422/1/mmods
Annie Clough	422		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	422/3/mmods
Annie Clough	422		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	422/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Annie Clough	422		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	422/2/mmods
Annie Clough	422		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	422/5/mmods
Victoria Emin	423		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	423/1/mmods
Victoria Emin	423		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	423/3/mmods
Victoria Emin	423		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	423/4/mmods
Victoria Emin	423		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	423/2/mmods
Victoria Emin	423		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	423/5/mmods
Theresa Dudek	424		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	424/1/mods
Theresa Dudek	424		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	424/3/mmods
Theresa Dudek	424		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	424/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Theresa Dudek	424		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	424/2/mmods
Theresa Dudek	424		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	424/5/mmods
Eva Maclaine	425		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	425/1/mmods
Eva Maclaine	425		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	425/3/mmods
Eva Maclaine	425		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	425/4/mmods
Eva Maclaine	425		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	425/2/mmods
Eva Maclaine	425		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	425/5/mmods
Robert Simpson	426		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	426/1/mmods
Robert Simpson	426		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	426/3/mmods
Robert Simpson	426		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	426/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Robert Simpson	426		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	426/2/mmods
Robert Simpson	426		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	426/5/mmods
Delphine Cressent	427		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	427/1/mmods
Delphine Cressent	427		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	427/3/mmods
Delphine Cressent	427		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	427/4/mods
Delphine Cressent	427		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	427/2/mmods
Delphine Cressent	427		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	427/5/mmods
Jane de Sausmarez	428		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	428/1//mmods
Jane de Sausmarez	428		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	428/3/mmods
Jane de Sausmarez	428		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	428/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Jane de Sausmarez	428		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	428/2/mmods
Jane de Sausmarez	428		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	428/5/mmods
Gerard McDonagh	429		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	429/1/mmods
Gerard McDonagh	429		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	429/3/mmods
Gerard McDonagh	429		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	429/4/mmods
Gerard McDonagh	429		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	429/2/mmods
Gerard McDonagh	429		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	429/5/mmods
Gerry Skinner	430		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	430/1/mmods
Gerry Skinner	430		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	430/3/mmods
Gerry Skinner	430		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	430/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Gerry Skinner	430		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	430/2/mmods
Gerry Skinner	430		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	430/5/mmods
Lucy Birch	431		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	431/1/mmods
Lucy Birch	431		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	431/3/mmods
Lucy Birch	431		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	431/4/mmods
Lucy Birch	431		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	431/2/mmods
Lucy Birch	431		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	431/5/mmods
Edward Doherty	432		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	432/1//mmods
Edward Doherty	432		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	432/3/mmods
Edward Doherty	432		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	432/4//mods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Edward Doherty	432		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	432/2/mmods
Edward Doherty	432		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	432/5/mmods
Thomas Milord	433		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	433/1/1/mmods
Thomas Milord	433		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	433/3mmods
Thomas Milord	433		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	433/4/mmods
Thomas Milord	433		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	433/2/mmods
Thomas Milord	433		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	433/5/mmods
Carolyn Kirkby	434		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	434/1/mmods
Carolyn Kirkby	434		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	434/3/mmods
Carolyn Kirkby	434		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	434/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Carolyn Kirkby	434		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	434/2/mmods
Carolyn Kirkby	434		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	434/5/mmods
Tim Parkinson	435		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	435/1/mmods
Tim Parkinson	435		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	435/3/mmods
Tim Parkinson	435		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	435/4/mmods
Tim Parkinson	435		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	435/2/mmods
Tim Parkinson	435		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	435/5/mmods
Ella Pays	436		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	436/1/mmods
Ella Pays	436		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	436/3/mmods
Ella Pays	436		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	436/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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 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	436/2/mmods
Ella Pays	436		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	436/5/mmods
Sue Jelley	437		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	437/1/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	437/3/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), 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	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.	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	437/2/mmods
Sue Jelley	437		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	437/5/mmods
Harriet Whitbread	438		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	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), 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	438/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Harriet Whitbread	438		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	438/2/mmods
Harriet Whitbread	438		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	438/5/mmods
Sue Davies	439		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	439/1/mmods
Sue Davies	439		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	439/3/mmods
Sue Davies	439		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	439/4/mmods
Sue Davies	439		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	439/2/mmods
Sue Davies	439		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	439/5/mmods
Paul Hancock	440		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	440/1/mmods
Paul Hancock	440		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	440/3/mmods
Paul Hancock	440		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	440/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
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.	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	440/5/mmods
Gordon Lipton	441		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	441/1/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." 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	441/3/mmods
Gordon Lipton	441		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	441/4/mmods
Gordon Lipton	441		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	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.	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	441/5/mmods
Thomas Campbell	442		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	442/1/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." 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	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 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	442/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Thomas Campbell	442		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	442/2/mmods
Thomas Campbell	442		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	442/5/mmods
Fiona Brickwood	443		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	443/1/mmods
Fiona Brickwood	443		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	443/3/mmods
Fiona Brickwood	443		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	443/4/mmods
Fiona Brickwood	443		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	443/2/mmods
Fiona Brickwood	443		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	443/5/mmods
Matthias Bauss	444		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	444/1/mmods
Matthias Bauss	444		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	444/3/mmods
Matthias Bauss	444		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	444/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Matthias Bauss	444		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	444/2/mmods
Matthias Bauss	444		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	444/5/mmods
Eliot Levey	445		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	445/1/mmods
Eliot Levey	445		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	445/3/mmods
Eliot Levey	445		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	445/4/mmods
Eliot Levey	445		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	445/2/mmods
Eliot Levey	445		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	445/5/mmods
Marilyn Taylor	446		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	446/1/mmods
Marilyn Taylor	446		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	446/3/mmods
Marilyn Taylor	446		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	446/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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	446/2/mmods
Marilyn Taylor	446		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	446/5/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.	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	447/3/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.	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	447/4/mmods
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff	447		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	447/2/mmods
Ms and Mr Kumrai and Woodruff	447		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	447/5/mmods
Nushin Elahi	448		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	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.	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	448/3/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 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	448/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Nushin Elahi	448		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	448/2/mmods
Nushin Elahi	448		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	448/5/mmods
Veronica Royet - chacon	449		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	449/1/mmods
Veronica Royet - chacon	449		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	449/3/mmods
Veronica Royet - chacon	449		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	449/4/mmods
Veronica Royet - chacon	449		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	449/2/mmods
Veronica Royet - chacon	449		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	449/5/mmods
Olga Astaniotis	450		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	450/1/mmods
Olga Astaniotis	450		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	450/3/mmods
Olga Astaniotis	450		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	450/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Olga Astaniotis	450		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	450/2/mmods
Olga Astaniotis	450		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	450/5/mmods
Ruth Brown	451		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	451/1/mmods
Ruth Brown	451		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	451/3/mmods
Ruth Brown	451		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	451/4/mmods
Ruth Brown	451		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	451/2/mmods
Ruth Brown	451		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	451/5/mmods
Michael Dale	452		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	452/1/mmods
Michael Dale	452		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	452/3/mmods
Michael Dale	452		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	452/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Michael Dale	452		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	452/2/mmods
Michael Dale	452		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	452/5/mmods
Roberto Silves	453		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	453/1/mmods
Roberto Silves	453		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	453/3/mmods
Roberto Silves	453		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	453/4/mmods
Roberto Silves	453		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	453/2/mmods
Roberto Silves	453		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	453/5/mmods
Judith Glover	454		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	454/1/mmods
Judith Glover	454		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	454/3//mmods
Judith Glover	454		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	454/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Judith Glover	454		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	454/2/mmods
Judith Glover	454		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	454/5/mmods
Mark Godfrey	455		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	455/1/mmods
Mark Godfrey	455		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	455/3/mmods
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), 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	455/4/mmods
Mark Godfrey	455		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	455/2/mmods
Mark Godfrey	455		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	455/5/mmods
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.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	456/1/mmods
Adrian Weir	456		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	456/3/mmods
Adrian Weir	456		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	456/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Adrian Weir	456		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	456/2/mmods
Adrian Weir	456		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	456/5/mmods
Leslie Hargreaves	457		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	457/1/mmods
Leslie Hargreaves	457		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	457/3/mmods
Leslie Hargreaves	457		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	457/4/mmods
Leslie Hargreaves	457		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	457/2/mmods
Leslie Hargreaves	457		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	457/5/mmods
Jennifer Ward	458		I am writing to 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 Bowes Primary School. The area surrounding Pinkham wood is a great community and this will be destroyed if Pinkham Wood becomes an industrial site.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	458/1/mmods
Jennifer Ward	458		We already have to contend with the huge amounts 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. This area is a wonderful place to live, please do all you can to preserve it just the way it is.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	458/2/mmods
Clr Kate Salinger	459		Haringey 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.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	459/3/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Clr Kate Salinger	459		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 SINC's or LNR's. Otherwise there is little point in having them in the first place. Haringey has always been at the forefront of green and conversation issues. I see no reason for it to alter now for purposes that will impact very badly on the locality.	Modification number 41 states that the Council will not permit development on SINC's and LNR's 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.	No further action proposed	459/1/mmods
Clr Kate Salinger	459		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 foolhardy 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.	The Inspector's Modification 28 does remove Pinkham Way from the list of LSIS. The SINC designation still applies. The Inspector's final report will include further explanation to this modification.	No further action proposed	459/2/mmods
Kawa Angela	460		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	460/2/mmods
Kawa Angela	460		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.	Modification number 41 states that the Council will not permit development on SINC's and LNR's 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.	No further action proposed	460/4/mmods
Kawa Angela	460		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.	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	460/1/mmods
Kawa Angela	460		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.	The site is designated a SINC. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning on this modification.	No further action proposed	460/3/mmods
Kawa Angela	460		We would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINC's 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." The first four or these SINC's are directly linked to each other and it would seem appropriate to include them all and to mention them together.	The purpose of the last sentence of para 6.3.23 is not to list all of the borough's SINC's, they are some examples. All of the SINC's will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.	No further action proposed	460/5/mmods
Penny Sewell	461		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	461/1/mmods
Penny Sewell	461		I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINC's 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "The Council will not permit development on SINC's and LNR's 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 SINC's. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINC's and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.	No further action proposed	461/3/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Penny Sewell	461		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	461/4/mmods
Penny Sewell	461		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	461/2/mmods
Penny Sewell	461		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	461/5/mmods
Theresa Jane Monagle	462		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	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	462/1/mmods
Dr Birte Twisselmann	463		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	463/1/mmods
Dr Birte Twisselmann	463		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	463/3/mmods
Dr Birte Twisselmann	463		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	463/4/mmods
Dr Birte Twisselmann	463		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	463/2/mmods
Dr Birte Twisselmann	463		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	463/5/mmods
Diana Fairfax	464		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.	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	464/1/mmods
Anne Dougall	465		I am following the Pinkham Way debate closely and apart from the pollution and even more traffic that would ensue around the already congested Colney 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 blight on the already busy community.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	465/1/mmods
Anne Dougall	465		I urge you to please keep the conservation status of Pinkham Way and not to turn it into a polluted eyesore and traffic nightmare for local residents and school children.	The SINC designation still applies to this site.	No further action proposed	465/2/mmods
Patricia Byczek	466		I am concerned that the biodiversity of the area be protected	The SINC designation still applies to this site.	No further action proposed	466/1/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Hillary Reynol	467		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	467/1/mmods
Hillary Reynol	467		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	467/3/mmods
Hillary Reynol	467		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	467/4/mods
Hillary Reynol	467		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	467/2/mmods
Hillary Reynol	467		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	467/5/mmods
Carol Sneddon	468		It would be a local tragedy if Pinkham Way Wood were to be given over for industrial use. I live just round the corner and already suffer from excessive pollution from North Circular traffic. Losing the wood would effectively mean losing the park and the golf course which abut it. The size of the factory and resultant smells and the fumes and noise from the number of trunks in and out of the facility would render the park and the golf course equally unusable for recreation. Therefore is not just a wood we would be losing but a wood, a park and a golf course in one fell swoop.	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	468/1//mmods
David Theodore	469		We feel strongly that the procurement for Pinkham way by the NLWA is not in the interest of the local community and the development should not proceed	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	469/4/mmods
David Theodore	469		We support the modification to SP8 made by the inspector. It would, however, be useful and helpful if the report reflected the evidence given at the hearing by the council. The Pinkham way site is not an industrial site and it should be made clear as to the status of the Employment Land Site	Support noted. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation on this modification.	No further action proposed	469/1/mmods
David Theodore	469		We would like unambiguous protection of SINCS within the biodiversity policy i.e. All sites and development should protect nature conservation etc	SP13 does protect all SINCS but does state that development will only take place in exceptional circumstances and where appropriate mitigation measures are carried out.	No further action proposed	469/3/mmods
David Theodore	469		Your report should clearly state that the site is open space and not brownfield land.	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	469/2/mmods
CGMS for Parkstock	470		It is therefore considered that the policy as currently worded precludes the consideration of individual sites for tall buildings as an AAP would not be produced. We recommend that the modifications acknowledge that in certain circumstances an AAP would not be required or appropriate. In such cases proposals for tall buildings should be considered against the Development Management DPD policies and CABE / English Heritage 'Guidance on Tall Buildings'.	The Council's emerging DM Policies document will contain a policy on Tall Buildings. An Urban Characterisation Study will be produced to inform this policy approach; looking at locations suitable for tall buildings and design principles that applications for tall buildings should be determined against.	No further action proposed	470/3/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
CGMS for Parkstock	470		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
CGMS for Parkstock	470		There are individual site opportunities within the Borough, such as within Finsbury 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
Tamsin Abrahams	471		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
Tamsin Abrahams	471		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
Tamsin Abrahams	471		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	471/4/mmods
Tamsin Abrahams	471		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.	No further action proposed	471/1/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Guy Abrahams	472		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	472/2/mmods
Guy Abrahams	472		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	472/3/mmods
Guy Abrahams	472		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	472/4/mmods
Guy Abrahams	472		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.	No further action proposed	472/1/mmods
Marilyn Arnott	473		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	473/1/mmods
Trish Silkin	474		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	474/1/mmods
Trish Silkin	474		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	474/3/mmods
Trish Silkin	474		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	474/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Trish Silkin	474		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	474/2/mmods
Trish Silkin	474		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	474/5/mmods
Jeffrey Lever	475		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.	SP13 clearly states that the Council will protect SINC's. The amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 clearly states how the Council will address any development proposals coming forward on SINC's and that appropriate mitigation measures are taken into account.	No further action proposed	475/2/mmods
Jeffrey Lever	475		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 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 considers the site to be brownfield. The Inspector's final Report will include further explanation and reasoning to this modification.	No further action proposed	475/1/mmods
Sean Fanning	476		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	476/1/mmods
Sean Fanning	476		I would like to see unambiguous protection of SINC's 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 SINC's and LNR's 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 SINC's. The supporting text simply provides further information on SINC's and how the policy is applied. No further change proposed.	No further action proposed	476/3/mmods
Sean Fanning	476		I would like to suggest one further minor amendment to paragraph 6.3.23 – that the last sentence reads "SINC's 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 SINC's 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 SINC's, they are some examples. All of the SINC's will be identified on the Proposals Map and listed in the forthcoming DM Policies document.	No further action proposed	476/4/mmods
Sean Fanning	476		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	476/2/mmods
Sean Fanning	476		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	476/5/mmods
Rod and Adrianna	477		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	477/1/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Rod and Adrianna	477		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	477/3/mmods
Rod and Adrianna	477		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	477/4/mmods
Rod and Adrianna	477		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	477/2/mmods
The Broomfield Association	478		The Association also takes the view that the inclusion of a statement that the Pinkham Way site is not an established industrial site would remove ambiguity as to the status of this significant employment land site. Such a statement should clarify the site's status as open space. It is not brownfield/previously developed land because it is excluded from this definition under the London Plan in the NPPF definitions of 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	478/2/mmods
The Broomfield Association	478		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/mmods
The Broomfield Association	478		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/mmods
Catherine Bail	479		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	479/1/mmods
Catherine Bail	479		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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "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	479/3/mmods
Catherine Bail	479		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	479/4/mmods
Catherine Bail	479		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/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
Catherine Bail	479		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	479/5/mmods
Louise Roche	480		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	480/1/mmods
Louise Roche	480		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	480/3/mmods
Louise Roche	480		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	480/4/mmods
Louise Roche	480		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	480/2/mmods
Louise Roche	480		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	480/5/mmods
John Stickland	481		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	481/1/mmods
John Stickland	481		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	481/2/mmods
John Stickland	481		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	481/3/mmods
John Stickland	481		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	481/4/mmods

Main Modifications November 2012

Representor Name	Unique Representor Number	Unsound/Sound	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.
John Stickland	481		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	481/5/mmods
Enrique Olivar	482		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	482/1/mmods
Enrique Olivar	482		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	482/2/mmods
Enrique Olivar	482		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	482/3/mmods
Enrique Olivar	482		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	482/4/mmods
Enrique Olivar	482		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	482/5/mmods
Laraine Feldm	483		I wish to confirm that I support the PWA response to the latest stage of this saga and am very against the proposed development of the site into a waste facility. There are already enough waste facilities in North London and object to this attempt to transport rubbish from other areas to be processed at an enormous facility. Regardless of my own views the transportation would take place along one of the narrowest most congested parts of the North Circular Road and I cannot understand how this part of the road is expected to cope with all the additional vehicles the facility would attract. I am also very worried about the pollution aspects both from the vehicles and the facility itself. There is much evidence from other parts of the country where these processors have been built, purely for profit, about problems with air pollution etc. The site is in a very built up residential area with schools etc. How can this be good for public health?	This representation does not relate to the Main Modifications consultation.	No further action proposed	483/1/mmods