

LDF Team  
London Borough of Haringey  
River Park House (6<sup>th</sup> floor)  
Wood Green  
London N22 8HQ

Kim Mason  
21 Pembroke Road  
Muswell Hill  
London N10 2HR

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing in response to the initiation to comment on the redesignation of the land at Pinkham Wood as industrial, which I believe has serious implications for the land's status as a Site of Importance of Nature Conservation.

I strongly object to this re-designation for the following reasons:

Firstly: It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and the re-consultation document (CSSD-3) has no new evidence. The updated Sustainability Appraisal which has been produced by Hyder Consulting UK Limited to provide further evidence in support of this re-consultation does not contain any new evidence to support this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site – see below.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as Metropolitan Open Land designation, alternative Local Green Space designation (or local SLOL designation?) or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

It is not consistent with national policy: [PPS 9](#) is the overarching framework in which policies should be developed - particularly para 9, which states that networks of natural habitats provide a valuable resource.

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

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation is removed or substantially compromised. The Council's own additional evidence points out in relation to the Friern Barnet site in particular that any development on the site has potential to have biodiversity impacts because it is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (p6 of [Hyder Addendum SA](#)). The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

In the Core Strategy pre-submission draft the site was designated Employment Land with supporting evidence for this designation. Why did the Council change the designation following consultation? What evidence emerged to persuade them the designation should be changed to LSIS?

By the council's own admission this redesignation has been influenced by 'pre-application discussions'. These discussions relate to the proposal by North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council to construct a massive MBT waste processing plant (to deal with up to 300,000 tonnes of waste per year) and Barnet Council's proposal to relocate its refuse vehicle depot (for vehicles it uses for waste collection and passenger transport and for parking

space for Barnet Council's fleet of refuse/ recycling and staff vehicles, plus a small office/storage building and a refuelling station).

This is clearly wrong; a case of ensuring the status of the land fits the needs of the planning application, rather than the other way round. How can this possibly be justified?

The consultation process itself has been very poorly handled. It would seem to have been conducted in such a way as to keep the people who are most likely to be affected by changes to the Core Strategy from having as little information about these changes as possible. How can that possibly be justified?

I look forward to your responses to my questions.

Yours faithfully

Kim Mason