PART 2 OF MY “RESPONSE TO HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN MAIN MODIFICATIONS PUBLIC CONSULTATION”

Introduction

1. The 8-week consultation period for this very complex, in parts confusing, in parts repetitive and altogether unsatisfactory consultation was too short, because it covered the very busy Christmas and New Year period. (I myself was abroad for most of December.)

2. Moreover, most of the proposed amendments were not put into context, so that one did not know what was being amended, and there was little or no indication of what they referred to. This is likely to have led to some erroneous responses. The current documents should have been supplied together with the amendment documents.

3. I am today (Sunday, 15.1.17) submitting Part 2 of my “Response” (of which I submitted the first part on Friday, 13.1.17), on the assumption that this will still be in time, since nobody would be looking at the consultation responses over the weekend.

Modifications to the Tottenham AAP

4. AAPMod 27: AAP6, Part E, Objection. The 2\textsuperscript{nd} part of the sentence, “whilst optimising opportunities for intensification and regeneration” should be deleted, because it does not belong there, i.e. it has nothing whatsoever to do with the need “to ensure the height of new buildings responds (NB. The “s” is missing in your document) and helps (NB the “s” is missing) to define the surrounding character.” The latter provision must not be watered down, because it is important.

Document entitled “Haringey Local Plan. Alterations to the Strategic Policies. Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). Addendum considering Inspector’s Main Modifications and Additional Modifications”

5. This bulky document contains an utterly confusing array of different documents, all bundled together, so that one is constantly unsure which document one is actually looking at.

6. At page 34 of the first document in the bundle, 500 White Hart Lane (HGY/2016/0828) is listed. This listing must be removed, for the following reasons:

(a) It comes under the Heading of “Areas of limited change”, which is patently false. A change from a designated LSIS to a residential development of 144 flats is a
huge change, which will only benefit the developer, Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, and which is, moreover, currently being challenged in the High Court on legal grounds.

(b) This listing appears under the Sub-heading “Sites with Planning Permission”, which is highly misleading, as it is a site for which the grant of planning permission is being challenged in the High Court on the grounds of procedural impropriety and illegality.

7. On page 12 of the last document in the bundle there is a reference, under SAMod 6 (re: para. 1.1) to “the adopted Policies Map”. This map is not attached. Please let me and all other consultees have a copy of the existing version of this map by return.

8. On page 43 of the last document in the bundle, “Modifications to the Policies Map” are mentioned. Map 1 is attached, but the other modified maps are not attached. Please let me and all other consultees have all the missing modified maps by return.

9. Please Note: I have, so far, only skimmed this bulky bundle of documents because, by the time I got to it, having considered all the other consultation documents, I had, more or less, lost the will to live! Besides, as indicated above, this document is incomplete, which suggests a flawed consultation.

Ursula Riniker

15.01.2017

(submitted attached to an email to localplan@haringey.gov.uk)