

**From:** Ms Linda Pym  
**Sent:** 03 November 2011 18:53  
**To:** LDF  
**Subject:** Re-Designation of Pinkham Way

Dear Sirs/Madam

I have just returned from a 2 week holiday and have just read a leaflet from the Pinkham Way Alliance explaining that residents living within 1km of Pinkham Way had a deadline of 5pm today to submit their objections to the re-designation of Pinkham Way.

This has been called a re-consultation. Why then have I not been leafleted by Haringey? I live approximately 500m from the proposed site, well within the 1km consultation circle, but I have had nothing from Haringey. Due to the lack of consultation (I don't possess a crystal ball) I want my objections to the re-designation of Pinkham Way to be taken into account.

My objections are as follows:

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

- 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 their own admission 'pre-application discussions' have influenced this re-designation. 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).

For all the above reasons the redesignation is not soundly based.

Please confirm that my objections have been taken into account. I wish also that my email address be added to your database for everything concerning Pinkham Way, so as not miss out of any 'consultations' that Haringey may conduct in the future. This email address is to be used for any public meeting or information concerning NLWA proposal for Pinkham Way.

Yours faithfully

Linda Pym

---

This email has been scanned by the MessageLabs Email Security System.  
For more information please visit <http://www.messagelabs.com/email>

---