

RESPONSE TO HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN MAIN MODIFICATIONS PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Modifications to the Development Management DPD

1. Policy DM 5 Part A (c): “Has had regard to”: **Objection:** this is too vague.
2. Policy DM 6 Part B: deletion of “community benefit as well as”: **Objection:** “taller buildings that project above the prevailing height of the surrounding area” to be merely “justified in urban design terms” (which are anyone’s guess) is far too vague, open to **any** interpretation and contrary to the rights and interests of the community.
3. Policy DM 6 Part C (c): replacing “be consistent with” by “Have regard to”: **Objection,** because this is too vague and ineffective. Anyone can claim to “have had regard to” something but go on to decide the very opposite.
4. DMMod 14, Fig. 2.2: I **object** to the inclusion of Apex House and Finsbury Park as locations potentially suitable for tall building. These are outer areas of London where, because of the proximity of tube stations, taller buildings (as defined) may be acceptable, but **not** tall buildings.
5. DM 13 Part B (c) Please **clarify** the proposed amendment which is unclear.
6. DM 28 Part D: For this amendment to be acceptable, **replace** “should not” by “must not”.
7. DM 37 amended to include a new Part B: This is **unacceptable**, unless the new part itself is amended as follows: **delete c.** (NB This would be no justification of otherwise inappropriate or damaging development.) **Replace** the deleted sub-para. c. by the following:
“The proposal would not restrict, harm, impair or in any way prejudice the enjoyment of nearby established residential properties, nor the health and well-being of its occupants.”
8. DM 38 Part A: This amendment is **only** acceptable if “will” is replaced by “may”.
9. DMMod 71 para. 6.12, 3rd sentence: I **object** to this amendment which would facilitate **inappropriate** mixed use development of **designated** LSIS land and **designated** employment land for the developer’s benefit and to the detriment of the community. Site “regeneration” of such sites can be achieved perfectly well without mixed use schemes which may be inappropriate and undesirable. Moreover, the proposed amendment seems to be contradicted by the next amendment at para. 6.13.
10. DM 40 amendment by provision of new Part A: **Objection,** unless “will” is replaced by “may”.

11. DM 40 Part A, changed to Part B: The introductory amendment is **only** acceptable if “will” is replaced by “may”. The amended sub-para. e. is **unacceptable** and should be changed to read: “Evidence is required of recent, continuous and suitable marketing of the site, covering a minimum period of 3 years, without success.”
12. DM 40 Part B: The amendment is **only** acceptable if “will” is replaced by “may”. (NB The Council does not seem to realise that “will” as opposed to “may” has legal implications which may be undesirable.)
13. DM 40 Part C: “may be sought” should be replaced by “will be sought” for the sake of clarity.
14. DMod 91, replacing paragraphs 6.26, 6.27 & 6.28. This amendment is a linguistic muddle and needs to be re-written to make sense. Moreover, “the vibrancy and” should be **deleted** because Haringey Council, from a distance, knows nothing about “vibrancy” and this is not a relevant consideration. Moreover, “can be demonstrated” is to be **replaced** by “has been demonstrated”.
15. DMod 98 para. 6.56, amendment of 1st sentence: **Objection**. This is an absurdly inappropriate amendment. The two alleged “commitments” have nothing to do with each other.
16. DM 30: **Objection**. This should be further amended by replacing “a significant” by “**any**”. Does Haringey Council think it is acceptable to damage the health of the population and the environment in the name of “development”?
17. DM 34 Part A: This needs to be further amended by substituting “should” by “**must**”. (“Should” is far too vague and achieves nothing.)
18. In Appendix A, “Schedule of Locally Significant Views” there is something locally significant to the area of Devonshire Hill Lane, N 17, missing from your schedule: The amazing view from the junction of Devonshire Court/Devonshire Hill Lane through the gap between the houses on “The Green”, right to the City of London (so many miles away!) with the well-known and loved buildings of the Gherkin, Cheesegrater etc., as a reminder that we live, albeit in a suburb, in this great city of London which we can actually see at a great distance. I suggest that this view be **protected**.

Modifications to the Site Allocations DPD

19. SAMod 29 of SA 11: I **object** to this modification which does not sufficiently protect the residents of those buildings.
20. SAMod 33: SA 15 para. 2.42: Please **define** “landmark building”. Some of the most inappropriate/ugly buildings have, in the past, been referred to as “landmark

buildings". If by "landmark building" you simply mean a building that is considerably taller than the neighbouring buildings, **this paragraph must be scrapped.**

21. SAMod 68: SA 36: This needs to be further amended by **deleting** "This site may be suitable for a tall building if designed in accordance with Policy DM 6". The area of Finsbury Park is most definitely **not** suitable for **any** tall building, as any such building would **clash** with the traditional housing of the area and the open space of this lovely park, and would merely provide another **eye-sore**, of which there are already **far too many** in Haringey due to the council's poor planning control. (I can give you examples on request.)

22. SAMod 73: SA 37: **further modification: insert:** "and height" after "The design".

Ursula Riniker

13.1.2017