

From: Chris Roberts

Sent: 31 October 2011 14:47

To: LDF

Subject: Pinkham way re-classification

This email is to voice my absolute astonishment that a waste development plant, the size and scale of the one you are proposing at Pinkham Way, is being considered for this location.

More specifically I am objecting to the re-classification of the proposed site from EL to LSIS

My objections are:

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).

I have been a resident of Southgate for 13 years and that part of the North Circular Road has always been a congestion blackspot. Even the new widening scheme has not addressed the main problem of the two bridges which will continue to restrict the number of lanes and hence, traffic capacity, that this stretch of road can cope with. To add several hundred large vehicle journeys every day to that piece of road will render it unusable. For this reason alone the whole surrounding area will become unworkable for businesses and residents.

To consolidate waste processing plants might make financial sense but to put such a massive facility in the middle of a, predominantly, residential area already suffering from significant traffic congestion is solving one problem by creating 100 others. The councils involved will spend decades fielding thousands upon thousands of complaints and paying and paying and paying to constantly combat the unacceptable effects that locating this facility here will inflict. Any savings made will be far outweighed by the colossal impacts it will have.

I strongly urge you to oppose this re-classification.

