

Jacqueline Staite
Seacole Court Residents' Association

Representator ID: (Unknown)

Name of Plan: TOTTENHAM AREA ACTION PLAN

Section of Plan we are addressing:-

MATTERS 1 – LEGAL COMPLIANCE

We believe the plan has not complied with the requirements of the 'Statement of Community Involvement and the Duty to Cooperate. How has the Public Sector Equality Duty been considered and complied with in Plan preparation'.

Our reasons for this are outlined below:-

There are plans for this estate (Seacole Court, directly adjacent to Apex House) which have been drawn up in detail by the developer, Grainger, but embedded within hundreds of documents on the Council's website. Most disturbingly, reference to a 'Masterplan' referred to in a Report for Consideration for the Planning Meeting on 9th May '16 was found under the heading 'Proposed uses of tall buildings'. After seeking clarification from the Council on this 'Masterplan' we were told it was on the website under the heading 'Design and Access Statement'. This showed detailed drawings for the redevelopment of this estate emphasizing this redevelopment is integral to the overall development of Apex House. The headings on both these documents are misleading. To bury plans for the redevelopment of this estate under titles bearing no relation to this estate is suspicious and leads to justified mistrust. Although the Council named this estate alongside Apex House in headings and references in documentation relating to the planning application, it stated this estate is 'non-material' to this specific planning application. Again, a level of subterfuge and misinformation is present which needs thorough investigation by an independent body.

Note: In a recent response from Claire Gunn, Feedback Review Officer, in responding to the publication of these misleading documents on the planning application website says:- "I note your comments that the department 'hid' the documents pertaining to Seacole Court. The application is published as it was received from the applicant (Grainger). There has been no ordering of the documents by the Planning Service that could amount to an attempt to keep sections hidden". We question this statement. Surely the Council's Planning Dept has a responsibility on the part of the Community to scrutinize these documents from the developer so they comply with transparency and accurate declaration of the developer's intention. The headings employed by the developer do not reflect transparency and openness and are therefore misleading. The Council seems to defend this complicity.

Hope the above is sufficient in including this as our front page for inclusion in the public examination.

Jacqueline Staite
Seacole Court Residents' Association