

From: Barbara Sommerville |
Sent: 31 October 2011 11:36
To: LDF
Subject: Response Against Pinkham Way Core Strategy Re Consultation
Dear Haringey,

This email is in response to the Core Strategy Re Consultation and specifically, to the question of the redesignation of the Pinkham Wood site (including the danger to the site's nature conservation status caused by any planned development) and the soundness or otherwise of Haringey's evidence for it.

For clarity, I am completely against the redesignation 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. In actual fact, it points out the threat to the biodiversity of the site.
- 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.

For all the above reasons the redesignation is not soundly based and I am opposed to it.

Please kindly acknowledge receipt of this email.

Sincerely,
Barbara Sommerville

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