

**From:** Emma Stannard

**Sent:** 31 October 2011 10:00

**To:** LDF

**Cc:** david@davidburrowes.com; alan.barker@enfield.gov.uk; henry.lamprecht@enfield.gov.uk; ann.zinkin@enfield.gov.uk; joanne.mccartney@london.gov.uk

**Subject:** Objection to Development Pinkham Way

Dear Sirs

I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of the site at Pinkham Way. My objections are based on the following points:

It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced by Haringey Council at the Examination in Public earlier this year to support this re-designation, on the contrary, their own evidence strongly recommended protection of all Employment Land. The re-consultation document CSSD-3, contains no new evidence. Hyder Consulting UK Ltd have produced an updated Sustainability Appraisal report but it does not contain any new evidence to support it. On the contrary, it points out the threat to the biodiversity of the site. The reasons Haringey gave for re-designation were (a) that the change will ensure it is targeted towards more traditional industrial uses (no evidence there is such a need) and (b) that it complies with pre-application discussions which have already taken place to use part of the site for recycling centre and other part as waste station. Planning applications should not drive local plan strategies.

There is no evidence Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as Metropolitan Open Space designation – alternative Local green Space 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. Pinkham Way is a natural habitat and designated as Grade I of Borough Importance.

It does not accord with Regional Policy: See The London Plan Policies 7.14; 7.18; 7.19; and 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. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

Haringey initially proposed to designate this as Employment Land with supporting evidence for that designation when it first developed its Core Strategy. However, following consultation on that proposal in 2010 it changed its mind and altered the designation to LSIS. Why did the Council change the designation following consultation? What evidence emerged to persuade them the designation should be changed to LSIS?

Yours faithfully

Emma Stannard

---

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

---