The Affordable Housing Viability Study supports the change in threshold from 5 units to 10 units, based on viability.

10/9/3.2

Insert new sentence at the end of paragraph 3.2.11 to read: “In addition, the Council will expect good quality housing to have a positive influence on the character of an area/neighbourhood. Please see SP11 Design for the Council’s approach to good quality design.”

15/43/3.2

Insert new sentence at the beginning of paragraph 5.1.13 to read: “The Council recognises that some of the designated employment land in Friern Barnet and Haringey has been identified as surplus to future employment requirements. The Council recognises that some of the designated employment land has been identified as surplus to future employment requirements. The Council recognises that some of the designated employment land has been identified as surplus to future employment requirements.”

22

It is noted that many of the references made in the Council’s document refer to previous London Plan (2008). As you will appreciate, the Council wishes to remove the possibility of confusion and to ensure the greatest possible consistency with current Mayoral policy and guidance. We would therefore urge you to ensure references made are in line with current Mayoral policy.

26

Amend the Appraisal Matrix on page 19 to reflect the findings for Friern Barnet on page 6.

16/17/3.2 and 5.1

“Sustainable development” and “sustainable growth” are oxymorons, because development and growth are both predicated on the assumption that they can be separated from costs and that these costs can be externalised and ignored -- assumptions which blatantly contradict the principles of sustainability.

22

Paragraph 53: “The primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to meet the demands of the short-term market or to maximise profit. The interest of the community, whether in the long-term uses of land against the short-term market-driven right to profit (i.e. to develop) of the developer, is crucial in determining the outcomes of development applications.”

99

Paragraph 99: “Local planning authorities should not question whether the service to be provided is needed nor seek to influence the outcome of the site determination process. The issue will be whether the site can reasonably be made available in accordance with the need for that service and the evidence that it is a need, without unduly delaying the site determination process. Local planning authorities should not block the development of a site which does not benefit the community or which would unjustifiably delay the delivery of a development of public benefit.”

103

“Local planning authorities should not question whether the service to be provided is needed nor seek to influence the outcome of the site determination process. The issue will be whether the site can reasonably be made available in accordance with the need for that service and the evidence that it is a need, without unduly delaying the site determination process. Local planning authorities should not block the development of a site which does not benefit the community or which would unjustifiably delay the delivery of a development of public benefit.”

99

Comment noted.

112

The implications of these consultations will be considered in future LDF documents.

116

As the topics for the revised consultation do not concern The Theatres Trust, we have no comment to make on these but would welcome any comments from the public on the draft National Planning Policy Framework and any implications this might have on the Core Strategy.

118

We note there is no reference to “Affordable Rents” in the document, and therefore infer that all homes for rent would be available at market rents. Metropolitan Housing Partnership welcomes the Council’s proposal to increase its targets for the provision of affordable housing on S106 sites, a target of 50% provision would make development in Haringey unviable. Similarly the lack of provision of ‘affordable housing’ in the draft Core Strategy is a concern as it will result in a reduction in the amount of affordable housing that can be provided in the area.

118

The Council recognises the inherent risks associated with Affordable Rent and is adopting a pragmatic approach to ensure that the policy is workable. The open book viability assessment is intended to achieve a site specific affordable housing mix, in terms of quantum, and to ensure that the scheme is financially viable. We acknowledge that there is a trade off between lower (social) rents and quantity (delivered through affordable rents).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>SP8</th>
<th>Policy Framework</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Erskine</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Cawdron</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Thompson</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice A Dinham</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ransome and Co</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been revised by the London Plan.

The employment designation is not new to the site. The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, which is a Site of Importance for Natural Conservation.

The level of impact should however be mitigated. The site's previous designation as for Employment Use carried a condition that such use is subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

Barbara Erskine 73 Not specified SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

We note that there has been a change in the proposals for the Pinkham Way site from employment to industrial use.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

I object to the site being transferred over for Industrial use due to the following: The site is listed as "green space" and also local school and the loss of land for "employment use" and the impact this will have on "creating" new jobs.

Furthermore, removing this protection will mean the site will become vulnerable to Policy 4.4 of the London Plan, which aims to promote industrial use, particularly when the site is very close to a built-up residential area and local schools.

There has been inadequate consultation of local people about the re-designation of the site and of the proposal to transfer it to industrial use. There has similarly been little attempt to inform people of the re-consultation process that is currently under way.

The Council has carried out the revised consultation in accordance with the statutory planning regulations and the Core Strategy. The documents were available in the borough's 9 libraries and the Council's website.

This comment relates to a planning application and is beyond the remit of the Core Strategy.

The Council’s employment land designations associated with SP8 are in line with PPS4 and they positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth. The employment land hierarchy in SP8 reflects this approach.

There are several economic buildings and areas within the employment areas that have either reached or within the employment land hierarchy. These locations are renewed to maintain and increase their economic competiveness and pass on the benefits locally.

The Employment Land designation offers a more flexible approach to the uses on them. Other employment generating uses such as retail and leisure, distribution, warehousing and other commercial uses, can be accommodated.

There has been no material change whatever to the site itself which could justify such a change in designation. All activity relating the site has been either motivated by the desire to prevent fly-tipping or connected with preliminary survey work.

The dual designation of the site takes into account the changes in biodiversity on the site. The dual designation does not impose any restriction on the scale of development and can be flexibly adapted to changing circumstances.

The level of impact should however be mitigated. The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, which is a Site of Importance for Natural Conservation. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

The Council's employment land designations associated with SP8 are in line with PPS4 and they positively and proactively encourage sustainable economic growth. The employment land hierarchy in SP8 reflects this approach.

There are several economic buildings and areas within the employment areas that have either reached or within the employment land hierarchy. These locations are renewed to maintain and increase their economic competiveness and pass on the benefits locally.

The Employment Land designation offers a more flexible approach to the uses on them. Other employment generating uses such as retail and leisure, distribution, warehousing and other commercial uses, can be accommodated.

There has been no material change whatever to the site itself which could justify such a change in designation. All activity relating the site has been either motivated by the desire to prevent fly-tipping or connected with preliminary survey work.

The dual designation of the site takes into account the changes in biodiversity on the site. The dual designation does not impose any restriction on the scale of development and can be flexibly adapted to changing circumstances.

The level of impact should however be mitigated. The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, which is a Site of Importance for Natural Conservation. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

This comment relates to a planning application and is beyond the remit of the Core Strategy.
The Council is of the view that the consultation exercise undertaken fully accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed. The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations. The NLWP statement of community involvement applies to the development of the NLWP only.

The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to the site. This reflects the Core Strategy's objectives to protect employment land and provide more jobs and training opportunities.

Indeed Mr Dorfman actually maintains that the possibility of using Pinkham Wood as a site for waste management purposes should be explored. If this is the case, then the Council should be content to agree with the withdrawal of the proposed changes. Mr Dorfman also expresses concern that the Council will not be in a position to ensure that the site remains a site for employment uses.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation. The site is currently open to the public and is accessible, although the site is not currently open to the public and is, in parts, impenetrable, due to dense undergrowth. The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not adversely affected the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

As a resident of 22 Evesham Road I object to a designation of the former Friern Barnet Sewage treatment site as a Locally Significant Industrial Site (LSIS). The LSIS designation is also a designation of Local Importance for Nature Conservation (LINC). Any designation of the site as an LINC is detrimental to the natural and local environment. The site is currently open to the public and is, in parts, impenetrable, due to dense undergrowth. The site is not currently open to the public and is, in parts, impenetrable, due to dense undergrowth. The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not adversely affected the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

The level of impact should however be mitigated. The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, the site is consistent with the Council's unstated wish to drop the SINC and caveat, potentially without proper consultation.

No further action required.

We also have a list of key statutory consultees that we must consult – like neighbouring boroughs, GLA, English Heritage, Historic England, etc. The Council is also required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to consult the London Borough of Barnet on any planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

No further action required.

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation is also deliverable. As the site does not meet this requirement, it cannot be designated as an LSIS.

No further action required.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation. The site is currently open to the public and is, in parts, impenetrable, due to dense undergrowth. The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not adversely affected the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required.

We also have a list of key statutory consultees that we must consult – like neighbouring boroughs, GLA, English Heritage, Historic England, etc. The Council is also required by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to consult the London Borough of Barnet on any planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

No further action required.

It is not consistent with national policy: PPS 9 is the overarching framework in which policies should be developed. The Council considers that the changes proposed do accord with the London Plan and the Council have met with the GLA during earlier stages of the Core Strategy production to ensure the plan is in general conformity with the London Plan.

No further action required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Dack and Paul Beaver</td>
<td>No further action required. 108/1/5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin and Susan Jones</td>
<td>No further action required. 112/4/5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Celia Capstick</td>
<td>No further action required. 114/2/5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni James</td>
<td>No further action required. 115/6/5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The site is an existing employment site and was designated as one in both the 1998 and 2006 UDPs, as well as being a SINC. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

2. The redesignation does not accord with Regional Policy, in particular Policy 7 (7.14, and 7.18-7.21).

3. 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.

4. There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether alternative designations would be appropriate - e.g. Metropolitan Open Land, Local Green Space designation or Green Grid cross-boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

5. The limited consultation that has been carried out and Haringey Council's failure to adequately consult local people and inform them of the re-consultation.

6. Finally, the Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the Examination in Public, and the approach is not consistent with national policy. It is not possible to re-designate in advance of consideration of the NPPG which should then lead to consultation on the Core Strategy.

7. We wish to protest about the failure of the local council to arrange a meaningful consultation, not only with residents of the immediate area, but also neighbours of our road who would suffer from the proposed changes to its planning status.

8. Given the circumstances, Haringey Council should be required to withdraw this change of land designation until such times that:

9. Has the document met legal requirements? Probably not given that the references to the change of designation for Pinkham Wood (DEA6) are misleading, unclear and ambiguous.

10. National policy has recognised that networks of natural habitats provide a valuable resource, and this should be reflected in the Core Strategy, and specifically in the designation of the site.

11. The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to the site. The revised consultation is in relation to a strategic policy document and not in relation to any planning application, and not in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations and its adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

12. The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation.

13. The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

14. It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the Examination in Public, and the approach is not consistent with national policy. It is not possible to re-designate in advance of consideration of the NPPG which should then lead to consultation on the Core Strategy.

15. The Council's database is made up of individuals and organisations who wish to be involved, including local businesses, local groups and others. This ensures that all those who wish to be consulted - and those who are consultees that we must consult – like neighbouring boroughs, GLA, English Heritage, the Environment Agency for example.
They care, too, about the responsible management of waste produced by our society. This scheme, however, is irresponsible and cynically inappropriate to the location. There are a number of reasons for my objection:

Haringey Council continue to refer to the site as ‘Friern Barnet Sewerage Works’. It ceased to be such almost 50 years ago. The council, it seems, were not informed. The site is simply called Pinkham Way (or ‘Pinkham Lane’ in the HS2 literature). Value). Referring to the site in that way is misleading to local residents, most of who only know it as Pinkham Way.

The loss of the caveat with in the EL designation to protect the nature conservation is a major change to the protection of the site. The re-designation would widen the range of uses on the site to include heavy industrial uses, with the associated noise, pollution and traffic congestion that this would bring.

There is no robust or credible evidence to support re-designation. No credible evidence was produced at the first public consultation. The impact of the planned waste plant on local residents and the effect on traffic volumes in an already busy area is bound to be detrimental. I know of no-one in the local area that believes it a good idea to change the permitted use of the land.

Former Friern

Barnet Sewage works

The Council considers that the changes proposed do accord with the London Plan and the Council have met with the GLA during earlier stages of the Core Strategy production to ensure the plan is in general conformity with the London Plan.

No further action required. 123/8/5.1

The Council has carried out the revised consultation in accordance with the statutory planning regulations and the consultation report has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Government (Consultation of the Public) Regulations 2007. The comments have been collated and a summary of the comments has been prepared. The consultation period was from 8th September 2011 to 6th November 2011.

The comments have been collated in accordance with the guidelines set out in the Local Government Act 1972 and the Local Government (Consultation of the Public) Regulations 2007. The comments are set out below:

I am a resident in N11 2NJ, very close to the Pinkham Way and I am very concerned about the planning. The main points are I have not been consulted.

No further action required. 125/1/5.1

No further action required. 125/2/5.1

This comment does not relate directly to the Core Strategy consultation. The environmental impact, impact upon transport and traffic congestion, and the impact of any proposed development will have to be addressed by all applications for development on the Pinkham Way site.

This objection is beyond the remit of the Core Strategy.

The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council’s views for the need to increase the protection to be afforded to the site. The need is particularly strong in employment areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

The employment allocation associated with SP8 in the Core Strategy is completely separate to a planning application for the O’Donovan premises adjacent. The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to the site. The council is in a strong position to attract businesses (and therefore create jobs) in the medium and longer term as the economy recovers.

I urge you to reconsider the industrial development of this land.

The impact of the planned waste plant on local residents and the effect on traffic volumes in an already busy area is bound to be detrimental. I know of no-one in the local area that believes it a good idea to change the permitted use of the land.

Further to my recent viewings of your premises, I regret to inform you that both parties have withdrawn their interest due to the noise, vibration and dust created by lorries going in and out of the O’Donovan premises adjacent.
The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be strongly encouraged in the employment area. The Council considers that the policy is consistent with national policy.

The employment allocation associated with SP8 in the Core Strategy is completely separate to a planning application for Barnet Sewage works. To achieve such targets we do not have the luxury of double handling waste by road. We also need to plan approaches that will achieve shorter journeys. I discuss this further under section 4 of my response in relation to alternative approaches.

Given that the consultation presents no evidenced based argument for the need for additional industrial land, or for its use which is proposed in the draft North London Waste Plan, which will undergo its examination in public early next year.

This change in designation is not specifically allocating this site for waste but for B1, B2 and B8 use. The evidence to demonstrate that any use should be "subject to not restricting the ability to de-culvert the stream on the site." is provided by the Council.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered alternative strategies such as Local Green Space designation, Metropolitan Open Land designation or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

The PPS sets out key principles to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decision on biodiversity and geological and marine habitats are considered. The current location of the PPS does not give the Council no power to prevent the loss of the ecological value of the site through clearance.

The explanation put forward for changing the designation from EL to LSIS is not unsound. Although aware of the implications of the designation, Haringey has provided evidence that the site can be developed for industrial uses, which would not be consistent with national policy.

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.
The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be ... areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

No further action required. 139/3/5.1

Also, in these difficult times it would be a strange decision to allow the loss of land for employment use, bearing in mind the negative impact this is likely to have on creating new jobs.

Barnet Sewage works

Like all local residents, I am painfully aware of the terrible traffic problems which already affect this part of the North Circular Road and Colney Hatch Lane. Therefore, I really do not see how a plan like this could be considered for this area.

Former Friern

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not ... effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

Kathryn Lwin Brooks 140 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The findings of the Study clearly state that all designated defined employment areas should be protected which strongly ... areas. The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation.

Karl Brown 141 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

A decision affecting such an important site, which will be in place for substantially more than one generation with ... undemocratic, autocratic processes and individuals. We surely do not wish the same to carry precedent in the UK.

Karin Mackenzie 142 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Although aware of pre-application discussions for Pinkham Way, the Council did not propose re-designation because of ... on an application for a waste management site as both designations include B1, B2 and B8 or Sui Generis use classes.

John Seeley

It is not based on robust or credible evidence.  No credible evidence was produced at the Examination in Public, and the ... new evidence to support this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out the threat to the biodiversity of the site.

John Menich 146 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Not specified

It is not based on robust or credible evidence.  No credible evidence was produced at the Examination in Public, and the ... new evidence to support this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out the threat to the biodiversity of the site.

National policy has recognised that networks of natural habitats provide a valuable resource and this should be reflected in the Core Strategy, and specifically in the designation of the site.

Finally, the Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).  It ... to re-designate in advance of consideration of the NPPG which should then lead to consultation on the Core Strategy.

 schools and parks that my children use on a daily basis.

The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to ... reflects the Core Strategy's objectives to protect employment land and provide more jobs and training opportunities.

I therefore strongly urge Haringey to listen to the local residents and reconsider the land usage change and ask the Independent Planning Inspectorate to do their utmost to prevent the change.

The Council considers the Core Strategy to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and it is against these ... that any future applications for FBSW will be considered, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.
After the closure of the sewage farm the site was able to recover from this use and that of being used for the dumping of rubbish to the extent that nature has been able to reclaim the site and it has now developed the rich biodiversity it has today.

In the absence of any such alternatives, local planning authorities should ensure that, before planning permission is ... permission should be refused. It is against these provisions that any future applications for FBSW will be considered.

The PPS sets out key principles to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decision on biodiversity and geological ... in the UDP gives the Council no power to prevent the loss of the ecological value of the site through clearance.

Former Friern

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation ... a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (p6 of Hyder Addendum SA). The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

Former Friern

The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be ... to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Study.

Not specified

No further action required. 156/2/5.1

The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to ... reflects the Core Strategy's objectives to protect employment land and provide more jobs and training opportunities.

Not specified

No further action required. 159/1/5.1

The Council has carried out the revised consultation in accordance with the statutory planning regulations and the ... papers and to ensure beyond borough boundary coverage adverts were placed in both the Enfield and Barnet Independents.

Not specified

No further action required. 159/2/5.1

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not ... be developed for employment use without some impact on biodiversity. The level of impact should however be mitigated.

It should be noted that the loss of the caveat to protect the nature conservation is a major change to the protection this site.

Not specified

No further action required. 160/3/5.1

Pinkham Way does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The site ... identified it as a site that should carry either the strategic designation of MOL, or the more local designation of SLOL.

Not specified

No further action required. 160/5/5.1

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation ... on the site has potential to have biodiversity impacts, because it is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

Not specified

No further action required. 162/1/5.1

Surely you know that the implications of this is ….

I am writing to object to Haringey's proposal to redesignate Pinkham Wood from an 'employment' to an 'industrial site'.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the retention of the SINC designation.

Ingrid Wassenaar 166 Not specified SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Jason MacKay 165 Not specified SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

I am writing to object to Haringey's proposal to redesignate Pinkham Wood from an 'employment' to an 'industrial site'.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the retention of the SINC designation.

Ingrid Wassenaar 166 Not specified SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Jason MacKay 165 Not specified SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified
The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. This dual designation envisages that this will be possible.

PPS9 states that, where granting planning permission would result in significant harm to biodiversity interests, LPAs should be satisfied that development cannot reasonably be located on any alternative sites that would result in less or no harm.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation.

The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

No further action required. 168/3/5.1

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

Not specified

The site at FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The Council will continue to protect this site as a SINC. The designation has not been removed. This dual designation envisages that this will be possible.

The Council recognises the nature conservation value of the site and this is reflected in the SINC designation.

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

I would like to object to the redesignation to LSIS for the following reasons:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The limited consultation that has been carried out and Haringey Council's failure to adequately consult local people and inform them of the re-consultation.

The Council is of the view that the consultation exercise undertaken fully accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed.

This reconsultation does not just "appear" to be prejudicial; more importantly, it is prejudicial. For this and other reasons this consultation exercise is not just "inadequate" - it is a sham. It should be pointed out, although it may be unnecessary to do so, is that the reason there were no objections was... restricted number of people informed. This first consultation clearly did not begin to accord with the Council's SCI.

It should be pointed out, although it may be unnecessary to do so, is that the reason there were no objections was... restricted number of people informed. This first consultation clearly did not begin to accord with the Council's SCI.

2 Is it based on robust and credible evidence? It would seem not.

No. The Council fails to set out clearly the reasons and justification for a change of land-use designation of the Pinkham Way site. In the post-EIP papers in the planning portal, there seem to be some hints, but that is all.

We, the Liberal Democrat Group on Haringey Council, are responding to the September 2011 re-consultation on the Local... carrying out the consultation in line with how to consult on a planning policy document and not a planning application.

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

This consultation document... carrying out the consultation in line with how to consult on a planning policy document and not a planning application.

I formally request an assessment of the eco systems and natural habitats on the site - which is one of only nine sites... have now provided the tools for conducting such an assessment which should form the basis of any proposed re-designation.

There are, it turns out, many parts of its own SCI which the council appears not to have consulted, which is a pity as in our view, if heeded, it would be an extremely valuable document.

Graham Woodward 177 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The site at FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The Council will continue to protect this site as a SINC. The designation has not been removed. This dual designation envisages that this will be possible.

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

I would like to object to the redesignation to LSIS for the following reasons:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:

Guy Veale 176 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The main reason that LBH have given for the redesignation is that it:
The recent consultation only related to SP2 Housing and SP8 Employment so this representation is not duly made.

This change in designation is not specifically allocating this site for waste but for B1, B2 and B8 use. The evidence to support the designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Areas Guidance. The Council considers that the changes proposed do accord with the London Plan and the Council have met with the GLA to ensure conformity with the London Plan. Furthermore, the Council considers SP2 and SP8 are consistent with national policy.

No further action required.

The environment impact, impact upon transport and health impact of any proposed development will have to be addressed to determine the scale and impact of the development upon the local area and would require mitigation where the impact is significant.

The Mayor is currently consulting on a draft All London Green Grid SPG. The aim of the SPG is to treat any consideration of a site as part of a strategic Green Grid where there is deficiency. The location of FBSW is outside of a defined area of open space deficiency (UDP map 8.1).

By your own admission ‘pre-application discussions’ have influenced this re-designation. These discussions relate to the provision of a new weighbridge, the Council’s fleet of refuse/recycling and staff vehicles, plus a small office/storage building and a refuelling station.

I formally request an assessment of the eco systems and natural habitats on the site to determine its nature conservation value which would inform any proposed re-designation. The Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). It will widen the range of uses on the site to include heavy industrial uses, with all their potential for noise, pollution and traffic congestion. It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and any evidence provided at the second Examination was not new or relevant.

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

The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be accorded to the site. The change in classification is not specifically allocating this site for waste but for B1, B2 and B8 use. The evidence to support the designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Areas Guidance. The Council considers that the changes proposed do accord with the London Plan and the Council have met with the GLA to ensure conformity with the London Plan. Furthermore, the Council considers SP2 and SP8 are consistent with national policy.

No further action required.
As regards change of designation of the land from Employment Use to Locally Significant Industrial Use, I totally disagree. The loss of protection for the site's nature conservation value would be detrimental to the local environment. I formally request that an assessment of the ecosystems and natural habitats on the site be carried out to determine its importance. The existing designation of Pinkham Way as an Employment Location being changed to LSIS. This change in designation is without justification and the leap to an industrial use with no consultation, evidence or justification for doing so is suspicious.

The Council considers the Core Strategy to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and it is against these principles that any future applications for FBSW will be considered, as well as other relevant national, regional and policy provisions.

Concern over the way Haringey Council has changed the designation of the Pinkham Way site from employment use to industrial use. The loss of any protection for the nature conservation value of the site would be detrimental to the natural and local environment.

The Council is of the view that the consultation exercise undertaken fully accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed.

Finally, the Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the Examination in Public, and the leap to an industrial use with no consultation, evidence or justification for doing so is suspicious.

The adjoining Hollickwood Park and the Muswell Hill Golf Course, as well as the adjoining Allotment Gardens, Albert Road and the council owned brownfield site Hollickwood Road, are managed and maintained to form part of the major London managed network of local green spaces to meet the provisions of the consultation draft All London Green Grid SPG.

In line with our SCI, the Council carried out the consultation in line with how to consult on a planning policy document and that any future applications for development on the Pinkham Way site will be considered.
Related Test of Soundness:
AE(Attending Examination) WR(Written

Related policy compliance 0= not on
Not specified

Pinkham wood is the heart of a mainly residential area and in close proximity to four local schools: Alexandra Park ... These activities only ceased recently, when the NLWA/London Borough of Barnet erected a security fence around the site.

The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

Re-designation of the site will expand the range of uses for the site which could include heavy industrial uses which I ... to noise pollution and traffic congestion in the area as well as damage to the site as an area for nature conservation.

I have not seen anything that shows me that any decision for the re-designation of Pinkham Wood is based on sound ... evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and the re-consultation document (CSSD-3) has no new evidence.

Barnet Sewage works
Not specified

Former Friern
No further action required. 202/5/5.1

Former Friern
No further action required. 202/7/5.1

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation ... on the site has potential to have biodiversity impacts, because it is a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation.

I formally request an assessment of the eco systems and natural habitats on the site - which is one of only nine sites ... has now provided the tools for conducting such an assessment which should form the basis of any proposed re-designation.

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not ... be developed for employment use without some impact on biodiversity. The level of impact should however be mitigated.

The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be ... areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

Although aware of pre-application discussions for Pinkham Way, the Council did not propose re-designation because of ... on an application for a waste management site as both designations include B1, B2 and B8 or Sui Generis use classes.

The Mayor is currently consulting on a draft All London Green Grid SPG.  The aim of the SPG is to treat any consideration ... where there is deficiency.  The location of FBSW is outside of a defined area of open space deficiency (UDP map 8.1).

The Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

This objection refers to issues that would have to be addressed by a planning application and is beyond the remit of the ... the scale and impact of the development upon the local area and would require mitigation where the impact is significant.

It seems to me that there has been very limited consultation that has been carried out and Haringey Council has failed to ... re-consultation, particularly those, like myself, who live in neighbouring boroughs and are extremely close to the site.

The Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209/3/5.1</td>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209/4/5.1</td>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209/5/5.1</td>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210/3/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210/4/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211/1/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211/4/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211/6/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213/2/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213/4/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214/2/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215/1/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216/5/5.1</td>
<td>Former Friern</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Green Space designation or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

The PPS sets out key principles to ensure that the potential impacts of planning decision on biodiversity and geological ... its previous use and as a result of dumping on the site. The site is not currently open to the public and is, in parts, the change of site would directly impact upon.

The SA assessed that development of Friern Barnet has the potential to impact upon biodiversity resources on the site. The SA therefore made recommendations to reduce potential environmental impacts.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as ... (or local SLOL designation?) or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

Charlie Kronick 211 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Celeste Stroll 213 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

Any merit in including it as part of a strategic Green Grid will be assessed following the Mayor's final publication of ... The recent consultation only related to SP2 Housing and SP8 Employment so this representation is not duly made.

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.

Celeste Stroll 213 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed.

Barnet Sewage works

I am extremely concerned about this whole situation re Pinkham Way and the change of use Haringey are trying to use. The suitability of using the site for industrial use when it has been previously listed as green space that should be protected.

The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

Carolyn Whitehead 214 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

We do not want a waste plant in our area. We do not want Haringey to turn Pinkham Way into an industrial site. The woodland will help to lessen the adverse effects of

Mrs Menelaou 225 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The reference to B class uses does no more than confirm the Council's views for the need to increase the protection to be ... areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

Alison Lister 227 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

I wish to place on record my objection to the change of use at the Pinkham Way. My objection are many fold but in ... rich woodland on Pinkham way to an industrial site. This is not what I want for me, my children and my family.

Former Friern

A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out to support all stages of the Core Strategy

To whom it may concern: as concerned local residents, we would like to protest against the proposed redesignation of the ... the entire area. Pollution and traffic levels will increase, and the quality of life for local residents will diminish.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations... Team so their details can be added to the consultation database. The consultation database is continuously being updated.
The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The Council does not consider it necessary to carry out further assessment of the site.

There are a number of grounds on which I object to the change of use for the Pinkham Way site. These include: the suitability of using the site for industrial use when it has been previously listed as green space that should be protected.

The Council has carried out the revised consultation in accordance with the statutory planning regulations and the Local Plan. The documents were circulated to the officers of the Borough of Barnet and the Borough of Haringey, to the London Borough of Barnet Independents. In addition, the documents were available in the borough's 9 libraries and the Council's website.

I am a former resident of Haringey and now live close to the site within Barnet Council's jurisdiction. I have heard that the site has been zoned as green space that should be protected and that it is a green buffer from the A406. I am deeply concerned for wildlife contained within the site also.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as Metropolitan Open Land, Local Green Space designation or Green Grid cross-boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether alternative designations would be appropriate - e.g. Metropolitan Open Land, Local Green Space designation or Green Grid cross-boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield. The change in designation does not hinder or reduce the scope for attracting employment generating activities to the area. It is impossible to ignore the fact that this is all about a waste facility - which will encounter such massive opposition that it will do is become a magnet for activism - so you may as well designate it as a campsite because that is what it will become.

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether this was the most appropriate strategy against alternatives such as Metro Lanes or Green Grid cross boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.

The Council did not propose re-designation because of assurances that the site will be available for employment uses and that the site is not suitable for waste. This change in designation is not specifically allocating this site for waste but for B1, B2 and B8 use.

There is no evidence that Haringey considered whether alternative designations would be appropriate - e.g. Metropolitan Open Land, Local Green Space designation or Green Grid cross-boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield. The site is not MOL site as it does not meet the criteria as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011.

Haringey must come clean about the reasons for this change. It does not accord with Regional Policy: See The London Plan in particular Policy 7 (7.14 and 7.18-7.21) and local policy 4.4 (or local SLOL designation?) or Green Grid cross boundary green space, connecting Barnet, Haringey and Enfield.
The Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

It does not accord with Regional Policy: See The London Plan in particular Policy 7 (7.14 and 7.18-7.21)

The site does not have established industrial use (see para. 5.1.10) and is not suitable for industrial use given its close proximity to residential areas.

The environmental impact, impact upon transport and health of any proposed development will have to be addressed by all...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Soundness</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Action Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenka Purdey</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincia Daniel</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Carroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M, E, C and L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Featherstone MP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muswell Hill Sustainability Group</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Friern Barnet Sewerage treatment site</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>No further action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Nevitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila Sifri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leila Sifri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barnet Sewage works evidences the under-provision of woodland and local nature reserves within the Borough. The proposed list of Locally Significant Industrial Sites and awarded the alternative designation of Metropolitan Open Land.

There was not a comprehensive leaflet drop in the area. In line with our SCI, community involvement activities are proposed. This accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed.

Not specified
Not specified

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not had a significant effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

Is it based on robust and credible evidence? It would seem not.

As set out in Appendix 2 of the SCI, Haringey Council will use a selection of potential methods to engage with the public and stakeholders. The consultation document does not mention the caveat (the use of the land for employment purposes shall be “subject to no adverse impact on the nature conservation value of the site”.)

To conclude, as shown above, the Haringey Liberal Democrat group not only considers this second consultation flawed but also considers it being a political decision.

I consider that, given the nature conservation value of the site and the site’s position adjacent to an ecological corridor, the council have not considered the implications of the proposed change in designation of the site to a locally significant industrial site, whereas the emphasis on biodiversity and the protection of the site’s ecological value has been neglected.

The site at FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The council have identified it as a site that should carry either the strategic designation of MOL, or the more local designation of SLOL.

I object to a designation of the former Friern Barnet Sewerage treatment site as a Locally Significant Industrial Use. The loss of any protection for the nature conservation value of the site would be detrimental to the natural and local environment.

The Council considers that the changes proposed do accord with the London Plan and the Council have met with the GLA during earlier stages of the Core Strategy production to ensure the plan is in general conformity with the London Plan.
The Council will continue to protect this site as a SINC. The designation has not been removed. The Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

It is believed that Haringey has not consulted with the London Wildlife Sites Board as directed in this policy?

No further action required. 283/3/5.1

There is great scientific basis for the health benefits of such tree rich areas to soak up the ill effects of the urban noise and pollution. The loss of such areas will lead to the degradation of the public open spaces in this area and nature and biodiversity will without a doubt suffer for concreting area of these natural spaces.

No further action required. 285/4/5.1

No further action required. 286/2/5.1

I believe the site should remain as a conservation site and the type of development should be compatible with that.

The consultation that was first carried out was very limited and Haringey Council failed to adequately consult local people or inform them of the consultation.

It is not based on robust or credible evidence. The updated Sustainability Appraisal which has been produced by Hyder Consulting, for FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The site does not meet the criteria for Local Green Space designation and the site is not included in any entries in the Greater London Wildflower Atlas.

The Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

Finally, the Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG). It is particularly despicable that people living on the Barnet side in the close proximity of the Pinkham Way site like Councillors Salinger and Villiers (In touch Newsletter Autumn 2011). Their official request has obviously been ignored.

Any merit in including it as part of a strategic Green Grid will be assessed following the Mayor's final publication of any supplementary guidance on the same.
1. Has it been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal to examine the social, economic and environmental impacts of the proposed strategy, as little to no consideration was given to the vast majority of Sustainability Appraisal Objectives.

This will link in to the Council's objectives relating to Biodiversity, Environment and Climate Change. Biodiversity and ecological functions. Development Plan Documents and Site allocations should also take this into account when identifying and

The Council should consider securing measures to enhance the biodiversity of the site from the applicant, if it is minded to grant permission for this application.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations... applications to contact the Planning Policy Team so their details can be added to the consultation database.

The consultation database is continuously being updated. All 300+ residents who recently expressed an interest in the... including local businesses, schools, residents associations, voluntary groups, government bodies and individuals.

The consultation documents were also deposited in all local libraries and available to view on the Council's website. The... accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed.

For those who know the site (rather than someone who sees it only as a red line on an OS map), the land is a mature green... (and use) would seriously and substantially compromise the networks of natural habitats that have evolved over the past 50 yeaf,s or so since the site was vacated.

Natural England has recently produced the London Landscape Framework which gives further guidance on the 'natural ... or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) the county ecologist and/or local Wildlife Trust should be contacted. Protected species.

The site at FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011.  The... identified it as a site that should carry either the strategic designation of MOL, or the more local designation of SLOL.

It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and... to support this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site – see below.

Finally, the Government has just concluded its consultation with regard to National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG).  It would be premature to re-designate in advance of consideration of the NPPG which should then lead to consultation on the Core Strategy i.e. the overall plan for the Borough...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Policy Section</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Abbey</td>
<td>Unsound</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnet Sewage works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The grounds on which I object to the change of use the Pinkham Way site</td>
<td>The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul and Josephine Moloney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Franklands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to the proposed change in designation of the Pinkham Way site</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McNamara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul and Ann Collard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This is an ecologically rich and valuable site, which is one of only nine sites designated Grade 1 of Borough importance in the Borough of Barnet. The site is known for its diverse range of natural habitats and this should be embedded in the Core Strategy and specifically in the designation of the site.</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Getraer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I object to a designation of the former Friern Barnet Sewage treatment site as a Locally Significant Industrial Use. The loss of any protection for the nature conservation value of the site would be detrimental to the natural and local environment.</td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Peers and Pamela Chatterjee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Franklands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No further action required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Related Test of Soundness:

**Intent:**

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The site at FBSW does not meet the criteria for MOL designation as set out in Policy 7.17 of the London Plan 2011. The Council considers that the policy is consistent with national and regional policy.

**Comment noted.**

It is not based on robust or credible evidence. No credible evidence was produced at the first Examination in Public, and the Council considers the changes to be in line with all national policy, including PPS9 and will assess any future planning applications against the provisions of PPS9, as well as other relevant national, regional and policy provision.

**I object to a designation of the former Friern Barnet Sewage treatment site as a Locally Significant Industrial Use. The loss of any protection for the nature conservation value of the site would be detrimental to the natural and local environment.**

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 audit of the site.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations to ensure beyond borough boundary coverage a press notice was placed in both the Barnet and Enfield Independent.

**Has consideration been given to alternative strategies such as “Metropolitan Open Land” or “Local Green Space” designation for this site?**

**Are we considering the site for any other potential use such as the North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council to build a waste-processing plant and refuse vehicle depot on the site?**

Focusing employment on land currently used for this purpose will generally reduce the risk of wider impacts on landscape, scenic quality and to some extent biodiversity resources on the site. The SA therefore made recommendations to reduce potential environmental impacts. The Council considers this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site – see below.

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation has not been removed. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

**It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation has not been removed. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.**

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 audit of the site.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations to ensure beyond borough boundary coverage a press notice was placed in both the Barnet and Enfield Independent.

**Has consideration been given to alternative strategies such as “Metropolitan Open Land” or “Local Green Space” designation for this site?**

**Are we considering the site for any other potential use such as the North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council to build a waste-processing plant and refuse vehicle depot on the site?**

Focusing employment on land currently used for this purpose will generally reduce the risk of wider impacts on landscape, scenic quality and to some extent biodiversity resources on the site. The SA therefore made recommendations to reduce potential environmental impacts. The Council considers this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site – see below.

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation has not been removed. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 audit of the site.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations to ensure beyond borough boundary coverage a press notice was placed in both the Barnet and Enfield Independent.

**Has consideration been given to alternative strategies such as “Metropolitan Open Land” or “Local Green Space” designation for this site?**

**Are we considering the site for any other potential use such as the North London Waste Authority and Barnet Council to build a waste-processing plant and refuse vehicle depot on the site?**

Focusing employment on land currently used for this purpose will generally reduce the risk of wider impacts on landscape, scenic quality and to some extent biodiversity resources on the site. The SA therefore made recommendations to reduce potential environmental impacts. The Council considers this re-designation; on the contrary, it points out its threat to the biodiversity of the site – see below.

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation has not been removed. The bigger the development the bigger the impact.

The Council will continue to protect this site as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The designation has not been removed. The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 audit of the site.

The Council has carried out the revised Core Strategy consultation in accordance with the statutory Planning Regulations to ensure beyond borough boundary coverage a press notice was placed in both the Barnet and Enfield Independent.
I am not sure what evidence you have to say that change in designation is useful and beneficial to the locality - it does not seem fair to me.

This change in designation is not specifically allocating this site for waste but for B1, B2 and B8 use. The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Land Study in terms of meeting the needs of employment areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

The Council considers the Core Strategy and its changes to be in line with national policy and is flexible enough to adapt to emerging and future legislative changes, through annual monitoring.

The site maintains a dual designation for employment use and as a SINC, subject to no adverse effect on the nature conservation value of the site. With appropriate mitigation measures employment uses are feasible.

The 2009 Employment Study recommended that all designated employment areas are strongly protected to provide choice and value to London as a whole and previous open space assessments have not identified it as a site that should carry either the strategic designation of MOL, or the more local designation of SLOL.

The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Land Study in terms of meeting the needs of employment areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

The Site of Nature Conservation Importance caveat still applies to this site.

The environmental impact, impact upon transport and health of any proposed development will have to be addressed by all applications for development on the Pinkham Way site.

The redesignation would widen the range of uses to which the site could be put, including heavy industries, with their environmental impact. It would potentially affect the environment here and lead to more traffic congestion on and around the North Circular.

The evidence to support the continued designation of the Former Friern Barnet Sewage Works Site is within the 2009 Employment Land Study in terms of meeting the needs of employment areas should be protected which strongly encourage the intensification and improvement of existing employment areas.

The Council considers the Core Strategy to be flexible enough to adapt to changes in emerging and future national policy.

The evidence that underpins the proposed change to weaker Land Use and Employment land includes:

The updated Sustainability Appraisal, produced by Hyder Consulting UK Limited, also does not contain any evidence in support of this re-designation. So again, why has the council proposed to re-designate?

It is not deliverable: The LSIS designation is only deliverable if the Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature designation (or local SLOL designation?) or Green Grid cross boundary green space connecting Barnet, Haringey and Barnet Council who want to dump their refuse vehicles there - this doesn’t seem fair to me.
For more than 50 years, nature has reclaimed the land. It is a precious wild space and is not an industrial site. Renaming it as an industrial site is shameful and goes against everything beneficial to the community. It is a valuable asset to our area.

The 2009 Employment Study recommended that all designated employment areas are strongly protected to provide choice and scope for attracting B use employment generating activities to the Borough and to decouple the local economy from the market that such employment uses (whether the site is designated EL or LSIS) could be provided on this site.

The Council carried out the revised consultation in accordance with the statutory planning regulations and the Council’s Corporate Plan. The consultation documents were also deposited in all local libraries and available to view on the Council’s website.

There is some justification to change the designation of Bounds Green Industrial Estate from an EL to a LSIS because the site is not a well-established industrial area, and it most certainly can’t be described as a well-established industrial area which Bounds Green Industrial Estate is.

Despite the passing reference to the SINC on page 34 of the consultation document, the council documentation is silent on whether the SINC is to be retained or dropped.

The Study recommends that the preferred scenario for employment growth represents an increase of around 15% in the stock modern employment generating development in the borough which is characterised by a very limited supply of such sites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representor Number</th>
<th>Unsound/Sound</th>
<th>Related Policy Compliance</th>
<th>Reference (if applicable)</th>
<th>Summary of Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The original SA did not give detailed consideration to the proposal, neither did the updated SA when the change was first made to bringing forward the site for significant industrial or other employment development and the onus is on the Council to demonstrate that such sites are deliverable at the time they are allocated.

Following additional information, the Addendum SA reassessed SP8. This assessment concluded that as a whole this policy has the potential to impact on biodiversity resources. The SA therefore made recommendations to reduce potential environmental impacts.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

No further action required. 384/11/5.1

PWA 384 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

There is no evidence that any research has been undertaken as to how the green network, the Green Grid in the London Borough of Barnet, should be designated as MOL and as an important element in the Green Grid network that connects boroughs has been missed.

The Mayor is currently consulting on a draft All London Green Grid SPG. The aim of the SPG is to treat any consideration of where to designate open green space as required, and where there is deficiency. The location of FBSW is outside of a defined area of open space deficiency (UDP map 8.1).

The adjacent Hollickwood Park and the Muswell Hill Golf Course, as well as the adjoining Allotment Gardens, Albert Road, should be designated as MOL and as an important element in the Green Grid network that connects boroughs. Therefore, this is a significant area that should be managed as a managed network of local green spaces to meet the provisions of the consultation draft All London Green Grid SPG.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/12/5.1

PWA 384 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The NPPF provides a set of core land use planning principles that should underpin plan making. Overall the NPPF seeks to ensure that the development plan is fit for purpose.

The Council considers that the submitted Core Strategy policies do contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and are appropriate at the strategic level. The NPPF encourages local authorities to consider providing for employment uses compatible with the site's potential. Where these could be developed for employment use without some impact on biodiversity. The level of impact should however be mitigated.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/13/5.1

PWA objects to the minor change put forward in the Council’s Schedule of Further Minor Changes Post Hearing. Changing the proposal to designate land as MOL or SLOL. This designation supports the NPPF criteria set out in para 131 page 37.

The draft NPPF clearly states that Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed. The Council considers that the site does not meet the criteria put forward in the NPPF to designate Local Green Spaces.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/14/5.1

PWA objects to the minor change put forward in the Council’s Schedule of Further Minor Changes Post Hearing. Changing the proposal to designate land as MOL or SLOL. This designation supports the NPPF criteria set out in para 131 page 37.

Disagree. The Council considers that the minor change put forward in the Schedule of Further Minor Changes post hearing is effective.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/15/5.1

PWA 384 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified

The NPPF provides a set of core land use planning principles that should underpin plan making. Overall the NPPF seeks to ensure that the development plan is fit for purpose.

The Council considers that the submitted Core Strategy policies do contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and are appropriate at the strategic level. The NPPF encourages local authorities to consider providing for employment uses compatible with the site’s potential. Where these could be developed for employment use without some impact on biodiversity. The level of impact should however be mitigated.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/16/5.1

PWA objects to the minor change put forward in the Council’s Schedule of Further Minor Changes Post Hearing. Changing the proposal to designate land as MOL or SLOL. This designation supports the NPPF criteria set out in para 131 page 37.

Disagree. The Council considers that the minor change put forward in the Schedule of Further Minor Changes post hearing is effective.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/17/5.1

Concerns over the inadequacy of the public consultation and how it has fallen short of what is required. See Appendix D for more information.

Our Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) clearly states that if anyone wishes to be involved in planning decisions they should write to the Council. Those who have declared an interest in the current consultation were notified, and their details added to the LDF consultation database.

The Council did not consult in Haringey People magazine. The use of Haringey People is only a “potential method of consultation”. Our SCI clearly states that we will “consider” the use of informal consultation methods. The Council places these in a variety of media including local newspapers and the London Gazette.

There was not a comprehensive leaflet drop in the area. In line with our SCI, community involvement activities are carried out the consultation in line with how to consult on a planning policy document and not a planning application.

The Council is of the view that the consultation exercise undertaken fully accords with and/or exceeds the statutory requirements and the SCI and is proportionate to the policy amendment proposed.

Former Friern Barnet Sewage works

AE

No further action required. 384/18/5.1

PWA 384 Unsound SP8 5.1 Not specified Not specified