

**From:** Roy Thompson

**Sent:** 22 October 2011 18:23

**To:** LDF

**Cc:** Allison.Ingham@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Subject:** Proposed change of designation for Pinkham Way site (DEA6)

I write to express my objection to Haringey Council's proposal to change the designation of the Pinkham Way site (ref:DEA6) to Industrial Use.

There are a number of reasons for my objection:

1. Despite being a Haringey Council Tax payer resident in the affected area of the borough, the council did not consult me or take any steps to make me aware that a consultation was taking place - even now when they have been obliged to repeat the consultation because the first was so inadequate. I only became aware of the re-consultation through third parties.
2. Haringey Council continue to refer to the site as 'Friern Barnet Sewerage Works'. It ceased to be such almost 50 years ago, and there is now no visible trace of that use. It has become a welcome and important green space (recognised as such in the Council's own Biodiversity Action Plan, and designated as Grade 1 Borough Importance for Nature Conservation Value). Referring to the site in that way is misleading to local residents, most of who only know it as Pinkham Way.
3. Rather than change Pinkham Way's designation from Employment to Industrial use, the Council should actually be paying more attention to their Biodiversity Action Plan and the reality of the site's natural development over the recent decades. This would potentially lead to it actually being designated as a Local Nature Reserve - as Barnet did with Coppett's Wood, which has a similar history.
4. The site's previous designation as for Employment Use carried a condition that such use is **subject to no adverse on the nature conservation value of the site**. The site's environmental diversity and value is only likely to increase with time. Therefore it is perverse to change it's designation to Industrial Use (inherently likely to have a bigger impact on biodiversity and the natural environment) **and at the same time** to strip away that condition.
5. The site is very close to residential areas and to local schools. Although the site itself is not open to public use, it adjoins a public space (Hollickwood Park) and a children's play area widely used by local mothers and toddlers. Industrial use of the site will inevitably impact on those local residents' quality of life.
6. I note that the Council's rationale for this change is that it fits with pre-application discussions they have had with a potential *industrial* user of the site (NLWA). Surely this is a reversal of the proper approach to strategic planning! *Applications should be judged and approved/rejected/modified to fit with the plan*. The plan should **not** be modified because some applicant (especially if the Council itself has a stake in that applicant) wants to use a site

in a way which contravenes the plan.

Regards,

Roy Thompson

---

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

---