

Dear Sir/Madam

Haringey Local Plan Main Modifications Public Consultation Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 18th November 2016- 13th January 2017

Thank you for your email dated 18 November. The modifications proposed to Site Allocations contain various errors as described below and in general do not offer adequate protection to the Highgate Conservation Area. I expect the Council to make some simple Plan modifications to meet the reasonable concerns previously outlined (C/F Representor 22).

The Plan still does not clearly label Coleridge Gardens - the public green space on Archway Road. This park comprises a major component of site SA39 (called Gonnerman and Goldsmiths Court). The new Development Guideline being proposed regarding Coleridge Gardens (SAMod77) is therefore as a consequence *wrongly recoded as referring to SA40*. Because the subject of the modification – Coleridge Gardens - forms part of SA 39 any new development Guideline with regard to it belongs in the text to SA39 - and not SA40 where it's import (if any) would be lost.

It's clear that the soundness of the Plan has been reduced by the inconsistency of approach adopted in proposed modifications to the Site Allocations Document.

For example, the Council has proposed amendments to protect green space elsewhere in the borough, eg in Lynton Road N8 (SA Mod 93) which, according to the new proposed text "is in the Council's ownership and provides local amenity" and therefore according to the modification proposed "must be retained".

This stance is in stark contrast to the approach being adopted over, eg, Coleridge Gardens – equally valued green space in the Council's ownership which also provides local amenity within the Highgate Conservation Area **and is therefore also in need of equally clear and unambiguous protection**.

The best that the Council presently offers this local green space (see SA Mod77) is simply not good enough:

"The requirement to retain or reprovide Coleridge Gardens should be considered against the value of providing improved access between open space(s) elsewhere"

This statement provides continued scope to dispose of Coleridge Gardens for redevelopment - justified by provision of improved "access "(somewhere else and to something else) as a "quid pro quo".

However, the proposed modification's wording sets up a false dichotomy – the idea that a choice needs to be made, between the garden's retention and the (erroneous) notion that it could just as easily and meaningfully be "reprovided" somewhere else. The idea that "access" between (two) other pre-existing pen space/s would compensate for (and therefore needs to be "considered against") the loss of this separate, valued, public amenity space is equally false.

The present plan's stance on such existing amenity green space is discriminatory; the Council is not treating the residents of different locations within the Borough in an equal, consistent or even-handed manner. Just like the Lynton Road space, Coleridge Gardens is in the Council's ownership and **also** provides an important local amenity. Likewise, it must be retained and protected from development by the Council. Equal treatment is needed.

Yours faithfully

Tony Rybacki