Summary of Responses to the Core Strategy Issues and Options Paper

NB. Percentages quoted are based on the number of responses to each question, not the number of respondents to the consultation and only used where more than 10 individuals responded.

	Questions	Response Summary
Objectives and Priorities	Q1. Do the spatial objectives provide a useful approach to identifying the issues and options for Haringey's future? Q2. Are there any other important objectives that should be included? Q3. Identify area specific priorities and objectives, the Unitary Development Plan divided the borough into eastern, central and western areas. Do you agree with this approach? Are the objectives for these areas still appropriate? Have we missed any key priorities?	Approximately 64% of respondents broadly supported the spatial objectives subject to minor changes, however there were concerns that the objectives are not distinctive to the borough and merely continue London Plan aspirations. The majority of alternative/additional objectives suggested were geared towards improving environmental sustainability. The following additional objectives were suggested: ▪ to reduce disparities between eastern and western sides of the borough ▪ to improve quality and size of affordable housing ▪ to reduce the need to travel (PPG13) ▪ to improve the accessibility to local services and amenities. ▪ to produce and distribute food locally ▪ to utilise mixed use development in accessible locations ▪ to increase renewable energy generation ▪ to improve water efficiency ▪ to improve air quality ▪ to consider adaptation to climate change ▪ to improve the attractiveness and value of the urban environment ▪ to increase "greening" and open space within the borough ▪ to protect and enhance biodiversity (PPS9) The division of the borough into east, west and central areas was not commented upon by the majority of respondents. Most responses focussed on discrete actions aimed at improving the urban environment in the east of the borough. Respondents that did comment on the division were generally supportive although a small proportion felt that the divisions were unduly prescriptive. Alternative divisions were proposed based on access to health services and public transport interchanges. Some confusion was apparent over the difference between spatial objectives, key priorities, aims and issues, possibly compounded by the interchangeable use of these terms in the consultation document. Proposed key priorities included: ▪ Demolishing high density tower blocks ▪ Developing cultural centres in east and central areas ▪ Preserving front gardens ▪ Improving accessibility to River Lee ▪ Enhancing waterborne transport ▪ Supporting town centres

| Climate Change and Environment | Q4. Do you think that the borough should adopt the London Plan carbon reduction targets or seek higher targets?

Q5. Should we require all new development to provide a proportion of their energy requirement from renewable sources? Should we require higher renewable energy targets (at least 20%) for major developments on selected sites?

Q6. Where developments cannot meet on-site renewable energy targets, should we allow them to make carbon reduction contributions in another way, for example by making a financial contribution to make existing buildings more energy efficient?

Q7. Should all developments meet high standards of energy efficiency and environmental performance, taking into account the specifics of the site, technology and cost? or should this only apply to schemes of certain types or certain sizes?

Q8. Should we require large development schemes to include decentralised energy / district heating and cooling systems?

Q9. Should we build local energy generation and distribution systems?

Q10. The Council is considering developing at least one zero carbon development in Haringey by 2013. Do you agree?

Q11. How could we encourage households to use less energy? Should we encourage measures to improve the energy performance of existing buildings, for example, by extending energy efficiency measures to the rest of the house when applications are made for extensions?

Q12. When considering the impact of solar panels, wind turbines and other 'green' technologies on their surroundings should we treat them in the same way as other building works or give environmental factors greater priority than other considerations, such as conservation/heritage? | The majority of respondents supported exceeding London Plan targets for carbon reduction; however, only 10 responses to the question were received. A key issue was raised regarding the measurability of the target and availability of baseline data.

Approximately half of respondents supported the prescription of renewable sources or on site energy generation in all new development subject to viability and proven carbon emission reductions. Some support was expressed for setting higher targets as part of major developments. The principle of decentralised energy production in large development schemes was supported but assessment of individual schemes was seen as more appropriate than a borough wide policy requirement. Some concern was expressed regarding the possibilities for proliferation of small scale particulate producing energy generation in the absence of a strategic policy to guide scale and location. Exploration of possible anaerobic digestion and waste biomass energy generation was supported. The majority of respondents oppose the development of local energy generation and distribution systems without the support of conclusive environmental and economic benefits.

Some opposition was expressed regarding the setting of arbitrary standards rather than adoption of existing standards such as the Code for Sustainable Homes. The GLA insist on adoption of London Plan targets.

There was general opposition to the use of commuted sums for renewable energy in the interests of environmental gains and borough wide planning gain priorities, although some developers were in favour of this approach. Energy efficiency was seen as equally, if not more, important than renewable energy use/generation. All respondents felt that high standards for energy efficiency should relate to all development irrespective of size.

90% of respondents were in favour of the move toward zero carbon development. A number questioned the specification of one development; some respondents advocated a more ambitious target whilst others advised a more cautious approach, with zero carbon limited to one small development. Natural England advice that one development may be insufficiently ambitious given the volume of development envisaged to 2016.

Most respondents felt that energy efficiency in existing households was more appropriately dealt with by building regulations, education campaigns or incentive payments/subsidy rather than the planning system. In relation to development control, respondents were generally opposed to the prioritisation of green technologies over other considerations, especially in regard to conservation and heritage. |

Adapting to climate change	Q13. Should we require all developments to include sustainable urban drainage systems and incorporates facilities to reduce water consumption and re-use grey water. Q14. Should we require a proportion of front gardens to be retained with vegetation to reduce surface water run-off? Q15. Should we require design and landscaping measures to reduce overheating and the 'heat island effect'	Near unanimous support of SUDs where such systems can be implemented. Environment Agency and Enfield Borough Council advise that the need for flood risk management should be set in its wider, cross boundary context in the Core Strategy. Thames Water advise pragmatism with regard to rainwater harvesting and SUDs as such measures are not practicable in all new developments. There was general support for design and landscaping to be used to contribute to natural heating and cooling in new development. The retention of front gardens was generally supported to maintain permeability, contribute to the urban environment and maintain biodiversity. The use of porous materials in any paved areas was also generally supported.
Reducing environmental impact	Q16. Should we expect major developments to provide for the sorting and storage of waste to aid waste handling and collection and encourage recycling? Q17. Should we require developments adjacent to or above watercourses to improve the water environment and quality? Q18. What steps should we take to reduce noise pollution in the borough? Q19. Should we require all developments which generate additional travel to introduce measures to manage air quality?	GOL felt that the questions posed with regard to waste did not address strategic concerns. The Core Strategy will need to reflect local waste needs/issues despite inclusion of the detailed policies in the Joint Waste Core Strategy. Respondents generally supported the inclusion of waste and recycling storage as an integral part of major development but some respondents felt a more comprehensive scheme of actions was necessary. Both Thames Water and the Environment Agency support the aim of improving the water environment and quality in line with the North London River Restoration Strategy. A number of policy suggestions were made by the Environment Agency, Thames Water and British Waterways. Other respondents supported the idea that water side development should contribute to improvements in the waterside environment. British Waterways would like to contribute to the development of a design code for waterside development Respondents suggested a number of measures for dealing with noise abatement measures including: specifying low noise surfaces on all new and repaired roads, limiting late night opening of noisy premises and limiting noise generating activities in public open spaces. The majority of responses concentrated on education and enforcement actions to reduce noise that could be carried out by the council. Sound insulation was also mentioned with support given to referencing of the measures in place in the Code for Sustainable Homes. The inadequacy of existing building regulations for sound insulation in conversions was also highlighted as an area of concern. There was support for minimising additional traffic generated as a consequence of new development by maximising public transport opportunities. There was also some support for car free development. GOL questioned the evidence supporting air quality and pollution as problem issues within the borough.

| Promoting sustainable travel | Q20. Do you support the sustainable transport measures in the Unitary Development Plan and Local Implementation Plan? Are there other measures we should be promoting?

Q21. Where large development schemes are taking place at or near transport interchanges should we require schemes to improve, or make a financial contribution towards, the capacity and accessible of the interchange?

Q22. Do you support car free housing, or are there other ways where we can reduce car use?

Q23. Should we require new and expanding schools to produce and implement a travel plan to reduce car use?

Q24. Do you support the public transport proposals listed in the Unitary Development Plan? Are there any other transport schemes for which we should be safeguarding land? | TfL/GLA response suggests that the Core Strategy should be developed to have a clear, overarching transport policy that guides the transport aspects of development, and is well linked to more detailed transport policies. The list of projects should be amended to reflect funded or committed TfL proposals.

The Highways agency response indicated that action should be taken to create a better alignment of jobs, houses and services to minimise the need to travel. Promotion of car free and permit free development in areas with good transport accessibility and maximum parking standards in line with the London Plan were also supported by the agency. Enfield Borough Council sought support for the North Circular Area Action Plan and the West Anglia Route Modernisation Enhancements.

There was general support for planning gain contributions to be directed towards a borough wide pool of transport infrastructure contributions subject to viability and achievement of strategic priorities (e.g. affordable housing). Wider use of waterborne transport was also supported.

A divisive response to car free development was received with approximately 50% of respondents in favour and 50% against. Respondents suggested research into the operation of existing car free developments within the borough and measures to reduce the need for private car use and ownership such as introducing car clubs, expanding the public transport network and improving walking and cycling infrastructure . A number of specific public transport improvements were suggested with many aimed at improving direct connections between the east and west of the borough.

A number of respondents supported retention of 'parkland walk' as a transport corridor with a view to reinstating the Finsbury Park to Highgate Line and supporting Alexandra Palace as a leisure centre. Reactions to an extension of the Victoria line to Northumberland Park were more ambiguous with mixed reactions to the feasibility versus possible regeneration outcomes. |

Managing growth	Q25. Should we try to concentrate most growth in identified areas of change and on identified housing sites or should we try to spread growth more equally across the borough? Q26. Should we ensure that all housing development takes place on previously-developed 'brownfield' land? What types of brownfield land should we give priority to? Q27. Should we resist higher density housing where it is poorly designed and does not fit in with its surroundings, or should we set maximum and minimum levels of density, such as the London Plan density standards? Q28. Should we identify locations suitable for tall buildings or identify areas where they are not suitable? Q29. Should we resist the conversion of single dwelling houses into flats or houses in multiple occupation in some parts of the borough? What proportion of conversions in a street is acceptable? Q30. How should we encourage the reuse of empty homes?	The general consensus around the question of growth concentration was that the concentration and dispersal options cannot be considered as mutually exclusive. GOL stress that housing and employment growth should be encouraged in areas with sufficient public transport capacity but that housing will also be needed across the borough. London Borough of Enfield support concentration of growth in identified areas of change to ensure a critical mass for service and infrastructure delivery. Respondents were generally supportive of brownfield housing development subject to consideration of impacts on biodiversity and other types of land use. Back land/back garden development was dismissed except where sites are very large; the majority of respondents opposed the categorisation of garden/back land and allotment sites as brownfield. Redevelopment of existing high density, high rise buildings was supported. The question regarding density was poorly received, GOL felt that the question was ambiguous and did little to convey the fact that the London Plan, including it's density matrix, is an inherent part of the Core Strategy. There was very little consensus regarding density. Approximately one third of respondents felt that density considerations should be decided on a case by case basis, one third according to high design criteria and the final third according to borough-wide maxima set at a moderate level. Tall buildings were another divisive topic. GOL and the GLA recommend setting out suitable and unsuitable locations. Some respondents were supportive of setting out locations for tall buildings but the majority were firmly opposed to the building of any tall buildings within the borough. There was general support for the setting of some restriction on the proportion of conversions to flatted or multiple-occupancy in a particular area to minimise transience in communities. Suggested proportions varied from no more than 5% to 40% although most respondents put forward values between 10% and 20%. A number of respondents felt that conversions should be subject to car-free or restricted parking policies with one respondent suggesting the complete withdrawal of parking permits in conversions. GLA requested reference to the Empty Homes Strategy. The majority of respondents supported the use of CPO powers to bring empty properties back into use. In addition a number of respondents suggested 100%plus levels of council tax to be levied on empty homes.
Managing the impact of growth	Q31. Have we identified all the infrastructure implications from future housing growth? Do you think we should 'pool' developer contributions towards infrastructure requirements in certain areas? Q32. Should we restrict or limit development in areas which have insufficient services and facilities, such as schools, health facilities and utility infrastructure and resources? Q33. Should we encourage mixed uses in certain developments and on particular sites in the borough? If so, should this be in the most accessible parts of the borough or should this also apply to other areas?	A very mixed response to the pooling of resources was received. Many respondents were concerned that pooled contributions may be diverted away from the communities directly affected by the development, whilst others saw a strategic benefit over piecemeal infrastructure development. It was felt that the needs of particular areas for social and amenity infrastructure should be investigated and expressed by the council as part of the policy framework; this could then guide development in the future. The majority of respondents felt that development should be restricted in infrastructure deficient areas unless significant action to improve infrastructure as a result of the development was undertaken. Mixed use development was supported in accessible areas of the borough, subject to preservation of 'residential amenity'. A number of respondents, including The Environment Agency, felt that infrastructure implications should also refer to water resources, water management and flood alleviation measures.

Providing affordable housing	Q34. Should we consider lowering the threshold (from 10 units) at which housing developments are required to contribute to affordable housing? Q35. For smaller sites below 10 units, should we require less than 50% affordable housing, or allow a financial contribution to be made instead of providing units? Q36. Should we require more than 50% affordable housing on very large sites? Q37. What factors may affect the financial viability of providing affordable housing on sites? Should these be taken into account? Q38. What mix of social rented and intermediate housing should we seek? To encourage balanced communities, should this mix vary in different parts of the borough according to existing concentrations of social housing?	There was general support for lowering the affordable housing site threshold in selected areas, particularly to the west of the borough. Respondents appreciated that a financial contribution in lieu of actual affordable housing in some areas of the borough may be advantageous and were generally supportive of financial contributions for 'difficult' sites. There was little support for considering financial viability as a consideration in calculating affordable housing although one respondent highlighted the possibility that the regenerating effects of some schemes may outweigh the contribution direct provision of affordable housing could make. There was some support for applying a differential affordable housing target e.g. 30% in the east, over 50% in the west, although some respondents were against this approach. Proposals for over 50% affordable housing provision on large sites were generally opposed in favour of securing mixed and balanced community development. GLA highlight the need for a 70:30 social intermediate affordable housing split to be maintained across the borough in conformity with the London Plan, however, subject to justification from needs assessments, this could be varied. Variations may also be justified on specific sites provided the 70:30 split is maintained overall.
Providing a range of housing types	Q39. Should we encourage more family housing in developments? Q40. Are larger family homes suitable everywhere in the borough and in all developments? If not, should we specify areas or certain developments which are suitable for family housing? Q41. In which locations should we encourage special needs housing? Q42. Should we encourage more lifetime homes and require more generous minimum floorspace standards for new dwellings and conversions?	There was general support for ensuring an adequate supply of family housing as part of new development throughout the borough based on needs assessments. Respondents were also supportive of ensuring that all housing development is family friendly by restricting use of tall buildings. Respondents supported special needs housing in all locations but felt that access to open space, shops and support services may be particularly important for elderly residents. The London Plan requires all new homes to be built to Lifetime Homes Standards. Lifetime homes are also a component of achieving Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Some respondents felt that any local policy was therefore unnecessary and objected to any stipulation especially regarding floorspace which is subject to building regulations. The majority of respondents were extremely supportive of increasing minimum floorspace standards in both new dwellings and conversions.
Creating high quality buildings and spaces	Q43. Should we resist design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area or should design be considered acceptable provided it does not harm the appearance of an area? Q44. Should we provide specific design guidance for different areas of the borough or should we seek good design everywhere?	Comprehensive response by English Heritage that highlights the need for a sound evidence base regarding the historic environment in support of the Core Strategy. They stress that understanding and valuing the historic environment should be intrinsic to achieving high quality buildings and public spaces. Lee Valley Regional Park Authority would like to see greater policy recognition of the park, supporting its stated priorities and in particular recognising the park as a key driver in the regeneration of the Upper Lea Valley. Natural England are concerned that opportunities for safe guarding and increasing biodiversity and nature conservation are taken as part of the approach to new development. High levels of design quality are supported by respondents who unanimously agreed that the design of development should improve the character and quality of an area and that design standards should be enforced across the borough. Some respondents acknowledged that characterisation of the different areas of the borough could support design objectives.

Protecting & enhancing the built environment & local distinctiveness	Q45. Should we continue to protect and enhance the borough's buildings and areas of architectural and historic interest? Or should housing requirements mean that we take a more flexible to the use and reuse of historic areas or buildings? Q46. In addition to the protection given to conservation areas and listed buildings, how should we seek to protect the local distinctiveness of certain parts of the borough?	GOL are keen to ensure that no repetition of national policy is included in the Core Strategy. English Heritage advise that the protection and enhancement of heritage assets should not prohibit potential for conservation led regeneration and the ability of heritage assets to meet the challenges of additional housing. They are also concerned that protection of the borough's archaeological heritage has not been considered. The majority of respondents felt that there was no need for housing requirements to take precedence over conservation aims; a number of respondents felt that good design meant that conversion and new build development can be compatible with heritage preservation aims. Respondents supported the use of enforcement action, public consultation and characterisation of each area as important in the protection of local distinctiveness. Suggestions regarding street furniture, street paving, lighting, advertising hoardings, tree retention and use of materials were also made.
Improving the quality & appearance of Haringey's public spaces & street scene	Q47. Should we expect all developments to contribute to physical works to streets and public places? Q48. What physical works do you consider best improve the visual attractiveness and use of public spaces? Q49. Are there other approaches to improving streets and public places in Haringey that we should consider?	There was some support for major development to make contributions to public space improvements and for 'Safer by Design' principals to be included in any works involving streets and public spaces. The GLA advised reference to the TfL Streetscape Guidance for schemes involving highway infrastructure on the TLRN (Transport for London Road Network). One respondent advised the Council to ensure that strategic priorities were assessed before setting out a wish list for planning gain contributions. A number of physical works were suggested to improve the urban environment: ▪ Retention and expansion of street tree planting ▪ More and improved street planting and maintenance ▪ Introduction of community gardens/food growing areas ▪ Setting development back away from busy roads ▪ Increased public art ▪ Removal of excessive street furniture ▪ Co-ordination of essential signage ▪ Removal of advertising hoardings, limited timings for 'for sale' signs ▪ Reduce traffic speeds e.g. 20mph in all residential streets ▪ Tarmac limited to vehicular crossways A number of approaches to street scene improvements were suggested: ▪ Process of working with key groups and residents e.g. Living Streets ▪ Parking enforcement ▪ Comprehensive approach to development within areas of terraced housing to include front gardens, back gardens, backlands development and front and rear aspects. ▪ A junction team to monitor, improve and maintain road junctions.

Protecting, enhancing & improving access to public open spaces & nature	Q50. Should we protect all green open spaces or allow new housing on some sites? Q51. Should we seek to create new parks and open spaces or improve the quality of existing spaces and access from residential areas? How can we encourage better use of our parks and sports facilities? Q52. Should we encourage developments to do more to protect habitats for wildlife in Haringey? What measures should we seek?	Respondents strongly opposed development on green open spaces. The majority of respondents felt that the number and extent of green spaces should be increased and that developments should contribute to wildlife habitats. Natural England are keen to see Haringey link with other boroughs to identify a network of existing and planned green spaces as mentioned in the East London Green Grid Framework and would like to see evidence of how the green space deficiencies in some areas will be addressed. Other respondents were keen to ensure that every opportunity is taken to increase green and open spaces and to maintain existing facilities and green spaces. Some concern regarding building in parks/open spaces as a driver towards increased use but some support for facilities such as cafes to ensure footfall. A number of respondents suggested the re-introduction of park keepers as a key improvement tool. GLA requested reference to the Lee Valley Ramsar Site, Policies 3D.8 and 3D.11 and London Plan guidance on DPD policies for biodiversity. Environment Agency advise that protection and enhancement can be achieved by naturalising river corridors and incorporating buffer zones into waterside development. Other respondents supported the integration of wildlife habitats into new development suggesting measures such as green walls and roofs, bird/bat nesting boxes and the inclusion of 'wild spaces' as part of development.
Increasing job opportunities for Haringey's population	Q53. Should we encourage developers to recruit local people and use local businesses and suppliers during the construction of a scheme and its final use, particularly in or near deprived areas? Q54. Should we encourage developers of large schemes to produce an employment and training plan to encourage job opportunities for local people and reduce barriers to work?	The majority of respondents felt that interventions into the recruitment and supply policies of developers were not a matter for the planning system. GOL were concerned that it is not a strategic concern. Some support was expressed regarding the use of local suppliers and local construction materials to contribute towards carbon footprint reduction. Some support was expressed for the creation of employment and training plans with the caveat that developers should not be penalised for non compliance. GLA refer to Policies 3B.1 and 3B.11 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy and advised that initiatives to create training and employment opportunities should be provided throughout the borough and not just in or near deprived areas with developers required to produce an employment and training strategy that will address barriers to employment.

Protecting viable employment land and buildings	Q55. Should we protect all employment land for business and employment use? Q56. Where vacant and surplus to requirements, should we allow employment land to be reused for housing or community uses? Q57. Where under-utilised, should we encourage mixed use development which increases the number and range of jobs on site or provides other regeneration benefits? Q58. Are there locations where we could allocate specific uses or 'clusters' of uses?	GLA strongly support the retention of Strategic Industrial Locations; smaller industrial sites and locally significant employment sites should be protected for industrial activity. Reference should also be made to the Mayor's SPG on Industrial Land. The majority of respondents supported redevelopment of employment sites only where a need/demand assessment could prove it was surplus to requirements with sites evaluated on an individual basis. A number of respondents felt that a loss of employment land in one location should be supplemented by an equivalent designation in view of long term economic needs, the need to reduce travel outside of the borough for employment purposes and retention of units particularly for small businesses. One respondent supported a definition of appropriate employment uses in the Core Strategy to include sui generis employment generating uses. The Mayor's SPG on Industrial Land was referred to; this prioritises reuse of employment sites for housing and mixed use development. Some respondents were keen to ensure that any re-designated employment site includes a mix of uses aimed at improving the economic, community facilities and cultural offer in the borough e.g. creative hubs, live/work units. The majority of respondents supported the mixing of uses on underutilised sites only where the number and range of jobs on site was increased. Some concern was expressed regarding the loss of flexibility introduced by including housing in the mix. Respondents suggested the following clusters: Health related cluster at St Ann's Hospital, Green Industries/green business cluster in Central Leeside, Bruce Grove cultural cluster.
Strengthening Haringey's town centres	Q59. Should any of Haringey's town centres be increased or decreased in size? Q60. Should the Core Strategy recognise the wider role of town centres as a focus for development? Q61. Should we seek to resist new shopping developments that are not compatible with the character and function of a centres, for example in terms of shop unit sizes and design and protect areas of specialist shopping? Q62. Should we apply stricter controls to restaurants, cafes, bars and clubs and manage the night time economy?	GLA, GOL and LB Enfield support appropriate sizing of town centres informed by retail capacity studies with reference to the London Plan hierarchy of centres. In addition LB Enfield recommends that the existence of town centres in neighbouring districts is taken into account. The Highways Agency recommends strengthening the role of town centres in line with provision of sustainable transport infrastructure to minimise the generation of additional trips. GLA also support the development of specialist centres in line with PPS6 and the Mayor's Economic Development Strategy. Respondents supported the retention, protection and strengthening of local centres as part of local communities. One respondent expressed the need for urgent improvements to Wood Green including a change in policy away from focusing all retail growth at Wood Green. One respondent supported the inclusion of the Sainsbury's store at Williamson Road within the Green Lanes Primary Shopping Frontage in recognition of its anchoring role for Green Lanes District Centre. The need for town centres to cater for a wide variety of uses beyond retail was a priority for many respondents. Cultural, leisure, and business uses were all supported with the caveat that noise generating, late night commercial premises are poor neighbours to residents. Respondents were generally in favour of the Core Strategy intervening in favour of smaller, independent and specialist retailers and against the provision of further supermarket/chain stores. However, some respondents felt that market forces should be allowed to decide the retail offer. There was strong support for a reduction in the number of take away outlets within the borough. Management of the night time economy was also supported although many respondents viewed this as a matter for restriction and control of opening hours rather than positive planning for living urban centres outside shopping hours.

Helping our local shops	Q63. What role should our local shopping centres play in future? Q64. Should we increase or decrease the number and size of our local shopping centres? Q65. Should we seek to protect public houses which serve as a local community resource?	Respondents supported the retention of existing local shopping centres particularly where accessible by walking. Council tax reductions for independent retailers were supported as was the use of local centres as local food hubs. The majority of respondents were in favour of retaining public houses as a community resource; a number of respondents opposed the setting out of a narrow definition of community resources.
Making Haringey a safer place	Q66. Do you agree with the planning measures to discourage crime and promote safer streets in the borough set out above? Are there other measures that we can take? Q67. Should we require all developments to demonstrate how they have addressed safer and security issues and have 'designed out' crime? Q68. Do crime "hotspots" need a specific approach in terms of community safety and planning? if so, what measures do you think are needed in these places?	The implementation of 'Secured by Design' requirements and 'Safer Places' guidance was supported by all respondents in addition to the proposed measures to discourage crime. One respondent suggested the use of low rise homes for families with gardens and open spaces as key to ensuring safer communities and another the use of green planting to effect a calming effect on the urban environment. The requirements for all developments to demonstrate that they have made efforts to 'design out' crime was generally supported. The consideration of the overall appearance of the street scene and nature of use of key premises was acknowledged to be important in relation to crime 'hotspots'.
Improving our health and well-being	Q69. Have we identified the right measures that planning can take to improve health and well-being in Haringey? Should we prioritise some of these measure above others? Q70. Should we require all developments to assess health impacts? Q71. Should we take a different approach to planning for health in certain parts of the borough to reflect different health issues and access to facilities?	The Core strategy should recognise the role of the Lee Valley Park and River Lee in tackling health inequalities. Concerns were expressed regarding the proposals for poly clinics and whether these would be in locations to serve communities. Haringey Teaching PCT have provided a comprehensive response to this section that includes a list of key considerations. LB Enfield report that the Barnet, Enfield & Haringey Strategy 'Your Health Your Future' only relates to hospital care, not the general health system. The list of measures was generally supported with equitable access to health facilities and safe and accessible leisure facilities supported as priorities. Approximately half of respondents were in favour of the preparation of health impact assessments; GLA highlighted that the preparation of assessments is a London Plan requirement for major development. An evidence based approach to the differing health needs in different areas of the borough was supported.
Promoting equality of opportunity and access	Q72. Are the measures identified appropriate in promoting equality of opportunity and preventing discrimination in Haringey? Are there other measures that we can take? Q73. Should we expect developers submitting major schemes to commission independent equalities impact assessments? Q74. Do you support the measures to promote accessibility of services and facilities in the borough? Are there other measures we should consider?	The measures identified with regard to equality of opportunity were supported with the proviso that health and recreation facilities should also be included. Equalities Impact assessments were supported by some respondents for larger schemes but were opposed by the majority of respondents. GLA highlight the Mayor's SPG Planning for Equality and Diversity and request a reference to it in this section. Measure to promote accessibility of services and facilities were generally supported. A lack of publicly accessible toilets was highlighted as a barrier to enjoyment of the public realm, the number of public conveniences should be included as a measure.

Supporting education and community services and facilities	Q75. What community facilities are needed in Haringey to deal with a growing population in addition to those already identified in current plans and programmes? Q76. Are there certain parts of the borough where particular facilities need to be provided? Q77. Should we require all developments to make a contribution to education facilities and services?	An amendment to the definition of community facilities was suggested as 'Community facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, education, leisure and cultural needs of the community'. The following community facilities were suggested: A hospital in Haringey (upgrade St Ann's) Younger peoples facilities Older peoples facilities Local health care for age related disorders Music venues Theatre venues Green open space Secure water supply Secure, local sustainable food supply Art gallery Museum Leisure facilities Health facilities Public toilets in town centres An evidence based approach to the location of new community facilities was supported. In addition, a Library was proposed for Green Lanes. Protection and retention of existing community facilities was also supported. Respondents generally supported contributions to education facilities and services for larger development where a proven need had been demonstrated.
Other Options	Q78. Are there any other issues and options we may have missed?	The following areas were felt to have been omitted: ▪ Light pollution ▪ Protection of non TPO trees and tree masses ▪ Specific waterside development policies ▪ Consideration of options not in conformity with London Plan policies ▪ Need for environmental infrastructure ▪ Integrated strategic approach to water management (detailed Environment Agency response received) ▪ Contribution that voluntary organisations and religious bodies make to community facilities ▪ Use of 341-379 Seven Sisters Road ▪ Telecommunications policy ▪ Secure local sustainable food supply ▪ Option of low density development to meet, but not exceed London plan targets ▪ Option to convert existing brownfield sites to green public open spaces