

## Schedule of Representations received and Council responses – SCI Submission to the Secretary of State

Ref	Contact Name/ Organisation	SCI section / paragraph	Test of soundness	Issue raised at earlier stage	Summary of comment	Council response
001	Environment Agency – Liz Lightbourne					
		General		NA	“We do not have any comments...however note that we have been identified as a ‘specific consultation body’ and wish to be consulted in the future’.	No response required.
002	The Theatres Trust – Rose Freeman					
		General		NA	“Thank you for including the Theatres Trust as a consultee in Appendix 5 and for incorporating our suggested text at 3.12 regarding information about the LDF consultation database. We find the SCI to be sound”.	No response required.
003	Muswell Hill and Highgate Pensioners Action Group – Janet Shapiro					
		Paras 5.5 (the Application Process,		Not raised previously	The Council should have a responsibility to monitor/check pre- application community involvement in order to see that it was fair and	There is no statutory requirement to carry out pre-application consultation but it something that the Council will encourage where appropriate. Page 25

Ref	Contact Name/ Organisation	SCI section / paragraph	Test of soundness	Issue raised at earlier stage	Summary of comment	Council response
		table 10			not misleading. This could be done by making any pre-application documentation subject to examination when an application is made.	(under c) requests that a Consultation Statement should be submitted with any planning application where pre-application consultation has taken place. This should summarise the type of consultation that was organised, the key issues raised and details of how the scheme addressed those issues. Where such a statement is submitted, the Council will have regard to it as part of the planning application, and will report its contents as part of any report written.
		Page 25 (pre-application involvement) last para		Not raised at an earlier stage.	At table 10 it appears that an application could be considered valid even if pre-application consultation was misleading – this should not be the case.	Misleading pre-application consultation is not a justifiable reason for refusing to validate an application. As part of any planning application, the Council undertakes to consult all reasonably affected parties. At that point it will be made clear to interested parties what the true implications are of the application. Any report written will also allude to the fact that misleading pre-application consultation took place.
		Table 10 page 29 re-consultation		Not raised at an earlier stage.	Table 10 – at re-consultation stage all residents should be re-notified with the opportunity to judge amendments for themselves.	It would be a waste of council resources to re-consult parties who have shown no interest in the original application and where the amendments to the original scheme now before the Council are not considered to be

Ref	Contact Name/ Organisation	SCI section / paragraph	Test of soundness	Issue raised at earlier stage	Summary of comment	Council response
						anything more than minor. Table 10 clearly states at page 29 that re-consultation will take place where, among other things, the earlier objections were substantial, there are significant changes to the scheme, whether the earlier views covered the matters now under consideration, or when the changes mean that others not previously consulted might now be concerned. It is considered that these criteria provide sensible and clear grounds for when and how much re-consultation takes place.
		Para 1.8 and appendix 1 page 33		Not raised at an earlier stage.	Section 1 of the SCI would become clearer if this was explained. Para 1.8 page 5 confuses people because it describes a consultation process to prepare well-defined rules for planning consultation , but appendix 1 page 33 will appear to most people to be a fuss about something that is meaningless to them.	Para 1.8 sets out very clearly how the SCI is prepared, while Appendix 1 sets out the work undertaken in preparing the SCI. Having re-read the relevant paragraphs it is difficult to envisage how this can be made clearer.
		Section 4, para 4.2		Not raised at an earlier stage.	– The diagram is not clear and the arrows do not convey which plans have precedence. It could be explained that that these plans set out constraints for local development and they are referred to when applications are presented to the Council.	It is not the aim of the table at 4.2 to show which documents take precedence. However, a line should be added to paragraph 4.2 to state that: “the Local Development Documents set out the spatial plan for the borough. These documents set out land use for the borough and are a material

Ref	Contact Name/ Organisation	SCI section / paragraph	Test of soundness	Issue raised at earlier stage	Summary of comment	Council response
						consideration in determining any planning application”
		Section 5, table 10 page 28 and Appeal page 30		Not raised at an earlier stage.	The constitution of Development Control Forums is not set out and it is crucial that these forums are representative of the community. An appeal is an important process and the mechanism should ensure that local residents have their interests fairly assessed – nothing is stated here to give that reassurance.	Table 10 directs readers to “the Development Control Forum – an aid to reaching decisions on large or difficult planning applications” which sets out more details on the constitution of the DC Forum. That is the proper place for such information, and not in the SCI. With regard to appeal, the Council’s website has information on the appeal process and can be found at <a href="http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/housing_and_planning/planning-mainpage/planning_appeals.htm">http://harinet.haringey.gov.uk/index/housing_and_planning/planning-mainpage/planning_appeals.htm</a>
004	Highways Agency – Patricia Blake					
		General		NA	No further comments further to their letters dated 13 <sup>th</sup> November 2006 and 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2007	No response required.