

## Appendix 2.9 - Comments on SA48-SA56 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

## Comments on SA48 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
740	SA1282	Hornsey Historical Society – David Frith	Conservation	The site is also within a conservation area and its development would similarly adversely affect the character and appearance of that conservation area.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document. <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
740	SA1283	Hornsey Historical Society – David Frith	Design	an objection to the proposal to erect residential development on the site of the Hornsey Water Filter Beds (SA48) on the grounds that the development of this site would have a serious impact on the character and appearance of Alexandra Palace and Park.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document. <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
572	SA1284	Beatrice Murray, resident	Design guidelines	A 'green' modern type should be selected, with planted balconies and green walls to merge with the park	Noted, design issues will be managed using DMDPD policies.
615	SA1285	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Future operational requirements	The landowner's claim that the two filter beds are now surplus to requirements needs to be treated with caution. In the past Thames Water sold for development the land now occupied by New River Village because it was seen as surplus to their needs. When it became apparent that their needs changed, TW had to build its new water treatment plant on some of the filter beds adjoining the reservoir, and these buildings now degrade the view from Alexandra Park and Palace. Any further requirement for TW to modify its operations on this site could be compromised by any short term decision to dispose of these two filter beds.	Noted, this is an issue that will be addressed through the IDP, particularly with regard to the projected quantum of house building in the borough over the plan period.
572	SA1286	Beatrice Murray, resident	Height	Any housing (not just that along the edges) should be low rise, no higher than the immediately neighbouring properties, not in line with the New River development	Noted. This site will be removed from the document. <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
742	SA1287	Friends of Alexandra Park – Gordon Hutchinson	Height	concerns expressed above re SA 29 are all the stronger regarding any potential development of buildings on the filter beds. However we also do not see how the construction of a building on the filter beds can be considered compatible with the site's designation as within the Hornsey Water Works & Filter Beds Conservation Area.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document. <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
268	SA1288	Colin Kerr and Simon Fedida	Heritage	The Hornsey Water Works filter beds of 1859 and 1879 are part of the New River infrastructure that exists at various sites across the Borough. They are a Designated Site of Industrial Heritage Interest. The loss of this industrial heritage must be resisted. Site Requirement bullet 6: Redefining the MOL boundary so that the filter beds are removed from the protections adhering to an MOL site, and thus to become a brown field site ripe for development is an exceptionally dark and cynical act of administrative legerdemain. Is this really representative of the Borough's attitude to its designated Metropolitan Open Land, one of the highest designations of quality that exists? It is hard to believe that this rather dishonest tactic has been openly published, or to imagine the degree of public opprobrium that will likely descend on the Council when its intent becomes widely known.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document. <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>

578	SA1289	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Housing need	The Hornsey Filter Beds site will help to address the housing need in Haringey by delivering approximately 40 units, on a site which has been previously developed, is in a sustainable location and is well related to the existing residential neighbourhood.	Noted.
579	SA1290	Laura Harrison, resident	Imbalance to the East	I am very concerned by the focus on increasing density in the East of the borough. Why is new development not equally spread across the borough?	The development is allocated in conformity with the strategic policies DPD. This identifies Wood Green and Tottenham as being the most suitable locations for growth, due to the availability of land and generally high accessibility in these locations.
578	SA1291	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Improved footpath	<p>The Council have expressed a desire for Thames Water to provide access across their site in order to create a more direct route from the New River Path Subway to the Alexander Park. Unfortunately Thames Water are unable to grant access across an operational site due to health and safety issues.</p> <p>As mentioned above any proposed development at the site could provide a better link between the Newlands Road the Alexander Park and Palace by way of a public footpath through the development.</p>	It is appreciated that the access to Alexandra Palace Park can be enhanced through the development.
578	SA1292	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Indistinguishable from built up area	<p>Hornsey WTW is split into two key areas. To the north of the site there is an open storage reservoir and located to the southern end of the site is the operational works. The area covered by the operational works is wholly made up of hard standing with 4 large operational buildings standing 44.70 meters high.</p> <p>The wider MOL designation includes Alexander Palace and Park. The proposed Filter Beds site is separated from the Palace and Park by these large operational buildings resulting in there being a disconnection between the proposed site and the wider MOL designation.</p> <p>The proposed allocated site cannot therefore be clearly distinguished from the built up area and therefore does not contribute towards the physical structure of London.</p>	Noted.
578	SA1293	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Infrastructure investment	Thames Water regularly identifies surplus land which can be sold for other uses. Thames Water Utilities Regulator OFWAT monitors and reviews all non regulatory business to ensure that all profits are invested back into the regulatory business. As such any profit made from development and subsequent sale of the site will be re invested into Thames Waters existing infrastructure.	Noted. The Council is interested in continuing to work with Thames Water with regards its surplus assets.
414	SA1294	GLA	MOL	<p>This site is an area of Metropolitan Open Land that is afforded strategic protection through London Plan Policy 7.17. Accordingly, the proposed redevelopment of this site for housing does not comply with this policy. GLA officers take the view that as a first principle this site should be retained as part of a wider expanse of open space at Hornsey Water Works/Wood Green Reservoirs. In broad terms, GLA officers are only in a position to consider a review of MOL boundaries where there are significant qualitative and/or quantitative benefits in terms of MOL quality and the appreciation of openness. It is, nevertheless, understood that the Council is currently considering developing a masterplan/planning guidance for this area, and that part of this process may seek to review the Metropolitan Open Land boundary. GLA officers seek further discussion with the Council with respect to any review of Metropolitan Open Land - which will need to inform the future assessment of general conformity in so far as this proposed allocation is concerned.</p>	<p>Noted. This site will be removed from the document.</p> <p><b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b></p>
419	SA1295	Haringey Liberal	MOL	The proposals also do not respect the status of the site as MOL. We note that there is potential for re-use of the existing filter beds as wildlife	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.

		Democrat Group		habitat, with controlled water levels and planting with wetland plants. Along with the benefits to biodiversity, would be educational opportunities and hands-on experience for volunteers and employment-related training.	<b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
740	SA1296	Hornsey Historical Society – David Frith	MOL; design; open space	We also wish to object to the deletion of the Metropolitan Open Land designation from this site. The development would be contrary to the proposed DM 26.E which provides that development adjacent to open space should protect and enhance the value and visual character of the open land.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
578	SA1297	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Not a Conservation interest	<p>The filter beds and other structures on the site are locally listed. A request was made to English Heritage to list the whole site including the filter beds. English heritage have produced their factual report which assesses the site historical significance. Thames Water instructed Montagu Evans to review this report and respond on their behalf.</p> <p>Their response to the report, which is submitted in full in support of these representations, concludes that the site and associated Sluice House do not have the requisite special interest to warrant inclusion on the Secretary of State's list of buildings as per s.1(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As such it is considered that the site does not contain features of historical value.</p> <p>The site is located within a conservation area. Any future development on the site, will need to respect and enhance the character of the conservation area, and mitigate against any potential impacts. Given the distance to Alexandra Palace and the presence of the water treatment works in between it is not considered that redevelopment of the filter beds will ultimately be harmful to the Conservation Area.</p>	Noted.
578	SA1298	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Not a Green chain	The site at present would not be considered to form part of a Green Chain as the site is not assessable by the public. It also has a developed character and does not represent an area of open space.	Noted.
578	SA1299	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf of Thames Water Group	Not open air facilities	The proposed filter bed site as described above is wholly made up of hard standing. The site does not currently provide open air facilities of any description as it is an operational works. For health and safety reasons it is not (and has never been) accessible by the general public. Its operational use also makes it unsuitable as a site for leisure, recreation, sport, arts or cultural activities use.	Noted.
615	SA1300	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Object to development	The APPCAAC is opposed to housing or other building development on this site.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
578	SA1301	Kennet Properties Ltd on behalf	Odour	The proposed allocation will result in residential dwellings being located in close proximity to an operational works. As the works are a Water Treatment Works there is no concern with regards to Odour.	Noted.

		of Thames Water Group			
742	SA1302	Friends of Alexandra Park – Gordon Hutchinson	Pedestrian; cyclists; Access	We support the use of the edge of the site to improve pedestrian and cyclist access from the Penstock Path to Newland Road and Alexandra Park, but we consider the filter beds should be retained as an important open space, even though not accessible to the public.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
624	SA1303	Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth	Potential ecological improvement	The filter beds formed an important ecological area – supporting large numbers of house martin and bats. Since the filter beds fell into disuse, they no longer provide the level of insects and hence feeding. It would be good if whatever development takes place does create some similar aquatic habitat that provides insects for bats and birds.	Noted.
422	SA1304	Environment Agency	Potentially contaminated sites	National Planning Practice Guide paragraph 005 states that Local Plans should be clear on the role of developers and requirements for information and assessments in considering land contamination. We note that some of the above sites highlight that a study into potential contamination should be undertaken. The design guidelines would be improved highlighting that these sites lie in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken	Noted.  <b>Action: Add a design guideline setting out that the site lies in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken.</b>
579	SA1305	Laura Harrison, resident	Presentational issues	I do not feel that these documents have been developed to a high enough standard to support a successful public consultation. In particular, drawings and diagrams are poorly labeled, if at all, and are often not provided at a high enough resolution for information to be legible. Whilst I am personally generally able to read these documents, and appreciate the opportunity to view them in their entirety, I do not feel that enough has been done to present this information in a clear and coherent form which will allow the majority of the community to engage and comment in a meaningful way, and the sheer volume of information under consultation at this stage will preclude most people's ability to contribute meaningfully to the consultation.	We recognise that some formatting could be presented better in the documents, but that it is required to meet a range of planning regulations.  We recognise improvements could be made to our map and image resolutions, and we will aim to ensure that documents are written and presented in a way that are clear to understand and consistent in the future.
419	SA1306	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	SA48: Development Guidelines	We are also concerned that housing on this site would be very close to Alexandra Park, any built structures would have substantial impacts on the landscape of the Park and views from the South Terrace.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
419	SA1307	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	SA48: Development Guidelines /Flooding	The report also mentions that there could be problems with flooding and drainage in this area. Some of the New River Village flats have recently had problems with damp and poor drainage. We are concerned this could happen to new homes built on the water treatment site. We do not believe these issues have been fully addressed. Such a development would clearly have a large impact on people living on roads such as Cross Lane and on the New River Village.	Noted.
419	SA1308	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	SA48: Site Requirements /Housing Quantum	On the water treatment works (7,000m2 MOL) site the council has said they believe it would be right have housing.  We are concerned that any new housing on this site would put a strain on stretched local resources. Developing the site for housing will mean that many more people will be living in Hornsey in the future if this site is developed as well as the Hornsey Depot site which recently got planning permission.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
739	SA1309	Dennis Bradley	Site boundary description	We are pleased that the Document mentions that part of the site lies within the Hornsey Water Works & Filter Beds Conservation Area and	Noted.

				states that development should preserve or enhance its appearance.	
739	SA1310	Dennis Bradley	Site boundary description; listed buildings	the Document fails to mention that the site also adjoins a number of nationally and locally listed buildings. We consider that any development should also respect the setting of these buildings, particularly 69-71 High Street. The recent Barnwell Manor judgement makes clear the importance of this matter.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
615	SA1311	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Unsuitable site	This is a sensitive site within a conservation area, bordering onto Alexandra Park, MOL and the north-south ecological corridor formed by the New River/ railway embankment. While the site offers the potential for improved pedestrian access via the Penstock footpath to Alexandra Park, any opportunity for housing development on this site should be resisted. The site also borders to the south onto high density housing, which needs to retain open space provision and not to lose it.	Noted. This site will be removed from the document.  <b>Action: This site will be removed from the document.</b>
697	SA1312	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Waste water	We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.  It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.  <b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards waste water capacity upon preparation of a planning application.</b>
697	SA1313	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Water	We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.  It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.  <b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards water supply upon preparation of a planning application.</b>



				necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

## Comments on SA49 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
697	SA1314	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Waste water	<p>We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	<p>Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.</p> <p><b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards waste water capacity upon preparation of a planning application.</b></p>
697	SA1315	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Water	<p>We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	<p>Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.</p> <p><b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards water supply upon preparation of a planning application.</b></p>
697	SA1316	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Sewers	<p>There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.</p>	Noted.
422	SA1317	Environment Agency	Potentially contaminated sites	<p>National Planning Practice Guide paragraph 005 states that Local Plans should be clear on the role of developers and requirements for information and assessments in considering land contamination. We note that some of the above sites highlight that a study into potential</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a design guideline setting out that the site lies in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to</b></p>

				contamination should be undertaken. The design guidelines would be improved highlighting that these sites lie in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken	<b>consider this receptor in any studies undertaken.</b>
--	--	--	--	--	--

## Comments on SA50 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
697	SA1318	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Waste water	<p>We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	<p>Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.</p> <p><b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards waste water capacity upon preparation of a planning application.</b></p>
697	SA1319	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Water	<p>We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	<p>Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.</p> <p><b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards water supply upon preparation of a planning application.</b></p>
697	SA1320	Savills on behalf of Thames	Sewers	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public	Noted.

		Water		sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	
674	SA1321	Vaughan Melzer, Chettle Court resident	Loss of play space	<p>Our Ball games area (recently completely and beautifully refurbished by the Council, at some expense I imagine) is always in use, except in the coldest of weathers. The play area beside it is constantly used and the picnic area provides a constant happy area for families to gather at weekends or warm evenings (even sometimes in Winter).</p> <p>180 homes are catered for on this estate and there are scores of children. The play areas have been a safe, happy place for our children for decades. I believe that this sort of security and high quality environment is part of a growing child's experience that makes for a happier adult. I am constantly surprised at how many children on this estate have gone to university and other further education facilities. There is no gang violence here, and few social disturbances.</p> <p>If a block of flats is inserted into the small amount of land surrounding the building, the leisure areas will have to go and the children will be forced to find outside places to meet and play, particularly the older children. There will be a loss of estate identity and a marked lowering of quality of life here.</p> <p>New flats will mean more children and where will they be able to play?</p>	It is noted that the leisure space is valued on this site. The Council will ensure that amenity open space on this site accords with the appropriate design standards.
674	SA1322	Vaughan Melzer, Chettle Court resident	Parking	Car parking, already at a premium, will become impossible and that will bring about a new level of discontent as residents will then have to pay parking fees for road parking which has very little room for more cars anyway.	Parking standards will be managed through the DMDPD.
422	SA1323	Environment Agency	Potentially contaminated sites	National Planning Practice Guide paragraph 005 states that Local Plans should be clear on the role of developers and requirements for information and assessments in considering land contamination. We note that some of the above sites highlight that a study into potential contamination should be undertaken. The design guidelines would be improved highlighting that these sites lie in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a design guideline setting out that the site lies in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken.</b></p>

## Comments on SA51 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
275	SA1324	Susan Swales	Access	Compromised access to The Grove for its inhabitants	The Council does not consider that this site will adversely affect access to the Grove due to the traffic restriction in place.
704	SA1325	Carol Ann Uszkurat	Access	worried that current road would be far too small for this proposal and that access could then be made from Park Road which would mean cutting down trees - picture attached - plus traffic noise and pollution	The amenity of neighbouring properties will be protected through the DMDPD.
381	SA1326	Caroline Heartfield	Amenity	A 5 storey building will block light and have an impact on the privacy of my neighbours	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the



					development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
701	SA1327	Julia Gale	Amenity	Scale of proposed development is out of proportion – too high. Should be limited to 3 storeys. It would have a negative impact on the light and privacy of a number of surrounding properties and impinges on a conservation area.	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
707	SA1328	Sophie Laws	Amenity	Five storeys would be absolutely out of keeping with the area, overshadowing neighbours and quite different from surrounding buildings.	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
716	SA1329	Sandra Clark	Amenity	It will have a very negative impact on the sheltered housing in The Grove. A five storey building will mean that nearby properties will be overlooked and their privacy reduced.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
709	SA1330	Emily Hall	Amenity	Not only would the development have an extremely detrimental impact on the light, views and privacy of a large population of surrounding properties, it would put enormous strain on local amenities such as schools and doctors surgeries.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
715	SA1331	Mr Denby-Wood Petition	Amenity	Have a fundamental and extremely detrimental impact on the light, views and privacy of a large number of surrounding properties	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
703	SA1332	Susan Taylor	Amenity	Proposed would block what little light there is into the north side of my home. Unacceptable loss of privacy into my home.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
704	SA1333	Carol Ann Uszkurat	Amenity	The Grove is a 2 story Homes for Haringey estate for those is us over 55 in need of supported housing - anything opposite us over 2 stories high will block light to our homes and gardens	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
713	SA1334	Helen dAmbrosio	Amenity	This would completely block the views and the daylight from half my flat (the bedroom, bathroom, kitchen and balcony) which would be thoroughly depressing.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
275	SA1335	Susan Swales	Amenity	Rear of the house will be overlooked and will result in unacceptable lack of privacy, this includes three bedrooms.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
434	SA1336	Will and Nicola	Amenity	As above then, we are extremely concerned that should a developer build up to 4 or 5 storeys on the industrial site, both we and a large	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the

		Spokes (adjacent residents)		<p>number of houses on Lynton Road, The Grove, Topsfield Road and Palace Road will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Suffer significant loss of privacy by becoming overlooked</b> – either into gardens or directly into homes. We are particularly concerned about our own home with this, as both our bedroom and the bedroom of our 3 year old daughter are on the front of the property (and the same goes for all our Lynton Road neighbours, who all have bedrooms on the front side of their houses) and we are located less than 5 metres from the Lynton Road boundary of the outlined site according to the DPD document. <p>The council own document states: [DM3 paragraph 2.23 quoted] Yet as far as we are aware, we can see no evidence of anyone from either Haringey Council or the architect or developer of this site (both of the latter whom are presumably both in place, given the proposed start date for building work is August 2016 and clearly, advanced discussions and negotiations must therefore have been undertaken with the landowner to assess the site for the Sites DPD document?) having undertaken any in-depth, professional assessment, or having held a meaningful consultation with the residents of this neighbourhood, to ensure that the privacy of surrounding homes is not harmed, before stating in the Sites DPD document that: ‘The maximum height on this site should be 5 storeys.’</p> <p>For us but particularly for our young children and other children in the homes surrounding this site, the right to privacy within the home and particularly within the bedroom, is absolutely fundamental, for obvious reasons.</p> </li> </ol>	<p>development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
274	SA1337	Will Johnson-Marshall	Amenity	Object: the rear of house will be overlooked. This includes into bedroom windows and will result in an unacceptable loss of privacy	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
708	SA1338	Susan Scott Hunt	Amenity	Privacy of gardens on Palace Road would be affected. Light and views would be interrupted.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
275	SA1339	Susan Swales	Businesses	The development would result in a loss of small business premises for local businesses	<p>Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a requirement to replace the number of jobs in the allocation.</b></p>
708	SA1340	Susan Scott Hunt	Character	This is a very large-scale development in relation to the area and it is right on the edge of a Conservation Area. It will significantly change the nature of the whole area because it is wholly out of scale with the size and architecture of the existing housing on Lynton Road and The Grove. It would give this whole corner of Crouch End a much more urban, as opposed to sub-urban, aspect, significantly decreasing the attraction of the area as one suitable for family residence.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.
434	SA1341	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Clarification	Finally, with all of the above objections, we would also like clarification on exactly who owns and is responsible for this site, how the development work is going to be funded, who the developer is and who will benefit from the sale of properties once built.	The site is privately owned, and will be bought forward by a private developer. The role of the site allocation is to guide the developer to an appropriate development scheme.
705	SA1342	JV Thomas	Commercial opportunities	The loss of industrial status will prevent investment in new and emerging commercial opportunities that could further benefit the area.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.

					<b>Action: Add a requirement to create an element of new employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
703	SA1343	Susan Taylor	Community	The proposal will have a negative impact on 'The Grove' residents who are a vulnerable community.	Amenity of neighbouring properties will be protected through the DMDPD.
706	SA1344	Diana Thomas	Conservation	This scheme will seriously detract from the neighbouring Crouch End Conservation Area.	It is noted that the site adjoins the Conservation Area. Appropriate response will be considered in preparing the next version of the Plan.
711	SA1345	Jane Roberts	Conservation	Destruction of Victorian heritage buildings.	It is not considered that there are any sites of significant heritage value that will be destroyed on this site.
705	SA1346	JV Thomas	Conservation	The scale of the proposed development is at odds with the need to complement the neighbouring Crouch End Conservation Area rather than to contrast with it.	It is noted that the site adjoins the Conservation Area. Appropriate response will be considered in preparing the next version of the Plan.
273	SA1347	Sophie Laws	Conservation	Part of a conservation area and the Victorian buildings should be protected. The standard for conservation areas is that development should improve the area not make it worse. Why is this even being considered?	It is noted that the site adjoins the Conservation Area. Appropriate response will be considered in preparing the next version of the Plan.
275	SA1348	Susan Swales	Conservation	Site impinges on Lynton Road conservation area	It is noted that the site adjoins the Conservation Area. Appropriate response will be considered in preparing the next version of the Plan.
274	SA1349	Will Johnson-Marshall	Conservation	Object: Scale of development impinges conservation area (Lynton Road)	This site is not within, but does adjoin a Conservation Area. It is considered that development could improve the setting of the Conservation Area.
703	SA1350	Susan Taylor	Conservation	Loss of quality period buildings	This site is not within, but does adjoin a Conservation Area. It is considered that development could improve the setting of the Conservation Area.
710	SA1351	Stephen Kenny	Conservation	The estate behind this location is very attractive & worthy of conservation & the small green space with its very attractive trees would be a severe loss to the neighbourhood. 5 storeys would overbear all local dwellings despite any idea that such a huge collection of flats could be attractively designed for this locality	This site is not within, but does adjoin a Conservation Area. It is considered that development could improve the setting of the Conservation Area.
716	SA1352	Sandra Clark	Conservation	Loss of well preserved and beautiful period buildings of a type that are not abundant in this area. Unacceptable changes on too large a scale in a conservation area.	This site is not within, but does adjoin a Conservation Area. It is considered that development could improve the setting of the Conservation Area.
707	SA1353	Sophie Laws	Conservation	This is part of a Conservation Area, and the Victorian buildings should be protected. The standard for Conservation Areas is that development should improve the area, not make it worse. Why is this even being considered?	This site neighbours, but is not inside a conservation area. How the development can enhance the setting of the conservation area will be considered in drafting the next version of this document.
706	SA1354	Diana Thomas	Consultation	why do we have to struggle to the far west end of Muswell Hill Broadway for any ward meetings to discuss anything to do with this site?	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
709	SA1355	Emily Hall	Consultation	I must also state how outraged I feel over the council's failure to publicise its plans and to alert our community to meetings that have considered the plans.	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
707	SA1356	Sophie Laws	Consultation	It is very upsetting to hear about this proposal so late, when the Council claims that meetings have already been held to discuss it.	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local

					Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
273	SA1357	Sophie Laws	Consultation	Upsetting to hear about this proposal so late when the council claims that meetings have been held to discuss it.	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
710	SA1358	Stephen Kenny	Consultation	We note the consultation deadline (we didn't even know there were proposals for this until VERY recently!) deadline on this has been extended (!) to 27/3. We wish to express our complete objection to the proposals - 51 flats!	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
708	SA1359	Susan Scott Hunt	Consultation	The public has not been given any information about why work appears to have been begun in digging foundations at the corner of Park and Lynton Roads. The Council's efforts to consult the public on the proposal have been scandalously inadequate. Is it reasonable for the Council to consider its web site documents an effective 'constructive notice board'? The residents of The Grove were only sent information about the proposal on the 13th of March, well into the consultation period, a mere ten days until its original closing date. The Council put up no signs and public meetings about the plan were not effectively publicised. This is proved by the fact that the local forum meetings at which the plans were discussed were not well attended by residents.	The Local Plan consultation was carried out in line with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, Local Development Scheme (LDS) and Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The Council has separate procedures for consulting on individual planning applications.
434	SA1360	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Consultation	As best as we can ascertain, the plans for the development of Lynton Road site were announced at a public meeting of the Crouch End, Hornsey and Stroud Green Area Forum and Committee on 15th January (as stated in the minutes of this meeting) yet, in spite of the allegedly 'public' consultation period expiring on 23rd March, they weren't included on the agenda for the next public meeting of this same committee, which took place last Thursday 5th March. Having made an arrangement to pose the same points and queries outlined in this letter at this meeting, we were informed that in actual fact, the development, though in the centre of Crouch End, in fact falls into Muswell Hill Ward and so we would need to also make a representation at the Muswell Hill committee meeting. Unfortunately, we are away on the date of the next meeting (19 <sup>th</sup> March) that falls within the public consultation period, so are unable to attend. Hence, we are outlining our concerns in this letter. It should also be noted that Councillor Adam Jogee, the Chair of the Crouch End Committee, has kindly offered to circulate our question to the relevant people too, so they may receive this letter and our question via Councillor Jogee.	The January meeting was indeed used to introduce the document, and the Planning Policy team has been in contact with Councillor Jogee about raising local residents concerns in the consultation.
434	SA1361	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Consultation	Secured first house on Lynton Road in 2013. Concerned elements of this proposed development would severely impact upon various aspects of our home and family life. We are not wholly against residential development on this site but rather some of the Site requirements and Development Guidelines stated in the SA DPD consultation document and the seeming complete lack of engagement and consultation with local residents on this proposal.	The consultation was carried out in accordance with the appropriate regulations.

274	SA1362	Will Johnson-Marshall	Density	Object: Proposal will lead to an over populated site	<p>The height requirements set out in the draft policy were drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area.</p> <p>Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, and specific height limits will not be included in Site Allocations, with all developments expected to respond appropriately to their context.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove height limits from the allocation.</b></p>
381	SA1363	Caroline Heartfield	Density	Proposal feels like a total overdevelopment of the site.	<p>The height requirements set out in the draft policy were drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area.</p> <p>Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, and specific height limits will not be included in Site Allocations, with all developments expected to respond appropriately to their context.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove height limits from the allocation.</b></p>
703	SA1364	Susan Taylor	Density	The proposal is over-development of a small site in a conservation area. The proposal is out of scale with existing dwellings. And will impact school places and parking	<p>The height requirements set out in the draft policy were drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area.</p> <p>Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, and specific height limits will not be included in Site Allocations, with all developments expected to respond appropriately to their context.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove height limits from the allocation.</b></p>
702	SA1365	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Design	Although the road is not part of the conservation area we believe that the design should be in keeping with the local architecture - especially in light of The Mission Hall, that we believe to be a building of special historic worth, which is currently poorly mirrored by the industrial units beside it.	Noted, development will be expected to respond to its surroundings, in line with Draft policy DM1.
702	SA1366	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Design	The current building also has been designed with little consideration for the surrounding area with the large unbroken brick wall dominating the street	Noted.
704	SA1367	Carol Ann Uszkurat	Disruption	Due to the many health issues of tenants ambulances arrive on a regular basis - building work would not only be disruptive for this but would also cause months of dust and noise not conducive to those of us used to the peace and quiet currently enjoy that is if great benefit to our end of life existence	Concern is noted, disruption will be minimised using the principles of the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD.
702	SA1368	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Frontages	we welcome the idea of the 'wall' being replaced with active building frontages and doors onto the street, we hope that the development is done to the benefit of the street by including enough space, light and architectural integrity to the design. This should also include adding provision for pavements, foliage and trees etc to soften such a large development.	Visual amenity of neighbouring properties will be protected through the DMDPD.
718	SA1369	Cllr Pippa Connor	Green Space	I object to: The loss of a valued green space that provides amenity for local residents and in particular those living at The Grove.	<p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p>



715	SA1370	Mr Denby - Wood	Green space	Involve the complete loss of open green space and demolition of a number of characterful and highly desirable Victorian mews buildings	<p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p> <p>It is not considered that there are any sites of significant heritage value that will be destroyed on this site.</p>
708	SA1371	Susan Scott Hunt	Green space	The removal of the small green space currently planted (by local residents) with established trees, is completely unreasonable. The advantages to the health and well being of residents and the aesthetic appeal of small open spaces within residential settings should not have to be recited to the Council. These small open sites are precious amenities. This small open space is not 'excess to requirement'. It is well valued and well used by residents. It is even partly maintained by residents.	<p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p>
706	SA1372	Diana Thomas	Green space	There is an attractive, much appreciated grassy knoll planted with 14 trees on the very edge of the area to be bulldozed. Why must this go? These much-needed, although small, breathing spaces of peace and quiet are vital to keeping a rural character in an urban area.	<p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p>
709	SA1373	Emily Hall	Green space; Parking	The plans would impact the availability of parking, involve the loss of open green space and demolish a number of beautiful, historical Victorian mews buildings, which are dearly loved.	<p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p> <p>Parking will be managed in line with standards set in the DMDPD.</p>
702	SA1374	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Height	the planning is for a building of maximum 5 storeys - this would dwarf all of the neighbouring buildings (with most being 2 storeys, with the singular exception of Veryan Court)	<p>Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
714	SA1375	Christine Nicholson	Height	It would be totally out of scale with existing buildings.	<p>Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
718	SA1376	Cllr Pippa Connor	Height	I object to: The proposed height of 5 stories is too high for the area and would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding conservation area.	<p>The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p>Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.</p>
706	SA1377	Diana	Height	The planned building heights, 4-5 stories will make the sheltered accommodation tenants, both on The Grove side and on the opposite	<p>Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the</p>

		Thomas		side of Park Road, feel very vulnerable, over-shadowed and over-looked.	development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
712	SA1378	Edwin Holder	Height	Four storey buildings along The Grove would be oppressive and out of character with the area. I'd suggest they should be restricted to the height of the existing Victorian homes in Lynton Road.  Five storey development along the Park Road frontage would dwarf the local high point of The Maynard public house. I'd suggest restricting the height to that of The Maynard.	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
705	SA1379	JV Thomas	Height	The proposal of five-storeys for this development is greater than the height of all the surrounding buildings and is therefore excessive.	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
273	SA1380	Sophie Laws	Height	Five storeys would be absolutely out of keeping with the area, overshadowing neighbours and quite different from surrounding buildings.	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
275	SA1381	Susan Swales	Amenity	Construction of the proposed height will lead to unacceptable loss of light to my property.	Visual amenity of neighbouring properties will be protected through the DMDPD.
434	SA1382	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Height	Building up to 4 or 5 storeys high on the industrial estate would have a fundamental and extremely detrimental impact on the light, views and privacy of a large number of surrounding properties, including our own and will also put a tremendous additional strain on parking – which is already scarce in the surrounding area – and local amenities such as schools. We are deeply shocked that absolutely no-one in the immediate area surrounding this site appears to have been meaningfully or actively consulted on this.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>  Visual amenity of neighbouring properties will be protected through the DMDPD.
419	SA1383	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	Height	We support local residents in their petition against the site allocation proposals for SA 51: Lynton Road.  In particular we object to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed height of 5 stories is too high for the area and would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding conservation area.</li><li>• Developing this industrial plot for residential housing will mean the loss of space for valuable small business units.</li><li>• The loss of a valued green space that provides amenity for local</li></ul>	Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>  Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a

				residents and in particular those living at The Grove.	<p>degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b></p> <p>There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b></p>
713	SA1384	Helen dAmbrosio	Height	<p>We would not want the building to be any taller than the industrial site is now.</p> <p>It would not be good for them either, to have the back of Veryan Court as their view.</p>	<p>Noted. Specific height limits have been removed from the plan as any proposed development will be assessed against the development management policies which address local character and amenity of neighbouring properties. The development management policies contain an updated policy on tall and taller buildings.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
275	SA1385	Susan Swales	Heritage	Quality period buildings would be demolished	It is not considered that there are any sites of significant heritage value on this site.
434	SA1386	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Heritage	If this development proceeds as is currently proposed, this is a very large scale development for Crouch End that – according to the Haringey Plan paperwork – could be built up to 5 storeys high on a piece of land that currently has a maximum of 2 storeys (on the industrial estate) and 3 storeys (on park Road), as do the vast majority of the properties in all of the surrounding streets, with the exception of Park Road where there are some 4 storey buildings along the main road. It would involve the demolition of a number of characterful – and, if converted into residential dwellings for sale – highly desirable Victorian mews buildings that appear to be in excellent condition and are currently being used as offices (the Site Allocations DPD document states that “No buildings need to be retained on this site”).	<p>The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p> <p>Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.</p>
434	SA1387	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Heritage	We also want to raise a strong objection to the potential demolition of the Victorian mews buildings currently being used as offices on the Lynton Road. (To recap the SA DPPD says no buildings need to be retained on site). They are seemingly in excellent condition, well-maintained and very much of the period of the houses within the surrounding area. They would make highly desirable residential developments therefore we can see no justification whatsoever for the wanton demolition of these historic buildings – it is this character that attracts people to live and work in this area and to demolish these buildings to overdevelop this site with a characterless block of flats would be an absolute travesty.	It is not considered that there are any sites of significant heritage value on this site.
274	SA1388	Will Johnson-Marshall	Heritage	Object: Loss of high quality period buildings	It is not considered that there are any sites of significant heritage value on this site.
711	SA1389	Jane Roberts	Homes loss	Loss of homes for the people who live in the flats above the shops.	Overall this scheme makes a positive net addition to the housing stock in the area.
702	SA1390	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Housing	We are in favour of increased housing in the area and also the jobs that the development would bring to the area,	Noted.
275	SA1391	Susan Swales	Housing	Significant negative impact will be cause to ‘The Grove’ which is predominantly Sheltered Housing for people in later life.	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
701	SA1392	Julia Gale	Housing	Consideration should be given as to whether the development will locate	Noted. No plan has been drawn up regarding the percentage of

			quality	a disproportionate amount of social housing units, affecting the predominant architectural environment. The loss of high quality period buildings should be considered.	social housing that will be required. The boundary of this site allocation is an industrial site only and therefore no period buildings will be lost.
274	SA1393	Will Johnson-Marshall	Industrial premises	Object: Loss of micros/ small industrial premises	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
274	SA1394	Will Johnson-Marshall	Job loss	Object: Loss of local jobs from residential led development	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
718	SA1395	Cllr Pippa Connor	Job loss	I object to: Developing this industrial plot for residential housing will mean the loss of space for valuable small business units.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
714	SA1396	Christine Nicholson	Job loss	People working on the current site would lose their jobs.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
706	SA1397	Diana Thomas	Job loss	This proposed site at present provides much employment, the plan will remove the livelihood of these people. New homes will add to the list of people needing jobs. Haringey needs to create more jobs, not take them away!	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
712	SA1398	Edwin Holder	Job loss	There is a problem of unemployment within the borough and this site largely comprises a variety of businesses that provide various types of employment. The variety of employment should be protected	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
716	SA1399	Sandra Clark	Job loss	Loss of local jobs and loss of local industry.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
711	SA1400	Jane Roberts	Job loss	Loss of livelihood to the people who work in the shops and small businesses.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
705	SA1401	JV Thomas	Job loss	The change from industrial to residential status will lose jobs contrary to Haringey Council's intention to increase employment within the borough	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.

					<b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
707	SA1402	Sophie Laws	Job loss	What about the people who would lose good quality jobs from the loss of the businesses there?	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
709	SA1403	Emily Hall	Job loss	Another aspect that is incredibly alarming, is the fact that should this plan go ahead, it would eradicate and destroy the livelihood of existing small creative businesses (a puppet maker, a small law firm, for instance), who's presence is and has been so important to the community.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
703	SA1404	Susan Taylor	Job loss	The proposal will eradicate existing small businesses, resulting in local job losses. Both #3 and 4 conflict with Haringey's stated aim of encouraging the protection of local business.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
273	SA1405	Sophie Laws	Jobs	What about the people who would lose good quality jobs from the loss of the businesses there?	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
275	SA1406	Susan Swales	Land use	The development will cause an irreversible change in the balance of the local area from industrial to residential.	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
274	SA1407	Will Johnson-Marshall	Land use	Object: Irreversible change to the balance of use in local area (industrial to residential)	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b>
275	SA1408	Susan Swales	Light	Significant loss of light to The Grove	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
434	SA1409	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Light	As you can see from the following photographs, taken from the first and second floors of our home on Lynton Road, just a few yards from the entrance gate to the industrial site, our home benefits from a considerable amount of light presently through both of these windows and we also enjoy a view directly onto Alexandra Palace (through the trees, up on the hill) and the treetops of the neighbouring parks and woods. As, as you can see, do all of the houses in the surrounding area, as roof heights have been kept to a comparable level.	Noted.
434	SA1410	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent	Light	2. <b>Suffer a significant loss of light to the inside of properties and to gardens</b> – as we have outlined, our home is less than 5 metres from this site – buildings of 4 or 5 storeys on this site could completely overshadow our house and cause a dramatic and extremely detrimental loss of light to the inside of our home. It	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable



		residents)		<p>could similarly impact upon a huge number of other homes and gardens within this immediate area.</p> <p>It is well documented and understood that light is a fundamental requirement of any home as it is intrinsically linked to physical, mental and social wellbeing. Indeed, Daylight and Sunlight are outlined as key considerations for the Haringey developments with the Council's own Plan. The quality of light within our home was one of the key considerations for us making what for our family is an extremely financial investment into buying this house and choosing to raise our two young children here. We oppose in the strongest possible terms any development on the Lynton Road site that will significantly impact the amount of light available to our home and thus negatively impact upon the mental, physical or social wellbeing of our family and likewise, the homes and gardens of our surrounding neighbours.</p> <p>Again, as yet, as far as we are aware, we can see no evidence of anyone from either Haringey Council or the architect or developer of this site having undertaken any in-depth, professional assessment, or having held a meaningful consultation with the residents of this neighbourhood, to ensure that the amount of light entering surrounding homes and gardens is not harmed before stating in the Sites DPD document that: 'The maximum height on this site should be 5 storeys.'</p>	<p>development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p> <p>Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.</p> <p>Further detail will be required as part of a planning permission.</p>
701	SA1411	Julia Gale	Local services	pressure on local Service (i.e. school places and parking).	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
704	SA1412	Carol Ann Uszkurat	Local businesses	My understanding of the call to revitalise Brown field sites for renewal as residential sites is that abandoned and disused sites should be used - there are many businesses currently operating on this proposed site - should you not be looking for sites where this is not the case???	<p>Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a requirement to providing an element of replacement employment floorspace in the allocation.</b></p>
712	SA1413	Edwin Holder	Local businesses	This site does not sit within the district centre and having lived here for 30 years I find it difficult to see how it could become so. It is marginal to the attractions of Crouch End and and I would think it unlikely to attract much interest from retailers given that even shops within the actual centre are closing to be replaced by charity shops	<p>Noted, the reference to this site extending the District Centre will be removed.</p> <p><b>Action: Change the allocation to " Mixed use redevelopment"</b></p>
701	SA1414	Julia Gale	Local businesses	The development should be for Key London workers only, to address the inevitable shortfall of such workers in the coming years: eg school teachers, nurses, emergency service workers.	All development will make a contribution to affordable housing in the borough.
708	SA1415	Susan Scott Hunt	Local businesses	Elimination of the workshop area directly contradicts the community's interest.	<p>Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a requirement to replace the number of jobs in the allocation.</b></p>
381	SA1416	Caroline Heartfield	Local character	When you look around there are only 3 storey buildings in view and then two storey houses behind.	Noted.
715	SA1417	Mr Denby – Wood Petition	Local services	Put a tremendous additional strain on local amenities such as schools and doctors' surgeries	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
275	SA1418	Susan Swales	Local services	There is already pressure of local facilities such as schools and GP practices, and this proposal will lead to an exacerbation of the situation	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
706	SA1419	Diana	Local services	The extra school places that will be needed in already bulging classes.	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population

## Appendix F (13) Site Allocations consultation report

		Thomas		Doesn't LB Haringey have a policy with restrictions governing expanding schools and building new schools? The extra pressure on other public services...doctors, refuse collections, the ailing sewers and drainage in the area.	will be identified through the IDP.
711	SA1420	Jane Roberts	Local services	More pressure on the local infrastructure.... schools, doctors, amenities.	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
705	SA1421	JV Thomas	Local services	The proposed density of housing occupancy will lead to pressure on local services. As examples, bulge classes in schools and longer waiting times to see a GP.	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
708	SA1422	Susan Scott Hunt	Local services	The impact of the development on local services such as schools and medical facilities, on parking and public transport are not out-balanced by the need for this type of housing (there is no mention of public housing, so it must be assumed that this is to be private housing).	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
714	SA1423	Christine Nicholson	Local services	It would put pressure on already scarce parking, school places and doctors' services in the area.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
710	SA1424	Stephen Kenny	Local services	where's the parking, school/nursery places, open spaces for children to play?	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.  Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
381	SA1425	Caroline Heartfield	Local services	Can you guarantee there will be no strain on local amenities, such as school places, doctor's surgeries and parking, which are all straining at the moment.	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
274	SA1426	Will Johnson-Marshall	Neighbouring properties	Object: Significant negative impact on the outlook from rear of home due to the scale of the proposal	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
274	SA1427	Will Johnson-Marshall	Neighbouring properties	Object: significant negative impact to the adjacent accommodation 'The Grove'	Visual amenity will be protected through the DMDPD.
701	SA1428	Julia Gale	Noise	There will be an increase in noise levels from change to Residential use and the number of units. This will be exacerbated by the proposed height of proposal. The effect on the local elderly residents of The Grove should in particular be considered.	It is not considered that a residential use will create significant noise uplift above the existing use.
275	SA1429	Susan Swales	Noise	The site will be over populated and this will lead to increased noise levels.	It is not considered that a residential use will create significant noise uplift above the existing use.
274	SA1430	Will Johnson-Marshall	Noise	Object: Increased duration of noise from change to residential use into evenings and weekends	It is not considered that a residential use will create significant noise uplift above the existing use.
274	SA1431	Will Johnson-Marshall	Noise	Object: Increased noise levels from change to residential use and the number of units. This will be exacerbated by the height of the proposal	It is not considered that a residential use will create significant noise uplift above the existing use.
714	SA1432	Christine Nicholson	Noise	It would cause a great deal of noise and inconvenience to local people, particularly those living at the sheltered housing on The Grove and the nearby two storey houses.	It is not considered that a residential use will create significant noise uplift above the existing use.
273	SA1433	Sophie Laws	Objection	Strongly object to the proposal	Objection is noted.
275	SA1434	Susan Swales	Objection	Objection to proposed SA51	Objection is noted.
274	SA1435	Will Johnson-Marshall	Objection	Object to the proposal	Objection is noted.
381	SA1436	Caroline Heartfield,	Objection	Do not object to new housing in London and understand the Council has housing targets to meet. Main objection to proposal is size of	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable

		Local resident – Topsfield Road		development.	to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
702	SA1437	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Parking	Parking is already difficult in the area so we hope that the development will carefully include provision for residents, and not at the expense of the residents already living in the area.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
381	SA1438	Caroline Heartfield	Parking	Will you provide parking for every unit that you allow to be built?	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
712	SA1439	Edwin Holder	Parking	Lynton Road and The Grove are already very crowded for parking. Access and parking for existing residents should be considered in any development.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
711	SA1440	Jane Roberts	Parking	More pressure on limited parking available in the area, which is already extremely difficult.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
715	SA1441	Mr Denby - Wood	Parking	Impact already scarce parking	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
275	SA1442	Susan Swales	Parking	Parking provision will be significantly reduced for local residents	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
434	SA1443	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	Parking	3. <b>Suffer a serious impact on available parking spaces and other local amenities including school places due to the overdevelopment of this site</b> – parking is already at a premium on Lynton Road and surrounding roads, with many residents frequently unable to park close to their homes, or simply unable to find a space nearby at all. The industrial estate is not large enough to provide enough parking even if just the existing commercial buildings were converted into domestic dwellings, let alone if the storey height was increased and the residential capacity was increased. School places are also over-subscribed in this area, as Haringey Council are very well aware, hence the discussions to increase the entry levels of St Mary's and other primary schools in the area. As we outlined at the start of the letter we are not against some form of residential development on this site but we are very strongly against the seeming proposed over development with the addition of multiple storeys both within the estate and on Park Road.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
274	SA1444	Will Johnson-Marshall	Parking	Object: Any additional development will increase the pressure on the limited local parking provision. Parking is already difficult for local residents and this development will lead to additional demand that cannot be accommodated and will severely reduce the amenity for existing residents.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
705	SA1445	JV Thomas	Parking	Some local transport by bus is excellent, but it is directed towards taking people to the centre of London and is not as useful for travelling around London's periphery. Plausible that this development will bring with it a high car ownership with the associated problems of increasing traffic on the already busy Park Road as well as intensifying local parking problems.	Parking standards will be set through the DMDPD policy.
716	SA1446	Sandra Clark	Parking	The scale of the development is out of proportion to the surrounding area, and the large number of residential units proposed will create	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be

				problems for parking, which is already difficult here.	<p>required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p> <p>Parking will be managed using standards set in the DMDPD.</p>
711	SA1447	Jane Roberts	Scale	Over development, much too large for this small area.	<p>The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
707	SA1448	Sophie Laws	Scale	<p>This is FAR too big a development for this area to sustain – too many extra people.</p> <p>Please reduce the scale of this development proposal greatly.</p>	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
275	SA1449	Susan Swales	Scale	Scale of development is out of proportion with the surrounding area	<p>The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.</p> <p><b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b></p>
274	SA1450	Will Johnson-Marshall	Scale	Object: scale of proposed development is out of proportion with surrounding area	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.
273	SA1451	Sophie Laws	Scale	Far too big a development for the area to sustain. Too many extra people	Infrastructure to be provided to meet Haringey's growing population will be identified through the IDP.
273	SA1452	Sophie Laws	Scale	Please reduce the scale of this development greatly. Surely new housing could be provided, hope it will all be social housing, without destroying good buildings and working businesses which are there at present, nor bringing in so many extra people as to cause difficulties.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.
697	SA1453	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Sewers	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted.

702	SA1454	Andrew Simms & Kristine Galiyano	Site boundary	We hope that the council also looks to repurpose/knock down the derelict garages next to the Mission Hall. likely to cause someone serious injury	Noted. It is considered that this site is not suitable to be included in this allocation due to separation and ownership.
715	SA1455	Mr Denby - Wood	Small businesses	Eliminate small businesses whose nurture is important to the community	Noted, noting the extant permission the Council is retaining a degree of commercial use, a point will be added to replace the job numbers lost in the redevelopment.  <b>Action: Add a requirement to replace the number of jobs in the allocation.</b>
273	SA1456	Sophie Laws	Social housing	Is the intention to provide social housing or just to allow development for commercial gain?	All housing developments will be required to contribute to affordable housing provision.
717	SA1457	Gerry Tvedt	Support	You should note that all of my tenants occupy this property on short term leases, outside of the act, and that consequently a housing development would be possible within the time frame you have outlined.	Noted.
717	SA1458	Gerry Tvedt	Support	I am now writing to inform you that I am broadly in support of a future housing development on my site, as outlined in your plan.	Support is noted.
381	SA1459	Caroline Heartfield	Traffic	Park Road is already a busy bus route. Will the local roads take the strain of the extra traffic this site will make?	The location of this site in close proximity to Crouch End District Centre will limit the trip numbers, and hence the impact on traffic. A transport assessment will be required as part of any planning application.
706	SA1460	Diana Thomas	Traffic	The pressure on the traffic flow at an already dangerous junction and part of Park Road. For the safety of this small area, young and old, this road block must be continued? Where will these new residents park their inevitable number of cars?	The location of this site in close proximity to Crouch End District Centre will limit the trip numbers
273	SA1461	Sophie Laws	Traffic	Extra traffic would be a major issue. The closed off end of Lynton Road brings huge benefits to these roads and must not be changed. Which way would this significant extra traffic arrive?	There is n intention to remove the blocked road to encourage rat-running.
273	SA1462	Sophie Laws	Traffic	There is a big cinema development underway on the other side of Tottenham Lane which is likely to cause traffic and parking issues to these streets since all the streets nearer there are solidly parked up most of the time already – this was pointed out when the proposal was being discussed.	The location of this site in close proximity to Crouch End District Centre will limit the trip numbers
273	SA1463	Sophie Laws	Traffic	Where would this number of new households park the cars they would undoubtedly have, however close the bus stop? As it stands it is frequently difficult to park in Lynton Road and Topsfield Road, we often have to park some way away.	The location of this site in close proximity to Crouch End District Centre will limit the trip numbers
707	SA1464	Sophie Laws	Traffic	The extra traffic would be a major issue. The closed off end of Lynton Road brings huge benefits to these roads and must not be changed. Which way would this significant extra traffic arrive? Where would this number of new households park the cars they would undoubtedly have, however close the bus stop? As it stands it is frequently difficult to park in Lynton Road and Topsfield Road, we often have to park some way away.	The location of this site in close proximity to Crouch End District Centre will limit the trip numbers
712	SA1465	Edwin Holder-Vale	Trees	The existing grassed public space and trees at the junction of Lynton Road and The Grove should be protected (and the public bench re-instated).	There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.  <b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b>
703	SA1466	Susan Taylor	Urban realm	Loss of small green spaces and walkway	There is no designated green space on this site, but the mature trees could be retained.



					<b>Action: Include reference to the retention of mature trees on the site.</b>
434	SA1467	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	View	Like the vast majority of Crouch End, most of the houses in the area are Victorian and were built up to a maximum of 3 storeys high. We live in a more modern sixties built property which is also 3 storeys high. Consequently, everyone in the area, from their top floor, can enjoy this beautiful view and have down so for the best part of the last 100 years.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
434	SA1468	Will and Nicola Spokes (adjacent residents)	View	<b>4. Lose the enjoyment of the historic view of Alexandra Palace</b> – as above, we and many of our neighbours in 2 and 3 storey dwellings within the Lynton Road, Grove, Topsfield Road and Palace Road area and further afield, all enjoy various views of Alexandra Palace up on the hill. This historic view has been an intrinsic part of the value and enjoyment of all these properties since they were built and is part of why many of the residents have chosen to buy homes within this characterful and historic part of Crouch End. Again, as yet, as far as we are aware, we can see no evidence of anyone from either Haringey Council or the architect or developer of this site appear to having undertaken any in-depth, professional assessment, or having held a meaningful consultation with the residents of this neighbourhood, to assess the impact upon this view that the development may have on any surrounding properties, impacting both the residents enjoyment of their homes and the sale or rental value of their properties, before stating in the Sites DPD document that: ‘The maximum height on this site should be 5 storeys.’	It is noted that the site lies within the Wider Setting viewing corridor from Alexandra Palace. It is considered that a 5 storey building is unlikely to have a significant impact on this setting generally, and any design will be required to demonstrate it specifically at the time of submitting a planning application.  The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.  <b>Action: Remove heights from the site allocation</b>
381	SA1469	Caroline Heartfield	View	A 5 storey building will interrupt historic views to Alexandra Palace	It is noted that the site lies within the Wider Setting viewing corridor from Alexandra Palace. It is considered that a 5 storey building is unlikely to have a significant impact on this setting generally, and any design will be required to demonstrate it specifically at the time of submitting a planning application.
697	SA1470	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Waste water	We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.  It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.  <b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards waste water capacity upon preparation of a planning application.</b>
697	SA1471	Savills on behalf of	Water	We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.

		Thames Water		<p>able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	<b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards water supply upon preparation of a planning application.</b>
--	--	--------------	--	---	--

## Comments on SA52 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
263	SA1472	Barry James	Access to SINC	This statement uses the term “if appropriate”. The use of the term ‘may’ already qualifies the obligation to improve access pursuant to policy 7.19 and the application of the term “if appropriate” is entirely unnecessary. Since this is a site requirement and the source of the principle is the London Plan, surely the need to improve access to the SINC must be mandatory	Any development on Pinkham Way will need to have regard to the SINC designation and take measures to improve access to the SINC, this is implicit in the policy.
263	SA1473	Barry James	Address	Referring to the site as the former Friern Barnet Sewage Works is completely misleading. It is so misleading that one of the senior Haringey Council planners even told the NLWP (Freedom of Information email evidence available) that there were buildings on the site that could be reused for development purposes. People will not recognise the site from the description and suggest a more meaningful address might be “The Wooded Land Adjacent to Hollickwood Park, Pinkham Way, Muswell Hill, N8.”	The site address is correct.
572	SA1474	Beatrice Murray, resident	Against waste/ industrial use	Haringey should resist any attempt to use this site for waste treatment or other industrial use.	The Plan is proposing to retain the existing lawful dual use of the site which is employment/SINC. A waste facility is an employment use but the plan is not specifically promoting the site for a waste facility.
263	SA1475	Barry James	Air quality	<p>Air quality is already an issue (due to busy section of A406) in an area where there are plenty of sensitive receptors (homes and schools). The trees on the site are probably very helpful in partially mitigating the air pollution. The URS Sustainability Appraisal Report (which is apparently limited to consideration of information provided by others (see page 1 Limitations), makes the following points:</p> <p><i>Section 7.4 (Scope) Page 18: “The Borough suffers poor air quality because of traffic congestion. The whole Borough is an Air Quality Management Area.”</i></p> <p><i>Section 14.18 (Air Quality) Page 52: “Air quality is a wide-spread issue in the borough, which has led to the following policy stipulation being drafted for most sites: “Mitigation of and improvement to local air quality and noise pollution should be made on this site.” It is noted that this policy stipulation is not made for any sites in the west of the borough, reflecting the fact that air quality is less of a concern here”</i></p>	It is noted that air quality is a concern throughout the borough, with the A406 being a particular issue due to the traffic generated here. Opportunities to improve this will be considered wherever possible but this does not preclude the future development of Pinkham Way.

263	SA1476	Barry James	Air Quality & Noise Pollution	Surely any mitigation associated with these NPPF topics should be site requirements. As a reader, I am left wondering whether this pitiful guidance ( all 17 words ) was added at a late date because somebody in the Council felt that a site description without any mention of air quality and/or noise pollution could be criticised.	The comment included is the same for any site with potentially poor air quality, and seeks to ensure that it is considered as part of any future planning permission.
263	SA1477	Barry James	Biodiversity	Appalling mismanagement over the years means not a surprise people will come to this consultation with a somewhat jaundiced eye and this misleading report does nothing to re-establish confidence. Notwithstanding the national importance of the NLWP and the status of the Pinkham Way site, SA52 appears to be tucked away in the SADPD and Sustainability Appraisal Reports, accompanied by inappropriate, trite and meaningless information and without any proper acknowledgement of SA52's biodiversity importance to the Borough. As URS so clearly state in the linked Sustainability Appraisal (Section 7.4) Natural England suggests a ratio of 1 hectare of Local Nature Reserve to every 1,000 heads of population whereas Haringey currently has 0.6 hectares per 1,000 populations. Clearly any development on SA52, at almost 6 hectares in size, will have a hugely negative effect on the Borough's biodiversity – a fact not mentioned once in this Report.	<p>The site is at the appropriate location in the document, and is not “tucked away” as claimed.</p> <p>The site does not have a Local Nature Reserve status, so the situation stated will not worsen as suggested.</p>
266	SA1478	Freehold Community Association	Biodiversity	As per para 114 NPPF local authorities should plan for networks of biodiversity. The Pinkham Way site forms an essential and integrated part of a green network running along the Bounds Green Brook valley. This network is then connected by the Pinkham Way site into the green network running south alongside the railway land and on to Alexandra Palace. Much of the land in these networks is located within London Borough of Barnet and yet there is no evidence that Haringey has acted with a strategic approach in assessing the wider impacts any development of Pinkham Way would have on these networks and biodiversity. They have therefore failed to comply with their duty under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.	Any future planning application on Pinkham Way will be required to meet the duty under the 2006 Act. Haringey's evidence base includes a biodiversity study which has assessed the biodiversity value of all the site allocations in Haringey.
427	SA1479	Pinkham Way Alliance	Biodiversity - invertebrates	Finding of the submitted 'Invertebrate Study February 2014-2015'	The Council does not believe the results of the study preclude development on Pinkham Way. Any future planning application will need to consider the biodiversity value of the site.
427	SA1480	Pinkham Way Alliance	Biodiversity loss	Pinkham Way's ecological value is threatened	The Council does not believe the development of Pinkham Way will threaten the sites biodiversity. Any future planning application will need to consider the biodiversity value of the site.
427	SA1481	Pinkham Way Alliance	Biodiversity targets	The Local Plan favours the protection of Pinkham Way SINC as a green open space, not as an employment site. The Pinkham Way SINC is a verdant open space that is recognised as having high nature conservation value by virtue of its designation as a Borough Grade 1 SINC.	The site has a dual lawful use of employment and SINC. The Council does not consider the site to be open space. Any future planning application will need to take account of the SINC status but at present neither the SINC or the biodiversity value of the site precludes any development on Pinkham Way.
266	SA1482	Freehold Community Association	Business	See comments on Bounds Green Industrial Estate above. This proposal would show no net gain to employment numbers.	This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.

266	SA1483	Freehold Community Association	Climate change mitigation	<p>To maintain the dual designation for Pinkham Way as a SINCE and Employment site requires a far greater assessment and evidence base than that presented by Haringey. The employment designation has been in place for nearly 30 years and in that time only one (withdrawn) planning application has been received and this would have required a redesignation of the site to Waste class Industrial use.</p> <p>Pinkham Way has a vital role to play in mitigating climate change, preventing flood risk and improving biodiversity, not only for Haringey but also the communities of Barnet and Enfield. Its cross boundary location makes it strategic for all three Boroughs and yet there is no evidence of cooperative working in assessing the strategic impacts any development of Pinkham Way would have.</p>	<p>A waste use is an employment use so should a waste facility be considered suitable on the site through the NLWP, the site would not require a re-designation.</p> <p>The Council is fulfilling and exceeding its obligations under its duty to cooperate with the neighbouring authorities.</p>
427	SA1484	Pinkham Way Alliance	Conclusion	The Pinkham Way site is unsuitable for development and the employment designation should be removed. The evidence does not support or justify its retention as a dual designated site.	Noted the objection. However, we are using the local plan to seek views from a range of stakeholders on the future of Pinkham Way. The Council believes the dual designation which is its existing lawful use is justified and sound.
266	SA1485	Freehold Community Association	Connectivity	The rights of way issue onto and across the Pinkham Way site was first raised with Haringey 1998 and again in 2012. Haringey's failure to act on the rights of way, established over 50 years use by the local community, undermines there compliance with Para 75 and if properly assessed would have a significant effect on any possible development.	It is considered that the allocation seeks to improve connectivity through the site. Issues of rights of way will need to be taken account of in any future planning application.
263	SA1486	Barry James	Contamination	Contamination study is surely a site requirement, not a guideline. The site requirement should include an obligation to deal appropriately with site contamination – as drafted, the statement suggests that as long as the contamination is understood, there is no actual requirement to deal with it. The SA52 description carefully ignores the historical fact that the site used to be a landfill site.	Any future planning application will be required to take account of the previous use of the site and include measures for dealing with any contamination on site.
266	SA1487	Freehold Community Association	Contamination	Between 1963 and 1980 Pinkham Way was used as an untreated waste landfill site finally being capped in 1980 with parks and highway waste. There is approximately 10m depth of contaminated debris located below the site and remediation will be extremely difficult and expensive. Any remediation work will require reducing the risks to health and the environment particularly risks to the surrounding residential areas and water courses.	<p>It is considered that the opportunity to manage the negative effects of contamination on this site is through the planning application process.</p> <p>Air quality is a concern throughout the borough, with the A406 being a particular issue due to the traffic generated here. Opportunities to improve this will be considered wherever possible.</p>
427	SA1488	Pinkham Way Alliance	Contamination	<p>Jacobs reported in 2008 that the site investigation demonstrated the presence of lead in the Made Ground at concentrations above the CLEA commercial soil guideline values. Asbestos was also identified as potentially present in the ground. Due to the site's former use as a Sewage Works, some residual microbiological activity has been identified both in the soils and the ground waters. Only limited testing has been carried out in relation to these contaminants, and soil and water should be classed as potentially hazardous to human health across the site. Microbes thrive in anaerobic environments and therefore may exist beneath any area of the site which was formerly occupied by sewage works structures or the related waste materials, which have since been buried.</p> <p>It should be noted in relation to Arup's and Jacobs' findings on contamination, that Haringey Council, in its website comment on the Contaminated Land Register it is required to maintain, asserts that 'there are no contaminated sites in Haringey'. We believe that Pinkham Way</p>	It is considered that the opportunity to manage the negative effects of contamination on this site is through the planning application process. Any future planning application will need to assess the extent of the contamination and take steps to ensure any discovered contamination is overcome.

				should be recorded as contaminated in that register.	
266	SA1489	Freehold Community Association	Cooperation	Whilst there is evidence of Haringey, as a Lead Local flood risk authority, being part of a strategic flood risk group there is no evidence of strategic flood risk planning cooperation between Haringey, Barnet and Enfield and evidence of this working must be shown in their annual Monitoring Report. No such evidence has been published.	The Council has met and exceeded its requirement under its duty to cooperate. The Council continue to work with neighbouring boroughs across all policy areas including flooding. One such example is through the preparation of the North London Waste Plan.
427	SA1490	Pinkham Way Alliance	Need for open space	There is an increasing amenity need for good Open Space in the area. Such a need would need careful balancing with protecting the site's biodiversity.	While the Council supports the desire for good open space across Haringey, Pinkham Way does not fall within an area of open space deficiency as defined by Haringey's open space study 2015.
263	SA1491	Barry James	Culvert	This is a short statement about the culvert that runs through the site and the need to inspect it before any development is agreed. It is clearly a site requirement, not a guideline. The tone of the statement is misleading since it is well known (from material available to the NLWP) that the culvert needs a lot of attention. Moreover, there is no mention of GLA Policy regarding existing culverts. The brevity of this statement is unacceptable in such an important document as the SADPD.	Agreed.
263	SA1492	Barry James	Current/Previous Use	Describing this site as a disused sewage works is wholly misleading. It might have been a disused sewage works 50 years ago but hardly that now. It could more accurately be described as an unused landfill site, a use it was put to long after it finished dealing with sewage. No infrastructure exists or is visible now of the sewage works.	As no new use has been identified (indeed there is evidence of significant levels of dumping on the site), the current/previous use is correct.
427	SA1493	Pinkham Way Alliance	Cycle and pedestrian connectivity	The Site Allocations document mentions cycle and pedestrian connectivity through the site to New Southgate Station. One of the proposals PWA has put to the Council in one of its recent meetings was a cycle/pedestrian route through the site from the Bounds Green side, which at present is unconnected to the area west of the site except by using the A406. PWA would envisage a route from Durnsford Road, through Tunnel Gardens. It could then pass for around 250m along the top of the railway embankment abutting Muswell Hill Golf Course – there is ample width of flat ground, up to 6-7 metres, most of the way along the top of the embankment – and into and across the site. This could give access, if necessary, to the Friern Bridge Retail Park and Tesco's, and on towards Coppetts Wood.	Recommendation noted.
422	SA1494	Environment Agency	De-culverting	There are two culverted watercourses that affect this site. The Bounds Green Brook is located outside the red line boundary to the north of the site and is designated main watercourse. There is also a culverted stream within the site however is designated an ordinary watercourse and is the responsibility of the Lead Local Flood Authority. The development guidelines should be amended to recognise the presence of these culverts. The site is also in the modelled 1 in 100 chance in any given year, including an allowance for climate change, flood extent, which has been included. The development guidelines state "more vulnerable uses should be kept from this part of the site" which is positive. However, the development guidelines lack any reference to the requirement for any built footprint within the 1 in 100 extent to provide level for level and volume for volume flood storage. Provision of Flood Storage is vital to prevent an off-site increase in flood risk.	Any future planning application for the site will need to be supported by evidence of flood risk mitigation in line with the development guidelines. This will include consideration of your all the points raised.
427	SA1495	Pinkham	Deculverting	There is potential to deculvert the watercourse under Pinkham Way	The Council at present has no expectation to deculvert the



		Way Alliance		(thought to be approximately 300m in length).	watercourse under Pinkham Way.
427	SA1496	Pinkham Way Alliance	Submitted Ecological appraisal done on behalf of PWA	<p>Findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the site is 'wasteland', a priority habitat in the London BAP - Section 9.3 of Haringey's own BAP 2009 describes how wasteland can provide 'stunning diversity'. Importantly, the site hosts a small area of Open Mosaic Habitat, a priority habitat in the UK BAP.</li> <li>that the site hosts 113 species of vascular plants</li> <li>that there are some 1500 trees – mainly semi-mature woodland (This is around 4% of the total number in the whole of Haringey). There are older, larger trees around the perimeter, and a few ancient oaks to the south of the site.</li> <li>that the PWA survey, and the Arup survey in 2011, between them found 6 notable bird species (UK BAP Priority Species or RSPB Red or Amber Status)</li> <li>That the site hosts two endangered species, the slow worm and the cinnabar moth</li> </ul> <p>Conclusions and Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite a lack of management, it continues to support habitats and species indicative of 'Wasteland', a target habitat in the London BAP. (5.2)</li> <li>Wasteland habitats that support Open Mosaic Habitats are becoming increasingly uncommon within the LB of Haringey due to development pressures (HARINGEY 2009), and therefore the site is of borough importance. (5.3)</li> <li>Notable habitats should be protected and appropriately managed to ensure the biodiversity interests of the site are maintained. In particular, management to control natural succession of the remaining areas of open mosaic habitat is needed to maintain the biodiversity interest of the site in the long-term. (5.6)</li> </ul>	The Council has assessed the document submitted by PWA and we do not believe the report precludes any future development on Pinkham Way. Any future planning application will need to assess the sites ecological value and to take the necessary steps to ensure the mitigation of any harm and to take steps to protect endangered species.
263	SA1497	Barry James	Ecological Corridor	This feature requires the same attention as the SINC and the need for a study is obviously mandatory. It should be described as a site requirement.	It is considered that this is an appropriate development guideline.
266	SA1498	Freehold Community Association	Ecological corridor	As stated previously Pinkham Way is integral in joining the rail line corridor with the Bounds Green Brook ecological corridor.	Noted.
266	SA1499	Freehold Community Association	Employment	There is no evidence that Pinkham Way provides an achievable opportunity for employment. The existing Bounds Green Industrial Estate, located on the east side of the railway line from Pinkham Way, has a significant number of long term empty units and Enfield, as part of their regeneration of the New Southgate Area, have demolished industrial units to be replaced with housing. The obvious evidence required to maintain "Employment" use for Pinkham Way (first designated in 1998) is to robustly assess the environmental importance of the site in mitigating the effects of climate change, air pollution and flood risk against its	This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.

				viability of ever being suitable for any form of development that might provide limited employment opportunities. Evidence indicates that regeneration of the Bounds Green Industrial Estate would provide a far more viable planning objective for a deliverable employment opportunity than the destruction of a SINC.	
263	SA1500	Barry James	Employment use	On what basis is “employment” the preferred use? Who thinks that ‘employment’ is the preferred use? What ‘preliminary viability evidence’ exists in relation to this site? As presented in this document, the preliminary viability evidence appears to suggest that this site is not suitable for employment. These points are offered in the document without any source indicator to legitimise the statements. Moreover, there is no indicator to show that additional “employment” is required to meet the site requirement. To be clear, if the proposed development is merely moving employment from one location to another (with no net gain), then surely the criteria on policies promulgated by Haringey on employment are not being met. It would appear that to meet the site requirement, there must be net additional employment – the site requirement statement needs to be clearer if it is to be useful.	This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough’s objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.
427	SA1501	Pinkham Way Alliance	Evidence	<p>In the opening section of the Introduction to the Workspace Viability Assessment, we are told that the work ‘has been carried out in parallel with a separate assessment of the viability of 15 proposed site allocations.’ At Section 6.41, however, GVA states that Sites such as Pinkham Way (and two others) ‘... have limited workspace drivers to support future workspace delivery.’ Pinkham Way makes no further appearance in the document.</p> <p>The ‘separate assessment of the viability of 15 proposed site allocations’ promised in the Workspace Assessment proves in the companion Site Allocations Viability Assessment 2015 to be an assessment of ‘the potential deliverability of a series of 12 sites across the borough’. There was no mention of any work’s having been done on Pinkham Way; indeed any mention of the site is omitted.</p> <p>PWA can only assume that the negative remarks in the Workspace Assessment mean either a) that the idea of assessing the site for mixed use was too impractical to be worth pursuing, or b) that an assessment was done but was too damning to be published.</p> <p>The Council, having lashed itself to the mast of evidence-based decisions, should clarify the situation, and publish either the completed assessment or the reasons for not undertaking one. Either way, it is part of their evidence.</p>	Pinkham Way, as an employment/SINC site with no policy aspiration for affordable workspace or housing, falls outside the scope of both the Workspace viability assessment and the Site Allocations viability assessment, therefore it was not assessed in either report.
427	SA1502	Pinkham Way Alliance	Explanation for inclusion	<p>The Pinkham Way SINC is included in the Site Allocations DPD but unlike the other sites, which have an explanation about why they are included, what the expectations are of their development and how they will contribute to the Council’s strategic plan for the area, the Council has omitted to state the reason or justification given for the inclusion of the Pinkham Way site and how it will contribute to the strategic plan. Its inclusion is contrary to all the evidence available to the Council.</p> <p>If an evidence based approach is to be taken, as it should, on the future designation and use of this site, in the light of all the evidence now available to the council, it should be designated either SINC, Local Nature Reserve, and/or MOL, and should be removed from the Site</p>	The Council do not agree with this comment. The Sites inclusion is on the basis of a call for sites exercise and a clear expression from the land owner to develop the site. The site has an existing Employment/SINC dual designation and the Council is not seeking to change this.

<sup>1</sup>[http://www.Haringey.gov.uk/sites/Haringeygovuk/files/Haringey\\_workspace\\_viability\\_study\\_draft\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://www.Haringey.gov.uk/sites/Haringeygovuk/files/Haringey_workspace_viability_study_draft_final_report.pdf) - p 78

				Allocations DPD.	
263	SA1503	Barry James	Flood Risk	There is a far better flood risk statement in the NLWP than that included in the SADPD. The whole tenor of the SADPD statement suggests that it should be a site requirement and indeed the statement refers itself to “sequential test requirements”, a description of which is not set out in this statement. If there are “sequential test requirements, they should be set out in the Site Requirements section.	Noted.
266	SA1504	Freehold Community Association	Flood risk	Information from the Environment Agency clearly shows the presence of a defended area of fluvial flooding on the site from a 20 year (5%) storm event (see attached). Haringey’s site specific flood risk assessment fails to identify this flood area and therefore does not assess the predictable increase in the area by including other sources of flooding i.e. rainfall and ground water. This area of the site, including the required uplift for climate change, clearly identifies it as only being suitable for water compatible uses. Haringey have failed to assess the strategic flood risk impacts development of Pinkham Way would have downstream of the site. In particular the increased risk of flooding to Barnet residents and Enfields proposals in their A406 Area Action Plan. The sequential test is a precautionary test to ensure that land at the lowest risk of flooding or causing flooding elsewhere is bought forward for development before land at risk of flooding. The ranking of Pinkham Way in the required sequential test is vital evidence for potential developers and should be fully disclosed and referenced to the required site specific Sustainability Appraisal.	It is noted that there is an element of flood risk on this site, and this has been identified in the Council’s sequential test, and SFRA.
422	SA1505	Environment Agency	Flood Risk Assessment of Sites of 1ha or more	The development guidelines for these sites should be amended to reflect the fact that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required, as stipulated by footnote 20 to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103. It is also a requirement of London Plan policy 5.13 that all sites over 1ha in size shall make use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should also be included in the site requirements or the development guidelines. Haringey’s Local Plan strategic policy SP5 also places a requirement on all development to implement SuDS to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity. We suggest the following wording: <i>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be undertaken to understand the flood risks of the site pre and post development. Development must be safe for future users, not increase flood risk on or off site, and utilise SuDS in accordance with NPPG and London Plan.</i> We are pleased that the SWMP designated Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) have been included within the considerations for the allocated sites where they are present. Where CDAs are present you may also wish to consider the inclusion of more stringent design guidelines to make it clearer to developers what this means for the design of the development. We suggest the following additional wording as a minimum: <i>This site falls within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). Development of this site must be shown, in a Flood Risk Assessment, to achieve a runoff rate of Greenfield or lower.</i>	Noted.
568	SA1506	CgMs on behalf of LB Barnet	Flooding	Notes that the flood risk is not present at the southern section of the site in Barnet’s ownership	Noted.

572	SA1507	Beatrice Murray, resident	Greenfield land	The site should properly be regarded as Greenfield land, and should be treated as such in all work relating to the sequential assessment in site selection and sustainability appraisal of plan options.	The Council regards this site to be previously developed land, and that it can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs.
266	SA1508	Freehold Community Association	Height	Current users of the Friern Bridge Park enjoy an uninterrupted view across the Pinkham Way site and up the railway green network to Alexandra Palace (see attached). This view is an important factor to the enjoyment and general environment of the park. Any development should be limited in height to maintain this view and the site levels reduced to ensure this. It was appropriate for Haringey to have carried out a landscape character assessment of the impact any development of Pinkham Way would have on the existing landscape but there is no evidence that this has been carried out. The height of a building is crucial in a decision as to possible employment units and uses and, based on evidence from an assessment, a definitive height limit should be set. This guideline is not robust.	The local plan must be read as a whole when submitted planning applications, including the Council's policies on tall buildings and views.
263	SA1509	Barry James	Height Guidelines	This is a meaningless statement since it offers no guidelines at all and it is so vague as to contain no information of any value. It is noticeable that in other site descriptions (e.g. SA54) height is a "site requirement", not a guideline, and the site guidelines offer some explanation of the site requirement. In SA52, it is unclear how the PTAL rating (a minimally low 1a) is linked to development height.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the UCS, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.
427	SA1510	Pinkham Way Alliance	High value development unlikely	We do not accept that it would be possible to cross subsidise employment on this site with housing or other higher value development due to the major constraints on the site.	The Council has not seen any evidence of <u>major</u> constraints which we believe precludes development on Pinkham Way.
263	SA1511	Barry James	Introduction	There is nothing mentioned in SA52 which suggests that SA52 is consistent with the Local Plan (as per introduction).	The proposal for SA52 is consistent with the sites adopted dual designation of SINC/Employment land.
263	SA1512	Barry James	Introduction	There is nothing in the description of SA52 that might suggest that SA52 is a strategic site nor that it will make any contribution towards the meeting of growth aspirations	This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.
263	SA1513	Barry James	Introduction	SA52 does not address any of these benefits listed in the introduction: - No development is specified let alone any indication of what level might be appropriate - Since SA52 does not mention a specific development, it is hard to see how this site will benefit from a positive approach to design - There is no meaningful reference to infrastructure in SA52, let alone any suggestion about delivery of infrastructure in "a timely manner".	The draft allocation sets a use, and provides some design guidance. Infrastructure will be identified through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
263	SA1514	Barry James	Introduction	SA52 contains virtually no guidance for developers so it is difficult to see how the SADPD will facilitate the determination of planning applications. As currently drafted, SA52 contains virtually nothing (barring the Biodiversity Study) which could be used as a basis for refusal for any development	The designation will control the type of development that comes forward on the site (employment use) and ensure that biodiversity considerations are taken into account.
263	SA1515	Barry James	Introduction	Call for sites description suggests that all sites listed as nominated by this means have been through a review for their potential. SA52 is one of these sites. Why is the detail of the review not set out in the Report.	The sites were considered through discussion over their suitability, as such there is no written report for this process.
263	SA1516	Barry James	Land Stability	As with so many topics set out in this site description, this reference to a key NPPF criterion is trite. It offers no sense of true consideration by the authors of the SADPD. Since this site was, for a significant period of time, a landfill site, there can be no doubt that there will be some land stability issues. Without question, a site requirement for SA52 must be a study to establish the facts and identify work necessary to accommodate any development.	Noted. Stability of developing on a site would be considered as standard in any development application, and as such the inclusion of additional guidance in a site allocation is not considered appropriate.

266	SA1517	Freehold Community Association	Land stability	The site suffers from significant land stability issues due to the depth and nature of the contamination. Any building foundations will require extensive and expensive engineering works as well as ensuring protection of the aquifer zone and effective flood plain.	Any future planning application would be required to consider these issues.
427	SA1518	Pinkham Way Alliance	LEA6 removal	At SA2: of the Site Allocations Document, under Changes to Employment Designations, we note that the Pinkham Way site is included in the list as LEA6. The introduction to these proposed changes states that they are informed by evidence in the Employment Land Review, and Viability Study. We believe this is not a correct interpretation of the evidence referred to. LEA6 should be removed as all the evidence goes the other way.	The Council does not agree for the reasons explained in previous responses.
427	SA1519	Pinkham Way Alliance	No need for employment designation	There is no strategic need for the continued allocation of the site for employment development.	Do not agree. This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.
263	SA1520	Barry James	North London Waste Authority	Is the inclusion of the statement about NLWA a statement by council that this will be a waste site subject to planning permission? If so it should be stated upfront. It is not a development guideline and should be removed.	No and agree to remove the bullet point.
263	SA1521	Barry James	NPPF	The Site Allocations Process has legitimised itself by repeated references to NPPF criteria, notably in the Sustainability Appraisal. What is clear is that there has been no attempt to match the circumstances at Pinkham Way to the NPPF criteria with the result that this site is included in the Site Allocations apparently without any understanding of the issues associated with the site. Why include this site in the site allocations document if local conditions (poor air quality/poor soil quality/poor transportation/ sensitive receptors/potential noise issues/low PTAL rating/conflicting biodiversity policies/etc etc) mean that developments can never be realistically justified, just as they haven't been justified for the last 50 odd years.	Local Plans are required to have reference to the NPPF which establishes the framework within which plans should be made. It is considered that the issues raised must be considered by all developments, and do not preclude development coming forward on this site.
263	SA1522	Barry James	Objective	There appears to be no clear objective for this site and the text associated with SA52 offers no coherent steps for setting an objective for the site. In this context I cannot see how the site can be referred to as a 'key' or a strategic site given that there is no objective for it, let alone any resemblance of a plan concerning itself with it. Indeed the text in SA52 appears to deal principally with the minutiae of the site and, with the exception of the reference to the need for a Biodiversity Study, offers no meaningful information on other important key activities that should be required before any permissions for development can be granted. It is entirely unclear why this site is included in the Site Allocations DPD by Haringey Council.	The Council does not agree with this comment. The aspiration is to maintain its existing lawful dual designation of SINC and employment. The Council is clear that this site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.
568	SA1523	CgMs on behalf of LB Barnet	Ongoing biodiversity study	<p>Barnet Council have commissioned Ecology Solutions to assess the site using a recent biodiversity survey undertaken by Capita.</p> <p>The assessment, which is based on the findings of a suite of habitat and species surveys undertaken at the site, shows that whilst some areas within the site are of ecological value, not all of the site is of equal quality in terms of the biodiversity that it supports. As such in ecological terms, subject to the retention of the most bio-diverse habitats and implementation of appropriate management to safeguard and enhance their value in the long term, it is considered that losses to areas of lower biodiversity may be fully offset, resulting in a net ecological benefit and enhancements over the existing situation.</p> <p>On this basis therefore it is considered that the two policy considerations</p>	Support is noted.

				(for employment and for nature conservation) can be reconciled, and that an appropriately designed development may contribute towards both policy objectives.	
427	SA1524	Pinkham Way Alliance	Open space need	<p>The document forecast that, by 2050, the equivalent of a further 9,000 hectares of green space would have needed to be created to meet anticipated population growth, while maintaining existing London Plan ratios of green space per capita. To give that figure some context, the area of Barnet, the fourth largest borough in London, is some 8,600 hectares. A further objective is that 30% of London's area should be under a tree canopy – that is a 10 percentage point increase (ie an increase of 50% in the area under trees) over 2008 levels.</p> <p>Loss of biodiversity and mitigation schemes all too often leave local communities at a loss to see what benefits mitigation actually provides. Tree planting and grassing of 'landscaped areas' to replace wildlife areas which are intricately and delicately interconnected and have generated naturally over an extensive period can result in a manufactured, low value blandness. Public cynicism is hardly surprising.</p> <p>In the light of this, PWA welcomes Haringey's stipulation that any development proposal should 'enhance' both the SINC and the ecological corridor which runs along the railway land and the eastern edge of the site.</p> <p>In our opinion, the local community would not have too much difficulty in recognising what would and would not enhance the ecology of the site.</p>	Support is noted.
427	SA1525	Pinkham Way Alliance	Open space study	<p>The Site Allocations document states that before any development is granted planning permission, a Biodiversity Study will be carried out to identify how the designated SINC can be enhanced by the development.</p> <p>We are unclear what such a study would achieve which previous studies had not, unless Haringey is proposing a suite of detailed species surveys. The SINC is only as good as the sum of its component parts. It is the variety of habitat on site - and the site's connection to adjacent green spaces, now so strongly emphasized in policy statements, as we highlight above - which makes it what it is. It is these characteristics that make it important to a number of species of fauna.</p> <p>Surely, before the question is asked as to 'how' any development could enhance the SINC, the principle of 'whether' this is possible should be answered. As we say above, it is the totality of the site, and the connectedness of its various habitats, which make it so valuable.</p>	The plan should read 'a biodiversity study should be carried out' which requires any future applicant to assess the biodiversity value of the site. The plan has therefore been amended to reflect this.
427	SA1526	Pinkham Way Alliance	Open space study - error	There is an error at Section 3 where Pinkham Way is described as SINC II. It is SINC 1 Borough Importance.	Noted. Open space study will be amended.
427	SA1527	Pinkham Way Alliance	Open space study – green grid requirements	<p>It is incumbent on Haringey to promote 'positive management' at its nature conservation sites, and it is encouraging to see that the proportion of the borough's SINC's being managed this way is growing, albeit gradually. The Introduction to the Biodiversity Duty in DEFRA's 2006 Guidance for Public Authorities states:</p> <p>3. Public authorities have a key role to play in conserving biodiversity, through their work in ... managing their land ...</p>	Noted.

				<p>5. The Duty applies to all public authorities including all other bodies carrying out functions of a public character and under a statutory power.</p> <p>This implies a duty on NLWA at least to maintain the present status of the site and its priority habitat. We mention above a perceived absence of due diligence on the NLWA's part before purchase in 2009. The Authority has now discovered that what it bought – described at the time as 'derelict', and therefore worthless, land by all proponents of the site's wholesale development – is, as shown by its own advisors, and by Haringey's, as well as by PWA surveys, a highly diverse and valuable 'wasteland' habitat totally unsuitable for development. Its actions should reflect this discovery, however unwelcome it may be.</p> <p>We urge Haringey to use its best efforts to fulfil its duties under the ALGG and remind the Council of the public commitment of well over 100 residents who stand ready to help in the management of the site under professional guidance.</p>	
263	SA1528	Barry James	Opposition	<p>Given the scale of the SA52 site, in proportion with the rest of the sites being examined in the draft SADPD, its treatment by Haringey is exceptionally poor and it's description has the look and feel of a site that the Council does not wish to bring to the public attention. It has been slipped into the document without any stated purpose, and with an oblique and low key reference to the North London Waste Authority. As such it is not "sound" and in due course, the Inspector must be requested to reject its inclusion in the finalised Report.</p>	This site has been considered using the same process as any other site.
266	SA1529	Freehold Community Association	Opposition	<p>The continuing lack of assessment evidence in relation to the designation of Pinkham as viable for Employment use is unsound and this designation should be removed.</p>	The Employment Land Study has identified Pinkham Way as being suitable to contribute to meeting the long-term employment needs in the borough.
263	SA1530	Barry James	Pedestrian & Cycling Connectivity	<p>While this may be rightly positioned as a development guideline for the site, the fact that this is the only reference to any transportation issue for this site is disgraceful. The author has omitted key NPPF factors (traffic volumes/existing congestion/traffic noise) associated with this site's inclusion in the site allocation process.</p>	Traffic and parking issues will be handled through the relevant DMDPD policies.
568	SA1531	CgMs on behalf of LB Barnet	Potential for mix of uses	<p>Whilst we support the employment designation of the site the designation should also reflect the potential for all or some of the site to be developed for housing.</p>	Noted. The use as existing SINC/Employment is proposed for retention by the Council. However, it may be appropriate for other small scale uses to help realise the sites employment potential and the protection of the SINC.
427	SA1532	Pinkham Way Alliance	Previous representation	<p>We wish to include as part of this response our previous submission document, in particular Sections 3, 4 and 5 of the Response and Appendix 2 (Management Brief 2014 – 19). These dealt in some detail with the Council's planning policies as they related to the Pinkham Way site. We consider them relevant to this consultation and wish you to take them into account in conjunction with the present submission. They can be found on the Haringey website.</p>	The Council has considered all documentation received from PWA.
624	SA1533	Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth	Pro nature conservation	<p>This site should be designated for nature conservation and plans put in train to manage it as such. Therefore it should have employment use removed from its designation. If development is allowed, it should maximise nature conservation value of the site, and retain the maximum size</p>	Noted. The SINC designation will be retained. However, the site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough's objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.
263	SA1534	Barry James	Proposed Site Allocation	<p>In every other allocated site listing in the SADPD, there is an explanation of the Council's interest in the relevant site. SA52 has only a statement about its SINC status and employment designation. There is no reason given for its inclusion.</p>	Noted. Plan amended to reflect to include a statement of inclusion.



427	SA1535	Pinkham Way Alliance	PWA proposals	<p>Representatives of PWA have welcomed the opportunity to attend a number of meetings with Haringey Council officers and Members, during which we have discussed various proposals that might be suitable. These included bringing employment and or housing on to part of the site and the surrounding area; bringing educational/medical/community facilities on to the site; possible extension of public transport to the Retail Park and Pinkham Way, linkages and footpaths/cyclepaths from the surrounding area through and around the site.</p> <p>In addition, PWA has put forward a proposal for retaining and enhancing the ecological value of the SINC by protecting the whole site from development, with local community participation integral in the ongoing management of the SINC, with public accessibility to part.</p> <p>To support this proposal, PWA commissioned a Site Management Plan 2014-19 for the Pinkham Way site from its ecological consultant, Denis Vickers, MSB, FSL, MCIEEM, and asked residents to indicate willingness to offer practical help in implementing it under his ongoing supervision. 134 people put their commitment on public record</p> <p>After considerable research and investigation, and after careful examination of the Council's evidence supporting the Site Allocations draft document, PWA has reached the conclusion that the Pinkham Way site is unsuitable for development, that the employment designation should be removed and the site be protected in its entirety as either a valuable SINC, a Local Nature Reserve and/or MOL.</p>	<p>The Council disagree with this conclusion and continue to maintain the dual designation of the site.</p> <p>The Council notes the support for the continued dialogue between PWA and the Council.</p>
263	SA1536	Barry James	Relocation from Regeneration Areas	This is meaningless padding which offers no sensible guidance. There are no adjacent Haringey regeneration areas from where businesses could be sensibly relocated.	Disagree. There is no reason that anything decanted onto this site would necessarily need to be adjacent to the site.
410	SA1537	North London Waste Authority	SA 52: Ownership	NLWA suggest that the wording here is amended to say 'Two public freeholds' rather than 'Multiple' public freeholds as this more accurately reflects the ownership position at the current time.	Noted, the wording is amended.
410	SA1538	North London Waste Authority	SA 52: Site Requirements	NLWA supports the statement that 'employment is the preferred use on this site@ and acknowledges bullet point three which states that in line with policy 7.19 of the London Plan that, 'if appropriate development may be required to improve access to the SINC'. However, Haringey's Open Space and Biodiversity Study Final Report, October 2014 states that 'relative to many London Boroughs, Haringey is well endowed with open space, which makes up more than 25% of its total area' and given that the site has dual designation for both employment use and as a SINC	Support is noted.
410	SA1539	North London Waste Authority	SA 52: Site Suitability	<p>NLWA owns the site. It is expected that the amount of waste generated in north London will grow in forthcoming years as a result of growth in disposal household income, household spending, the 'time variable' for the cumulative effect of waste prevention and minimisation measure to take effect, and the fact that Haringey's strategic housing target has significantly increased by 83%, which will increase overall waste arisings. Accordingly the NLWA anticipates there will be increasing pressure to find suitable land for new waste management facilities and to retain land that is suitable.</p> <p>The Pinkham Way site remains an asset for NLWA due to its strategic location and planning designation as an employment site.</p>	Noted.

414	SA1540	GLA	SA52	The intention to retain the existing joint designation of this site as a Local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (Grade 1) and Local Employment Land is noted and supported.	Support is noted.
410	SA1541	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Allocation	Given the Borough's stated comment under 'Site requirements' that 'employment is the preferred use on this site' NLWA recommends that the proposed site allocation text is altered from 'The site is borough Grade 1 SINC, and for employment uses' to 'The site's preferred use is for employment, but it is also designated as a Borough Grade 1 SINC'. NLWA considers this change would more accurately reflect the balance of interests presented in the draft DPD.	Noted, wording in the plan has been amended to reflect this.
410	SA1542	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Development Guidelines	NLWA recommends that the 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet point be clarified that the ecological corridor in the vicinity of the north east corner of the site is just the National Rail land (i.e. the railway embankment) outside if the NLWA ownership.	Generally, most ecological corridors are adjacent to railway lines, so this clarification is not required.
410	SA1543	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Development Guidelines	Opposes the proposal that pedestrian and cycling connectivity through the site should be optimised, as this would severely compromise the development of the site for employment. Any such route would have to be fenced in (for health and safety reasons) and at best an unwelcoming route and at worst an unsafe route from a crime perspective.	Not agreed. The Council is interested in optimizing access to and through open spaces, so a consideration of this on a site with a SINC designation is appropriate.
410	SA1544	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Development Guidelines	The existing public access from the north of Alexandra Road and eastwards to the Pinkham Way roundabout seems to be of a similar distance to the proposed route through the Pinkham Way site. The proposed route also crosses Hollickwood Park with gates locked at night and therefore benefits would be minimal where compared with the existing route. NLWA recommends the yellow lines on the diagram be removed. The site is not currently accessible to members of the public.	Not agreed. The opportunities to improve access to and through open spaces should be realised even if not 24 hour.
410	SA1545	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Development Guidelines	NLWA considers the requirement in bullet point 8 – to improve air quality' is inconsistent with the current undeveloped nature of the site and the preference for future employment uses. Also site is adjacent to A406 which is the main contributor to air and noise pollution, so should not be on the owner or operator to make improvements. Recommends this statement be removed.	This is a statement in line with the rest of the document and will be retained.
415	SA1546	Transport for London	SA52: Development Guidelines	The Mayor of London has revealed further details to redesign a number of key road networks in the capital in order to unlock growth and make the capital a more attractive place to live and work in line with the Mayor's 2050 Infrastructure Plan and the recommendations of the Roads Task Force. One of these locations is the A406 in New Southgate, where decking or a mini-tunnel over this junction on the North Circular would unlock land for new homes and connect the area around the proposed Crossrail 2 station. TfL will wish to discuss this further with Haringey (and Barnet and Enfield) councils. As such we would suggest including a new bullet in the development guidelines of " <i>TfL is investigating options for decking or a mini tunnel over this part of the North Circular as part of the Mayor's 2050 Infrastructure Plan, which if progressed could change the development context for this site.</i> "	This is noted. It is considered that further information will be needed, and certainty accrued before the Council can support a more positive planning designation for this site.  It is recommended that if this proposal is to come forward, an Area Action Plan covering the New Southgate Crossrail 2 station area is the appropriate way to manage redevelopments linked to this infrastructure upgrade.
410	SA1547	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Site Requirements	NLWA has no comment on the requirement that a Biodiversity Study be carried out to identify how the designated SINC can be enhanced by the development.	Noted.
410	SA1548	North London Waste	SA52: Site Requirements	Supports 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point and acknowledges 3 <sup>rd</sup> re improving access to the SINC, but references the statement in the Open Spaces & Biodiversity Study (2014) that 'relative to many London Boroughs,	Noted, both designations will be referenced equally, and their order is irrelevant.

		Authority		Haringey is well endowed with open space, which makes up more than 25% of its total'. Given the site has dual designations, NLWA considers the preference for employment use should be prioritised and include a caveat that improving access to SINC secondary.	
410	SA1549	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Site Requirements	Pinkham Way has extreme changes in height, stands of invasive, including poisonous plants and areas of contamination. In NLWAA view is not suitable for public access. Considers the best prospects to be for part of the site to be developed for employment (in NLWA view waste management) whilst preserving other parts (particularly the perimeter trees) undisturbed.	Noted.
410	SA1550	North London Waste Authority	SA52: Site Requirements	The site is protected from housing by the Muswell Hill golf course to the south, the railway line to the east, the A406 to the north and Hollickwood Park to the west. This separation makes the site particularly well suited for development into employment use.	Noted.
419	SA1551	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	SA54: Site Requirements	We are concerned that using the site for waste purpose has not been ruled out despite the protests of many residents and the site's important ecological nature.	Concern is noted.
419	SA1552	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	SA54: Site Requirements	We also note that the preferred use, employment, is by the council's own admission difficult on this site. We believe the council should strongly commit to not using the site for any employment, industrial or waste purpose and to protect the ecological importance of this site. Any development must be compatible with the protection of the SINC (Site of Importance for Nature Conservation).	Noted, this is in accordance with the document. The Council is of the view that the site can make a contribution to meeting the objectively identified employment needs in the borough and is consistent with the adopted site designation.
263	SA1553	Barry James	Sensitive Receptors –	There is nothing in this description that relates to sensitive receptors, even though sensitive receptors are an important topic in the NPPF. If there has been no consideration of the effects of large scale developments on this large and contentious site on sensitive receptors, one has to ask whether the site is ready to be included in the Site Allocations DPD. If conclusions have been drawn by the planners setting up the SADPD, then one wonders why there is no mention of them in this document. The silence and omission is hugely suspicious.	The issues raised are not appropriate to be detailed in a Site Allocation. These issues will be picked up through the Sustainability Appraisal of the Plan, and will be considered again at the planning application stage.
572	SA1554	Beatrice Murray, resident	SINC	The Pinkham Way SINC is an important Site of Nature Conservation of borough-wide significance; its protection as such should be the primary objective for the Council. The future protection and proper management of the site is critical if its nature conservation value is to be sustained and enhanced. The development of the site for any major built development would be incompatible with the site's importance for nature conservation and as open land. The site is highly valued by local residents for its biodiversity value and as a local amenity space for informal recreation and should be designated for this purpose	Noted. Although the site holds a SINC designation, the Council do not believe that this is incompatible with development taking place on this site. What will be expected is that any development will make a positive enhancement to the biodiversity of the area.
427	SA1555	Pinkham Way Alliance	SINC protection	Given that policies relating to open space and biodiversity have been identified among the priority policies for the Muswell Hill neighbourhood it is appropriate that these should take greater precedence in informing the Council's decisions as to the future designation of the site. Hence, achieving compliance with and furthering the objectives of Policy SP13 should be at the forefront of the Council's consideration of the future role of the site. Of relevance in this respect is that Policy SP13 gives full protection to SINC's and presumes against any development which would harm the nature conservation value of such sites. The policy also recognises the importance of "green chains" both for nature conservation	Future planning applications will be required to meet the Local Plan as a whole and not individual policies in isolation.

				and public access and notes that there will be a shortfall of public open space in the borough of the order of 24-32 ha by 2016 which the Plan states will be very difficult to remedy because of Haringey's being an urban borough.	
427	SA1556	Pinkham Way Alliance	Site constraints	<p>The Council's Land Use Consultants' Report of October 2014 in its review of the site found that this site is a "large unlit site has no public access and is therefore almost undisturbed. Making it a rare resource for Haringey of high ecological value". The interest found on the site included invertebrate, amphibian, reptile, mammal, birds, higher plant, Bryophyte and Lichen. It was rated in terms of Species Richness as Average/Rich.</p> <p>The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report 2013 commissioned by PWA, and passed to the Council on publication, confirmed that the site was a valuable ecological site and justified its Grade 1 Borough status. In addition it was described as part of an important green chain.</p> <p>The Preliminary Invertebrate Survey 2014-2015 (March 2015) by Edward Milner BSc MCIEEM commissioned by PWA, and passed to the Council on publication, concluded that the site has "considerable conservation value" and that "it should be an urgent matter to conserve the site, as well as extending the survey area"</p>	The Council does not believe the submission from PWA on ecological grounds precludes any future development on Pinkham Way.
263	SA1557	Barry James	Site history	<p>In the past, the owners of the site have been guilty of underhand dealings with this site. A cynical and deceitful strategy (involving a sharply timed outline planning application) was adopted for this site and ultimately it was only thwarted by the diligence of local residents who would have been seriously harmed if the owners' plans had been successful.</p> <p>Haringey Council were caught in a position where, on the one hand, they were attempting to be the impartial planning authority while, on the other hand, they were party (through Council nominated representation on the Board of one of the site owners) to the pursuit of the cynical strategy. In fact, employees of the Council were found to have attempted to manipulate the consultation data, the evidence for which has been clearly declared in the NLWP consultations.</p>	This comment is not relating to the current Plan.
263	SA1558	Barry James	Site identification	<p>This is a very misleading section. While there were two nominations they were different. However, the description does identify the North London Waste Authority and its waste aspirations.</p>	Clarification has been added to the Plan.
263	SA1559	Barry James	Site inclusion	<p>Quite simply, this site should not be listed for development. Without doubt, waste is an entirely inappropriate use for the site, a fact clearly demonstrated by the NLWP. Indeed, once again we appear to be seeing Haringey Council wearing its "independent planning authority hat" which at first view looks independent but on closer examination is passively supporting a strategy apparently promulgated by the owners of the site.</p>	The Plan is proposing to retain the existing lawful dual use of the site which is employment/SINC. A waste facility is an employment use but the plan is not specifically promoting the site for a waste facility.
263	SA1560	Barry James	Site requirement additions	<p>The nature of the site suggests that, at a minimum, the following should be added to Site Requirements:</p> <p>a) A detailed air quality study that specifically monitors existing air quality and evaluates the effects of new developments and operation on sensitive sites, loss of existing environment notably air cleansing of greenery, and the impact of extra traffic.</p> <p>b) A detailed transportation study which outlines transportation issues.</p>	These issues will be managed through the DMDPD in the same way as for other sites.
422	SA1561	Environment Agency	Sites in Flood Zone 2	<p>Where sites are in Flood Zone 2 this should be noted explicitly in the explaining what this means for the design guidelines of the development.</p> <p>Where there is more than one flood zone (e.g. in Flood Zones 1 &amp; 2) this</p>	Noted. Plan amended to reflect this guidance.

				<p>should also be noted and the development should follow the sequential approach to steer the development to the parts of the site at lowest risk of flooding. We suggest the following additional wording is added to the development guidelines for the above sites:</p> <p><i>This site is in Flood Zone 2, classified by the National Planning Practice Guidance as having a medium risk of flooding from rivers. Development of this site must be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment. For development on this site to be acceptable the FRA must show there will be no increase in flood risk on or off site and that the development will be safe for future users. Development should be focussed in areas of Flood Zone 1 and no highly vulnerable uses will be permitted in areas of Flood Zone 2 without passing the sequential test.</i></p> <p>For sites where there is more than one Flood Zone (<b>AAP</b>: NT2, NT3, NT4; <b>SA</b>: SA52, SA63, SA66) we suggest the following additional wording:</p> <p><i>This site is in Flood Zones 1 &amp; 2 &amp; 3 [delete as applicable], classified by the National Planning Practice Guidance as having a low/medium/high [delete as applicable] risk of flooding from rivers. Development of this site must be supported by a Flood Risk Assessment. The FRA must show there will be no increase in flood risk on or off site and that the development will be safe for future users. Development must be steered to the areas within the red line boundary that are at lowest risk of flooding. Development should be focussed in areas of Flood Zone 1 and no highly vulnerable uses will be permitted in areas of Flood Zone 2 without passing the sequential test.</i></p>	
427	SA1562	Pinkham Way Alliance	Transport	<p>PWA considers that the site does not provide for good accessibility for HGVs because there is no direct access to the site from the North Circular Road. Any major employment development would, therefore, result in large number of HGVs having to queue on roads which front onto residential property with consequential harm to the amenity of those properties.</p> <p>Given that any employment or other built development of the site would be car/HGV dependent there could also be significant potential air quality impacts in a situation where the whole of Haringey is designated as an Air Quality Management Area and road transport is the major contributor to the current levels of air pollution.</p>	Any future planning application for the site will need to demonstrate through appropriate evidence that the future development will not impact the existing road network or increase levels of congestion.
427	SA1563	Pinkham Way Alliance	Tree value	Whilst many of the older trees around the site are subject to Protection Orders – highlighted in the PWA Pinkham Way Strategic Risk Assessment – the majority of the 1500 trees on the site are of no particular individual value. Collectively, however, they are vital for absorption of pollution, as a noise buffer, and as part of an ‘urban heat sink’.	Any future planning application will need to assess the value of the trees on site as set out in the Councils DMDPD biodiversity policies.
263	SA1564	Barry James	Waste	It is unclear why the site has an “employment” designation at all. There has been no employment on the site for at least 65 years, if not longer (In 2011 council tried to get LSIS designation which was rejected by inspector due to lack of industrial history evidence). The site has poor soil quality having been used as a ‘landfill’ for many years. In the event, nature has now reclaimed it. The North London Waste Authority strategy	This site can play an important role in providing employment floorspace capacity to meet the borough’s objectively identified employment needs, as set out in the Employment Land Study.

				<p>will not bring new employment to the area, merely transfer it from elsewhere. Indeed, a proper investigation will probably demonstrate that the use of the site for waste purposes will actually be employment negative overall.</p> <p>Haringey Council should remove the employment designation as it is an inappropriate designation for the site. Of course that would not be welcome to the NLWA and its supporters who clearly have a vested financial interest.</p>	
263	SA1565	Barry James	Waste	<p>It is my understanding that Haringey Council have given an undertaking that they will not submit the Pinkham Way site to be considered by North London Waste Plan II until a proper evaluation has been undertaken by the Council and until the Council is satisfied that use of the site for waste purposes is appropriate. If this particular consultation is to be the basis of the “proper evaluation of Pinkham Way” prior to submission as a suitable site to be considered by the NLWP, then I believe it to be serious flawed. The Sites Allocation DPD is not an appropriate examination of Pinkham Way to the extent that Haringey Council should feel that they can, after Examination, offer it to the NLWP for development for potential waste purposes.</p>	<p>The Site Allocation sets out the Council's preferred use for the site. Having undertaken additional biodiversity and employment evidence and determined that the site has biodiversity value, and also offers an opportunity to provide employment capacity to meet need.</p>
266	SA1566	Freehold Community Association	Waste	<p>The North London Waste Plan must comply with, and be in accordance with, the Plans and Policies of the individual LPA's. Waste development would only be suitable for sites designated by Haringey for Industrial development classes above those identified for Pinkham Way.</p>	<p>The Plan is proposing to retain the existing lawful dual use of the site which is employment/SINC. A waste facility is an employment use but the plan is not specifically promoting the site for a waste facility.</p>
427	SA1567	Pinkham Way Alliance	Waste plans	<p>In the Development Guidelines of SA52, the Council states that the site has been nominated by the NLWA as a potential waste site in the preparation of the North London Waste Plan. The Council will be aware that the NLWA has publicly stated that it has no immediate or medium term plans for the site, ie it has no plans for the site at all. The North London Waste Plan, in which the site was mentioned, no longer exists. There is no current version of the NLWP. The Inspector in his Report on the Council's Local Plan Strategic Policies said that the NLWP was the appropriate vehicle for determining the suitability of sites for waste. Until such time as the NLWP has produced evidence that any particular site is suitable and necessary for inclusion in that plan, no site can be properly earmarked or set aside for inclusion. There is no current evidence on which to base any such assumption for the Pinkham Way site.</p>	<p>Noted. Plan has been amended.</p>
595	SA1568	Susan Bennett	Waste use	<p>I wanted to make a comment about my objection to a waste site at Pinkham Way ...but did not find out how to on this site.</p> <p>apart from the environmental damage . .the North Circular is already a cause of pollution and congestion . .and more lorries . . .held in traffic jams. belching out toxic fumes would make the situation worse</p>	<p>Noted. The Plan is proposing to retain the existing lawful dual use of the site which is employment/SINC. A waste facility is an employment use but the plan is not specifically promoting the site for a waste facility.</p>

#### Comments on SA53 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
370	SA1592	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Access	<p>The document states that Parkland Walk should be extended through the site and a new cycling route should be created on the edge of Highgate Wood. This would mean taking away land that is currently taken up by the gardens of 102-110 Woodside Avenue to</p>	<p>On the map at present there are two proposed pedestrian/cycling links, one along Woodside Avenue and one along (but outside of ) the northern edge of Highgate Wood, which will help to achieve the objective stated in this response.</p>

				create a cycling route that will not be used, as it will only lead up a steep hill and then down again to the path parallel to Holt Close but not to any routes that might be of use to cyclists (i.e. an East-West axis along Woodside Avenue leading to East Finchley). Cycling is not allowed in Highgate Wood	
370	SA1593	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Access	Creating additional footway around the school is not needed. The school already has enough footway – the chief problem is parking, with a large number of parents parking illegally to drop off and collect their children. Having more footpath will not solve the problem as the school, which is denominational, has a large catchment area and has so far not succeeded in encouraging parents to use public transport.	<p>It is considered that the provision of an improved link/piece of urban realm between Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk would not compromise the development of new affordable housing on the remainder of the site.</p> <p>It is considered that the provision of the open space/ new entrance to the school near the bus stop on Muswell Hill Rd, could if designed appropriately help to create mode split by making bus use more attractive to pupils and parents.</p>
370	SA1594	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Allocation wording	There is much detail in the document on footways, urban realms and the needs of St James' School but very little on residential housing which supposedly is the priority use of the site. We are worried by this vagueness. What sort of development is envisioned? Will there be communal space? Who will be allowed to live there? How many units are planned?	The requirement for this Site Allocation is to set the principals of development. The estimated quantum of development was set out at Appendix B of the document. The actual mix of affordable units will be decided when a planning application comes in. This Allocation seeks to manage the design implications of any future development, but the exact mix and design will be determined at the time an application is submitted.
725	SA1595	Katharina Rietzler & Ananyo Bhattacharya	Entrance	Highgate Wood does not need an “enhanced entrance”. The current entrance serves the community well and is well-maintained by the Corporation of London which presumably would have to agree to such an enhancement. We feel this is an ill thought-out sound-bite that, if realised, would dedicate land and resources to an improvement that is not needed.	It is considered appropriate that any change that would affect the existing entrance to Highgate Wood should constitute an enhancement.
422	SA1596	Environment Agency	Flood Risk Assessment of Sites of 1ha or more	<p>The development guidelines for these sites should be amended to reflect the fact that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required, as stipulated by footnote 20 to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103. It is also a requirement of London Plan policy 5.13 that all sites over 1ha in size shall make use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should also be included in the site requirements or the development guidelines. Haringey's Local Plan strategic policy SP5 also places a requirement on all development to implement SuDS to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity. We suggest the following wording:</p> <p><i>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be undertaken to understand the flood risks of the site pre and post development. Development must be safe for future users, not increase flood risk on or off site, and utilise SuDS in accordance with NPPG and London Plan.</i></p> <p>We are pleased that the SWMP designated Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) have been included within the considerations for the allocated sites where they are present. Where CDAs are present you may also wish to consider the inclusion of more stringent design guidelines to make it clearer to developers what this means for the design of the development. We suggest the following additional wording as a minimum:</p> <p><i>This site falls within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). Development of this site must be shown, in a Flood Risk Assessment, to achieve a runoff rate of Greenfield or lower.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Addition of a development guideline noting that a flood risk assessment is required. Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment further outlines when an assessment is required and what it should include.</b></p>
725	SA1597	Katharina Rietzler & Ananyo	Green Space	A separate but related concern is that extending Parkland Walk through the site might not benefit future residents as it could exacerbate problems with littering and dog-fouling.	It is considered that the improved connection would have a benefit that outweighs the perceived impact of increased propensity for littering and/or dog fouling.



		Bhattacharya			
725	SA1598	Katharina Rietzler & Ananyo Bhattacharya	House future	As residents on the Cranwood, Woodside Avenue and St. James' School site we are concerned that the local plan will mean that we will lose our home. we only recently bought as a freehold. If Haringey Council does decide to go ahead with the current Local Plan, which implies that Woodside Avenue 102-110 will be demolished, we would like to hear more about what the council proposes to do to mitigate the impact on current residents, not just us but our neighbours, some of whom have lived in their houses for several decades.	It is noted that there is concern. The overall freehold of Cranwood and the majority of the Woodside Ave properties is Council-owned, and that a comprehensive redevelopment offers the greatest opportunity to maximise the affordable housing provided in this area however.  It is important to note that the Site Allocations document only sets the principals for development if a proposal comes forward. The Council will continue to work with local residents to understand how this site should be designed to accommodate their needs.
725	SA1599	Katharina Rietzler & Ananyo Bhattacharya	Housing	we feel it has to ensure that the new buildings that will be built on the site do really meet the needs of the local community and do not just represent a vanity project. Taking somebody's home away is a decision that should never be taken lightly.	Noted.
737	SA1600	Ann Limond	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
737	SA1601	Ann Limond	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
737	SA1602	Ann Limond	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
737	SA1603	Ann Limond	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
736	SA1604	Claire Davies	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
736	SA1605	Claire Davies	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
736	SA1606	Claire Davies	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
736	SA1607	Claire Davies	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
733	SA1608	Debra Stephens	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.

				detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	
733	SA1609	Debra Stephens	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
733	SA1610	Debra Stephens	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
733	SA1611	Debra Stephens	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
735	SA1612	Magda Robinson	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
735	SA1613	Magda Robinson	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
735	SA1614	Magda Robinson	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
735	SA1615	Magda Robinson	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
816	SA1616	Michelle Marshall	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
816	SA1617	Michelle Marshall	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
816	SA1618	Michelle Marshall	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
816	SA1619	Michelle Marshall,	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
731	SA1620	Sara Mackie	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.

Appendix F (13) Site Allocations consultation report

731	SA1621	Sara Mackie	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
731	SA1622	Sara Mackie	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
731	SA1623	Sara Mackie	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
811	SA1624	Stephanie Meehan	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
811	SA1625	Stephanie Meehan	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
811	SA1626	Stephanie Meehan	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
811	SA1627	Stephanie Meehan	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
732	SA1628	Stephen Smith	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
732	SA1629	Stephen Smith	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this purpose.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
732	SA1630	Stephen Smith	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
732	SA1631	Stephen Smith	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
734	SA1632	Veronica Chau	Lack of Schools	Additional housing at Cranwood and St James's and St Luke's sites will put further pressure on already limited primary school places in Muswell Hill. None of these plans have yet been fleshed out in any detail and so may not be acceptable to parents and local residents.	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
734	SA1633	Veronica Chau	Lack of Schools	Haringey also need to commence a similar process for secondary school places with the Cranwood site also considered for this	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the

				purpose.	borough over the Plan period.
734	SA1634	Veronica Chau	Lack of Schools	Land is in short supply for schools it is therefore irrational to even consider building additional housing in Muswell Hill until the Council has in place a plan	The IDP, informed by the school place planning report does not identify a need for additional school places in the west of the borough over the Plan period.
734	SA1635	Veronica Chau	Lack of Schools	The Council should find alternative sites to meet its commitment to build more affordable housing.	Objection is noted.
370	SA1636	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Local views	The document states that “views of Highgate Wood across the site from Muswell Hill” should be maintained. Will residents of the new development also have views on Highgate Wood?	It is considered that Highgate Wood is an asset that should be enjoyed by as many future occupiers of the site as possible. This will be managed using DMDPD policies.
586	SA1637	Tina Nicos, resident	Opposes renewal	Does not want to have her home demolished, would like to stay in the area. Has concerns over her health if the redevelopment goes ahead. Has 3 children who also rely on the house.	Objection is noted.
697	SA1638	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Piling	No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement is submitted and approved.	Noted.  <b>Action: Include reference to a piling statement being needed prior to any piling taking place.</b>
414	SA1639	GLA	Regeneration	It is noted that, as part of a borough-wide review of Haringey’s housing estates, the Council has identified this area as potentially suitable for regeneration. GLA officers acknowledge the opportunity to deliver a step change in residential quality and neighbourhood permeability/legibility at this site, and support the allocation in principle, subject to a collaborative engagement with residents and an appropriate response to the requirements of London Plan policies 3.9 and 3.14.	Support is noted.
697	SA1640	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Sewers	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a ‘Build over or near to’ Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer’s request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted.
370	SA1641	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Urban realm	Concern with proposal on the south-eastern corner of the site which will supposedly link the Parkland Walk, entrance to Highgate Wood and entrance to the school. Where, in this scenario, will new housing go? Will it be surrounded by ‘urban realm’? Where will the entrance to the school be located? Will it have an impact on future residents? It seems much more sensible to locate the entrance to the school on Woodside Avenue, not busy Muswell Hill Road.	It is considered that the provision of an improved link/piece of urban realm between Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk would not compromise the development of new affordable housing on the remainder of the site.  It is considered that the provision of the open space/ new entrance to the school near the bus stop on Muswell Hill Rd, could if designed appropriately help to create mode split by making bus use more attractive to pupils and parents.
370	SA1642	Katharina Rietzler and Ananyo Bhattacharya	Urban realm	The document states that there will be a new entrance to the school (even though the decision to expand the school is not certain) as part of a piece of rather vaguely defined “urban realm”. We are very concerned that this means that land on which our house is located will be turned into “urban realm” which would mean taking away housing space to create space that will be used by parents and children of a relatively small primary school during term time only. This cannot be in the interest of the borough as a	It is considered that the creation of an urban realm that links up the Parkland Walk, seeks to encourage mode shift of users of the school, as part of a comprehensive development of the site is considered to be sustainable development.

				whole.	
725	SA1643	Katharina Rietzler & Ananyo Bhattacharya	Urban realm	The most troubling paragraph concerns the south-eastern corner of the site which will supposedly link the Parkland Walk, entrance to Highgate Wood and entrance to the school. Where, in this scenario, will new housing go? Will it be surrounded by 'urban realm'? Where exactly will the entrance to the school be located? Will it have an impact on future residents? It seems much more sensible to locate the entrance to the school on Woodside Avenue, not busy Muswell Hill Road.	<p>It is considered that the provision of an improved link/piece of urban realm between Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk would not compromise the development of new affordable housing on the remainder of the site.</p> <p>It is considered that the provision of the open space/ new entrance to the school near the bus stop on Muswell Hill Rd, could if designed appropriately help to create mode split by making bus use more attractive to pupils and parents.</p>

## Comments on SA54 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
279	SA1644	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Community	The site on Tunnel Gardens is comparatively small. There are just 16 semi-detached houses. Some have already been fitted with double glazing and central heating. Tenants do not want their homes to be demolished. This is a tight knit caring community that would be destroyed. They have been informed that they could return but it takes years to build up such a relationship. Some tenants have lived here for 50 years. And could they afford the new rents or price of a house if they did return?	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
393	SA1645	Gillian Pritchard	Community cohesion, demolition	Residents are feeling distraught and upset about plans to demolish our houses and break up this close knit community.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
393	SA1646	Gillian Pritchard	Community cohesion, health and well-being	Residents are like a little community, where everyone looks out for each other. It is a quiet and peaceful place where residents feel safe and can relax knowing we are secure in our lives.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
393	SA1647	Gillian Pritchard	Concern for relocation	There are neighbours that have lived here for over 40 years, who have brought up families here, and to uproot them is distressing.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
671	SA1648	The Clifton family	Covenants	<p>Due to previous transfer of the land from CoFE to LBH, conditions were set out regarding the use of the land, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only standard size houses must be built on the site and these should not be of a size that would overlook the existing private properties. Neither should they be situated whereby they would overlook the private properties.</li> <li>Trees in the gardens on the west side of the road need to be retained</li> <li>The road must not be a through route for traffic</li> <li>The rail line acts as a constraint on the size of development on this site</li> </ul>	<p>Amenity considerations of neighbouring properties will be considered using policies in the DMDPD.</p> <p>Mature trees will be preserved.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to the retention where possible of existing mature trees.</b></p> <p>There is no intention to make Tunnel Gardens a through route.</p>
671	SA1649	The Clifton family	Decent Homes	Would like the cost and potential of installing double glazing and a pitched roof explored.	Noted, as part of detailed redevelopment plans, all options including the costs of refurbishment will be considered.
279	SA1650	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Deeds	After the London blitz of WWII there was a great need for housing. Tunnel Gardens was chosen for development. This was fiercely opposed, as now, by the residents of the well built 19302 privately owned houses in the immediate area. At that time Tunnel gardens was a beautiful and green park with tennis courts; as Mr Lock can testify. The land owned by the church was sold to the then council for £5,000 on 5 March 1947. Because of the outcry the church	<p>Noted that there are restrictive covenants on the land. This will be noted in the allocation.</p> <p><b>Action: Refer to covenants in the allocation</b></p>

				imposed certain stipulations within the Deeds in order to protect the area. {Relevant clauses quoted regarding that there will be no erection of private houses and council will not do anything which may be or tend to the annoyance, nuisance, disturbance of tenants or lessees, nor fell the trees to preserve them as a screen along Winston Avenue, access to one part will be by people on foot only] Understand the problem faced by council regarding the need for housing for an ever increasing population and the demands on councils made by the government. But the above legal requirements contained in the Deeds must be respected.	
721	SA1651	Laura Brennan	Demolition	I would like a name decided that this houses should be earmarked for demolition?	This site was identified as a potential housing investment location in the November 2013 cabinet paper on the basis that it contains houses built out of orlit which will not be able to be maintained in perpetuity.
722	SA1652	Tucker J Kalibbela	demolition	With all due respect we prefer to keep our homes as they are and make necessary repairs. Reference to the <i>Sustainable Communities Act</i>	Objection is noted.
721	SA1653	Laura Brennan	Demolition; Question	What is the difference between the cost of demolition and the cost of refurbishing out homes?	This is outside the scope of the Local Plan
721	SA1654	Laura Brennan	Density	To demolish these homes and rebuild with higher density housing would destroy our community and separate neighbours and friends who have great relationships.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
719	SA1655	Barbra Carlise	Design	The redevelopment not being in keeping with the local neighbourhood	Developments will be designed with neighbouring amenity in mind, in line with DMDPD policies.
671	SA1656	The Clifton family, residents	Doesn't want to leave	Nobody on the estate want to move from their homes on the estate. It is a pleasant environment in which to live.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
279	SA1657	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Education	Infrastructure cannot cope with a denser population: Bounds Green Primary School is the state school for the area and is at full capacity. There are 500 children with a bulge year of 90 pupils in year 2. There are plans for the build of extra classrooms for which there is already a waiting list. Alexandra Park Comprehensive School is also at full capacity. There are 1,500 applicants for 200 places at present.	The infrastructure needs of a growing population will be considered in the infrastructure delivery plan.
671	SA1658	The Clifton family	Elderly accommodation	Concern that if a redevelopment goes ahead a suitable new property for the existing elderly occupant. There is a lack of supply in this regard.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
279	SA1659	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Employment	There is no employment in the immediate area	Noted, although the plan does put forward sites that can meet the land for employment need in the borough.
393	SA1660	Gillian Pritchard	Estate renewal, concern for relocation	We do not want to move from here and we want to stay in our homes right here, not move somewhere else and have to move from our friends and neighbours.	Objection is noted. Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
393	SA1661	Gillian Pritchard	Estate renewal, demolition	All we want is to be listened to and not to demolish our homes, and repair and modernise them.	Objection is noted. Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
395	SA1662	Tunnel Gardens and	Estate renewal, demolition,	We the undersigned and tenants of Tunnel Gardens and Blake Road Residents Association wish to make it quite clear to Haringey	Objection is noted.

		Blake Road Residents Association	community cohesion	Council that we do not want our homes to be demolished and our unique community destroyed. (Petition with 25 signatures)	
393	SA1663	Gillian Pritchard	Estate renewal, health and well-being	We are at the time in our lives where we should be able to relax and be stress free and enjoy our lives. Some of us have illnesses and this stress is not helping our well being.	Objection is noted.
271	SA1664	Joe and Mrs Kate Catlin	Evidence	Correspondence between councillors and respondent between December 2009 October 2014 regarding evidence of flooding and roundabout concerns.	Flood risk will be considered through a Flood Risk Assessment at the time of any development going ahead.
422	SA1665	Environment Agency	Flood Risk Assessment of Sites of 1ha or more	<p>The development guidelines for these sites should be amended to reflect the fact that a Flood Risk Assessment will be required, as stipulated by footnote 20 to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 103. It is also a requirement of London Plan policy 5.13 that all sites over 1ha in size shall make use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), which should also be included in the site requirements or the development guidelines. Haringey's Local Plan strategic policy SP5 also places a requirement on all development to implement SuDS to improve water attenuation, quality and amenity. We suggest the following wording:  <i>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) must be undertaken to understand the flood risks of the site pre and post development. Development must be safe for future users, not increase flood risk on or off site, and utilise SuDS in accordance with NPPG and London Plan.</i></p> <p>We are pleased that the SWMP designated Critical Drainage Areas (CDAs) have been included within the considerations for the allocated sites where they are present. Where CDAs are present you may also wish to consider the inclusion of more stringent design guidelines to make it clearer to developers what this means for the design of the development. We suggest the following additional wording as a minimum:  <i>This site falls within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). Development of this site must be shown, in a Flood Risk Assessment, to achieve a runoff rate of Greenfield or lower.</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Addition of a development guideline noting that a flood risk assessment is required. Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment further outlines when an assessment is required and what it should include.</b></p>
279	SA1666	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Health	As everywhere the national health system is overwhelmed	The infrastructure needs of a growing population will be considered in the infrastructure delivery plan.
719	SA1667	Barbra Carlise	Height	The redevelopment being over 3 storeys.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the urban characterisation study, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.
279	SA1668	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Height	Tunnel Gardens is at the top of a hill. Four storeys would appear to be far higher. An overload of flats would destroy the open aspect and space of the present area. However, according to the Deeds there must only be dwelling houses erected on this site – not flats.	The height requirements set out in the policy are drawn from the analysis of urban form contained within the urban characterisation study, and are suitable to deliver the spatial vision for the area. Detailed design will be required on all sites to gain planning permission, but the heights set out in the document are considered appropriate to enable development that brings change while having an acceptable impact on the rest of the borough.



Appendix F (13) Site Allocations consultation report

720	SA1669	Yang Fan	Home conversion	<p>I am writing regarding the above property. We are not pleased with the new home conversion plan.</p> <p>We wish you could either keep the property the same way or you would allow ourselves to do the development to meet your standards.</p>	Noted. The Allocation ensures that a comprehensive approach to development in the area will take place.
719	SA1670	Barbra Carlise	Image resolution	Unable to read the legends of the maps due to poor quality of image.	Noted. It is acknowledged that improvements could be made to maps and image resolutions and the Council will seek to improve this in future documents.
719	SA1671	Barbra Carlise	Increased population	The new development proposed on Durnsford road - with higher rise behind. I am concerned that this could lead to an increase in the neighbourhood population by 100s	The Plan is to build additional housing to help meet housing need.
279	SA1672	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Location	Local transport is quite a distance away in all directions. Other than a few local shops nearer to the Main Bounds Green Road and Bounds Green tube station the larger shopping areas of Wood Green, Muswell Hill, Southgate and North Finchley are a long distance away by bus and road.	It is noted that this area is not suitable for high density development, and the allocation represents this.
671	SA1673	The Clifton family	Mortgage/ Insurance	One resident has recently improved their property and obtained housing insurance and a mortgage.	Noted, the housing investment team will be notified of this.
279	SA1674	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Neighbouring properties	Opposition from the surrounding neighbourhood. Private home owners do not want their homes devalued by overdevelopment.; the loss of green space and or a spacious environment; the pleasant and peaceful ambience of the area; extra cars; density of people and the possibility of anti social behaviour. They (the home owners) could or would demand compensation from London Borough of Haringey for the devaluation of their property.	The Council would consider it is extremely unlikely that any legal action would succeed. Developments will be designed with neighbouring amenity in mind, in line with development management policies.
604	SA1675	Shengming Wang & wife, residents	Objection	We are writing regarding the above property. We are not happy with the new home conversion plan effecting our property. We wish you could keep the property this way, or if you have to rebuild, we would like to build ourselves to meet your standards.	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
279	SA1676	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Opposition	Strongly oppose proposed demolition and development of Tunnel Gardens	Objection is noted.
697	SA1677	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Piling	No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement is submitted and approved.	Noted.
719	SA1678	Barbra Carlise	Pollution; noise	we are in distance from the Cross rail 2 potential shaft/ tunnel entrance (behind St martins school ) - these, and with development at Pinkham way will transform this leafy neighbourhood into a building site with increased levels of noise and pollution	All of these proposals, if they come forward, will be managed as sensitively as possible to minimise impact on local neighbourhoods, in line with development management policies and the Sustainable Design Construction SPD.
721	SA1679	Laura Brennan	Question	Where are all of the families going to go?	The Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
721	SA1680	Laura Brennan	Question	Why hasn't a surveyor been to look at these houses?	A detailed review of the condition of the estate has been undertaken.
721	SA1681	Laura Brennan	Question	Why have new tenants been moved in with no information as to what is being proposed up here?	The future potential redevelopment of the buildings does not mean that it shouldn't be used as a home in the meantime.

					The Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.
721	SA1682	Laura Brennan	Question; demolition; development	If demolition and rebuild goes ahead how long will this process take?	There are no detailed plans at this stage. Any development on this site will be undertaken in full consultation with local residents.
721	SA1683	Laura Brennan	Question; development	If we are decanted out of our homes where will we be put and what help will we be given in this process?	There are no detailed plans at this stage. Any development on this site will be undertaken in full consultation with local residents.
279	SA1684	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Refurbish	Surely it would be more economically viable if the council houses in Tunnel gardens were to be modernised to present day living standards? This has been successfully achieved elsewhere – for example in Chingford.	Noted, the full range of development options will be considered in the preparation of detailed proposals.
719	SA1685	Barbra Carlise	Refurbishment option	Under the localism act presumably the residents are being given the option to look at how to manage their homes? the properties could be refurbished with a proportion sold on the open market to make sure you get your money back	Noted, the Council will work with existing residents to ensure their needs are identified as part of the detailed planning for any redevelopment.  The full range of development options will be considered in the preparation of detailed proposals.
719	SA1686	Barbra Carlise	Road adjustments	I object to the road being opened up on Wroxham Gardens as this will fundamentally change the local area	There are no plans to open up the road block between Tunnel and Wroxham Gardens.
414	SA1687	GLA	SA54	It is noted that, as part of a borough-wide review of Haringey's housing estates, the Council has identified this area as potentially suitable for regeneration. GLA officers acknowledge the opportunity to deliver a step change in residential quality and neighbourhood permeability/legibility at this site, and support the allocation in principle, subject to a collaborative engagement with residents and an appropriate response to the requirements of London Plan policies 3.9 and 3.14.	Support is noted.
697	SA1688	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Sewers	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted.
719	SA1689	Barbra Carlise	Site allocation boundary	Outline map is wrong as it currently includes houses in Wroxham Gardens. I live in Wroxham and have not been engaged in any discussion of such a large renewal programme within 200- yards of my home. I presume this is because it won't impact on me.	The map is correct, but it is noted that the address can include greater detail. The consultation has been carried out in line with the relevant regulations.
721	SA1690	Laura Brennan	Site allocation boundary	What was the criteria used to make this decision?	The site is identified through the Council's Estate Renewal programme on the basis that the cost to repair/refurbish the properties to a decent standard would be prohibitive.
671	SA1691	The Clifton family	Survey	Residents aren't aware of a survey having been undertaken of the housing stock that evidence the undeliverability of undertaking decent homes work. Would like to see a copy if it is available.	Noted, the Council consider that the carrying out of a survey is essential in understanding the range of options for this site.
279	SA1692	Bounds Green and District Residents Association	Traffic	Increased use of cars causing more pollution and contributing to the already dangerous 'rat run' of Winton Avenue and Blake Road	Parking standards will be set in the DMDPD.
723	SA1693	Michael Casey	Trees	Respondent highlights the historical and environmental importance of the oak trees at Tunnel Gardens which are remnants of Tottenham Woods (the original great wood covering most of	Mature trees will be preserved.  <b>Action: Include reference to the retention where possible of</b>

				Middlesex). Directly related to Bluebell Wood – site of environmental importance. <i>Historic and modern images attached including the Tunnel Garden estate</i> . The land is in the ownership of Haringey Council, therefore there is no requirement for TPO's. The trees will be under treat from any future redevelopment.	<b>existing mature trees.</b>
271	SA1694	Joe and Mrs Kate Catlin	Water capacity	P11 says there are forecasts for heavier rain in the future. P12 refers to water quality. If residences increase and number of people nearly doubles two chief concerns are drinking water supply and sewerage disposal. Since January 2001 it has become noticeable that excess surface rainwater remained in puddles. Surface water drainage and sewerage gullies installed should receive priority inspection before new development is undertaken.	Noted, this will be addressed through development management policies relating to drainage.
271	SA1695	Joe and Mrs Kate Catlin	Water supply	Mains water pressure does not fluctuate as it used to but does cease entirely when work is going on a mains supply located at mains supply at Bounds Green / North Circular junction. Mains water supply to Tunnel Gardens as it is may not be adequate if number of residents doubles.	This issue will be handled through the infrastructure delivery plan.

## Comments on SA55 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
615	SA1696	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Conservation	The site more than “lies within” the Conservation Area, it defines it, which restricts the scope of developments that might be considered. Similarly, it is remiss that there is no reference to both the Park and Palace being listed by English Heritage as Grade II, that part of the Park is designated as a Historic Garden and that the whole of the land is MOL – all of which is significant.	Noted.  <b>Action: Amend “lies within” to “is the centrepiece of” the Alexandra Palace Conservation Area</b>
813	SA1697	Lynne Zilkha	Conservation	I am dismayed to see Alexandra Park and Palace (SA55) included here for development.  Alexandra Park and Palace is the borough's most important site of historic importance, recreational value and most important local attraction. It is of importance not just London wide, but is of national significance. The site is a conservation area and both the Park and the Palace are listed by English Heritage as grade II and Historic Gardens. Because of its significance, status as a public good, local value and inadequacy of prior consultation the Park and Palace should not be included in the Proposed Site allocation plan.	This Site Allocation is considered appropriate to ensure any improvements to the Palace and/or the Park are co-ordinated. The site allocation recognises the conservation area and states that any development should preserve or enhance its appearance.
813	SA1698	Lynne Zilkha	Height	The fact that the plan proposes a 25 storey block adjacent to the park at the foot of the Penstock Tunnel, at the same time that the report also suggests the important views of and from the park must be preserved and exploited suggests that has been a failure in “joined up thinking”. I urge the council to preserve the palace and park and their setting.	Noted, the impact on the park of proposals in Wood Green will be a key consideration in the Local Plan.
615	SA1699	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra	Objection	The APPCAAC objects to the inclusion of this site in the context of the Proposed Site Allocation document and we ask for it to be withdrawn.	This Site Allocation is considered appropriate to ensure any improvements to the Palace and/or the Park are co-ordinated.

		Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee			
742	SA1700	Friends of Alexandra Park – Gordon Hutchinson	Open space	We support the comments on improving the open space where possible, and in particular the improvement of walking and cycling routes, with the proviso that this does not entail additional buildings in the Park.	Support is noted.
615	SA1701	Colin Marr on behalf of the Alexandra Park And Palace Conservation Area Advisory Committee	Ownership	<p>The site considered here comprises the whole of Alexandra Park, including the Palace – all of its 77.5 hectares. Ownership of the site is indicated as being “unified public ownership”, just as if it is the same as any other council owned site. This is crassly misleading!</p> <p>The whole of Alexandra Park and Palace (the site) is owned under trust law by the Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust. What is permissible or not permissible by way of development within the site is determined by act of parliament, the Charity Commission and planning law, not by deliberation of the Haringey Local Plan.</p> <p>Haringey Council may have been appointed in law as trustee for APP, but it does not own it. The council exercises its charitable responsibilities through a board of appointed trustees – the beneficiaries of the charity being the general public. The board has not been consulted over the inclusion of Alexandra Palace in the Proposed Site Allocations document.</p> <p>Although the text used to describe the site requirements and development guidelines is not objectionable, it has no validity. It looks as if the author of the document was either misinformed or ignorant of the actual ownership of the site and Haringey’s degree of freedom for development of it. Alternatively, if it is kite-flying to introduce the idea that some form of development might be considered, then it is misconceived.</p>	It is considered that the wording is appropriate.
422	SA1702	Environment Agency	Potentially contaminated sites	National Planning Practice Guide paragraph 005 states that Local Plans should be clear on the role of developers and requirements for information and assessments in considering land contamination. We note that some of the above sites highlight that a study into potential contamination should be undertaken. The design guidelines would be improved highlighting that these sites lie in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Add a design guideline setting out that the site lies in a Source Protection Zone as we will expect such sites to consider this receptor in any studies undertaken.</b></p>
418	SA1703	Sport England	SA55 Policy Justification	<p>Further clarity is required around allocation SA 55: Alexandra Palace. The allocation includes existing playing field land yet the policy allocation is unclear on exactly what is intended for these areas, and whether they are to be protected in line with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF or if it indented that there be some loss of playing field land as part of this allocation.</p> <p>Sport England aims to ensure positive planning for sport, enabling the right facilities to be provided in the right places, based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need for all levels of sport and all sectors of the community. To achieve this our objectives are to seek to PROTECT sports facilities from loss as a result of</p>	<p>Clearly the requirements of NPPF Paragraph 74 do apply, as all Local Plans are required to be in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>Requirements for open space provision are identified in the Open Space and Biodiversity Study, and will be delivered through the infrastructure delivery plan.</p> <p>This allocation does not enable the loss of any open space, as reinforced in the development management policies.</p>

				<p>redevelopment; to ENHANCE existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management and to PROVIDE new facilities that are fit for purpose to meet demands for participation now and in the future. We work with the planning system to achieve these aims and objectives, seeking to ensure that they are reflected in local plan policies, and applied in development management.</p> <p>The Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is clear about the role that sport plays in delivering sustainable communities through promoting health and well-being. Sport England, working with the provisions of the NPPF, wishes to see direct reference to sport in local planning policy to protect, enhance and provide sports facilities, as well as helping to realise the wider benefits that participation in sport can bring.</p> <p>Sound policy can only be developed in the context of objectively assessed needs, in turn used to inform the development of a strategy for sport and recreation. Policies which protect, enhance and provide for sports facilities should reflect this work, and be the basis for consistent application through development management. Sport England is not prescriptive on the precise form and wording of policies, but advises that a stronger plan will result from attention to taking a clearly justified and positive approach to planning for sport.</p> <p>Policies could be included in a separate chapter on sport and recreation or, following the NPPF, be part of a chapter on health and well-being. In all cases, however, policies for sport and active recreation must be properly justified, include criteria against which development proposals will be judged and be based on a robust and up-to-date assessment of need as required by paragraph 73 of the NPPF.</p> <p>In this way, planning authorities will be able to demonstrate that their plan has been positively prepared (based on objectively assessed needs), is consistent with national policy (reflecting the NPPF), is justified (having considered alternatives) and effective (being deliverable). Without such attention there is a risk that a local plan or other policy document could be considered unsound.</p> <p>The NPPF clearly recognises the role of sport and recreation as a fundamental part of sustainable development, and expects local authorities to plan positively for these needs and demands accordingly. The protection and provision of opportunities to participate in sport is seen as fundamental to the health and well-being of communities (NPPF, section 8), meaning that local authorities must plan and provide accordingly through policy and development management. Without a robust and up-to-date assessment of need (as required by paragraph 73 of the NPPF), there is a risk that a local plan document could be considered unsound.</p> <p>Sport England will resist the allocation of any playing field site for development unless there is a robust assessment (Playing Pitch Strategy to Sport England methodology:  <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-</a> </p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<a href="#">sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/</a> in place at the point of allocation which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements.  Sport England would expect any policy to be very explicit on the need to retain and not prejudice the use of Alexandra Park Cricket and Football Club and any other formal sporting uses of the site.	
--	--	--	--	---	--

#### Comments on SA56 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
828	SA1704	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Access	As has been the experience at Gilson Place, most people living down here have cars because of the location. This side access road leading to our gardens, the clubhouse and school measures just 2.5m wide and cannot be expanded as properties on Gilson Place and 141 Coppetts Road are either side. Access to the rear of the site is not suitable for large numbers of residents' vehicles and impossible and dangerous at weekends. Currently the access road is used also by council workman sited on the fields and Veiola who have a base there too for a rubbish collection vehicle and walking road pavement cleaners and their equipment so large vans use it daily	Noted, access arrangements will be considered through a planning application in line with DMDPD policies.
260	SA1705	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Document design	Add a key to the site diagram on p150 to make the document easier to read and understand.	The positioning of a key on each page is not possible. We will attempt to make the maps in the document as clear as possible however.
828	SA1706	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Flooding	Also please note that we have ongoing flooding problems experienced by both the school, clubhouse and our houses as waste from these properties struggles to join the drainage pipes coming down from Coppetts Road due to the volume of water. The football pitches also now flood since Gilson Place was built as drainage that existed below ground was blocked off. Thames Water are still trying to address this for the immediate area.	Noted, the requirements of the SFRA covering this site will be required, and this is managed through the DMDPD.
828	SA1707	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Height	Gilson Place has been built recently and following representations the houses built adjoining the site were kept low rise ie 2 storey so protecting the amenity of us residents. The clubhouse and school are single storey. We note with concern the reference to building 5 storey high blocks. This would not be appropriate here as both we and the Gilson Place Residents would lose privacy completely in our 2 storey houses and gardens. This is a low rise area and is a mix of education leisure and residential.	Noted, this is a suburban area with relatively low PTAL, and as such is not considered appropriate for taller buildings. Five storeys are considered to be the limit of height on the scheme, which will enable a viable scheme to come forward which also manages the sensitive interfaces with neighbouring properties.
260	SA1708	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Height	Generally supportive of 5 storeys and consider it largely suitable for the Coppetts Wood Hospital site in particular.	Support is noted.
260	SA1709	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Housing numbers	Confused appendix says 21 units for Hospital given the site allocation itself takes in other uses. Welcome feedback on how this number was achieved. Own masterplan suggests c. 85 units could be delivered. Welcome further discussions with council to ensure delivery of housing optimised.	The methodology is set out in Appendix A. There is a 50% assumption of community space at present to accommodate any replacement community uses. It is noted that the numbers in Appendix B are considered minimums as defined by the density matrix in the London Plan.

828	SA1710	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Local services	<p><b>Schools</b> Our two bedroom houses have not accommodated families in the last 20 years but our houses do not fall into a catchment area for schools.</p> <p><b>Doctors</b> The closure of surgeries in Fortis Green and forthcoming retirement of doctors in Colney Hatch Lane have left us struggling to sign onto medical practises.</p> <p><b>Increased population in the area</b> An additional 144 properties were built at Gilson Place with no additional services or infrastructure for the new population, Osier Crescent was developed some 15 years ago again with no additional local services provided. Both developments were on Brownfied sites and so were completely new residential developments adding considerable numbers to the local areas without anything other than a playground being provided.</p>	Additional capacity covering infrastructure need generated by new development will be considered through the infrastructure delivery plan.
260	SA1711	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Mixed use	The allocation for a ' <i>mixed use development</i> ' should clarify that this is subject to demonstrating that the existing uses are surplus to requirements and once this test has been met residential development would be supported.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Action: Add wording to make clear that each individual use must demonstrate it is surplus to requirements before planning consent is granted for change of use.</b></p>
828	SA1712	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Parking	This area is much used by visitors using the football pitches at weekends and midweek, there is a major increase in the population in and around our houses, the school and football club house. Adults and children on Saturdays play soccer and children play on on Sundays accompanied by families. The skateboard park also attracts boarders from outside of the area who come in by car and also dog walkers come in. Everyone. This access road leads round also to Greenfield School. It is a good mixed use area at the moment as the school is in use during the week when the pitches are not in use and the pupils and teachers have ease of arrives by car as there is no tube nearby and one limited bus service (234) which runs between E Finchley and Barnet via Muswell Hill. As result parking and traffic is intense all weekend.	Noted.
828	SA1713	Ms Hazel Penry, Ms L Alliston, Ms D Harrison and Mrs M Osborne, adjacent residents	Parking	In 1964 the council agreed that our 4 houses should be allocated 2 spaces to the rear of the properties for residents parking and access to gardens via the rear. The arrangement has been in place for the subsequent 50 years. This arrangement has been respected by the club and council and any development must factor in this continued arrangement and preferably add 2 more spaces in the event that more residential housing comes into the area.	This is outside the scope of this Allocation, but will be considered through any future planning application, most likely as part of a transport assessment.
697	SA1714	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Piling	No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement is submitted and approved.	<p>Noted.</p> <p><b>Action: Include reference to a piling statement being needed prior to any piling taking place.</b></p>
697	SA1715	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Sewers	There may be existing public sewers crossing the site. If building over or close to a public sewer is agreed to by Thames Water it will need to be regulated by a 'Build over or near to' Agreement in order to protect the public sewer and/or apparatus in question. It may be possible for public sewers to be moved at a developer's request so as to accommodate development in accordance with Section 185 of the Water Act 1989.	Noted.
260	SA1716	Catalyst	Site boundary	Do not agree with including church in site allocation as have serious	Noted. This is considered to be an appropriate requirement as the



		Housing (CgMs Consulting)		concerns about comprehensive development of the site already. Also church is on the other side of the road and therefore disjointed from main site by a busy road. See no merit in including it in the allocation.	Church is not an efficient use of the whole of that site.
260	SA1717	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Site characteristics	Red line includes a number of individual ownerships and uses which although geographically adjacent have no linkage in terms of ownership or operations. The policy wording as currently drafted is confusing and ambiguous in relation to redevelopment options and site boundaries. We recommend that in the first instance the red line plan should differentiate between these uses and ownerships.	The principle of including all of these sites together is that the requirements of the rest of the land parcels will be taken into account when the first planning application comes forward. This is considered prudent to ensure good design is brought forward on all contiguous sites.
260	SA1718	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Site characteristics	Wording refers to consolidation of existing land uses for mixed use development. This is ambiguous and does not provide clear development guidelines. Serious concerns about the deliverability of development at Coppetts Wood Hospital if councils intention is for comprehensive development including other uses within the site allocation. We strongly disagree with any aspirations for the comprehensive development of the site and consider this would stifle and delay development. The Coppetts Wood Hospital site has the ability to deliver an appropriate and suitable development within its own red line whilst not prejudicing or impacting on future development options within the northern / western part of the wider site allocation. This should be reflected within the site allocation map and text.	Noted. The Council will not require comprehensive development, but we will require any applications to consider the future of the remainder of the site.
260	SA1719	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Support	Supportive overall but have some serious concerns about ambiguous drafting of the policy.	Noted.
697	SA1720	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Waste water	We have concerns regarding Wastewater Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the wastewater network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing drainage infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the developer to provide a detailed drainage strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.  It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.  <b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards waste water capacity upon preparation of a planning application.</b>
697	SA1721	Savills on behalf of Thames Water	Water	We have concerns regarding Water Supply Services in relation to this site. Specifically, the water network capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development. Upgrades to the existing water infrastructure are likely to be required to ensure sufficient capacity is brought forward ahead of the development. Where there is a capacity constraint and no improvements are programmed by Thames Water, the Local Planning Authority should require the	Noted, reference will be included in this site allocation.  <b>Action: Make reference to the need to consult with Thames Water with regards water supply upon preparation of a planning application.</b>

				<p>developer to provide a detailed water supply strategy informing what infrastructure is required, where, when and how it will be funded. At the time planning permission is sought for development at this site we are also highly likely to request an appropriately worded planning condition to ensure the recommendations of the strategy are implemented ahead of occupation of the development.</p> <p>It is important not to under estimate the time required to deliver necessary infrastructure. For example: local network upgrades can take around 18 months to 3 years to design and deliver.</p>	
260	SA1722	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Wording	<p>First bullet point of site requirements is ambiguous suggesting all facilities must demonstrate they are surplus to requirement before <i>any</i> development can take place. As said already the hospital can deliver its own development and reliance on other landowners would stifle delivery. Recommend policy text is clear that individual landowners will only be required to demonstrate <i>their</i> facilities are surplus to requirements. I.e. Hospital would not be expected to address the school and changing facilities too.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p><b>Action: Add wording to make clear that each individual use must demonstrate it is surplus to requirements before planning consent is granted for change of use.</b></p>
260	SA1723	Catalyst Housing (CgMs Consulting)	Wording	<p>Second bullet point of site requirements is ambiguous. Assume that the statement refers to one of the existing school buildings on site but this must be clarified and explained further. The current wording of the policy is also ambiguous in relation to the potential requirements for a new school or conversion of an existing building to residential. The exact location and building relating to this issue should be clarified.</p>	<p>Noted, the update to the infrastructure delivery plan will address school need in the area.</p>