

Appendix 2.12(b) - Comments on SA 63 of the Local Plan: Site Allocations Regulation 18 consultation Feb-Mar 2015 (continued)

Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
232	SA3643	Steve Hill (local resident)	Biodiversity	Development would have a detrimental effect on the biodiversity of the area.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA3644	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Biodiversity	Public parks are final frontiers of green space for songbirds and other flora and fauna as increasingly private gardens are used for development.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
243	SA3645	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Biodiversity	Haven for wildlife, including variety of birds	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3646	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Biodiversity	The Rec is a haven for wildlife, and the northern part of the Rec has improved hugely in this respect in the last few years with creation of wildflower meadows and new tree planting. There remains more capacity for tree planting in the area. The site represents a remarkable contiguous green space with Downhills Park to the south.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
131	SA3647	Peter Corley	Biology	Trees including fruit trees are valuable public and biological resources (as is the sports ground).	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
207	SA3648	Erica Ward	Borough differences	Why don't we see proposals like this in Crouch End, Muswell Hill? Imagine a similar proposal for Priory Park it wouldn't happen.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
166	SA3649	Janet Lallysmith	Borough differences	Building on Lordship rec and depriving community of green space and sports space is a terrible idea. Why don't you do this in Priory Park or Highgate Woods instead?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3650	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Borough differences	It is noted that there are no proposals to build on areas of green space in the west of the borough.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
243	SA3651	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Community work	Rec has become the renewed focus for community activities, volunteering, recreation and engagement for residents	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
211	SA3652	Veronica Bailey Straffon and James Straffon (local residents)	Community work	Re-development would cause huge upheaval to both the Broadwater Farm Community and the wildlife. It is not necessary to go this route of SA63 and plans have to be re thought. The community and green space needs protecting from short -sighted ideas.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
818	SA3653	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	Community work	The sudden threat to Lordship Rec would bring the Council into direct conflict with the Lordship Rec park users' organisations, and all the funding bodies (Lottery, GLA and the Environment Agency) who have supported the successful community-led regeneration.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3654	Friends of	Community	Threat to Lordship Rec will bring council into conflict with user organisations	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		Lordship Rec	work	and funding bodies who have supported the regeneration.	Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA3655	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Community work	Local community regenerated the rec with lottery funding to create a wonderful resource for all.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3656	Friends of Lordship Rec	Community led regeneration	Community has worked with Parks' Service to achieve a successful, nationally-celebrated, community-led regeneration of Tottenham's largest public park.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3657	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Conservation area	The origins of Lordship Recreation Ground are entwined with those of Tower Gardens Estate, and it has been the place where residents have gone for recreation for almost 100 years. To separate the Estate from the Rec would have extremely negative social and environmental costs to the Estate.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
138	SA3658	Federico Calboli	Covenant	In breach of a legally enforceable covenant that prevents its development in perpetuity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
109	SA3659	Will Embliss	Covenant	The park is safeguarded and protected by a covenant preventing it being developed or sold.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
173	SA3660	Jonathan Maris	Covenant	The park is safeguarded and protected by a covenant preventing its sale or development.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
7	SA3661	Peter Thomlinson	Covenant	The park is safeguarded from sale and development by a 'Fields in Trust' covenant.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
176	SA3662	Beewan Athwal (adjacent resident)	Covenant	The park is under a 'field of trust' covenant and should not be developed.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
177	SA3663	Stella Smith	Covenant	The Rec is protected by a fields in trust' covenant to stop it being sold or developed	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
179	SA3664	Stephen and Susan Ellis	Covenant	Lordship Rec protected in law by a covenant so unacceptable to propose building on it. Cannot allow few green spaces to be salami sliced in this manner.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
225	SA3665	Dr Glenys E Law	Covenant	The park is safeguarded and protected for all time by a covenant its development or sale. Local people have a right to continuity of access.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
226	SA3666	Alyson Brewer (local resident)	Covenant	The sports field has "Fields in Trust" status, which means that it must be preserved as public open space. How do you intend to override that status?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
230	SA3667	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Covenant	It is also protected by a 'Fields In Trust' covenant giving it protection for all time as a public green space.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
237	SA3668	Broadwater United Sports and Football Association	Covenant	The pitch is an integrated element of Lordship Rec. These plans go against the covenant which protects it for the community and cannot be undermined.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
247	SA3669	Christopher Currie (local	Covenant	Park is protected by a fields in trust covenant. If the covenant can be broken their is no protection for parks anywhere else.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		resident)			Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
248	SA3670	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	Covenant	Building on Lordship Rec in breach of: Fields in Trust covenant in 2012 to protect land being sold or developed. Park was runner up in award for most improved park	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
251	SA3671	Inga Bystram	Covenant	Understand Lordship Rec is protected by a trust	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3672	Friends of Lordship Rec	Covenant	Park is protected: Fields in Trust covenant in 2012 to protect land being sold or developed. Park was runner up in award for most improved park	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
256	SA3673	Reardon family	Covenant	Is council still planning to build on Lordship Rec given covenant and Lottery funding issue?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
272	SA3674	Mr R J Ferguson	Covenant	Sites proposed are ridiculous for example building on Lordship Rec which has had millions spent on it recently and is protected in perpetuity by a covenant. Clever lawyers and their procedures to get around this are not cheap.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
818	SA3675	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	Covenant	Lordship Rec Over the last 10 years Lordship Rec park users and the Friends of Lordship Rec have worked with the Parks Service to achieve a successful, nationally-celebrated, community-led regeneration of Tottenhams largest public park. The Lottery would demand their 4m grant back, as may others who have contributed. The park is safeguarded and protected for all time by a Fields In Trust covenant preventing any part of it being developed or sold off and park users have pledged to defend it. A Council planner has stated that the proposed use of a large part of the Rec for house-building is because <i>otherwise the demolitions on the estate could not go ahead</i> .	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
170	SA3676	Philippa Snoaden (local resident)	Covenant	For Lordship Rec where amount of money spent on improving is comparatively small presumably attraction is that already owned by council so is free. However, sports field is a 'field in trust' given to the nation as an amenity in perpetuity. This seems to have been overlooked or maybe overridden.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
99	SA3677	Catherine Riley (local resident)	Covenant	Lordship RG is safeguarded and protected by a 'Fields in Trust' covenant, preventing any part being developed or sold off.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
150	SA3678	Tedd Lavia (local resident)	Covenant	Lordship Rec is protected by 'Fields in Trust'. Council entered into a deed of dedication in 2013 which restricts use of ground to recreational purposes only. The park offers a clean safe environment for all and is used by the community to enjoy the open space which is limited in the area.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
5	SA3679	Katie Kinnear (resident)	Covenant	The park is safeguarded and protected by a covenant preventing development or sale	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
422	SA3680	Environment Agency	De- culverting	The Moselle Brook culvert runs through this site, however it has not been mentioned in the text and is not drawn on the location plan. This must be amended as the proposed works have the potential to damage the culvert and the condition of the culvert must be assessed before commencement of development. The SFRA identifies the culvert condition as having brickwork missing in places, loss of mortar in brick joints, bulging to brickwork and tree works intruding in places. The development of this site may have capacity to undertake improvement works or deculvert sections. This needs to be	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

				<p>explored and implemented if feasible.</p> <p>To amend this we suggest you change the text in your development guidelines to:</p> <p><i>The Moselle Brook runs in a culvert under the site and has been identified as being in a potentially poor condition. Development proposals must explore opportunities to de-culvert the Moselle Brook, with clear and robust justification provided if considered unachievable. No new buildings will be permitted within 8m of the edge of the culvert and it's condition must be commensurate with the lifetime of the development.</i></p> <p>This site has been included in your SFRA. The SFRA wrongly identifies the site as including an EA asset. This should be amended as we do not own the culvert.</p>	
146	SA3681	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Flooding	<p>Green land is required for flood defence. Land around Lordship rec is very marshy due to Moselle river. Building on such land is difficult and expensive and does not make sense from environmental angles.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
138	SA3682	Federico Calboli	Flooding	<p>The Rec is built in a flood plain so building houses there is inappropriate. Hope BWF is not a flood plain either as it was clearly built to house people as cheaply as possible. Don't repeat mistakes made in the past.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
192	SA3683	London Waterkeeper	Flooding	<p>Surface water flooding is a problem in London and Haringey has seen too much open space paved. This means more pollutants are washed into rivers and rivers become more prone to flooding. Open space is to be cherished not developed on.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
253	SA3684	Sofie Pelsmakers (local resident)	Flooding	<p>Building on the Re is contradictory to Local plan (p11) that Met Office indicates more floods and greater storm intensity. Lordship Rec is a flood zone protecting neighbouring houses. It won't be possible to reduce permeable land without compromising water storage capacity. Last year one of wettest winters and Mays and the allotments and Lordship Rec flooded preventing damage to properties.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
422	SA3685	Environment Agency	Flooding	<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. Where there is more than one flood zone (e.g. in Flood Zones 1 & 2) this 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 (AAP: NT2, NT3, NT4; SA: SA52, SA63, SA66) we suggest the following additional wording:</p> <p><i>This site is in Flood Zones 1 & 2 & 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</i></p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: Add “<i>This site is in Flood Zones 1 & 2 & 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>

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				<i>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>	
254	SA3686	Friends of Lordship Rec	Football field	Broadwater United have managed and helped maintain the football field an essential facility for youth football including the 11 teams based there. This makes a big difference to young people and part of the area's positive transformation.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
109	SA3687	Will Embliss	Football field	Broadwater United manage and help maintain sports field an essential facility for youth football. There are 11 teams based here and it has made a huge difference to young people in the area and is a key part in positive transformation.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
246	SA3688	John Mullee (local resident)	Football field	Where will BW United operate if pitch built on and community centre demolished? Children come not only for the love of sport but for direction from respected adults and to earn respect through hard work, team work and determination. The loss of the club would be a sad thing for current and future kids.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
278	SA3689	Ms S C Allen	Football field	Garden which has been cultivated for 21 years backs onto the sports field which is in constant use by many youth football teams. Furthermore the turf was removed and re-laid to improve the playing surface with funding from National Lottery during May – November 2011. This caused 7 months of daily noise, a constant and thick film of saw dust throughout my home and a garden of dirty plants which became impossible to enjoy for much of 2011. Although inconvenient this particular regeneration which included other major areas within Lordship Rec was intended to be for a good cause to help this community and rebuild its facilities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
180	SA3690	L Miller (local resident)	Football field	Sports field is a safe environment for young people to get together to build skills such as communication and promote health and well being.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
214	SA3691	Simon Butterworth (adjacent resident)	Football field	The Scheme would deprive the community of football pitches currently available to the community. As the remaining part of the Lordship Lane Recreation Ground is 'valley shaped' either side of the river Moselle there is no flat ground in the vicinity for the community on which to site replacements.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
232	SA3692	Steve Hill (local resident)	Football field	Moving football pitches would remove much needed recreational activity outlet for children aged 7 upwards. There are no similar pitches available in the area to use instead.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
224	SA3693	Anonymous (local resident)	Football field	I would also suggest that you keep the football fields that are regularly used and where the football clubs play.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
233	SA3694	Rockstone Foundation	Football field	The local football teams will have nowhere to play if the plans go ahead.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
223	SA3695	Tarin Unwin	Football field	The sports field is used by many local football teams and to take this space away from local young people would have many negative consequences, including for health and opportunity to engage in something positive	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
240	SA3696	Esther Pierce (local resident)	Football field	Where will BW United operate if pitch built on and community centre demolished? Children come not only for the love of sport but for direction from respected adults and to earn respect through hard work, team work and determination. The loss of the club would be a sad thing for current and future kids.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
237	SA3697	Broadwater	Football field	Our organisation is the leading provider of sports and youth activity within	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		United Sports and Football Association		the borough and we have a proud record of gaining milestones of achievement for all of our young participants. Ongoing success in local youth football due to home football pitch at the back of the Community Centre, that has meant can host matches including teams from around the world.	Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
247	SA3698	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Football field	The area includes only sports field home to 11 football teams which promote healthy activities for youth and keep them out of antisocial activities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
818	SA3699	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	Football field	Sports Field Broadwater United officials and volunteers have managed and helped maintain this essential facility for youth football for over 20 years there are currently 11 teams based there. This has made a huge difference to young people in the area, being a key part of the areas positive transformation. [See BUSAFA statement/objection]	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
187	SA3700	Eleanor Hooker (local resident)	Football field	This is a well used park which shouldn't be used to meet housing targets particularly as the sports grounds are used by young people in the area who aren't well served by other facilities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
623	SA3701	Cllr Felicia Opoku, and separate identical response as local resident	Football field	Lordship Rec is a protected site. Reduction of the park by one third is something that should not have been considered. Additionally, the football park should also not be removed/reduced. Many residents both in Broadwater area as well as beyond use this facility and it has helped improve the health of service users. Any open space that developers would like to make should be additional to existing green space.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
225	SA3702	Dr Glenys E Law	Football field	Haringey desperately needs its green open spaces and its sports clubs. How many hundreds more young men will be out on the streets looking for excitement, if they can't go to their local park and be in a local football club? Do you think the answer to the riots of a few years ago is to make young people feel even more resentful and disenfranchised?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
243	SA3703	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Gate	Main gate is Lordship Lane gate	Noted.
571	SA3704	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Gate	The main gate of the Lordship Recreation Ground is the Lordship Lane gate. This provides – at this high point – the main ceremonial entrance to the Recreation Ground, from which it can be viewed in its entirety. It is thus of vital importance to the identity and status of the Recreation Ground. We believe this part of the Rec is of inseparable integrity to the whole.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
140	SA3705	Laura Pickering	Green space	Green space in London is precious. Lordship Rec prides itself on having a varied ecosystem so using to temporarily house people is unacceptable. Lottery funding has been used too.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
180	SA3706	L Miller (local resident)	Green space	Developing BWF leaves little green space in an already built up area	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
182	SA3707	Ellie Tindal	Green space	Green space is valuable for health, well being, leisure and cohesion of the community. High quality green space increases house prices and improves local economies. They should be protected from development	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

194	SA3708	Julie Woodall & family (adjacent residents)	Green space	Please do not build on precious green space. Preserve for future residents.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
204	SA3709	Katherine Currie (local resident)	Green space	Haringey does not have enough green space for people to enjoy (it fails to meet required ration) and if population density increases such space will be even more needed if people are to be able to rest and recover their equilibrium.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
217	SA3710	Andie Frost	Green space	Strongly opposed to reduction of size of parks or public amenities. Haringey needs more parks and open spaces, not less. Any reduction would be a dereliction of duty by the officers of the council and a betrayal of trust to the electorate by the members of the council.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
227	SA3711	A Crawford, K Docherty and J Crawford-Docherty	Green space	The park has recently been invested in and is well used. The park provides much needed green space for an already very populated & increasingly populated London	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
247	SA3712	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Green space	Tottenham has green space well below nationally recommended minimum. In light of increase population and reduction of green space, including to private owners, is outrageous.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
253	SA3713	Sofie Pelsmakers (local resident)	Green space	Building on a park, well used and loved by local people means we can never get that land back. It will be forever lost. Given the increasing density in the borough and lack of large open spaces nearby - it is outrageous this is even being considered.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
25	SA3714	Sophie Mcilwain (resident)	Green space	Tottenham is overcrowded, polluted and noisy and building in any city on green space is absurd	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
27	SA3715	Will van der Knapp (local resident)	Green space	Objects as the use of parkland for building is completely unacceptable even if it is temporary	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
36	SA3716	Ruth Hastings Iqball and Mohamed Iqball	Green space	Strongly objects to the loss of green space. London's parks should be protected.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
41	SA3717	M Duerden & K Klier (local resident)	Green space	Local parks are incredibly important for all residents and plans to build on Lordship rec are distressing and unacceptable.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
139	SA3718	Tracey Tindall	Green space	Insufficient undeveloped green space in the city	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA3719	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Green space	Increasing density means access to green areas is vital. More not less is required. Gardens are being built on and green space is being lost at a bewildering speed. Losing public space is not good planning for the future.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
149	SA3720	Martin Braund	Green space	Ripping to pieces award winning parks shows incredible stupidity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
150	SA3721	Tedd Lavia (local resident)	Green space	Building on Lordship Rec will leave the locals with limited green space in an already built up area	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

					Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
345	SA3722	S. Dobie	Green space	Lordship Rec is a much used local green space and should not be built on .	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
386	SA3723	Colin P. Holyhead	Green space	The Lordship Recreation Ground, I would consider sacrosanct, as it is parkland and through the efforts of the Friends of the Park and local people, it now has paradise like conditions.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
386	SA3724	Colin P. Holyhead	Green space	Please don't spoil it now by overdevelopment but preserve the park for future generations.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
391	SA3725	Craig Kennedy, Local resident – Gloucester Road	Green space	Understand that a consultation taking place, with a view to build on Lordship Rec. If the plan to build goes ahead, our park is gone forever. Parks are very important places in our brick and concrete cities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
173	SA3726	Jonathan Maris	Green space	Green spaces are a huge benefit and draw to the area. Taking bits of them is short sighted and won't benefit the area. Protect what is good don't destroy it.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
208	SA3727	Yvonne Say (local resident)	Green space	London is famous around the world for the number of beautiful parks it has protected to provide essential therapeutic space for its communities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
121	SA3728	Joe Bryant (adjacent resident)	Green space	Dismayed that SA63 includes Lordship Rec for housing development. We must protect our relatively few green spaces in London	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
235	SA3729	Dara O'Reilly (local resident)	Green space	Building on Lordship Rec, a much loved community facility is unacceptable. Green space is at an absolute premium and to squander limited space that is held in trust by the local authority is short-sighted and foolish.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA3730	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Green space	Developing this land would be a betrayal to the community. Loss of public open space cannot be justified; the rec needs to be preserved in its entirety and the pressure to build on it resisted for the good of future generations.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3731	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Green space	We believe the Council has a clear and overriding duty to preserve and enhance this most important of Haringey's open green spaces.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
341	SA3732	Jennie Pedley	Health and well being	The parkland and sports field are vital for the physical and mental health of local residents.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
183	SA3733	Michelle Lawson (local resident)	Health and well being	Unthinkable that building on Lordship Rec is being considered. We must work together to ensure residents have access to plenty of green space for health and mental well-being.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
163	SA3734	Federico Picinali	Health and wellbeing	Lordship Rec is a wonderful park which offers the opportunity to perform outdoor activities in an excessively developed area. Without the park people will rely on pubs and the mall to socialise. A healthy community cannot just rely on these.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
230	SA3735	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Health and wellbeing	Tottenham is a densely populated area and green space is vital for both physical and mental well-being and for community cohesion.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
159	SA3736	Mrs V A Macdonald (adjacent	Health	Lordship Rec is precious parkland from which the community and BWF residents benefit in their physical and mental health. The park is essential, a valuable community asset. Council should be protecting it.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		resident)			
208	SA3737	Yvonne Say (local resident)	Health	This lovely open space should not be converted into housing, as it is well known that stress levels and ill health are induced by cramming people too close together.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
204	SA3738	Katherine Currie (local resident)	Health	Space and greenery are vital for public health. Back2Earth and TCV have a wonderful garden on BWF where people can sit and relax and children play. A poor community needs somewhere families can enjoy themselves without spending money.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
216	SA3739	Tamsyn Wills (local resident)	Health	Cannot accept that there should be a huge loss of green space. There will be even more people to appreciate and depend on the park and its facilities. Families living in confined spaces as defined by Agenda 21, are more likely to end up with mental and physical health problems unless they can escape and interact with nature and fresh air. Take away the green space and you take away peoples sanity and quality of life.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
224	SA3740	Anonymous (local resident)	Hedgerow	Replace the wonderful hedgerow that will be lost at the Lordship Lane end of the Rec. Hedgerows are so marvellous and they are under threat. There are other hedgerows in the Rec of course but that would be a lot to just lose.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
382	SA3741	J.M. Jachim	Historic character	Lordship Rec. is linked with one of the first garden suburbs, a conservation area of social housing par excellence. Locally cottages from the Art Deco period and older villas nestle side by side, forming a delightful mix which typifies the area – an ambience which is Tottenham.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
227	SA3742	A Crawford, K Docherty and J Crawford-Docherty	Legality	Legally we are not sure how it is possible to use park land for this purpose.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3743	Friends of Lordship Rec	Lordship Rec	The estate and park have won national awards for successful community-led regeneration and empowerment and are admired throughout the UK and beyond.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
382	SA3744	J.M. Jachim	Lordship Rec	Lordship Rec. Provides a vital green breathing space, filtering out dirt from heavily polluted London, helping to keep us healthy.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
119	SA3745	Ceri Williams (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Existing residents should not be decanted away from the area. The park should be sacrosanct.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
127	SA3746	Luci Davin (local resident)	Green space	Loss of space for children and adults to play, take part in sport and relax.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
136	SA3747	Thomas Anderson (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Well used and well loved park and the only one in this part of the borough where there is a large open expanse of land. These parks are important for Londoners living in fairly confined quarters.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
154	SA3748	Susan Turner	Lordship Rec	The park does not belong to Haringey Council it belongs to the people of Tower Garden, surrounding streets and Lordship Lane. Council will be challenged and needs to look at the history of Lordship Lane and the rec	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
155	SA3749	David Corio (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Award winning park planning on decimating.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
169	SA3750	Gareth and Bonnie Walker	Lordship Rec	Loss of a cherished amenity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
172	SA3751	Brian Belle-Fortune (local	Lordship Rec	Tottenham is already densely populated. We rely on the Rec for our breathing space on the same way as people around Hampstead Heath do.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		resident)			Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
175	SA3752	Abdul Bham and Judith Ironside (adjacent resident)	Lordship Rec	The disruption will ruin enjoyment of the park which is now a much appreciated local amenity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
176	SA3753	Beewan Athwal (adjacent resident)	Lordship Rec	Widely used public space which has been greatly improves. To take away this green space would be detrimental to Tottenham's residents.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
177	SA3754	Stella Smith	Lordship Rec	The Rec is the lungs of Tottenham and if built on will deprive the community including those without gardens of an area of beauty and space to breath	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
180	SA3755	L Miller (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Lordship Rec is a safe clean environment and well used by community including Health Centre which holds walks to improve patients' wellbeing	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
191	SA3756	Russell Wyatt (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Lordship Rec is a wonderful park regularly used. Having green space in an urban environment is essential to our mental and physical health. Building on Lordship Rec would be a downgrade to the local amenity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
209	SA3757	Rosemary Hollis (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Particularly concerned about threat to Lordship Rec and implications for residents in proposed redevelopment area.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
212	SA3758	Pete Simmons (local resident)	Lordship Rec	All for the wide open spaces and use the park each morning, also a friend thinks it is the best park in London. There have been some great things done and sense of community established. All for redevelopment, regeneration and maybe some gentrification of Tottenham but a massive pull factor for the area is the Rec with its terraced houses. It is of critical importance to the desirability of the area to keep it in its current form.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
220	SA3759	Daniel Cressey (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Improvements must not come at the cost of the loss of local parkland. It is vital local green space for many, many people. The park must be preserved in its current state. Failure to do this will be a disaster for local residents and in the long term for Haringey, as the council will find that it becomes a less desirable place to live.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
224	SA3760	Anonymous (local resident)	Lordship Rec	Some people will instinctively hate losing part of the Rec. That part of it is not heavily used even in the summer and it is a big space. Most people congregate around the hub in the south. Even if we lost some of it there would still be plenty of room for the Rec Festival in the autumn.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
226	SA3761	Alyson Brewer (local resident)	Lordship Rec	The proposal will be little short of vandalism. It would reduce the area of this beautiful park and the glorious sense of space in our heavily built up area would be ruined together with its appeal to many users.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
230	SA3762	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Lordship Rec	This park is a highly valued asset for local residents, providing much needed access to green space for relaxation and exercise and for contact with nature.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
243	SA3763	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Lordship Rec	Far more important amenity space than other nearby green spaces.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

243	SA3764	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Lordship Rec	White Hart Lane ward is deprived but access to Lordship Rec is one of the things ensuring a high quality of life, recreational opportunities, social and amenity space that promotes social harmony, wellbeing and cohesion.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3765	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Lordship Rec	Tottenham suffers from a range of social deprivations, all of which are ameliorated by the presence of the Recreation Ground, and all of which would be inclined to worsen significantly if such a large part of the Rec were to be lost to housing development.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
141	SA3766	Joan Curtis (local resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship Rec refurbished with national lottery fund money and is a fantastic resource for the local community and visitors to the enhanced facilities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
135	SA3767	Regina McLennan (local resident)	Lottery fund	Recent multi million pound redevelopment has brought users back to the park where once it felt unsafe and derelict.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
10	SA3768	Clare O'Boy (Tottenham resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship RG has recently had a £4 upgrade. It was out of action during this period and this would happen again	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
11	SA3769	Sarah Bayley (Tottenham resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship RG has recently had a £4 upgrade. It was out of action during this period and this would happen again	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
153	SA3770	Michael Hodges (local resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship Rec has been improved through lottery funding. It is an amenity used by a wide range of residents facilitating community cohesion.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
151	SA3771	Sylvia Oland (local resident)	Lottery fund	Can't believe would contemplate building on Lordship Rec. The park has received lottery funding, matched by council, has greatly improved facilities and is used for so many for leisure.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
182	SA3772	Ellie Tindal	Lottery fund	How can a park be included when invested in so heavily and improved through lottery fund	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
193	SA3773	Maureen Black (local resident)	Lottery fund	The Heritage Lottery funding has transformed the Rec, and it is likely they would ask for their money back.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
208	SA3774	Yvonne Say (local resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship Rec has had millions of pounds of lottery money spent turning it into a beautiful natural resource for all the community to enjoy - it should not be turned into a building site for years	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
204	SA3775	Katherine Currie (local resident)	Lottery fund	Friends of Lordship rec and local community campaigned for regeneration of the park and got a £3.8million grant in October 2010. Leader quoted as saying was an excellent partnership between council and community. Why is council now happy to destroy what was created and betray the trust placed in it by the Heritage Lottery Fund and the local community?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
213	SA3776	Elizabeth Adams (local resident)	Lottery fund	£4m in Lottery money has only recently been poured into the 'Rec' to ensure that the local community can benefit more from it for sport and numerous activities in the new 'Hub'	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
219	SA3777	Mark Pickworth (local resident)	Lottery fund	Lordship Rec has just been regenerated after a long and successful community campaign, and £4m from the National Lottery Fund. These proposals to build housing on part of the park would destroy much of what has been achieved.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
236	SA3778	Catherine	Lottery fund	Heritage lottery funding and work of the Council and local community has	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		Collingborn (local resident)		resulted in massive improvements in Lordship Rec. All these efforts would be negated if the proposal was to go ahead and the Lottery funding might be required to be repaid	Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
247	SA3779	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Lottery fund	Breach of trust with Heritage Lottery Fund would make council an unreliable partner for future grants. Serious breach of councillors' duty to residents and electors.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
251	SA3780	Inga Bystram	Lottery fund	Lottery fund would object strongly if the land was built on.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
248	SA3781	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	Lottery fund	Building on Lordship Rec in breach of: contract between council and Heritage Lottery Fund to protect and maintain Rec's facilities until 2037	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3782	Friends of Lordship Rec	Lottery fund	Park is protected: contract between council and Heritage Lottery Fund to protect and maintain Rec's facilities until 2037. Lottery would demand money back.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
109	SA3783	Will Embliss	Lottery fund	The Lottery will demand their £4 million grant back	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
173	SA3784	Jonathan Maris	Lottery fund	The lottery would demand their £4m grant back.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
230	SA3785	Ms H Steel (local resident)	MOL	Lordship Recreation Ground should immediately be removed from any development plans. It is protected Metropolitan Open Land which is equivalent to Green Belt (management plan p12)	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
236	SA3786	Catherine Collingborn (local resident)	MOL	Lordship Rec is Metropolitan Open Land and Fields in Trust and as such is protected from development	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
248	SA3787	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	MOL	Building on Lordship Rec in breach of: its status as MOL land	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3788	Friends of Lordship Rec	MOL	Park is protected: as MOL land	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
414	SA3789	GLA	MOL	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. It is noted that the red line boundary also includes part (approximately 6.6 hectares) of the Lordship Lane recreation ground – an area of Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) that is afforded strategic protection through London Plan Policy 7.17. The Council's stated intention to explore opportunities to enhance linkages between this open space and others in the area is supported in principle. However, in accordance with Policy 7.17, GLA officers take the view that as a first principle Lordship Lane recreation ground should be retained as a coherent	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

				and contiguous expanse of open space. 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. Accordingly, GLA officers do not anticipate that the allocated area of Lordship Lane recreation ground would be subject to residential development, and recommend that the red line boundary of the site allocation is revised to remove Lordship Lane recreation ground. Notwithstanding this, GLA officers would welcome further discussion with the Council with respect to how the desired networking of green spaces through the area might be achieved in the context of the broader regenerative proposals for this site.	
419	SA3790	Haringey Liberal Democrat Group	MOL	This site includes 66,000sq.m of MOL (part of Lordship Recreation Ground). We are not satisfied that the council has done enough to ensure there will not be loss of MOL. We believe any development of the MOL should be avoided.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
192	SA3791	London Waterkeeper	Moselle River	Opposition as building on Lordship Rec will reduce further the quality of Moselle River and its watershed	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
382	SA3792	J.M. Jachim	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	People from all walks of life enjoy Lordship Rec., love it and look after it. Do not tamper with it. It is part of Tottenham's heritage.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
435	SA3793	Ertogrul Ibrahim (adjacent resident)	Open space	The proposals will violate limited open space and cause much disruption and have a negative impact on us.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
382	SA3794	J.M. Jachim, Local resident – Walpole Road	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	I find it beyond belief that the Council could be cynical enough to contemplate development in Lordship Recreation Ground.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
8	SA3795	Geraldine Turvey	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Comments that councils 'have your say' document says council will protect Haringey's open spaces and ensure access. Therefore does not understand and objects to Lordship RG redevelopment.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
122	SA3796	Emily Unell	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	This proposal would damage Lordship RG which is a valuable community resource. There is a lack of green spaces in Tottenham. It is a fantastic park and a great resource used by the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
126	SA3797	Holly Cassidy	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Objects to building on the rec as it is precious green space. It needs to stay that way so everyone can enjoy it. It's a place to go running, play football, walk dogs and somewhere to enjoy peace and quiet in the busy city.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
128	SA3798	Lynda Brennan	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Opposes building on Lordship RG. It is one of the most beautiful parks in the area and caters for everyone.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
131	SA3799	Peter Corley	Opposes development on Lordship	Object to proposals to demolish part of BWF and build on Lordship Rec considering public money spent on park and Tottenham's only large open space on the west side.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

			Rec		
132	SA3800	Wayne Walters (local resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Unacceptable to build on Lordship Rec when demolishing / redeveloping BWF. Assume is not viable.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
140	SA3801	Laura Pickering	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Argue against Lordship Rec for people who may be displaced by BWF redevelopment.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
144	SA3802	Stephen Whittle (local resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Strongly objects to this proposal. Haringey Council has been assiduous on not building on precious open spaces therefore surprised by proposal to build on one of the most valuable open spaces in Tottenham.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
147	SA3803	Amanda Been	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Objects to building housing on Lordship Rec as it is one of the only open spaces in Haringey and is of great need and happiness to people near it.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
160	SA3804	Eva Atkins	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Why has part of Lordship Rec been included. This is valuable green space which should be left alone (or add a playground or other decent attraction in the north)	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
193	SA3805	Maureen Black (local resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Objects to building on Lordship Rec to temporarily house people from BWF. The Rec is a local amenity for the whole community, including sports pitches, and open green spaces which are so important in an urban area like Tottenham.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
203	SA3806	Mary L Ford	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Tax money has provided a vital outdoor, ecological space for people, plants and animals. Proposals to ruin this are absurd and show incompetency amongst council officers.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
207	SA3807	Erica Ward	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Shocked at plans to cover a third of Lordship Rec with housing. The park is highly valued by the community and the much needed sense of openness that you get would be severely impaired by a reduction of such scale.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
195	SA3808	David Stoker	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Shock and concern at plans to build flats on Lordship Rec. This would tear out the jewel out of Haringey's park landscape. Quality of life would suffer. Save Lordship Rec.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
231	SA3809	Diana Shelley (local resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Appalled to find a proposal to build over any part of such a wonderful open space. That is a sorry contrast to what most borough councils, of whatever political colour, would contemplate. It is a sorry contrast, too, to the Council's own laudable attempt to protect the Plevna Crescent site. I understand Lordship Rec is actually protected by a covenant, and wonder even more at the attempt to change its use.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
242	SA3810	Karin Lock	Opposes development on Lordship	These plans are short-sighted because these developments will destroy the positive benefits of the borough that would encourage people to move here in the first place.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

			Rec		
243	SA3811	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	The inclusion of Lordship Rec will be damaging to Tower Gardens residents. Separating the park and estate would have negative social and environment costs for residents.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
277	SA3812	Anonymous 2 (local resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Against: encroachment on Lordship Lane park (green space), one third taken the start of absorbing the whole area	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
695	SA3813	Russell Dove, local resident	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	I object to any plan to build on Lordship Rec. The proposal to build on Lordship Rec is unacceptable in principle and must be withdrawn. It is hard to imagine how such an appalling idea could ever have been put to paper by council officers. The proposals represent a loss of almost one third of the area of the park. As a matter of principle, the council must not build on green sites, here or elsewhere in the borough. If building is allowed on public open space here, on land held in trust for the community, the protections of all open space anywhere else in the borough, from Highgate Woods to the Lea Valley, will be shown to be worthless. Or is it only acceptable here, like the excessively high buildings proposed for sensitive historic sites elsewhere in the documents, because this is Tottenham and Tottenham does not matter? This is an award-winning park recently refurbished with substantial public and other funds, and is a vital amenity to local residents. Open space will be even more essential if the increase in housing density goes ahead.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
645	SA3814	Keith Dobie, local resident	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Objects to Building on award winning parks and playing fields (Lordship Rec').	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3815	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Strongly opposed to any suggestion of building on Lordship Recreation Ground, whether this is permanent or temporary. Has high local and strategic value.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
672	SA3816	Jonathan Maris	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Park should be protected and improved, not built upon	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
678	SA3817	Lynda Brennan, Tottenham Theatre	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	I want to add my voice to opposing the building of temporary houses in Lordship Rec So much effort has gone in the transformation of this park. It is a nationally acclaimed park and is fully used by many Haringey residents including of course people from Broadwater Farm Estate As the director of Tottenham Theatre I have worked in The Hub in the Rec and often locally with young people from Tottenham. I am appalled at cuts	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				in sports provision of all kinds but cutting from Broadwater would be a stupidly short sighted act flying in the face of labours work for young people and regeneration	
4	SA3818	Beatrice Peries-Brown (site resident)	Opposes development on Lordship Rec	Objects to building on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
2	SA3819	Stephen Brown (site resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Objects to building on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
5	SA3820	Katie Kinnear (resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Objects to building on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
6	SA3821	John Hodgkinson (resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Objects to development on Lordship Recreation Ground	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
7	SA3822	Peter Thomlinson (local resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Opposes destruction of Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
22	SA3823	Nick Putz (local resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Opposes building on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
49	SA3824	P Cole (local resident)	Opposes development on LRG	Opposes plans to build on Lordship RG. This is a criminal act of unforgiveable arrogance.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
80	SA3825	Murray Wyatt	Opposes development on LRG	These plans must not happen. Building on the park ruins the local green space and football team for the sake of developers. These developers are thirsty for money and take away the homes of the poorer people in Haringey.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
341	SA3826	Jennie Pedley	Opposition	The parkland and sports field should not be built on.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
24	SA3827	Anthony Jelley	Opposition	Does not support development on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
143	SA3828	Sandra Saad and Youssef Saad (local residents)	Opposition	Opposed to building on Lordship Rec.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
26	SA3829	Iona McCaie	Opposition	Does not support development on Lordship RG	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
200	SA3830	Ebony Riddell Bamber (adjacent resident)	Park protected	Understand Lordship Rec is protected open space. The park is an invaluable asset to the local community in one of the most deprived areas of the borough.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
143	SA3831	Sandra Saad	Park protected	The recreation grounds are protected so why has this proposal been put	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		and Youssef Saad (local residents)		forward? Chose to live here for parks and is unacceptable to build on it for any reason.	Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
382	SA3832	J.M. Jachim	Park protected	Lordship Rec. is protected from those who would destroy this ambience by legislation in perpetuity. Any attempt to dodge this is invidious.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
9	SA3833	Anne Stewart (councillor)	Park protected	The land is protected as open space therefore requests this proposal is removed from the plan.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
207	SA3834	Erica Ward	Park protected	Proposal goes against a number of council's own policies in particular SP13 Open space and biodiversity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
207	SA3835	Erica Ward	Park protected	Also against Strategic Policies which states development will not be permitted on open spaces unless limited scale and ancillary to uses and for which there is a demonstrable need. This is not small scale given that it is taking up so much of the park to the detriment of its openness, appearance and setting.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
818	SA3836	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	Park protection	Some key Council policies protecting open space include Page 45 of the Local Plans Development Management DPD [DM26 quoted in full].	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
818	SA3837	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	Park protection	The whole park is protected in the following important ways: as Metropolitan Open Land, Fields In Trust, 2015-2025 Lordship Rec Management Plan	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
248	SA3838	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	Park protection	Building on Lordship Rec in breach of: DMDPD which restricts grant of planning permission that would result in loss of open space	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
254	SA3839	Friends of Lordship Rec	Park protection	Building on Lordship Rec in breach of DMDPD which restricts grant of planning permission that would result in loss of open space unless assessment shows open space is surplus.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
234	SA3840	Asher Jacobsberg (adjacent resident)	Park regeneration	Park redevelopment was funded on the basis would be an outdoor space for the community. It is essential to the community enterprise, the hub. Tearing it up would do immense damage to an area that is on the up without the need for private redevelopment.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
205	SA3841	L. Morgan (adjacent resident)	Park size	The proposal will cause a substantial reduction in size of one of the best parks in Haringey and London	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
135	SA3842	Regina McLennan (local resident)	Park size	The park's size improves air quality and its configuration gives a sense of being in the country. The park should remain for people who spent years redeveloping it.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
109	SA3843	Will Embliss (local resident)	Park use	Uses the park daily. It has improved so much since the 1990s and is a real community asset in a deprived area.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
114	SA3844	Jackie Ekim	Park use	Long term resident. Been part of the efforts to improve the neighbourhood and frequent park user for many reasons i.e. walking, cycling, football, dog walking. Very important that the plan is stopped.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
418	SA3845	Sport England	Policy Justification	<i>Further clarity is required around allocation SA 63: Broad Water Farm area. 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</i>	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

				<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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 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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p><i>plan document could be considered unsound.</i></p> <p><i>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: https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/planning-tools-and-guidance/playing-pitch-strategy-guidance/) in place at the point of allocation which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Sport England would expect any policy to be very explicit on the need to retain (in playing field use) and not prejudice the use of the existing playing field.</i></p>	
230	SA3846	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Covenant	<p>A press release from the Council in 2013; quotes the Cabinet Member for the Environment "The council and the community's joint efforts have resulted in an open space that is a truly awesome community asset. Now that the Rec has QE11 status it will be protected as an open space for ever."</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
9	SA3847	Anne Stewart	Recent improvements	<p>Concerned about the negative impact development would have on the open space. Development could ruin all the work that has gone into preserving the rec as a community asset.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
803	SA3848	Liz Young	Recent improvements	<p>Lordship Recreation Ground is a fantastic resource and contributes to a greater quality of life for local people. This park has been refurbished with lottery money and it is very well used. I appreciate that housing is needed but building on parkland is a terrible option. Why in Tottenham too? The biggest green space in Haringey is Alexandra Park - has the council considered building on any of it? People in Tottenham are an easy target.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
382	SA3849	J.M. Jachim	Recent improvements	<p>Lordship Rec has recently received Green Flag status for its excellence. Millions of pounds have been poured into this open space.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
243	SA3850	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Recent improvements	<p>Rec has received huge investment in new landscaping with wild flower meadows and tree planting</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
129	SA3851	Catherine Suttle	Recent improvements	<p>Oppose takeover of part of Lordship Rec. The community has spent a lot of time and money on the park and facilities. Offensive to hear that council proposes to take community land to house displaced people while developers take their housing for private profit.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
171	SA3852	Frances Bradshaw	Recent improvements	<p>Careful consideration and participation by local people was key to success of regeneration of Lordship Rec. It's fantastic to see all the activities now going on it the park and can only assume those who made this proposal are completely unfamiliar with what happens in the park.</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
184	SA3853	Caroline Jepson (adjacent resident)	Recent improvements	<p>Lots of work has gone into improving the park and usage has increased which will continue with opening of Eco Hub. Losing the north of the park would be devastating for the sense of space. Surely with a higher density population open space needs to be protected for the physical and mental health of residents</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>
196	SA3854	Paul Wheeler (local resident)	Recent improvements	<p>Horrified that council would consider building on Lordship Rec. Open green space protected by covenant must remain just that. These plans do not take into account the destructive impact that building on green space would have on the community and the endeavours build the community as part of the</p>	<p>Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation.</p> <p>Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground</p>

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				park regeneration. Disturbed by precedent this would set.	
223	SA3855	Tarin Unwin	Recent improvements	Building on the sports field will diminish the feeling of green space in Lordship Rec, so essential for urban dwellers. It has only recently been much improved by daylighting the Moselle and many other improvements. This would be a step backwards.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
233	SA3856	Rockstone Foundation	Recent improvements	Redevelopment on Lordship Rec will potentially take up an area currently used by football teams and sports networks, a bike repair space and cycling hub – (organisation has 5 year lease for youth engagement, cycling and educational programmes) and user groups from the Lordship Rec User Forum - who campaign to preserve green spaces in Haringey and the wider area.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
240	SA3857	Esther Pierce (local resident)	Recent improvements	Park is vital part of the community especially as people don't have their own gardens. It is well used by a variety of people. The Friends worked hard to win lottery funding. Improvements were done in recognition of the value of the park to the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
246	SA3858	John Mullee (local resident)	Recent improvements	Park is vital part of the community especially as people don't have their own gardens. It is well used by a variety of people. The Friends worked hard to win lottery funding. Improvements were done in recognition of the value of the park to the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
257	SA3859	Broadwater Farm Residents' Association	Recent improvements	Horrified to learn about plans to build on ordship Rec. It is where the young people play sports. It is a beautiful area and has had a lot of money spent on it. Building on it would be an act of vandalism and cannot believe council is seriously considering such a plan.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
639	SA3860	Francesca Hall, local resident	Recent improvements	Lordship Rec - this is a valuable community resource fundraised by local people, and it is vital to maintain this as it is.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
124	SA3861	Mrs D Conaghan	Recent improvements	Do not agree with development on Lordship RG. The park has just been regenerated with funds from the lottery fund and is used by the local community. This is a green area and should not be taken to build more social housing as there is already new housing being developed in the area. Parkland should be kept for use by the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
130	SA3862	Issy Harvey (local resident)	Recent improvements	Lordship Rec is a unique open space enjoyed by the local community. Community involvement in regeneration of the area is a rare example of community cohesion in action. Football diverted boys from anti social activities.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
145	SA3863	Lynda Jessopp	Recent improvements	Concerns regarding building on Lordship Rec. Seems extraordinary given external funding for Lordship Rec and build the hub. It is much improved and better used.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
152	SA3864	Helen Oliver (adjacent resident)	Recent improvements	The rec has improved after a lot of hard work from residents and is busy all year round and much valued by the community. It gives the diverse community a natural space to mix and meet and building on it would be detrimental to the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
159	SA3865	Mrs V A Macdonald (adjacent resident)	Recent improvements	Time, money and effort have been expended very recently to improve Lordship Rec. Money was raised from a number of sources and the park lauded.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
164	SA3866	Holly and Michael Browne (local residents)	Recent improvements	Sad that redevelopment of Lordship Rec will be ruined and council will have to pay back lottery grant in times of austerity.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

167	SA3867	Reba Johnson	Recent improvements	Plans to destroy Lordship Rec are terrible. People have worked so hard to make this a lovely place for local people. It is a community venture. It belongs to the community.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
178	SA3868	Dan Rosenberg & Sagarika Chatterjee	Recent improvements	Proposal to use Lordship Rec is absurd and goes against planning policies. This proposal will destroy the enjoyment of the area. It has taken years of hard work to get where it is and now is packed with families enjoying it.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
205	SA3869	L. Morgan (adjacent resident)	Recent improvements	Lives in the area because of parks including Lordship Rec. It is one of the nicest in the local community and London. It is green flag, lottery funded and should be seen as a jewel of Haringey – not something to sell off. What is being proposed will change the area. Disgusted as a local resident who will be affected.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
215	SA3870	George Britovsek & Johanna Wadsley (adjacent residents)	Recent improvements	Particularly concerned about plans to build on Lordship Rec as is well used by hundreds every day. The parks recent development has made it an accessible community asset and it should be left alone for enjoyment for generations to come	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
211	SA3871	Veronica Bailey Straffon and James Straffon (local residents)	Recent improvements	This area has just been re-developed with great support from community and Heritage Lottery Fund. Lordship Rec has reached a high green flag standard. The new cafe is in use and natural habitats for birds and wildlife restored.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
221	SA3872	Mr O'Connell (site resident)	Recent improvements	What about building on Lordship Rec which has recently had millions of pounds of work done on it?	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
226	SA3873	Alyson Brewer (local resident)	Recent improvements	Shocked SA63 includes Lordship Rec. The park has undergone restoration with lottery funding and community involvement. Public usage by a variety of groups has increased. Friends group has done a lot of voluntary work and their work is greatly appreciated by all users of the park and sports ground.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
229	SA3874	Woodlands Park Residents Association	Recent improvements	it will ruin the improvements to Lordship Recreation Ground that have been the focus of a substantial regeneration programme in recent years and may contravene conditions attached to some of the funding streams used to carry out the works	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
232	SA3875	Steve Hill (local resident)	Recent improvements	Building on the north end would affect the whole park both aesthetically and practically regarding access from the north. There has been extensive time and money spent on regenerating the Rec for the benefit for all residents. Buildings in the north would curtail the likelihood of Tower Gardens residents using the park as well as diminishing green spaces available in the area. The park would also be less visible from Lordship Lane, the major road adjacent to the park.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
238	SA3876	Margaret Burr	Recent improvements	Implications for Lordship Rec, one of most attractive and welcoming places in Tottenham, are unacceptable. So much has been done to improve the Rec, some external funding which will affect other applications for grants if outcomes and benefits ignored.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
239	SA3877	Rose McFadzean	Recent improvements	1985 riots did a lot of damage to the area and the park became neglected. Over the last few years money has been spent improving it and making it safer including new well used cafe and community centre.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
429	SA3878	Simona Sideri	Recent improvements	Parks are a vital part of the city and Lordship Rec is used by thousands of people. The recent redevelopment of the Rec has made it even more inviting and it is greatly used and loved. There are surely better places to build new	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				houses than on park land which is necessary for all the people in the area and gives many the only access they have to outside space in nature.	
622	SA3879	Rebecca Opoku, local resident	Recent improvements	I strongly object to any proposals to build on Lordship Rec. Lordship Rec is a protected site which recently received Heritage Lottery Funding. Friends of Lordship Rec worked extremely hard to clear up the area and transform it to what it is today. I regularly use the area as well as many residents who do not live in the Broadwater Area as this is one of the few parks we have. The red line boundary across Lordship Rec and also the football fields near the community centre should be removed. There should not be a loss to existing social housing on this site. It should be re-provided on a like for like basis. Any open space developers would like to make should be additional to the existing green space.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
633	SA3880	Anne Gray, Local Resident	Recent improvements	The proposal to build on the park is absolutely abhorrent, given the vast public investment in it and the labour of many volunteers to make this a prized park	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
104	SA3881	Francis Blake and Alexandra Harley	Recent improvements	Lordship RG has only recently been improved in terms of appearance and is now a delightful park which Tottenham deserves and needs. To allow any erosion of the land would be a tragedy.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3882	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Recent improvements	Lordship Recreation Ground is Tottenham's equivalent of Hyde Park. After years of relative neglect, in recent years it has received a massive investment in new landscaping and community activities, volunteering, recreation and engagement.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
243	SA3883	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Recreation	Origins of Rec and Tower gardens estate are intertwined. It is where residents have gone for recreation for almost 100 years	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
214	SA3884	Simon Butterworth (adjacent resident)	Recreational space	Even were pitches to be placed in the remaining areas, the space then left available for the community for other recreational purposes would be substantially reduced as a result.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
108	SA3885	Jacky Wedgwood	Riots	Please keep Lordship RG. It is of great benefit to the community. Don't try and cram too many houses into an already overpopulated area. It will lead to more riots if young people haven't got parks in which to let off steam and play sport.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
192	SA3886	London Waterkeeper	Storms	Building on Lordship Rec would reduce resilience to storms as well as damaging a vital green space, highly valued by local people.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
222	SA3887	Fraser Borwick	Support	Council is unable to provide full maintenance of the park, so it makes sense to use some of it for badly needed housing. The current park is enormous, barren grassland which has to be cut regularly. The football pitches to the north-east could be moved into the rec ground itself while the land they currently occupy is used for redevelopment. The wildlife habitat currently	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				provided in the park is very limited. Opportunities to enhance it were unfortunately missed by the recent lottery redevelopment (despite our efforts!)	
681	SA3888	Olivia Festy	Temporary housing	We understand that people need to be rehoused but think this can be planned better so that We do not have to build into the park space. Also we would want reassurance that if you are building into the park space, that this will only be a temporary build.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3889	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Value	The designation of this major park as a ‘recreation ground’ might lead some to accord it less value than a formal park, but this would be entirely at odds with its value to the local community, to wildlife, and to the visual amenity and landscape of Tottenham.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
571	SA3890	Matthew Bradby, Chair, Tottenham Civic Society	Views	In terms of its importance in the landscape, the views from Lordship Lane to the south, and from the southern end of the Rec up to Lordship Lane are sightlines of key importance and beauty. This is the landscape on which Luke Howard observed and formulated his new names for clouds.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
247	SA3891	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Recent improvements	With austerity cuts parks have been understaffed exploiting the goodwill of volunteers to preserve facilities in them. Their sacrifice will be in vain.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
180	SA3892	L Miller (local resident)	Drainage	Investments and improvements would need to be made to remainder of park to fix water drainage problems if expect children of the football team to move to this part of the park	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA3893	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Health and wellbeing	Green space isn’t potential development land it is vital to people’s mental health and wellbeing. Places without traffic and hold events.	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
87	SA3894	Michael Whyte	Moselle river	Moselle river will become more polluted leading to an increased chance of waterborne diseases. Doesn’t want to see plan go through	Noted. Lordship Rec will be removed from the allocation. Action: amend site allocation to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
Respondent ID	Comment ID	Respondent	Topic	Summary of Response	Council Response
2	SA3895	Stephen Brown (site resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
3	SA3896	Edel Brosnan (unknown)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
4	SA3897	Beatrice Peries-Brown (site resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
10	SA3898	Clare O’Boy (Tottenham resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals including that the redevelopment zone includes Lordship RG	Objection noted.
11	SA3899	Sarah Bayley (Tottenham resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals including that the redevelopment zone includes Lordship RG	Objection noted.
12	SA3900	Fiona Sutherland (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

13	SA3901	Billie Regnier (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
14	SA3902	Robert Darnell Bradley (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
15	SA3903	Nora Kilgannon and Yutaka Hamano (adjacent residents)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
16	SA3904	Lynne Darnell (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
17	SA3905	Lorna Carsley (Tottenham resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals particularly construction on the sports ground which really engages young people and is needed in the area.	Objection noted.
18	SA3906	Deborah Berger (N17 resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
19	SA3907	Sacha Armitage (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
20	SA3908	Caroline Carter	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
21	SA3909	Trevor Banthorpe	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
22	SA3910	Nick Putz (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
23	SA3911	Robert Samuel Hall (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
16	SA3912	Lynne Darnell (adjacent resident)	Outrageous plan	This plan is not in the interests of local people and is an insult to those locals who have worked tirelessly for the good of the community.	Objection noted.
27	SA3913	Will van der Knapp (local resident)	Objection	Objects to proposed development	Objection noted.
28	SA3914	Sylvie Dupuy (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
29	SA3915	S T Khatoon (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
30	SA3916	Theo Kindynis	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
31	SA3917	Friedrich Ernst (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
32	SA3918	Michael Spiers	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
33	SA3919	Richard Abbott (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

34	SA3920	Candy Jannetta-Porter	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
35	SA3921	Nicola Hammond	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
36	SA3922	Ruth Hastings Iqball and Mohamed Iqball	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
37	SA3923	Thomas Gray (site resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
38	SA3924	Sally Stewart, Pete Franklin and Francesco DiManicor (local residents)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
39	SA3925	Ruth Green	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
40	SA3926	Stephen Reynolds and Jose Cano Ruiz	Objection	Strong objection to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
41	SA3927	M Duerden & K Klier (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
42	SA3928	Alison Johnston	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
43	SA3929	Stephanie Grant (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
44	SA3930	Paul Chapman, Carol Chapman, Nicola Chapman, Mark Chapman, Claire Hinchliff, Jo Hart, James Askham, Gary Clarke, Tara Houlihan and Thomas Dunn	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
45	SA3931	Duncan Johnson (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
46	SA3932	Veronica Mole (borough resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
47	SA3933	Philip Foxe	Objection	Plan to sell off Broadwater Farm to be exploited by private developers is so	The principal objective of carrying out housing investment is to build

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				disgusting as to beggar belief	more, affordable, homes. A delivery model has not been consulted upon.
50	SA3934	Dr Sarah Pucill	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
51	SA3935	Alex Berry	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals as the facilities are precious resources	Objection noted.
52	SA3936	Mona	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
53	SA3937	Bertha Bruce-Larbi	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
54	SA3938	Cassie & Michael Birtwistle (local residents)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
55	SA3939	Sarah Masters (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
56	SA3940	Joan George	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
57	SA3941	Kate Priest (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
58	SA3942	Wei Pan	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
59	SA3943	Kiran Gungadin	Objection	Firmly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
60	SA3944	Fabio Monteforte (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
61	SA3945	Natasha William (Tottenham resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
62	SA3946	David Wheatley (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
63	SA3947	Genet Menalu (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
64	SA3948	Gulem Ezer	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals and strongly against demolition plan	Objection noted.
65	SA3949	Ezer family	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals and strongly against demolition plan	Objection noted.
66	SA3950	James Blond	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
67	SA3951	Amani Hussein (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
68	SA3952	Pat Devereaux	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
69	SA3953	Mr Artur Stefanowicz and Mrs Agnieszka Stefanowicz (adjacent residents)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

70	SA3954	Kevin O'Connell	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
71	SA3955	Dhavan Abiyani	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
72	SA3956	Mr and Mrs Osborne	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
73	SA3957	Grace Dyer (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
74	SA3958	Dee Seale	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
75	SA3959	Keith Lemon (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
76	SA3960	Caesar Lalobo (site resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
77	SA3961	Lorna Waite (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
78	SA3962	Tim Rawe	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
79	SA3963	Seda Mertdjan	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals and demolition plan	Objection noted.
80	SA3964	Murray Wyatt	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
81	SA3965	Vadivelu Yogaratnam	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
82	SA3966	Ozlem Arslan	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
83	SA3967	Elif Arslan	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
84	SA3968	Tiborfialka	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
85	SA3969	Nathan Wilson	Objection	Deeply distressed and disturbed by SA63 demolition and redevelopment zone	Noted, however there are no detailed plans for demolition or development. The site allocation proposes housing investment to improve the quality of homes.
86	SA3970	Dugan Warn (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
88	SA3971	Eve Ellis	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
89	SA3972	Storm Moncur	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
90	SA3973	Tessa Forbes	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
91	SA3974	Martina Koepcke	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
92	SA3975	Elize Truter	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
93	SA3976	Louisa Livermore (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
94	SA3977	Khahir (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
95	SA3978	John and Murielle Porter-Weiss	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

96	SA3979	Joanne Milmoe and Daniel Rudd	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
97	SA3980	Miss J Turnbull	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
98	SA3981	Joe Syers	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
99	SA3982	Catherine Riley (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
100	SA3983	Jonathan Sampaney	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
101	SA3984	Alec Peschlow	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
102	SA3985	Joanna Monaghan	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
103	SA3986	Valentin Kovalenko and Chiara Contrino	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
104	SA3987	Francis Blake and Alexandra Harley	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
106	SA3988	Karen and Jodi Ahmed	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
107	SA3989	Matt Burns	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
105	SA3990	Hugh Knopf	Opposition	All benefit from land threatened by housing development. Lots of effort and energy from local people working alongside council has gone into improving it. Do not let the good work be destroyed.	Noted.
120	SA3991	Chris Hutton (site resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals.	Objection noted.
109	SA3992	Will Embliss (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
110	SA3993	Candy Amsden	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
111	SA3994	Ann McTaggart	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
112	SA3995	Zoe Fox (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
7	SA3996	Peter Thomlinson (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
113	SA3997	Sophie Wolchover	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
114	SA3998	Jackie Ekim	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
115	SA3999	Lucy Edkins	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
116	SA4000	Candice Sly	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

117	SA4001	Heather Beverley (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
118	SA4002	Dorota Gnyp	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
122	SA4003	Emily Unell	Objection	Objects to SA63	Objection noted.
123	SA4004	Samantha, Zoe and Pamela Wyles	Objection	Anger upon hearing of SA63 which could lead to demolition and redevelopment of the local area. Strongly object to the proposal.	Objection noted.
125	SA4005	Sally Gray (local resident)	Objection	Object to proposals for redevelopment at Broadwater Farm	Objection noted.
127	SA4006	Luci Davin (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
130	SA4007	Issy Harvey (local resident)	Opposition	Opposition to development plans for BWF.	Opposition noted.
134	SA4008	Hilary Plews	Object	Object to proposals to build on Lordship Rec	Objection noted.
133	SA4009	K Guinness	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals as will disrupt lives of people especially vulnerable ones. BWF is great and people are happy with their homes. It doesn't need to be fixed.	Objection noted.
135	SA4010	Regina McLennan (local resident)	Objection	Objects to proposals to redevelop BWF and building on Lordship Rec.	Objection noted.
136	SA4011	Thomas Anderson (local resident)	Objection	Object to plans to redevelop BWF and use of land in Lordship Rec. Can't imagine would lop off the edge of the park in the west of the borough. This plan is ill conceived and must not go ahead.	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
137	SA4012	Melania Sandron	Objection	Strongly oppose proposals to redevelop BWF and Lordship Rec. They are key features in Tottenham promoting regeneration and community. No regard for the local people. Plans are short sighted and will be detrimental after hard work that has gone into regenerating the rec.	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
139	SA4013	Tracey Tindall	Objection	Objects to proposed housing development on Lordship Rec. The common outdoor space should remain untouched by building development.	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
141	SA4014	Joan Curtis (local resident)	Objection	Register objection to building on Lordship Rec	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
142	SA4015	Glen D'souza (local resident)	Objection	Object to this threat to the estate and park. How can you take away limited green space in the borough which all residents are able to enjoy?	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
146	SA4016	Louise Hannah (local resident)	Objection	Opposes plans to re-home BWF residents on Lordship Rec	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
148	SA4017	Ghazale Jamsheed (adjacent	Objection	Particularly object to redevelopment plans for BWF	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		resident)			
149	SA4018	Martin Braund	Objection	Opposes SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
150	SA4019	Tedd Lavia (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
151	SA4020	Sylvia Oland (local resident)	Objection	Strongly object to proposed demolition redevelopment at Broadwater Farm.	The allocation does not propose an intention to demolish the estate or to build on the Lordship Recreation Ground. Rather the allocation reflects comments received to consultation that suggests residents would like to see further improvements to the Broadwater Farm estate in the future.
152	SA4021	Helen Oliver (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
153	SA4022	Michael Hodges (local resident)	Objection	Object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
154	SA4023	Susan Turner	Objection	Opposes plans to demolish flats and build on Lordship Rec	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
121	SA4024	Joe Bryant (adjacent resident)	Objection	Objects to this proposal	Objection noted.
138	SA4025	Federico Calboli	Opposition	Opposes plans to turn parts of Lordship Rec into housing.	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
155	SA4026	David Corio (local resident)	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
156	SA4027	Martyna M	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
157	SA4028	Saphia Crowther (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
159	SA4029	Mrs V A Macdonald (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly object to building on Lordship Rec as part of SA63	Noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
161	SA4030	Fr James Hill (parish priest)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
162	SA4031	J Skinner (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
164	SA4032	Holly and Michael Browne (local residents)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
165	SA4033	F Fantahun	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposal	Objection noted.
166	SA4034	Janet Lallysmith	Objection	Object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

167	SA4035	Reba Johnson	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
168	SA4036	Michelle Laugie (adjacent resident)	Objection	Object to redevelopment plans. Love the way the area is now and always has been	Objection noted.
169	SA4037	Gareth and Bonnie Walker (local residents)	Objection	Object to SA63 proposals as do not make economic or environmental sense.	Objection noted.
170	SA4038	Philippa Snoaden (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to plans for Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
173	SA4039	Jonathan Maris	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
158	SA4040	Angela and Tony Baker	Opposition	Oppose demolition and rebuilding plans of SA63. Withdraw immediately	Opposition noted.
163	SA4041	Federico Picinali	Opposition	Strongly oppose SA63 proposals	Opposition noted.
172	SA4042	Brian Belle-Fortune (local resident)	Opposition	Opposes SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
182	SA4043	Ellie Tindal	Object	Object to inclusion of Lordship Rec in SA63	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
174	SA4044	Tony Wood	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals. Concerned about proposals to knock down BWF, build on Lordship Rec and then sell assets to a private developer.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
175	SA4045	Abdul Bham and Judith Ironside (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals.	Objection noted.
176	SA4046	Beewan Athwal (adjacent resident)	Objection	To building on Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
178	SA4047	Dan Rosenberg & Sagarika Chatterjee	Objection	Opposes SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
179	SA4048	Stephen and Susan Ellis	Objection	To building on Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
180	SA4049	L Miller (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

181	SA4050	Amanda Latimer	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
183	SA4051	Michelle Lawson (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
184	SA4052	Caroline Jepson (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
186	SA4053	Mark Jameson (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposal for inclusion of Lordship Rec and sports field	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
187	SA4054	Eleanor Hooker (local resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63 proposals and particularly inclusion of Lordship Rec and sports field	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
189	SA4055	Yusuf Mertdjan (181 signature petition)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
190	SA4056	Hasibe Guler (21 signature petition)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
192	SA4057	London Waterkeeper	Opposition	Oppose SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
177	SA4058	Stella Smith	Opposition	Oppose SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
188	SA4059	Albertina Benedetti-Hall (local resident)	Opposition	Opposes these plans which will be detrimental to everyone living in the area including loss of communities, facilities and the incentive for people to invest themselves in an area.	Opposition noted.
191	SA4060	Russell Wyatt (local resident)	Opposition	Oppose plans to redevelop BWF including building temporary housing on Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
185	SA4061	Turkan (and 181 signature petition)	Strongly object	Strongly object to SA63 proposals.	Objection noted.
207	SA4062	Erica Ward	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
208	SA4063	Yvonne Say (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
197	SA4064	Eloise Kelly	Objection	Objects to building on and around Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
198	SA4065	Mark Applegate	Objection	Objects to SA63 demolition of housing and building on Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
199	SA4066	Amanda Wright (local	Objection	Objects to building on Lordship Rec.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		resident)			Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
200	SA4067	Ebony Riddell Bamber (adjacent resident)	Objection	Objects to SA63	Objection noted.
202	SA4068	Mary Cooney (site resident)	Objection	Object strongly to SA63 demolition and redevelopment zone	Objection noted.
204	SA4069	Katherine Currie (local resident)	Objection	Object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
205	SA4070	L. Morgan (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
209	SA4071	Rosemary Hollis (local resident)	Objection	Express concern about SA63 proposals: demolition and redevelopment zone.	Concern noted.
210	SA4072	Noel Treacy	Objection	Object to build on Lordship Rec thus diminishing the park and depriving people of access to recreational facilities and natural environments.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
211	SA4073	Veronica Bailey Straffon and James Straffon (local residents)	Objection	Object strongly to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
213	SA4074	Elizabeth Adams (local resident)	Objection	Strongly object to demolition and redevelopment of BWF and Lordship Rec	Objection noted.
214	SA4075	Simon Butterworth (adjacent resident)	Objection	Object o SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
215	SA4076	George Britovsek & Johanna Wadsley (adjacent residents)	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
216	SA4077	Tamsyn Wills (local resident)	Objection	Object to the Local Plan proposal to build on the north end of Lordship Rec SA63.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
217	SA4078	Andie Frost	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
218	SA4079	Jules Holroyd	Objection	Strongly object to possibility of building on Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
203	SA4080	Mary L Ford	Opposition	Opposed to SA63 proposals	Opposition noted.
202	SA4081	Mary Cooney	Opposition	Owned home in BWF for 43 years and do not want to move. Has seen a lot	Opposition noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		(site resident)		of change but does not want to see this one.	
219	SA4082	Mark Pickworth (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
220	SA4083	Daniel Cressey (local resident)	Objection	Strong opposition to SA63 especially that it involves taking over part of Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
223	SA4084	Tarin Unwin	Objection	Object to the proposed demolition and redevelopment scheme for the Broadwater Farm area	Objection noted.
227	SA4085	A Crawford, K Docherty and J Crawford-Docherty	Objection	Object to use of Lordship Rec for housing development	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
228	SA4086	Jess Kitley (local resident)	Objection	Object to proposals for redevelopment at Broadwater Farm	Objection noted.
229	SA4087	Woodlands Park Residents Association	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
230	SA4088	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Objection	Object to inclusion of Lordship Rec	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
234	SA4089	Asher Jacobsberg (adjacent resident)	Objection	Strongly object to inclusion of Lordship Rec in SA63	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
225	SA4090	Dr Glenys E Law	Opposition	Opposition to the proposal to demolish BWF and use Lordship Rec for temporary housing, while development takes place.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
232	SA4091	Steve Hill (local resident)	Opposition	Opposition to SA63 proposals	Opposition noted.
235	SA4092	Dara O'Reilly (local resident)	Objection	Object strongly to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
236	SA4093	Catherine Collingborn (local resident)	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
238	SA4094	Margaret Burr	Objection	Object to redevelopment of BWF	Objection noted.
240	SA4095	Esther Pierce (local resident)	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
244	SA4096	N Turkan (adjacent resident)	Objection	Object to proposals that see park being turned into housing developments	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
245	SA4097	H Turkan (adjacent resident)	Objection	Object to proposals that see park being turned into housing developments	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
246	SA4098	John Mullee	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		(local resident)			
247	SA4099	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
248	SA4100	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	Objection	Object to SA63 proposals	Objection noted.
243	SA4101	Tower Gardens Residents Group (local residents)	Opposition	Strongly opposed to SA63	Opposition noted.
237	SA4102	Broadwater United Sports and Football Association	Strongly object	To SA63 proposals in particular including football pitch and home ground.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
249	SA4103	Hornsey Action Group	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	
252	SA4104	Grayham Edmunds	Objection	Strongly object to demolition of Somerset Close. It will be homes and lives destroyed. There is a strong community here and the plans should not go forward.	
253	SA4105	Sofie Pelsmakers (local resident)	Objection	Object to plans for Broadwater Farm's redevelopment	
254	SA4106	Friends of Lordship Rec	Objection	Strongly object to SA63 proposals	
256	SA4107	Reardon family	Objection	Strongly object and proposal should be withdrawn immediately.	
254	SA4108	Friends of Lordship Rec	Opposition	Council should be celebrating what has been achieved not proposing destroying homes and breaking up communities	
272	SA4109	Mr R J Ferguson	Objection	This idiotic proposal should be thrown in the dustbin.	
276	SA4110	Anonymous	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	
278	SA4111	Ms S C Allen	Objection	Draft proposal for BWF is absurd, inappropriate and clearly ill conceived bearing scant reference or understanding of the area concerned and the community within it. Therefore object to SA63.	
385	SA4112	D. Chambers, Local resident – Gloucester Road	Objection to Site Allocation	Object to proposal for a demolition and redevelopment zone covering Broad water Farm, Somerset Close, Lido Square, Moira Close, some houses along Lordship Lane and northern part of Lordship Recreation ground.	
385	SA4113	D. Chambers	Site allocation, site selection	Allocation is unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	
386	SA4114	Colin P. Holyhead, Local resident – Bedford Road	Objection to proposals of SA63.	Object to proposals for site SA63.	
390	SA4115	Mr and Mrs	Objection to	Object to proposal for a demolition and redevelopment zone covering Broad	

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		Young, Local resident – Higham Road	Site Allocation	water Farm, Somerset Close, Lido Square, Moira Close, some houses along Lordship Lane and northern part of Lordship Recreation ground.	
429	SA4116	Simona Sideri	Objection	Strongly objects to SA63 proposals	
808	SA4117	Harun Tanriverdi	Objection;	The proposal would cause massive stress to all concerned, displacement and disruption for years, and undermine all the successful efforts over decades to build a strong and stable local community and to improve local facilities. It breaches a whole range of planning policies which should protect our community. It is unacceptable & should be withdrawn immediately. Instead the Council must work with the community to protect, support & improve all the existing homes, estates, facilities & communities in the area.	
659	SA4118	Haringey Federation of Residents Associations (HFRA)	Object	We support the objection of the Haringey Defend Council Housing organisation, and as an example the points raised by the Broadwater Farm Residents Association	Objections noted.
818	SA4119	Our Tottenham - Claire Colomb	objection	We support the 3 specific objections made by the Broadwater Farm Residents Association, the Friends of Lordship Rec, and Broadwater United Sports and Football Association [See Appendix]	Objections noted.
672	SA4120	Jonathan Maris	Objects to redevelopment	We as a family object strongly to the draft Local Plan proposal SA63 for a demolition and redevelopment zone covering Broadwater Farm, Somerset Close, Lido Square, Moira Close, some houses along Lordship Lane, and the northern part of Lordship Recreation Ground, including the enclosed sports field. The proposal would cause massive stress to all concerned, displacement and disruption for years, and undermine all the successful efforts over decades to build a strong and stable local community and to improve local facilities. It breaches a whole range of planning policies which should protect our community. It is unacceptable & should be withdrawn immediately. Instead the Council must work with the community to protect, support & improve all the existing homes, estates, facilities & communities in the area.	Noted.
673	SA4121	Diane Beddoes, local resident	Objects to redevelopment	I object to the draft Local Plan proposal SA63 to demolish and redevelop Moira Close, Somerset Close, Lido Square, some houses on Lordship Lane, Broadwater Farm, and the proposal to build on Lordship Rec. You should be helping and supporting the communities you serve and looking after the buildings they live in. If things get tough the answer is not: raze it to the ground and start again	Noted.
679	SA4122	Rod Anderson	Objection	We object strongly to the draft Local Plan proposal SA63 for a demolition and redevelopment zone covering Broadwater Farm, Somerset Close, Lido Square, Moira Close, some houses along Lordship Lane, and the northern part of Lordship Recreation Ground, including the enclosed sports field. The proposal would cause massive stress to all concerned, displacement and disruption for years, and undermine all the successful efforts over decades to build a strong and stable local community and to improve local facilities. It breaches a whole range of planning policies which should protect our community. It is unacceptable & should be withdrawn immediately. Instead the Council	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

				must work with the community to protect, support & improve all the existing homes, estates, facilities & communities in the area.	
435	SA4123	Ertogrul Ibrahim (adjacent resident)	Objection	Object to proposals that see beautiful and much needed recreation park and sports field being turned into housing developments.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
10	SA4124	Clare O'Boy (Tottenham resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
11	SA4125	Sarah Bayley (Tottenham resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
13	SA4126	Billie Regnier (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
14	SA4127	Robert Darnell Bradley (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
15	SA4128	Nora Kilgannon and Yutaka Hamano (adjacent residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
16	SA4129	Lynne Darnell (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
17	SA4130	Lorna Carsley (Tottenham resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
18	SA4131	Deborah Berger (N17 resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
19	SA4132	Sacha Armitage (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
20	SA4133	Caroline Carter	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
21	SA4134	Trevor Banthorpe	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
22	SA4135	Nick Putz (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
23	SA4136	Robert Samuel Hall (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
3	SA4137	Edel Brosnan (unknown)	Proposal unacceptable	Proposal is unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	Noted.
28	SA4138	Sylvie Dupuy (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
29	SA4139	S T Khatoon	Proposal	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

		(site resident)	unacceptable		
30	SA4140	Theo Kindynis	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
31	SA4141	Friedrich Ernst (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
32	SA4142	Michael Spiers	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
33	SA4143	Richard Abbott (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
34	SA4144	Candy Jannetta-Porter	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
35	SA4145	Nicola Hammond	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
36	SA4146	Ruth Hastings Iqball and Mohamed Iqball	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
37	SA4147	Thomas Gray (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
38	SA4148	Sally Stewart, Pete Franklin and Francesco DiManicor (local residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
39	SA4149	Ruth Green	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
40	SA4150	Stephen Reynolds and Jose Cano Ruiz	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
42	SA4151	Alison Johnston	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
43	SA4152	Stephanie Grant (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
44	SA4153	Paul Chapman, Carol Chapman, Nicola Chapman, Mark Chapman, Claire Hinchliff, Jo Hart, James Askham, Gary Clarke, Tara Houlihan and Thomas Dunn	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

45	SA4154	Duncan Johnson (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
46	SA4155	Veronica Mole (borough resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
50	SA4156	Dr Sarah Pucill	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
51	SA4157	Alex Berry	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
52	SA4158	Mona	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
53	SA4159	Bertha Bruce-Larbi	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
54	SA4160	Cassie & Michael Birtwistle (local residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
55	SA4161	Sarah Masters (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
56	SA4162	Joan George	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
57	SA4163	Kate Priest (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
58	SA4164	Wei Pan	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
59	SA4165	Kiran Gungadin	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
60	SA4166	Fabio Monteforte (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
61	SA4167	Natasha William (Tottenham resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
62	SA4168	David Wheatley (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
63	SA4169	Genet Menalu (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
64	SA4170	Gulem Ezer	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
65	SA4171	Ezer family	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
66	SA4172	James Blond	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
67	SA4173	Amani Hussein (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
68	SA4174	Pat Devereaux	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

69	SA4175	Mr Artur Stefanowicz and Mrs Agnieszka Stefanowicz (adjacent residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
70	SA4176	Kevin O'Connell	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
71	SA4177	Dhavan Abiyani	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
72	SA4178	Mr and Mrs Osborne	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
73	SA4179	Grace Dyer (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
74	SA4180	Dee Seale	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
75	SA4181	Keith Lemon (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
76	SA4182	Caesar Lalobo (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
77	SA4183	Lorna Waite (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
78	SA4184	Tim Rawe	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
79	SA4185	Seda Mertdjan	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
80	SA4186	Murray Wyatt	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
81	SA4187	Vadivelu Yogaratnam	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
82	SA4188	Ozlem Arslan	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
83	SA4189	Elif Arslan	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
84	SA4190	Tiborfialka	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
85	SA4191	Nathan Wilson	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
86	SA4192	Dugan Warn (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
88	SA4193	Eve Ellis	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
89	SA4194	Storm Moncur	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
90	SA4195	Tessa Forbes	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
91	SA4196	Martina Koepcke	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
92	SA4197	Elize Truter	Proposal	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

			unacceptable		
93	SA4198	Louisa Livermore (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
94	SA4199	Khahir (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
95	SA4200	John and Murielle Porter-Weiss	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
96	SA4201	Joanne Milmoie and Daniel Rudd	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
98	SA4202	Joe Syers	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
99	SA4203	Catherine Riley (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
100	SA4204	Jonathan Sampaney	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
101	SA4205	Alec Peschlow	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
102	SA4206	Joanna Monaghan	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
103	SA4207	Valentin Kovalenko and Chiara Contrino	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
104	SA4208	Francis Blake and Alexandra Harley	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
106	SA4209	Karen and Jodi Ahmed	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
107	SA4210	Matt Burns	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
109	SA4211	Will Embliss (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
110	SA4212	Candy Amsden	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
111	SA4213	Ann McTaggart	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
112	SA4214	Zoe Fox (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
7	SA4215	Peter Thomlinson (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
113	SA4216	Sophie Wolchover	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
114	SA4217	Jackie Ekim	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

115	SA4218	Lucy Edkins	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
116	SA4219	Candice Sly	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
117	SA4220	Heather Beverley (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
118	SA4221	Dorota Gnyp	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
123	SA4222	Samantha, Zoe and Pamela Wyles	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
127	SA4223	Luci Davin (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
129	SA4224	Catherine Suttle	Proposal unacceptable	Opposes SA63 plans for demolition and use of Lordship Rec for housing displaced people.	Noted.
120	SA4225	Chris Hutton (site resident)	Withdraw	SA63 should be withdrawn in its entirety immediately.	Noted.
122	SA4226	Emily Unell	Withdraw	Disappointed council has put forward this proposal which undermines community resource and the people around it. Should be withdrawn immediately.	Noted.
149	SA4227	Martin Braund	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
152	SA4228	Helen Oliver (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
151	SA4229	Sylvia Oland (local resident)	Withdraw plans	No need for redevelopment. The plans should be scrapped and withdrawn.	Noted.
155	SA4230	David Corio (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	Should be withdrawn immediately	Noted.
156	SA4231	Martyna M	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
161	SA4232	Fr James Hill	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn immediately.	Noted.
164	SA4233	Holly and Michael Browne (local residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
167	SA4234	Reba Johnson	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
173	SA4235	Jonathan Maris	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
109	SA4236	Will Embliss	Withdraw	Throw out these plans and fulfil obligations to volunteers, residents, tenants and council staff who have made Lordship Rec the fantastic place it is.	Noted.
174	SA4237	Tony Wood	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
178	SA4238	Dan Rosenberg & Sagarika Chatterjee	Proposal unacceptable	It should be withdrawn immediately.	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

183	SA4239	Michelle Lawson (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
184	SA4240	Caroline Jepson (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
185	SA4241	Turkan (and 181 signature petition)	Proposal unacceptable	Should be withdrawn immediately	Noted.
189	SA4242	Yusuf Mertdjan (181 signature petition)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
190	SA4243	Hasibe Guler (21 signature petition)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
193	SA4244	Maureen Black (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
175	SA4245	Abdul Bham and Judith Ironside (adjacent resident)	Withdraw	Withdraw this proposal.	Noted.
181	SA4246	Amanda Latimer	Withdraw	Unacceptable plan should be scrapped immediately	Noted.
202	SA4247	Mary Cooney (site resident)	Proposal unacceptable	Should be withdrawn	Noted.
205	SA4248	L. Morgan (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
208	SA4249	Yvonne Say (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
215	SA4250	George Britovsek & Johanna Wadsley (adjacent residents)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
217	SA4251	Andie Frost	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
204	SA4252	Katherine Currie (local resident)	Withdraw	The plans are destructive to the existing community and should be rejected.	Noted.
214	SA4253	Simon Butterworth (adjacent resident)	Withdraw proposals	Proposals ought to be withdrawn immediately	Noted.
219	SA4254	Mark Pickworth (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

229	SA4255	Woodlands Park Residents Association	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
231	SA4256	Diana Shelley (local resident)	Proposals withdrawn	These proposals are not acceptable and should be withdrawn	Noted.
227	SA4257	A Crawford, K Docherty and J Crawford-Docherty	Withdraw	We would request that this proposal is rejected and that a more considered proposal is made	Noted.
230	SA4258	Ms H Steel (local resident)	Withdraw	There is no way that any part of Lordship Rec should ever have been included in development plans and SA63 should be withdrawn from the Site Allocations DPD.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
226	SA4259	Alyson Brewer (local resident)	Withdraw proposal	Reconsider draft plan and withdraw this proposal.	Noted.
219	SA4260	Mark Pickworth (local resident)	Work with community	Council should work with the community to protect, support and improve the area.	Noted.
229	SA4261	Woodlands Park Residents Association	Work with community	Council should work with the community to protect, support and improve the area.	Noted.
236	SA4262	Catherine Collingborn (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
240	SA4263	Esther Pierce (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
244	SA4264	N Turkan (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	If there is a proposal to build on park consider it unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
245	SA4265	H Turkan (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	If there is a proposal to build on park consider it unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
246	SA4266	John Mullee (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
247	SA4267	Christopher Currie (local resident)	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
248	SA4268	Stuart Philip Gillings and Ruth Pattison (adjacent residents)	Withdraw	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
249	SA4269	Hornsey Action Group	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
254	SA4270	Friends of Lordship Rec	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
254	SA4271	Friends of Lordship Rec	Withdraw	Red zoning of this area is institutionalised bullying. It will cause mistrust and conflict, undermine plans and funding for future improvements and cause stress for communities and park users unless is withdrawn immediately.	Noted.

Appendix F (17) Site Allocations consultation report

276	SA4272	Anonymous 1	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
390	SA4273	Mr and Mrs Young	Site allocation, site selection	Allocation is unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	Noted.
429	SA4274	Simona Sideri	Proposal unacceptable	The proposal should be withdrawn	Noted.
435	SA4275	Ertogrul Ibrahim (adjacent resident)	Proposal unacceptable	If there is a proposal to build on park consider it unacceptable and should be withdrawn immediately.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
345	SA4276	S. Dobie	Objection	Object to proposals of SA63.	Noted.
138	SA4277	Federico Calboli	Alternative solution	Come up with a proper thought out plan that doesn't damage rec and create more problems than will be solved.	Objection noted. Lordship Recreation Ground has been removed from the allocation. Action: Amend site boundary to exclude Lordship Recreation Ground
218	SA4278	Jules Holroyd	Alternative solution	These plans should be withdrawn forthwith, and acceptable alternatives explored.	Noted.
225	SA4279	Dr Glenys E Law	Alternative solution	Reconsider these rash plans to which there will be massive objections and unpredictable consequences	Noted.
223	SA4280	Tarin Unwin	Alternative solution	This proposal is highly flawed and should be reconsidered.	Noted.