

Our Ref: TJ/19292

E-mail: tanya.jordan@cgms.co.uk

Date: 28th July 2016

**MATTER 3
REPRESENTOR 19
SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD**

Jackie Lawrence
Programme Officer
Haringey Council
Level 6
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
N22 8HQ
BY EMAIL ONLY

Dear Sirs,

**SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (SA DPD) EXAMINATION
SA36: FINSBURY PARK BOWLING ALLEY
HEARING MATTER 3 (SA36) – SITE SPECIFIC ISSUES
SUBMITTED BY CGMS ON BEHALF OF PARKSTOCK LTD
REPRESENTOR ID: 19**

Introduction

We write on behalf of our client, Parkstock Ltd, who are the freeholders of both 10 Stroud Green Road and 269 – 271 Seven Sister's Road located within Finsbury Park.

We submitted representations to earlier SA DPD consultations which confirmed our overall support for the proposed allocation of SA36.

Hearing Matter 3 (SA36)

Within the above context the following comments are submitted in relation to Hearing Matter 3 and specifically the following question raised by Inspector in relation to SA36:

'Where there are numerous landowners and the site may be developed in parts, is it reasonable to expect a master plan? Who will provide the master plan?'

Whilst we can understand the benefits of a masterplan approach and demonstrating how individual submissions would not compromise future proposals, it would not be appropriate for this policy to require one masterplan or submission to cover the whole site given the multiple different land operations and ownerships.

This approach would also require engagement with other landowners and occupiers of other parts of the site (in accordance with Policy DM55). There may be circumstances where adjoining landowners are unwilling to engage or discuss proposals and such situations could delay or hamper development proposals unnecessarily. The Council should take a pragmatic

approach to engagement with neighbours on a site by site basis and if reasonable steps have been taken to engage with other landowners then this process should not delay or hamper development proposals unnecessarily.

Given the multiple landownerships we do not consider it feasible for one landowner to prepare one masterplan to cover the whole site. We acknowledge that any individual submission on an individual plot should be cognisant of the adjoining context and respect the potential for future, adjoining development but we do not consider that a masterplan approach is appropriate or necessary for this allocation.

Therefore as currently worded we do not consider this part of SA36 to be sound as we consider it is not effective and will hamper delivery of the site over the plan period.

We have already confirmed that we would like to take part in the examination for Hearing Matter 3 in relation to SA36.

We look forward to being involved going forward and if you have any questions at this stage please do not hesitate to contact me on the above details.

Yours faithfully



Tanya Jordan
Director