

20. Luci Davin.txt

From: davin luci
Sent: 03 March 2016 23:31
To: LDF
Subject: Haringey Local Plan

I am writing to formally object to the Haringey Local Plan. My representation is below.

There has been a significant lack of consultation in this final step of the process. In asking if this plan is justified, one of the required criteria is 'evidence of participation of the local community and others having a stake in the area'. There is little evidence of community participation encouraged or promoted by the LA in this final round of consultation which goes beyond a minimum. The main means of consultation were:

- Documents posted on the Council website
- Two hour sessions for people to attend at local libraries.

This is a formal process, and the documents are technical and complex. This is a challenge for the layperson, and even more so when reading online as it is very hard to cross reference. But, even

before attempting to read them online, residents had to know they were there. This was not

straightforward. There were no public meetings called by Haringey to explain these plans even

though the consultation ran for several weeks. The Council's borough wide magazine Haringey

People - which goes to households directly - did not include one word or reference to this

consultation - <http://www.haringey.gov.uk/.../haring.../haringey-people-archive> . This would

have been the most effective method for directly communicating with residents. The documents

are hard to read online yet active residents' groups had to ask and press for printed copies in

order to meet with their members.

Consultation sessions in the public libraries were poorly promoted and publicised, running at

times most people could not make, even if they were aware of the sessions. Given these

circumstances, it would not be surprising if there was not a large response to this very limited

consultation exercise and local people should not be blamed.

Haringey Council was criticised in the Supreme Court regarding consultation. Their judgement

set out conditions for fair consultation. Amongst the four criteria it states that 'the proposer must

give sufficient reasons for any proposal to permit of intelligent consideration and response.' I

would question whether this condition to allow for 'intelligent consideration and response' has

been met in relation to consultation on the Local Plan.

This plan depends on private property development. This is its single dimension - there appears

to be no alternative. This is high risk and runs counter to other soundness criteria of flexibility

and deliverability. There are many alternatives to private sector development, including working

with community land trusts, building higher on existing buildings or refurbishment. None of

these are mentioned as alternative options for consideration.

Instead this plan is predicated on demolition of estates, including Broadwater Farm and

Northumberland Park, where many people will be at risk of losing their homes and their security

The local authority is also planning to enter into a joint venture with a private development

20. Luci Davin.txt

company where the Council will transfer two large council estates, a public library building and many other properties. It is evident from recent news that the economy is fragile and any downturn could have a serious impact on the viability of these plans, which appear predicated solely on a strong and rising property market. I consider it irresponsible for the local authority to invest all its efforts in one single approach which could have a devastating impact on tenants living on estates, and families waiting for housing. As a resident of Tottenham, I am very concerned about plans to build such tall buildings in our communities. Tottenham is essentially a low-rise area and it is noticeable that this mass of tall buildings, (many over 20 storeys) is being proposed in the east of the borough. The argument put forward in the local plan is that these high rise buildings will support the development of "mixed communities" in Tottenham. This is entirely spurious and misleading. Tottenham is already a hugely mixed community with N15 and N17 reputed to be the most diverse postcodes in Europe. The community is mixed by race, age, class and employment. There are people from all walks of life living alongside each other. Council estates are similarly mixed and to argue otherwise is misleading. They have leaseholders, council tenants, private sector tenants, and where there are houses, freeholders. Council estate residents are located firmly in our communities. Demolition in favour of high rise towers is likely to result in the reverse happening, with the development of more single or limited mix of tenure communities, and exclusion of families on low income and those needing affordable social housing. Instead, these plans promote demolitions, with no detail about how people will be rehoused. I understand that high rise blocks are considered too expensive (by those proposing to build them) to be built as social housing or affordable housing. In the Evening Standard Comment section, Tuesday 29th February, they argue that 'Housing needs a more imaginative approach' to high-rise. "[I]t is simply not true that for central London the best options are skyscrapers or outward expansion. We are far less densely populated than, for instance, Paris, where people live in housing that is concentrated without being intimidatingly tall. It is possible to envisage far more medium-rise developments that we have at present - four to eight or nine storeys, say - which would accommodate far more people without altering the skyline. The mansion blocks of Marylebone, for instance, are high-density but aesthetically pleasing and popular with residents; the same is true of the Peabody and Guinness estates, which are medium-rise. It is certainly true that how we build is a critical aspect of our ability to meet the housing crisis but [high rise is] not the best answer." The same argument could be made for Tottenham. The Local Plan is, at best, vague on what will happen to the existing communities who need housing. Paragraph 3.21.18 of the Alterations to Strategic Policies, Pre-Submission version January 2016, states that the council "aim to ensure an adequate mix of

20. Luci Davin.txt

dwellings is provided".

There is no detail as to how this will be achieved especially with housing for families. The proposed developments are largely high density flats, most likely one and two bedrooms. There is no consideration of the needs of those on the Housing List, or of people who are accepted by the Council to in need of housing or rehousing. These will not cater for local families and it is likely that current residents living in either private sector rented, temporary or threatened council homes will be left out. The Council can claim its plans will meet housing need. But this plan does not meet the needs of people in housing need who live here now.

Signed Luci Davin

Dated 3 March 2016

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>