

Respondent 6: Our Tottenham

ID	Rep ID	Allocation / Policy / Figure / Para	Sound	Legally Compliant	Reason	Change Sought	Council's Comments / Response
40		Consultation of the Local Plan			<p>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 not enough evidence of community participation encouraged or promoted by the LPA in this final round of consultation which goes beyond a minimum. Independently of this part of our submission, we presented a more detailed analysis of the consultation process and its shortcomings (see text box below). The Council posted the consultation on</p> <p>its website and offered two hour sessions for people to attend at local libraries, at hours most people could not make, even if they were aware of the sessions. These were not very well publicized, and were very poorly attended. This is not the fault of local people. There were no public meetings to explain these plans even though the consultation runs for several weeks. The Council's borough-wide magazine <i>Haringey People</i> – which goes to households directly – did not include one word or reference to this consultation (see http://www.haringey.gov.uk/news-and-events/haringey-people/haringey-peoplearchive). This would have been the most effective method for directly communicating with residents.</p> <p>The documents are hard to read on line yet active residents' groups had to ask and press for printed copies in order to meet with their members.</p> <p>The Supreme Court in the Moseley v Haringey Council judgement set out</p>		<p>The consultations undertaken in the preparation of the Plan have been held in accordance with the Town and Country Planning Regulations, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.</p> <p>As a result of the last</p>

ID	Rep ID	Allocation / Policy / Figure / Para	Sound	Legally Compliant	Reason	Change Sought	Council's Comments / Response
					<p>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.' It is questionable as to whether this condition to allow for 'intelligent consideration and response' has been met with regard to this vital consultation on the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council's 'Statement of Community Involvement' says that the Council will provide summaries in plain language. Although in correspondence with Our Tottenham last year, a senior Council officer expressed the view that to provide summaries would lead to confusion about whether the public should respond to the summary without reading the full text, we think summaries should have been provided at the library drop-in sessions and elsewhere (community centres, online, and in Haringey People) and that without them, it is difficult for residents to gain interest in or grasp the meaning and significance of the full text to which they are required to respond.</p> <p>The Council did not pro-actively seek to involve non-English speaking communities with special meetings for example with Turkish translators. There was also some delay from the start of the consultation period in accessing translation apps for the documents online.</p> <p>From the start of the consultation the Council were reluctant to provide any hard copies of the documents. They claimed that a set of the documents were available in libraries and that was good enough. Latterly they accepted it was not sufficient and provided copies to community representatives and groups. In</p>		<p>consultation the decision was taken to remove the MOL of Lordship Rec from the site boundary. The MOL boundary at present passes through the Broadwater Farm Community Centre. As there are not any firm plans for the whole of the site at the time being, it is considered that any proposals</p>

ID	Rep ID	Allocation / Policy / Figure / Para	Sound	Legally Compliant	Reason	Change Sought	Council's Comments / Response
					<p>addition, an extra two sets were provided to each of the open public libraries and a set was sent to elected councillors with the instruction that they should make their copy available to their electors.</p> <p>The first tranche of consultation events were held at Haringey's public libraries during the day time. This prevented those with 9-5 Monday to Friday jobs from attending. At Coombes Croft and Alexandra Library our members observed that they were the ONLY members of the public present. At Wood Green there were only 5. Cllr Clive Carter reported to Friends of Finsbury Park that only one person had been recorded as attending the consultation at Highgate Library. Later in the consultation period a number of evening events were organised. However, these were poorly advertised - mainly through the council website - and since most residents only use the</p> <p>Council web site, if at all, if they are looking for something they already want or know about, it was no surprise that they failed to attract people to get along. One evening event - held at 639 High Road, where the council's Tottenham regeneration team have an office - was attended by only one member of the public. In desperation, council officers resorted to standing on the High Road failing to entice passers-by inside. There was no mention of the consultation in the February-March 2016 edition of the Council's borough-wide publication Haringey People. Not having a major article on the Local Plan in the one publication going to all households, and not placing advertisements in the local press, is a serious failure to engage as many people as possible in the consultation. Indeed, many residents may have known nothing about the</p>		<p>affecting the Community Centre will be managed once greater detail becomes available.</p> <p>It is noted that at present the table on SA62 states that the ownership is simply "LBH". It is recognised that this is overly simplistic. This will be replaced withj "mix of public and</p>

ID	Rep ID	Allocation / Policy / Figure / Para	Sound	Legally Compliant	Reason	Change Sought	Council's Comments / Response
					<p>consultation until some residents complained to the press</p> <p>(see http://www.thetottenhamindependent.co.uk/news/14246972.Council_criticised_over_Local_Plan_consultation_timings/).</p> <p>The provided documents contain many mistakes. For example, in the Site Allocation DPD,</p> <p>section SA62 on Broadwater Farm gives a contradictory account in different parts of the page about who owns the land and neglects the private ownership of houses in Lordship Lane which may be marked for demolition under the proposed plan. The map for this page shows the boundary of the redevelopment zone going through the middle of a very large and important building, the Broadwater Farm Community Centre. Section SA15 concerning Whymark Avenue, N22, contains the extraordinary statement that 'no buildings need be retained' even though it contains a new block of mixed residential and retail units only about three years old which presumably had planning permission when constructed. Another mistake is that on the map Bruce Grove station is represented as a national rail station, when it has been a London Overground station for several months.</p>		private freeholds and leaseholds".