

Respondent Name: Russell Dove

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

Document	Policy/Para number	Legally compliant?	Sound?	Complies with DtC?	Please give further comments.	Please set out suggested changes	Do you wish to attend the oral examination?
TAAP	All	No	No	No	There is a legal obligation to consult with residents. This documents under consultation here, and their previous versions, are complex, poorly designed, consist of multiple documents with appendices and are effectively impossible for any ordinary resident to address. This form for making representations and the structure is itself couched in language that is very difficult to understand even for an educated resident. If the consultation is to have any validity it must address residents in clear comprehensible language, or at the very least a summary should be provided outlining the key principles and concrete proposals contained in the plan to which residents could then respond. The requirement to address each document separately is further offputting and adds to the complexity. In	To make the consultation as a whole legally compliant and sound it should be rerun with a longer consultation period, supported by effective engagement with residents in public, online and in the streets/ shopping centres and other places where large numbers of people travel or congregate. Of the 10 sites where there was a public presentation only 3 out of 10 were located in Tottenham. This is not appropriate where a key part of the total plan and some of the most wide-ranging proposals relate to Tottenham. The initial consultation referred to, quoted in the text here (page 11, point 1.24) only 80 people were contacted out of a total population of over 100,000 in Tottenham. This consultation is unlikely to have achieved a much greater reach. In terms of specific content, the Action Plan is both vague in its overall aim and principles and over-specific in detail in relation to particular sites, and does not	No

Respondent Name: Russell Dove

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

					<p>addition, the two open events were also poorly publicised and not sufficiently accessible to residents. I learned of them only after they had taken place.</p>	<p>sufficiently draw these two elements together. For example, there are references to a landmark tall building at the Seven Sisters Apex House site (page 63, point 5.38) where it is argued that the location is “a suitable location for a high quality tall building” without no evidence or argument why this should be the case. What features of the surroundings justify this? This has evidently been predetermined since no evidence for this assertion is given here. Where does this meet the needs of Haringey or Tottenham in particular? I have selected just one example since it is simply not possible to go into all the elements for reasons of time. Not all sites and elements of the plan are objectionable, but evidence is lacking. I would need to see greater evidence provided throughout both for the specific proposals and the business case that underlies them. I would like to see a much closer, evidence-based arguments how this plan addresses the needs of Tottenham’s existing residents and the new ones who are likely to move in. How do these plans relate to the council’s existing social housing waiting lists? What research</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

**Respondent Name: Russell Dove**

(Submitted through online Snap survey)

						<p>has been carried out to identify what kind of people can afford to buy the new housing provided under this plan, other than landlords. Does this plan provide a long-term future for Tottenham's new residents under existing tenancy laws? Much of this is speculative and any growth is focused on public sector development. Any social housing referred to is based on 'renewal' – in itself possibly/ probably a good thing in certain individual cases - but there is no parallel expansion of genuinely affordable, low-rent social housing to match the large number of new properties to buy or address existing demand. The plan as a whole therefore does not address London's housing crisis or the immediate needs of Tottenham.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--