## PRESS RELEASE FROM THE PINKHAM WAY ALLIANCE

The Pinkham Way Alliance (PWA) notes the comments made by a Barnet Council officer about a potential planning application on the Pinkham Way site for a waste lorry depot/waste transfer station.

The PWA makes the following observations:

The officer stated that the site was 'zoned for industrial use'. This is untrue.

The site has a dual designation, as a Grade 1 Site for Nature Conservation (SINC), and as a Designated Employment Area (distinct from an Industrial Area). The status as Grade 1 SINC was confirmed by the PWA's 2013 ecological survey, reinforced subsequently by Haringey's own study.

As Barnet Council will know well, the attempt by Haringey Council to redesignate the site as a Locally Significant Industrial Site in 2010 was firmly rejected by the Planning Inspector of Haringey's Local Plan, who said in his report that there was no sound evidence for changing the designation.

He recommended a review of the site's status, stating that the following aspects should be taken into consideration:

... its open space value, its biodiversity and its specific site features such as the culverted water course ...

Haringey's Local Plan states that developments can only take place on a SINC where there are 'exceptional circumstances' and 'the value of the development outweighs environmental considerations'. Barnet already has a waste lorry depot on the Mill Hill site, so it is difficult to see how it can make out a case for 'exceptional circumstances'!

Before deciding to sell its existing depot for development, Barnet should have secured planning permission on an alternative suitable site within its own borough boundary. It is entirely the Council's own doing that it is now in this position.

Why should a valuable nature conservation site in a neighbouring borough be destroyed, not to mention Haringey residents' being lumbered with Barnet's 'bad neighbour, noisy nuisance' waste lorry depot, simply because Barnet's own incompetence has left it without a suitable alternative site before contracting to move off its current one?

The Council gives a sorry account of itself, apparently having so little confidence in its own case that it cannot bring itself to give residents the full picture, but relies instead on misrepresentation and wishful thinking.

Stephen Brice Chair - Pinkham Way Alliance 7<sup>th</sup> September 2014

## Note to Editors:

In December 2009 Barnet Council entered into a contract with the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) to sell part of the Pinkham Way site to the Authority. A condition of the contract required the NLWA to submit a joint planning application with Barnet Council for the Council's waste transport depot and an MBT waste plant for the Authority. The application was never validated and was eventually withdrawn.

The NLWA, which owns the larger part of the site, subsequently changed its mind about developing the site and issued a statement in December 2013 to the effect that it had no plans to use the site in the short or medium term. In June 2014 the joint planning application was withdrawn.

The current position on the designation of the Pinkham Way site is that Haringey Council is conducting a site review following the Inspector's report and extensive representations received from the public (including from the PWA). There is no evidence that Haringey will decide to designate it as a waste site. There are a number of competing options other than waste use open to Haringey, including community use, housing development, open space etc. The council has issued a statement on its website to the effect that any decision about the future use of this site will be made in public by the Council's Cabinet after carrying out a thorough review of all the issues relating to the site.

The full Inspector's report is available at:

http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/housing\_and\_planning/planningmainpage/policy\_and\_projects/local\_development\_framework/local\_plan\_adopti on/corestrategy/core\_strategy\_examination/cs-documentlibrary/post\_examination\_documents.htm#letter-tab-mods-insp-to-lbh-220812

## Ref PE-30

Paras 56 and 62 are the relevant paragraphs to support the information above.