Argles James

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/0261
Site Address: 115 North Hill London N6 4DP
Comments by: Caron Dunkley
From:
117
North Hill

London

N6 4DP
Submission: Objection
Comments: 117 North Hill, Highgate, London N6 4DP

Friday 12 February, 2016 Your ref: HGY/2016/0261

Emma Williamson
Head of Development Management
Planning Service - Haringey Council
6th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
LONDON
N22 8HQ

Dear Ms Williamson

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Location: 115 North Hill N6 4DP
Proposal: Proposed disabled car parking space

I am in receipt of your letter of 28 January 2016 informing me of a planning application for a proposed disabled car parking space directly in front and in the garden of 115 North Hill N6 4DP.

My comments are as follows:

Firstly, although the application is from a resident at 115 North Hill, N6 4DP the actual site development is proposed to take place at 113 North Hill i.e. immediately adjacent to the front garden and house at 111 North Hill ¿ the owners of which I note, according to Haringey Council Planning Service¿s list of document/letter recipients, have not even been circulated with a copy of the Planning Application for some reason; yet the occupiers of 113 North Hill are on the list! This confusion is presumably attributable to the Architect (acting for the applicant) who has completed the application forms inaccurately?

This is a grade II listed terrace from 109-119 built in 1811 which makes it one of the few Regency terraces in Highgate if not London worthy of note. In fact when Sir Nikolaus Pevsner wrote his 46-volume series of county-by-county guides, ¿The Buildings of England¿, the terrace is mentioned in the London section.

Not only will the Planning Application need Planning Permission, of course, it will also need Listed Building Consent. In this case I assume that the views and Report of the Conservation Officer will also be very important (since the Grade II listed terrace consists of the buildings and the curtilage ie gardens surrounding them both front and back).

In my opinion the proposed development would destroy the dignity and integrity of the terrace. If permission is granted the Council will ruin the Regency terrace that has survived and been well maintained for over 205 years as it was originally conceived.

Also, it would set a precedent for others in the terrace (109-119) to try to follow suit in the future.

The Council is well aware that there is the very busy Highgate Group Practice opposite one end of the slip road and two infants/junior schools (integrated ¿ and including the Blanche Nevile school for Deaf children) at the other (North) end of the slip road; together with an elderly peoples home, The Mary Feilding Guild, adjacent to the Regency terrace in which the development is proposed. Both the slip road itself and its single pathway are narrow.
Thus, the pavement and slip road itself are very busy with pedestrians at all hours of the day both the young (a lot in pushchairs and on scooters) attending the Primary School and the elderly. In addition, the slip road acts like a magnet as a rat-run for drivers wishing to avoid or short-cut the traffic lights, in particular at the south end of the slip road. Larger lorries parked or waiting in the slip road, where two cars cannot pass without one having to mount the single narrow pavement, exacerbates the traffic problem.

All this has lead to serious parking and safety problems for the slip road¿s residents and users. The Council (to its great credit) has recognised many of the problems. A 3 tonne weight restriction (for other reasons) has been advised and a one-way traffic system from South to North is destined to be installed. This may, of course, have the effect of inviting vehicles to be driven with more speed down the slip road which, apart from the effects of existing problems and conditions, will certainly be a danger to pedestrians especially young children.

I write the above in order to elucidate the difficulty and length of time which any driver would have in parking, or attempting to park as depicted in the front garden of 113 North Hill. The slip road is very narrow (only 1.8m wide) outside 113. The proposal is to remove the gateway to the garden and to remove part of the low wall entirely in order to considerably widen the entrance. And, to install a double crossover in order to enter the space cleared. Which, is to allow, presumably a large car or other vehicle to be (permanently) parked in the garden of 113.

Recognising this impossibility/dangerous manoeuvre, the proposal is to remove the designated parking space outside 113 to allow the applicant to turn into the proposed parking space at 113.

There are few residents¿ parking spaces along this designated area (commencing at the boundary between 111 and 113) and often the spaces are like gold dust for residents along the slip road clambering for them. Not only do I consider this to be a rather arrogant proposal it is also selfish and shows no consideration whatsoever for other residents in the terrace and further along the slip road.

It is not clear from the proposal how the ¿removable bollards¿ would operate. But it does seem that they will promote the entry of foxes and dogs into all the gardens within the terrace. No gates could be used. With a car or other vehicle in the garden, gates which opened either inwards or outwards onto the narrow pathway (which would be dangerous for young and old pedestrians alike) could not be installed because there would be no room whatsoever for them to operate in any case.

I consider that a car turning at 90 degrees across the very narrow North Hill slip road and mounting and crossing the very narrow pavement outside 113 (then attempting to park) would pose a serious likelihood of danger to the public and in particular to children and elderly pedestrians using the only narrow pavement. This would be exacerbated and cause chaos should similar permanent parking spaces be perpetuated in other or all the front gardens of the terrace (Prospect Place); and indeed in other front gardens beyond this terrace.

I question whether Mr Shaw is quite as disabled as indicated in the ¿Background¿ notes as I still see him regularly fully kitted out with his tennis racquet going to play tennis. Therefore, a key question which must

be asked is whether in fact either the applicant or Mr Shaw have, or, are entitled to a Blue Badge (designated solely for disabled persons) and if and when such entitlement was obtained ¿ and therefore whether they are legally entitled to apply for the development(?).

I have no problem whatsoever if the applicant should apply for a Disabled Parking Bay to be created within the designated parking bays which run along the slip road to the terrace. That way other ¿Blue Badge¿ holders who already live in the terrace (and further down) would benefit from it also, as would Badge Holders in the Mary Feilding Guild.

If a designated ¿Disabled only¿ parking space should be created by the Council along the slip road within the specified parking spaces I would support it provided it was in front of the Mary Feilding Guild ¿ which would seem to be the ideal location for one.

I have lived in my home (117) for more than 40 years and during that period, knowing that the Council and the LBH Conservation Group have a duty to provide services and to protect Listed Buildings from unwarranted changes and developments, I have always supported the LBH in their efforts to do so and will certainly continue to do so.
In addition to the clutter and lack of space which would be caused in the garden of 113 if a car was parked there ¿ a large car would hardly fit-in and ¿removable bollards¿ are suggested because there is no room for gates to be fitted which could open either inwards or outwards ¿ a ramped access is suggested from 113 to an entrance at 115. Surely the access should be via the existing front door to 113 thus obviating an unsightly ramp from 113 to 115?

I very strongly object to this planning application and I am also copying my reply to Michael Hammerson and Elspeth Clements who cover Planning & Development of The Highgate Society for their comments.

Yours sincerely

Caron Dunkley

Copied to:

Tobias Finlayson, Case Officer, Planning Services, Haringey Council Elspeth Clements, Planning & Development, The Highgate Society, 10A South Grove, London N6 6BS Michael Hammerson, Policy & Projects, The Highgate Society, 10A South Grove, London N6 6BS Francis Birch, 11 North Hill Avenue, London N6 4RJ Tessa & John Wilson, 109 North Hill, London N6 4DP Tiz Blackwell & Rufus Rottenberg, 111 North Hill, London N6 4DP Paula & Trevor Shaw, 113-115 North Hill, London N6 4DP Lucy & Joe Connolly, 119 North Hill, London N6 4DP