Skapoullis Jon

From: development.control@haringey.gov.uk
Sent: 27 April 2016 16:06
To: Planning Support
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/0637
Site Address: Rear of 29 Haringey Park London N8 9JD
Comments by: David Wylson
From:
54B
Cecile Park

London

N8 9AU
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments: Rear of 29 Haringey Park, N8 9JD

Application number ¿ HGY/2016/0637

I am writing to make the strongest objection to the above planning application.

I am resident at the Cottage 54B Cecile Park, located in the garden of Derwent Court some 50 metres from the proposed development site at the eastern end of the Back Lane, now known as Abbots Terrace. We use this Lane on a daily basis both by car and on foot; it forms the principal access to our property.

The proposed four bedroom family dwelling house of two floors represents gross overdevelopment of this site, originally the vegetable garden of 29 Haringey Park including an Edwardian pitched roof garage. It should not be considered as a brownfield site.

At the pre-application meeting it would appear that the planning officer may have become intoxicated by a slick presentation including a design and access statement which though carefully crafted with examples of international conceptual architecture, does not stand up to close local contextual appraisal.

The proposed development is at the centre of an area of green land between Cecile Park and Haringey Park, which makes a significant contribution to the Crouch End Conservation Area. It is a remnant of the rural setting of Crouch End village. The maturely planted gardens and the Back Lane, on the northern leafy slope of Crouch Hill contrast with the intensely developed inner London borough of Islington. The Back Lane was flanked by sentinel Elms now re-greened by Ash, Chesnutt and Sycamore.

It is a haven for wildlife as is well reported by other objectors. I had the pleasure of watching woodcock foraging along our hedgerows this winter.

The applicant has sought to denigrate the condition of the location, which is and must be treated as a heritage asset.

The proposed design of the large four bedroom house is wholly out of character with the Conservation Area .The dominant glass walls whilst providing panoramic views for the occupants both east and west extend to the full depth of the site. This will adversely change the whole setting of the area to the detriment of adjoining residents and the local community who enjoy walking along and using the back lane for their amenity.

At night both the proposed building and the outdoor dining area will generate significant light pollution to the detriment of the birds and wildlife. It will destroy the setting and atmosphere of this quiet, green and natural area.

The proposed deep concrete ¿trough¿ on the roof which will apparently form a planter for trees and shrubs will significantly contribute to the height, bulk and over-bearing presence of this proposed large house.
Most of the top soil has already been scraped away during the recent site clearance, the ¿trough¿ would therefore be filled with heavy London clay (suitable for grazing land) making an nonsense of the environmental platitudes in the Design and Access Statements.

The southern boundary of the site, with recent new fencing has been illegally extended into the Back Lane to the detriment of adjoining owners and existing users. The proposed development would be built right up to this notional boundary creating a pinch point.

The Back Lane (Abbots Terrace) is a fire access route for the Cottages 54a and 54b Cecile Park, the Derwent Court garden Flat (No 1) and the rear of Derwent Court with its access balconies to all the flats and garages below. The London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority has made clear representations (21/3/16) under the Fire Safety Regulations on this application. The proposed development is not compliant and should be refused on the above grounds alone.

All loading and unloading should take place within the curtilage of the site, the planning application demonstrates this would not be possible. Furthermore access to and use of the proposed garage is not possible, given the width of the Back Lane at this point, without encroaching onto the land and garage forecourt of 36 Cecile Park.

The Design and Access Statement suggests that the proposed development would be fully serviced with a new main access way to Haringey Park and bin store at Ravensdale Mansions. This is spurious. There is substantive objection from and no agreement with the residents of Ravensdale Mansions in this matter. The residual adverse cumulative impacts of this proposed development on adjoining owners will therefore be severe.

Pell Frishmen apparently appointed by Haringey Council to provide a road safety audit seem to wholly ignore the above access related matters which are a key concern. Site clearance alone has churned up deep mud and made the lane virtually impassable to the detriment of users. The report erroneously concludes that there are no major issues which should restrict the development proposal.

The applicants suggest that the Back Lane is an uncared for location: this is incorrect. The western end is cared for and planted by the Abotts Terrace and Ivy Garden residents and the eastern end by ourselves at Derwent Court, including clearing up any litter, putting down wildflower seed and managing trees.

In conclusion the applicants have failed to come forward with a proposed development which both protects and enhances this most important element of the Crouch End Conservation Area. The design is wholly inappropriate for the location. The development would fail to meet the most basic of access requirements.

Approval of this scheme would set an appalling precedent for the Crouch End Conservation Area. It would undermine current and relevant planning policies for Haringey. It would be at variance with the conclusion of the Planning Inspectorate in respect to recent appeals.

I would urge the Councils Planning Committee and Crouch End ward members to give the objections by the Crouch End Neighborhood Forum and local residents full weight, to stand by their evidence based and relevant local policies and to refuse this application.