Argles James

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/0673
Site Address: Holly Bank Cottage Holly Bank Muswell Hill London N10 3TH
Comments by: John Laird
From:
27
Cranmore Way

London

N10 3TP
Submission: Objection
Comments: 10 planning applications under reference numbers HGY/2016/0667 to HGY/2016/0676 inclusive were submitted on behalf of the property owner to address specific conditions attached to the approval on appeal of the plans for development for the site filed under application HGY/2013/2606. These 10 applications were lodged on 4th March 2016 with a closing date for consultation of 4th April. We are owners/resident on one of the adjoining properties and thus directly affected by these applications, however, there has been no attempt by either the owner, the owners agents or the Council to notify us that these documents had been lodged and it was only early April that we became aware that these had been so lodged. We therefore object to any decision being made on these applications until we have had a reasonable chance to review all the submitted documents in depth. We therefore request an extension to the original date of 4th April.
From a limited review available in the time available, we have the following comments:
(1) Tree Report
On the rear boundary of our property there is an old Yew tree (ref T31 on the site map). The proposed House #5 and its sunken private patio are well within the root protection area of this tree. Whilst the report discussed methods of protection during the construction phase, it is silent on the impact the proposed work on house #5 and the sunken patio could have on the tree i.e. is it acceptable for this degree of excavation close to the tree and could the tree be damaged.
I object to the planning application HGY/2016/0675 until this concern is specifically addressed by the arboriculture report.
(2) Vehicle Crossover
The architects pre commencement report shows, on p7, that there is room for 2 vehicles to pass side by side at the entrance to the site, a requirement for safety, however, it is clear from the diagram provided that this is achieved by assuming the full width of the driveway access up to the fence to the rear of the garden at 1 Cranmore Way. It is clearly not reasonable to assume that a vehicle can safely drive without a safe clearance from the fence.
I object to the planning application HGY/2016/0668 until it can be demonstrated that there is enough clear space for 2 vehicles to safely pass side by side. It must be noted that the bottom of Muswell Hill is a dangerous place with many accidents from cars crashing into the bollards by the side of the road in the close proximity of the access road to this site. Recent proposals from Haringey Council to alter the layout of the intersection at the base of Muswell Hill surely indicates that the Council also believes there are traffic safety issues in this area.
On another aspect, the architects pre-commencement report, also on p7, states that ¿The proposed development will create an inwardly looking private mews. At the entrance, an automated solid wooden gate will be installed for security and privacy. This will prevent non- resident use of the mews and will reduce the potential for criminal behaviour in what is currently an unobserved space.
The new use of the site reduces opportunities for criminal behaviour through creating a definable dwelling space¿.
This gate was not included on the original plans submitted with HGY/2013/2606 and, therefore it appears to be a change. There is no need for a gate as, once the houses are occupied, there should be no greater incidence of criminal behaviour than on neighbouring streets ¿ arguably it should be lower as the houses all look onto each other so there would be a greater degree of mutual surveillance from those residents. A

gate would itself attract greater attention (suggesting there must be something requiring such additional protection!) and would inhibit legitimate exercise of rights of way by neighbouring residents (see also 3 below). The owners and their agents have frequently made unsubstantiated allegations of trespass and fly tipping on the site as reasons for requiring the gate already installed (supposedly a temporary measure until construction was completed), however, if there has in fact been any such activity then it has resulted because of actions taken by the owners themselves who terminated all the leases for local residents who previously used the garages and removed the tenant from Holly Bank Cottage thus ensuring there was very little practical oversight of the site. Trespass has also been made more likely as the owners have also disconnected the site lighting which would automatically come on if anyperson entered the site after dark. We therefore also object to HGY/2016/0668 as it appears to be being used to introduce changes from the previously approved plan without passing through the due process.

(3) Rights of Way over Holly Bank.

In common with many other residents on Cranmore Way and Etheldene Avenue, we have legal rights of way to pass over the Holly Bank site. These legal ROWs are recorded on the Land Register. The CMP and CLP document prepared by Maybach Projects on behalf of the applicants makes it quite clear that the site will be made secure and DOES NOT mention how our legal rights will be provide for during the construction process ¿ it is quite possible that Maybach were not informed about the presence of these ROWs which, undoubtedly, Holly Bank¿s owners would rather did not exist. They do, however, exist and the affected residents will continue to exercise their rights ¿ I do not to propose discontinuing the use of my back gate for the many months the building project will continue!

We object, therefore, to application HGY/2016/0669 until the CMP and CLP is prepared in a manner that shows how the ROW¿s will be respected and provision made for those entitled to use the ROWs in a safe manner during the construction phase.