Argles James

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/1606
Site Address: 57 North Road London N6 4BJ
Comments by: T Gray
From:
Flat 1, Northfield Hall
59 North Road
Highgate
London

N6 4BJ
Submission: Objection
Comments: (Also sent by email)

Dear Matthew,

I am copying this to Susan Rose, chair of Highgate CAAC, Gail Waldman (Highgate Society & CAAC) and our councillors.

I would like to object to planning applications HGY/2016/1606 and HGY/2016/1751 on the following grounds:

1. Despite more information being provided recently relating to HGY/2016/1751 in addition to that originally posted in support of HGY/2016/1606, there is still insufficient information to form an opinion. The information detailed below needs to be provided before neighbours can comment properly on either.

I will comment separately on HGY/2016/1756 in due course, if necessary. Needless to say, splitting the information between applications in this way makes commenting more difficult!

2. Neither the very sketchy plan of the ground floor of the site included for HGY/2016/1606, nor the plan Ground Floor Plant Specification.pdf- for HGY/2016/1751, make clear what materials the boundary of the site will be constructed from, or its height.

A high, very alienating brick wall was originally proposed around the entire site, which would have caused security problems for people entering and exiting Northfield Hall, 59 North Road, walking down to 61-67 North Road and Highpoint garage users, as no-one would have been able to see anyone lurking in our entrance way on approach to No 59-67 and the garages, and no-one exiting No 59 would have been able to see anyone lurking in the lane outside the synagogue.

This was subsequently changed to include railings around the corner by the entrance to Northfield Hall, 59 North Road to give a better view both ways.

The plans given in the documentation for HGY/2016/1606 and HGY/2016/1751 do not make clear how much of the boundary will be high brick wall and how much will be railings or fencing, and no detail is given of the design and materials of any wall, railings or fencing.

Clearly we would object to any wall or fence which blocked the view of the lane when exiting from Northfield Hall, or which obscured the entrance of Northfield Hall to pedestrians and garage users walking down the lane from Highpoint, Grimshaw Close or the main part of North Road.

To obscure these views would be contrary to council policy on security, non-alienating environments an so-on, and would discriminate against pedestrians.

Since there is no information on this I object to HGY/2016/1606 and HGY/2016/1751.

3. One version of the plans given permission included a very chunky security gate on the boundary not far from our entrance, similar to an airport security gate. This was very ugly indeed and obscured the view up the lane. It is unclear from plans in HGY/2016/1606 and HGY/2016/1751 whether this very unsightly feature is still included in the plan and, if not, what is to replace it. We need to see this information before we can comment on it.

4. No information is given either on the noise made by any of these gates, for instance compared to the loud buzz of the previous gate each time it was used on non-Sabbath/holy days.

5. The sketchy plan included for HGY/2016/1606 hints at some sort of drainage gullies across the car park area at 90 degrees to Northfield Hall. This is not sufficient to deduce whether the proposals are adequate.

Since our lobby and patio area have in the past been subject to flooding from rainwater build-up, and a considerable amount of rain water used to gather in the synagogue car park on the eastern side of our drain by the entrance, we need to know that whatever is proposed now will not result in flooding of our properties.

More information should be provided on this, for instance including slopes around the "drainage gullies" in the car park area. For this reason I object to HGY/2016/1606.

6. No information Is provided on changes - if any - to the drain on the boundary between 57 and 59 North Road. This is important for the same reasons as (5).

7. No information is given in either HGY/2016/1606 or HGY/2016/1751 on the height of the planters or plants. No information is provided on which plants will go where. The new building has already blocked a significant amount of light from Northfield Hall and inappropriate planting along our boundary and on the roof terrace will make this worse.

This information needs to be provided, including cross sections of the site.

8. Some of the plants suggested in HGY/2016/1751 would not be suitable for planting in the very shady conditions between Nos 57 and 59. As far as I can tell from the list given, better, more interesting shade plants could be included. As it stands, the planting looks like it may be very dull indeed along the boundary with No 2-4 Northfield Hall's patio. More information needs to be provided on this.

9. It is in any case not clear why a sedum roof which will only be used for 9 days a year as a site for the Sukot needs planters and barriers around it at all. Removing them would increase the amount of light reaching Northfield Hall and Grimshaw Close.

10. The pavers suggested for HGY/2016/1606 seem odd colours compared to the reused London stock and modern white-ish brick used for the two buildings.

11. No information is given in HGY/2016/1606 or HGY/2016/1751 on whether the ground floor surface will be permeable, in line with council policy. I would object to non-permeable surfaces.

12. None of the planting proposed around the roof terrace in HGY/2016/1751 would do anything to reduce noise from the roof terrace, which is only about 8 meters from our bedrooms.

For all these reasons I object to HGY/2016/1606 and HGY/2016/1751.

I would also note that the upstairs dormer window of the cottage nearest Northfield Hall seems to have been wrongly reconstructed compared to the original.

All the best,
Therese Gray