

James Argles

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2022/2723
Site Address: Brunel Walk London N15 5HQ
Comments by: Anna Wainwright
From:
112
Seaford Road

London
N155DT

Submission: Objection

Comments: I am a resident of Seaford Road and will therefore be directly impacted by the proposed construction of Block A on the Brunel Walk Site.

I would like to object to the planning permission sought for the major development on Brunel walk HGY/2022/2723 for the following reasons:

Summary of concerns

Making reference to the list of comments that are material and relevant to planning as listed on the Haringey Planning website Comment on Applications | Haringey Council

Height of the buildings - the proposal is for 4 stories ' the existing building is 1 -2.5 stories high (according to the Statement of Community Engagement) - this is an overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing and disturbance issue

Balcony location - the balconies are facing east which means that each of them will have a side aspect view directly south and into our windows and gardens - this is an overlooking, overbearing, overshadowing and disturbance issue

Trees - The current trees are not high enough to block out 4 stories ' whilst there is a plan to put more trees up, I don't understand how they will immediately block the overlook problem as they will need time to grow? this is an overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing issue

Blocking light - this will not doubt block light into our gardens and the Daylight and Sunlight report does not give confidence that it will not - this is an overlooking, overbearing and overshadowing issue

Anti-social behavior - the communal areas are open to anti-social behavior and no reference has been made to how this will be managed - this is a principle and disturbance issue

Demolition of existing 'temporary buildings' - this was not consulted on nor was sufficient notice given of the plan to conduct the work ' it over ran by 3+ weeks (still ongoing) and instilled a great sense of distrust in the process ' this is a disturbance issue

Construction time - 3+ years of constant noise and disruption is a terrible prospect for residents - this is a disturbance issue

Engagement ' very limited notice was given when the demolition of the existing Brunel Walk buildings was started ' 1 piece of paper was attached to a lamppost and that was the only engagement we had before the

demolition started 2 weeks later ' there was no time to consult, object or engage with the process. When this was raised with the engagement team, I was told that this was due to 'anti-social behaviour' on site ' this has completely removed my confidence in the process

Detailed Concerns

Block A ' First, Second, Third and Fourth Floor Balconies ' the proposed site plan shows a balcony with an east and south facing aspect. The south facing aspect looks directly onto Seaford Road. This enables residents of the Brunel Walk development to look directly into mine and other residents' windows/gardens. I note that the new plans have privacy screens, but this does not prevent residents leaning over the balcony to view our gardens/properties.

The second concern related to these balconies is one of noise and anti-social behaviour. This development will effectively hang 3 balconies directly behind my garden which could easily be the source of loud noise or anti-social behaviour.

Block A ' First, Second, Third and Fourth Floor Windows

These windows are angled but this will not prevent residents easily being able to see into my property and I into theirs.

This is an overlooking/overbearing and privacy concern

Block A ' Ground floor Seating Area ' the Proposed Site Plan shows an outdoor seating area which appears to be directly behind my garden ' there is no scale on the plans, so it is not possible to confirm the proximity to my border, but it seems extremely close. The outdoor seating area is of concern as it presents a disturbance and principal issue. It essentially puts an outdoor living space directly behind my garden which did not exist and presents a risk of noise disturbance.

Tree coverage

The key on the plans says new trees are in lighter green with existing trees in darker green. From what I can tell you will therefore be removing the only tree that currently offers any privacy to my garden. Please can you confirm what you plan to do with the tree directly behind 112 Seaford Road - will this be removed? How do you plan to put a tree up next to that seating area which will be high enough to have any impact on the overlooking issues?

This is an overlooking and privacy concern

Supporting Documents

Daylight and sunlight report

My property ' 112 Seaford Road is directly referenced in this document and it is difficult to ascertain the exact impact

On a more general point, the conclusion of your report seems to suggest that whilst the plan does not meet the standards, they are flexible and should be open to interpretation. This doesn't not fill me with confidence. The report essentially seems to suggest that mitigating measures are to interpret the rules as flexible because a precedence has been set by other projects who have done the same.

Construction Plan

The length of time that this proposal will take to construct means that the quality of life of Seaford Road residents will be severely diminished for over 2 years from March '23 to July '25. The current demolition work which is being conducted was not consulted on, has over run and has been extremely disruptive.

Based on this lived experience of a resident I cannot trust the quoted timelines and must assume that they will over run and be entirely lacking in regard for the living standards of neighbouring residents.

Statement of Community Involvement

4.19 The placement and design of 8 windows and balconies also specifically seek to avoid direct overlooking of neighbouring property. The simple and balanced articulation of the elevations and considered use of materials seek to complement the proportions of the buildings and provide a distinctive, contextual and robust architectural language '

This simply is not accurate as per my previous comments

4.5 Prior to undertaking wider community engagement, contact was made by The Applicant with the ward Councillors and the Cabinet Member for Housing. The initial proposals for site were discussed and the following key issues were raised: ' Scale, height and design of the development ' Neighbouring residential impact ' Security and anti-social behaviour ' Community facilities ' Construction impacts ' Parking implications ' Safety and management ' Landscaping and play space

All of these concerns remain and do not appear to have been mitigated in the recent plans ' what, therefore, is the purpose of engaging if feedback is ignored?

Following the community engagement exercise, the Local Planning Authority held an online Development Management Forum on 26th of October 2021. This was attended by members of the local community and Councillors.

The following key concerns and comments/queries were raised during the event: ' Position of building A ' Loss of green space for building A ' Anti-social behaviour could be shifted to Elmar Road ' Access concerns to Brunel walk ' Who will do the surveillance? ' Will allotments be compromised or encroached upon? ' Parking inadequate for additional units ' CPZ on Elmar Road already makes it difficult to park there ' Where is the exact position of block A in relation to Elmar Road? ' Where would new residents park their cars? ' Where will electric car charging points go? ' Concerns with increased Service Charges ' Is there an independent survey of the existing building? ' More information required on existing residents ' What is the proposed construction work route? ' Query on the parking survey ' Concerns the buildings will be demolished ' Is there an independent survey available to the public? ' Question on tenure and rents ' Upkeep on green spaces ' How will the scheme be financed if there is no market sale ' What is Homes for Haringey's position on this type of accommodation in terms of management? '

There is no apparent answer to many of these questions. The engagement activity therefore yielded no response or changes which begs the question once more ' what was its purpose?

4.21 The development has been carefully sited and designed to fit into its challenging context and to safeguard neighbouring residential amenity. In particular, the scale and form of the proposed buildings reflect the shape of the site, its boundary conditions and the nature of the local built environment and neighbouring residential and visual amenity. The new buildings have been carefully sited and vary in height from three to four-storeys to respond to the position and scale of neighbouring property and safeguard adjoining amenity.

This is inaccurate ' whilst they may vary in height this does not change the impact in terms of overlooking, privacy invasion overbearing and disruption

4.22 In particular, the proposed buildings have been positioned and designed to avoid neighbouring property being directly overlooked and overshadowed and thereby protect existing levels of privacy and light enjoyed by adjoining residents. A sunlight/daylight assessment has been carried out and is submitted with the planning application, which demonstrates adjoining property within and bordering the site will not be adversely affected by the proposed development in this regard. In addition, comprehensive noise and air quality assessments have been undertaken which highlight that the proposed development will not adversely impact living conditions in the local area.

This is also inaccurate ' there are numerous examples of Seaford Road properties being overlooked

5.3 Feedback received during the engagement process, from the scheme's inception through to the detailed design state, has been taken on board and a number of changes to the scheme have been made to reflect the comments received.

What exact changes have been made? The new plans appear the same as the old plans but with the addition of privacy screens to on the south side of the balconies which have limited positive effects for Seaford Road residents

Consultation Comments

Why is only one email with one comment included in this? There have no doubt been many more interactions. I am confident of this as I myself have raised numerous concerns via email, using the engagement@haringey.gov.uk address.

Therefore there are known commissions from the consultation comments, further degrading trust in this process

Summary Comments

This proposal raises issues, concerns and questions. I am not confident that engagement feedback has been absorbed, listened to or acted upon and have serious concerns about the way in which the work will

be conducted. The recent demolition work was allegedly conducted earlier than planned to mitigate the 'anti-social behaviour' taking place on the site. This was the reason given for the fact that no consultation was conducted with residents, no information was given until it was far too late to object, and the information was provided as 1 piece of laminated paper attached to a lamppost.

This experience has led me to believe that a larger, more disruptive project will be managed with the same disregard for local residents.

I have no confidence in the desire from the council to make this a less problematic experience nor do I have confidence that the building design has taken into consideration the rights, needs of concerns of Seaford Road resident.

As such I would firmly object to this development going ahead to its current design.