

James Argles

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

Application Reference No. : HGY/2022/2775
Site Address: Cranwood 100 Woodside Avenue London N10 3JA
Comments by: John Jo Hammill
From:
37
Park Hall Road
East Finchley
London

N2 9PT

Submission: Objection

Comments: This is a very poor set of documents that verges on treating the local community with contempt. The demolition works began in September without either planning permission or discharge of this condition. The application form states that the development has not yet commenced, which I believe should be sufficient grounds for refusal of these documents. I strongly object to approval to discharge this condition based on the woeful set of information provided. I look forward to details of what LB Haringey planning is doing to bring this development back into line with the planning process. Please also provide photo evidence of where this application was advertised on Woodside Avenue - I haven't seen anything.

What is the role of Delta Architects who are noted as the agent for the planning condition discharge application? Planning condition 26 requires Levitt Bernstein Associates to be retained as Project Architect for the project

Date of Documents

Why are the CEMP and DEMP dated 18th October? Both documents clearly state the planning conditions for the two documents, but by this point works were underway already.

Generic Documents

Both the CEMP and DEMP appear to be generic and 'tick box' focussed. There are references to other locations, e.g. Seaford Road, the development providing facilities for the school, plus they are written in the future tense and don't state that asbestos is present, plus that many things have been implemented on site which I am not sure is actually the case. Neither is in a fit state to allow works to continue, in my opinion. New revisions are needed with a real update on the current state, plus named individuals and real details of what Formation has decided to implement.

Asbestos

The DEMP states that presence of asbestos will be checked. Why say this in October? No details of removal are provided. This is another strong indicator that the CEMP and DEMP are generic documents by a consultancy who Formation have brought in to 'tick the box'.

There are three asbestos surveys uploaded, from two different companies. How was the 2014 survey used as part of the 2022 reviews? It doesn't seem to be referenced.

The July 2022 asbestos survey document is confused as it states that the survey took place in July 2021 for Formation. Is this the case or not? Why is something as important as asbestos subject to a report where there is confusion on which year was the survey

The August 2022 asbestos survey doesn't even appear to be focussed as a pre-demolition report. It states that residents were living in the property and another visit would be required. Did this take place?

Irrespective of this Formation must confirm that a full survey of all areas on the site was carried out before the demolition commenced and then during demolition as hidden areas became visible. Formation must confirm that all ACMs were removed before demolition.

In the DEMP, P7 2.5 notes an asbestos removal notice. When and to whom was this issued?

Unexploded WWII bombs

In the DEMP, 2.6 UXO survey states:

The future intention for the land is the construction of new facilities for the school; it has been assumed that

What? Have they even looked at the plans?

The UXO strategy needs to include confirmation of an agreed process for liaison and notification with school and strategy to communicate quickly.

Utilities

There are a lot of old drawings in the application of the original services. Have all of these now been disconnected. Please provide proof from the utility provider for each service.

Community Engagement

Also in the DEMP,

2.8 Community Engagement Arrangements

Prior to the demolition phase, Formation will undertake a letter drop to nearby residents. This letter drop will contain primarily demolition information. Furthermore, this will include Formation details (contact, phone number, email, titles, and names), and any other information pertaining to the relevant scope of the works including hours of work.

Did they do this? If not, then why bother saying they will. Did anyone from NRG actually visit the site?

P26 notes a large number of items that are stated to have been implemented on site. I don't believe this to have been the case.

Installation of Dust Monitors

P32 notes details of two Airly PM10 dust monitors. Were these installed before demolition?

Respecting Noise Limits and Monitoring

Condition 12 sets limits for noise at the school. Have the acoustic meters been installed by Formation yet and are they working and storing data? Why not include this data to build trust with the community?

Logistics Plans

The logistics plans in each document are poor and I think may have been prepared by someone from an office without a site visit. Do Formation really think that articulated vehicles will be able to drive down Woodside Avenue at 9am? The deliveries details are formulaic and don't state that the route to and from is directly past St James, plus Treehouse, plus Tetherdown access and the NHS facility at Simmons House in Woodside Square. No notice of 20mph zone. Minimal details that there is nowhere nearby to wait. Vehicles should wait at London Gateway/Hendon Services on the M1 if running early and then be called forwards.

Swept path analyses show an articulated lorry. Why is this considered acceptable? How many banksmen will Formation provide to stop cars and pedestrians (as the whole road will be blocked) during these manoeuvres? How can an artic turn left from Woodside Ave to Great North Road A1000? I don't think this is possible and again suggests an office produced plan.

What's the route for a turned away vehicle if it arrives early? Does it drive around Muswell Hill? This is unclear and again adds danger. Just saying to turn away vehicles is facile. LB Haringey need to take responsibility here

Both documents appear to miss times when deliveries are restricted. Why are deliveries allowed until 4pm? These should be prevented from 3pm to 5pm to suit the end of the school day and after school clubs, especially now that we have returned to dark afternoons with GMT. Also reference no noisy work during school breaktimes. I'd also propose no deliveries until after 0930hrs to allow the many Treehouse taxis and drop-off vehicles to dissipate and prevent cross over with dropoff.

CEMP queries

In the CEMP, P11. the entire community engagement strategy is described as:

2.8 Community Engagement Arrangements

Prior to any major works on site, Formation will undertake a letter drop to nearby residents. This letter drop will contain all construction and works information. Furthermore, this will include Formation details (contact, phone number, email, titles, and names), and any other information pertaining to the relevant scope of the works including hours of work.

This is woeful given the location of the site next to a school, an NHS facility adjacent, a senior living facility to the north, a specialist school to the west, another school adjacent, a busy road to the east, and Highgate Woods to the south. Formation can do a lot better and Haringey Homes need to insist on this.

Also in the CEMP, 2.10 drainage. Planning review said to be careful of risk of runoff to the Parkland Walk. There is no reference to this. There's no mention of the need for a Groundwater Risk Management Permit which is noted from Thames Water as an informative to the planning permission. It also needs reference to approval by Thames Water to works around their sewers and mains water tunnel and shaft.

P14 Section 4 environmental monitoring

Why does this talk about everything in the future tense, when most of this has happened already

Why are so many items still to be agreed with LB Haringey? These should have already been decided.

Why are drainage consent limits still to be agreed? Isn't this part of the planning condition?

P8 add details of tower crane and reach. The school and community need to be reassured at no risk of collapse into the playground.

P10 the waste management strategy should be in place by now. Where is it and who is the champion?

P12 no reference to school in hoarding design or marshalling

P18 the deliveries doesn't state that the route to and from is directly past St James, plus Treehouse, plus Tetherdown access. No notice of 20mph zone. No notice that there is nowhere nearby to wait. Vehicles should wait at Hendon Services if running early and then be called forwards.

Swept path analyses show an articulated lorry. Why is this acceptable? How many banksmen will Formation provide to stop cars and pedestrians during these manoeuvres?

How can an artic turn left from Woodside Ave to Great North Road A1000. Heavy cycle risk.

What's the route for a turned away vehicle? Does it drive around Muswell Hill? This is unclear and again adds danger

P27 downplays importance and number of schools e.g. significant number of vehicles to Treehouse. Narrow 20mph road along Woodside

P31 who is the nominated employee for complaints? What is the phone number?

P33 dust management notes Seaford Road so is likely an unchecked copy and paste. Needs revision. No mention of school or Highgate Woods

P34 has ticks for implemented on site when nothing has been done yet apart from releasing a lot of dust as a breach of planning

P35 why note future registration when there are lots of machinery on site already

P36 dust receptors doesn't note the school or senior living facility or the Woods

P37 13.3 doesn't mention Woods or Parkland Walk

Where are monitoring records to date, including PM10 and daily and weekly checklists?

Has the site been registered at NRMM.London?