

Planning Application at 20 Devonshire Gardens N17 (HGY/2026/0897)

This comment is made on behalf of the 'Crossover Group', a group of cross-Haringey residents who are concerned about the proliferation of crossovers, the loss of front gardens and front walls with associated damage to the environment and street-scene – all to the disadvantage of residents generally. In addition, the process whereby a resident applicant can appropriate a section of the public road space for their exclusive use, to the detriment of other residents is objectionable.

This submission is made with contact details supplied, but because of previous instances of intimidation they are withheld from this consultation comment.

The reasons for comment are identical to those made in response to the identical application made in 2024 – they are repeated here:

As it stands, the proposal is in conflict with Local Plan policies DM33 (Crossovers, Vehicular Access etc) and DM34 (Driveways and Front Gardens). In normal circumstances the Crossover Group would have submitted an objection to it. However, reviewing the site location and the context of this proposal, the submission from the Crossover Group is simply a comment, rather than objection.

Context:



It is evident that the site is completely surrounded by off-street/front garden parking that has removed a huge area of greenspace, and destroyed the quality of the street scene and local environment. Sadly, the damage has been done - it is too late, and it would be futile to object and try to save this remaining green patch.

Comment.

The council has long had policies to protect the local environment from what has happened here in Devonshire Gardens – DM33 and DM34 are the latest and most rigorous in this respect. Perhaps most of this destruction has been done DIY and unlawfully. It is lamentable that the council (Highways?) have not taken enforcement action to resist and deter this irreversible degradation of the local environment. Sadly, it is too late to do so now.

The documents relating to this proposal suggest the need for disabled access. Surely, there is some alternative and less invasive way to provide for this.