

Planning Application at 30 Church Crescent N10 (HGY/2026/1427)

This objection 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 objection include:

The council's decision to refuse the previous application in 2019 are still valid and should be reasserted.

The proposal is clearly in conflict with Council Policy DM33, which is carried over into the new draft local plan as Policy T6, and in DM34.

The previous objection made by the Crossover Group is still valid and is repeated below:

Objection to HGY/2019/1651

The Crossover Group supports all the points of objection submitted by the Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association.

In addition, we emphasise our concern about the negative impact this proposal would have on the conservation area. The councils Conservation Area Character Appraisal refers to the significance of Church Crescent – in section 7.3 it states:

“Church Crescent is a quieter, narrower residential street of two parts, the southern part steeply sloping and curved in its alignment, whilst the northern part is flatter and tree lined.” It goes on to state in the context of number 30: *“The buildings at the southern end of the crescent ... become an important component in the views along the street adding visual interest to the street scene. Unfortunately, there has been substantial disruption to the visual quality of the frontages of the buildings by the removal of front boundary walls to allow for the creation of frontage parking where the slope is less pronounced.”*

Clearly, number 30 is at a sensitive location and any further losses of front boundary walls for parking should be resisted. The existing boundary wall at number 30 is a good example of an original clinker front wall – it adds to the quality of the conservation environment and should be retained. The following photo shows the front wall and garden – even in its neglected state it contributes to the conservation area and its loss would be detrimental to it.



Photo taken June 2026 – note CPZ restriction and original boundary wall

The photo-images given in the proposal illustrates the awfulness of the visual impact that would result from it!

It is relevant to refer to a recent refusal for a similar application also within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area – see HGY/2019/1384. In this instance, refusal was partly based on the damage that would result from the loss of an original front boundary wall and vegetation.

All of the above policy considerations are sufficient grounds to refuse this proposal.