

LADDER COMMUNITY SAFETY PARTNERSHIP

CELEBRATING 25 YEARS 1999 – 2024

Ms Anna Anderson
LBH Planning,
Alexandra House,
10 Station Road,
N22 7TR

17 July 2026

Dear Ms Anderson,

Re: HGY/2026/1854: Certificate of Lawfulness (proposed) for transformer building etc. at Colina Road /Green Lanes, Haringey N8 0RA.

I am writing to you on behalf of the local community in my capacity as the elected chair of the Ladder Community Safety Partnership (LCSP) and the Haringay Ward Police Panel.

The LCSP is an umbrella organisation containing hundreds of individual members, along with representatives of Neighbourhood Watches and Residents' Associations throughout Haringay ward. We are an independent group, although we work in partnership with many other key stakeholders to improve the quality of life for local people. The Police Panel obviously works closely with our local officers and sets priorities which aim to keep the area safe and free from crime, anti-social behaviour and other nuisances.

Our members are very concerned by the Certificate of Lawfulness (C of L) application for a transformer building on the corner of Colina Road and Green Lanes N8. This was fully discussed at our monthly LCSP meeting, held on 16 July 2026.

The nature of a C of L is that it precludes any scrutiny by, or consultation with, local residents. Yet we know from the applicants themselves that the building will generate a degree of both noise and vibration. It is also on a prominent site and will have a major negative impact on the street scene of Green Lanes, not to mention the numerous residents of the adjacent Evergreen development.

We believe that TfL are using the T and C Planning (General Permitted Development) Order of 2015 as the peg upon which to hang the C of L. However, the planning history of the site clearly reveals that this specific location was identified as a "new pocket space" (HGY/2016/1807, Landscape Design statement, Introduction, Para 5). This was then incorporated into the formal planning permission as a condition which "must be complied with" (HGY/2016/1807; Condition 2 ... approved plans and specifications: Landscape Design {June 2016}).

However, diligent research by a local resident has now revealed that the original planning permission was changed in December 2021 (HGY/2021/3583) following TfL's request to take back ownership of their land on the site.

No one in the community was aware of this because the submission was made as a "non-material amendment" under section 96 of the T and C Planning Act 1990 which allows a Council / Local Authority to make a change to any planning permission if it is satisfied that the change is non-material.

Furthermore, as this is not deemed to be an application for planning permission, the provisions relating to Statutory Consultation and publicity do not apply. This explains why residents were not aware of the situation.

It does not explain, of course, why LBH Planning thought the loss of a pocket park / green space, much vaunted in the original application, was a non-material issue. Nor does it explain why LBH Planning did nothing to pursue this when they could, between 2016 and 2021.

This digression into the history of the site is necessary because it makes it all the more important that, on this occasion, the application for the transformer building, on what should have been a green space, is subject to a very close scrutiny.

In particular,

(1) Why has TfL chosen this specific high-profile site for a quasi-industrial building, adjacent to dozens of flats and an NHS clinic / surgery?

(2) Have TfL submitted evidence to demonstrate that other locations have been examined, which might be less obtrusive and harmful to local amenity?

(3) LBH Planning Policies stress the importance of “Delivering High Quality Design – DM 1” and of avoiding “harmful impacts, especially to the amenity of neighbouring buildings, local character..., new development should enhance the quality of life of those living and working in the borough...” (DM 1, 2.1).

It is very hard to see how a huge and solid building, lacking any distinctive quality, on a prominent corner site of our local high street, could be anything other than an unacceptable eyesore. TfL presumably realise that, as they are proposing an equally unlovely advertising hoarding as a “screen” – all on what was supposed to be a green space.

(4) TfL claim that the site is an “existing operational railway compound”. This is simply untrue. Before the current development it had a variety of wholesale and retail uses, including BDC electrical and Hawes & Curtis clothing, but it has never been a “railway compound”.

We believe this means that future development of the site should not be decided by a C of L because it is not “development by a railway undertaker on its operational land” as the TfL submission claims. As noted above, the site has not been used by TfL (or its predecessors) for operational purposes for many years, if at all.

Furthermore, the non-material change of use granted by HGY/2021/3583 only allowed TfL permission for uses which: (i) would not change the approved scheme for 590–598 Green Lanes and its adjoining site and (ii) required only design changes.

All of this suggests to us that TfL cannot claim lawfulness for a development and railway use on the site without obtaining full planning permission. LBH should therefore reject the C of L as an erroneous and unlawful application and require TfL to re-submit their application via the normal planning process for a new development.

Ian Sygrave
Chair LCSP / Harringay Police Panel.