

Planning Application: HGY/2026/2308.

Site: YMCA, 184 Tottenham Lane, Hornsey, London N8 8SG

Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application HGY/2026/2308

I am a resident of Elmfield Avenue, and I object to the application in its submitted form. The proposed height, massing and intensification of use are excessive for the site and would cause unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity, townscape, noise, daylight/sunlight, and servicing. Construction disruption is considerable and potential risks should be properly identified, considered and mitigated.

I request that the Council require the applicant to reduce the scale of the scheme and also resolve the technical inconsistencies identified below.

If the Council approves the application, I request any necessary operational and construction controls are secured by applied conditions.

Overall scale, height and massing.

The proposed development has increased the Gross Internal Floor Area from 4218sqm to 6141sqm on a minimally increased footprint. The proposed design accommodates the additional area by extending the building height. The increased floor area is a function of the Applicant's funding requirements (reference DAS page 37 Option 3) to provide 174 en-suite bedrooms and apparently is not derived from a townscape analysis. The increased massing is especially evident at the junction of Elmfield Avenue and Tottenham Lane where the indicated height increase is from +57.427m to approximately +65.000 (no level is provided by the Applicant on the submitted elevations). Ground level FFL is indicated on the submitted drawings as +41.750.

The result is a suboptimal design that does not achieve the criteria set out in Section 27 of the London Borough of Haringey (LBH) document PRE/2025/0199 and the Applicant's Planning Statement item 5.17/e. The design is inherently too large for the site resulting in a design solution which is not appropriate for its context, and which has unresolved technical issues.

The London Borough of Haringey (LBH) document PRE/2025/0199 is included in the Applicant's Planning Application submission and it is assumed that the LBH planning advice is still current. Reference is made to this LBH document in the following comments.

Corner massing and treatment onto Elmfield Avenue.

The Applicant in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) notes on page 40 that the new scheme "represents only a modest increase in height and massing compared to the existing YMCA complex." We appreciate that the Applicant wishes to promote the scheme, but this statement is incorrect as the proposed massing accommodates a 45.5% increase in area and the Elmfield Avenue corner height has increased by 48.3% (to top of plant room). This is a major change to the existing townscape and is not a "minor neutral" impact as noted in Table 7.2 in the 260806 Heritage, Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). The views in the VIA illustrate the detrimental visual impact of the excessive accommodation on the adjacent properties. The proposed design provides a disappointing and suboptimal solution to the corner of Tottenham Lane and Elmfield Avenue and does not have the elegance of the existing articulated corners indicated on page 41 of the DAS. The criteria set in the PRE/2025/0199; item 27/a, and 27/c have not been met. It is informative to review the development and design proposals for this building corner on page 90 of the DAS which illustrate the over development of the site and the suboptimal corner design.

PRE/2025/0199 item 33 advises that the roof plant form should not project above the 6-storey level. The proposed south elevation indicates an extensive plant room above the top of the Level 06 rooms. This would appear to be non-compliant with the LBH advice note. The roof form itself is not sympathetic in terms of form and materials and will not complement the adjacent conservation area buildings. The required extent of the plant enclosure is considered in the East Elevation section.

We request the London Borough of Haringey Planning Department to review the submitted design proposals and request the Applicant to reconsider the treatment of this important corner. There are alternative design solutions which would involve reducing the proposed number of units (currently +17 no. over existing provision) and amending the layout of the roof plant area. The preferred approach is to provide an elegant solution which complements the surrounding townscape and does not adversely impact the adjacent residents.

East elevation.

The submitted drawings do not indicate the proposed cill heights and the assumed cill height of 1.1m has been taken from Energy Statement's Overheating Risk Design Note (page 11 of 22). The proposed cill height appears high for wheelchair accessible / adaptable accommodation and the applicant should confirm that the proposed cill levels are in accordance with Approved Documents and relevant accessibility guidance.

The roof plan and section indicate the air sourced heat pumps (ASHP) located in an external plant room which has enclosed walls and a roof structure. The Applicant should confirm this arrangement as ASHPs normally require to be externally located in an open area to maximise efficiencies. If the extent of the enclosed external plant room enclosure can be reduced and the ASHPs located on the open roof, the impact of the building massing on Elmfield Avenue and Tottenham Lane could be reduced. Relocating the enclosed plant room further back into the building to include the isolated lift overrun structure would integrate roof elements and reduce the visual impact on Elmfield Avenue.

The Applicant is requested to confirm if the acoustic studies are based on the indicated external enclosed ASHP plant room configuration (reference Sustainability Report Item 3.11.0).

Ground floor plan.

The submitted DAS indicates a secondary side entrance/exit for 'Move-on' residents and staff (DAS on page 49). This card access/egress point is not visually supervised by YMCA staff and is in an area currently subject to anti-social behaviour. The residents request confirmation that this entrance will be securely monitored by the YMCA management and anti-social behaviour avoided. These requirements are included as item 61 in the LBA document PRE/2025/0199.

The DAS in page 47 advises that the side gate on Elmfield Avenue will be used by residents of 52 Elmfield Avenue which appears to contradict the Applicant's assurance given in the Teams discussion that this gate would only be used for refuse collection and means of escape.

There is an extensive pavement area on the corner of Roseberry Gardens and Tottenham Lane which could end up being a collecting area for discarded electric bikes. If the Applicant wishes to avoid this scenario adjacent to glazed facades, he may wish to consider preventative measures.

Courtyard design.

The Applicant has submitted an attractive courtyard design which has inadequate daylight levels as recommended by BRE. Please refer to the findings in the Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Assessment. This document provides the most detail on where the scheme fails the BRE guidelines and illustrates the implications of the excessive building height on adjacent residential properties. The submitted documents do not comply with LBH document PRE/2025/0199; item 60.

The courtyard area will require artificial lighting, and the DAS does not confirm that the light sources will be concealed so that the impact of the fittings and light spread is restricted to the courtyard.

Acoustic considerations.

The Noise Impact Report is based on a maximum of forty persons in the courtyard area which should be confirmed by the YMCA management. The report's basis of design for adjacent residents lists an acoustic rating for a traditional "leaky" single glazed sash window. We recommend that the Applicant confirms his basis of design assumptions for the adjacent properties' components.

Various submitted documents state that the courtyard will be used from 0800 to 2300. At the Teams presentation, YMCA representatives confirmed that the courtyard would not be used after 2200. We request that the Applicant clarifies the hours and the acceptable limits of the generated noise (Housing Management Plan; Item 7.2) to LBH so that this could be included in the Planning Conditions.

The Housing Management Plan provides a good policy but does not detail acoustic criteria in Item 7.2 or management (Item 7.1). We respectfully request that LBH confirm requirements in the Planning Conditions and confirms how non-compliance will be monitored. The Housing Management Plan does not advise proposed staffing numbers as requested in the LBH Pre-Application Advice Note (reference PRE/2025/0199; Item 12). We welcome the Applicant's proposal that music will not be permitted in the courtyard except for specific and occasional events overseen by the Management Team (Item 8.2).

The submission does not indicate noise mitigation measures in this area. There may be the opportunity to consider acoustic absorbent materials on the courtyard wall and soffit of the semi-enclosed cooking / seating area. The Applicant states that buffer planting has been provided to mitigate noise transfer, however this is not evident in the Application and, to be effective, would require dense planting (reference Statement of Community Involvement; item 7.2)

Daylighting to adjacent residential properties.

The Planning Statement recognises “the scheme will not unduly compromise the amenity of neighbouring residential properties” (item 5.74) without offering solutions to the detrimental issues arising from the proposed design.

The Applicant seeks to justify the shortcomings arising from the increased building height and massing by stating that the development is located in a “dense urban environment”. We would welcome LBH’s comment on the Applicant’s assumption and derived conclusions. If LBH does not agree with this “dense urban environment assessment”, then a number of the Applicant’s justifications are invalid.

The relevant documents are:

1. Planning Statement; Item 5.80, 5.83, 5.84
2. Sustainability Statement; item 3.10.0
3. Daylight, Sunlight & Overshadowing Assessment; numerous references.

Air quality.

The Air Quality Assessment and the Sustainability Statement (4.1) does not include for onsite crushing of demolition materials noted in the accompanying documents and we would request the Applicant to clarify where the concrete / brick crushing activity will take place. The Applicant confirms that on-site measures will reduce dust to “negligible” amounts. Independent monitoring and reporting are recommended and could be included as part of the Planning Conditions.

Adjacent properties, including Rokesly Infant and Junior School, will be adversely affected by demolition / construction generated dust and we query whether the Applicant is willing to contribute to adjacent residents’ cleaning costs, including a final clean at the end of the project.

Recycling of Materials.

The listed reports below assume that the recycling rate of demolition materials by weight is assessed at 94.9%.

- Circular Economy; item 1.0,
- Whole Life Carbon Assessment; item 4.3.2 Demolition

The documents refer to concrete and brick being cut and used / crushed and recycled on site (reference Circular Economy item 5.2). As the courtyard will be intensively used for excavation, waste trucks, segregated storage, welfare etc., we query where the material crushing will take place. The reports on air quality, noise, sustainability etc., make no reference to site crushing of materials.

There is a brief reference to an off-site consolidation centre, but the vehicle movements do not indicate this arrangement. We respectfully request LBH to request the Applicant to advise how he intends to achieve the stated recycled criteria whilst minimising disruption to adjacent residents.

Construction activities.

The Applicant has submitted the following documents for review.

1. Outline Construction Logistics Plan v0.3
2. Outline Site Waste Management Plan issue 1.0

We appreciate that details will be developed by the selected contractor, but the submitted documents indicate a general approach and do not address specific planning site issues which will have direct impacts on the public and adjacent residents.

We respectfully request LBH to obtain clarification from the Applicant on the following items.

1. Site Planning of Courtyard.

The existing courtyard working area will be reduced by barriers to facilitate safe demolition working areas. We assume HGV vehicles will also need to reverse into this space to collect spoil. The reduced working area will be used during demolition activities for segregated waste (an extensive list is in Outline Site

Waste Management Plan; Section 8 Conclusions), bunded areas for hazardous waste and chemicals, wheel wash and contractor's plant and materials. There is no indication of site welfare facilities and space for onsite crushing of materials noted in the submitted planning documents and Outline Site Waste Management Plan (reference 2.3.2). The constraints will continue into construction phase as the area will accommodate scaffolding, waste management, craneage and hoists with increased requirements for laydown areas, welfare, skips, and storage. An indicative schedule of construction requirements and their location during the various demolition and construction phases would be helpful to understand how the Applicant intends to organise the building's construction to minimise disruption and nuisance.

If welfare cabins are located in the courtyard area, we request the Applicant to ensure there are no overlooking issues to residents' areas.

The documents mention the possibility of using a consolidation centre (Outline Construction Logistics Plan; item 5.2.4) but this is not reflected in the vehicle movements. The lease of the adjacent petrol station site may be coming up for renewal, and the Applicant could investigate the possibility of using this area.

2. Pedestrian access.

It is possible that scaffolding will restrict part of the Tottenham Lane and Elmfield Avenue footpaths and potentially affect the flow from the current pedestrian crossing point adjacent to the ArtHouse Crouch End. If this is the case, a concern is that site hoarding may force pedestrians to cross Elmfield Avenue close to the petrol station traffic. We request the Applicant to indicate the proposed line of hoardings during the various phases of demolition and construction and advise if any other traffic measures need to be undertaken to maintain safe school and resident access and egress. The Outline Construction Logistics Plan item 7.1.4 notes that controlled HGV access from the A103 Tottenham Lane frontage may be required. If this is implemented, the Applicant should indicate how he intends to avoid potential conflict with the pedestrian island flow and pavement traffic.

3. Construction vehicle traffic.

The construction traffic diagram (reference Outline Construction Logistics Plan; Diagram 4-2) indicates HGV waste traffic using Roseberry Avenue. This contradicts item 4.1.6 which states that construction traffic will return via the A103 Tottenham Lane. Clarity of construction traffic movements is requested. Trucks will need to reverse into the site to collect spoil and waste and will potentially disrupt traffic flows on Roseberry Avenue. The proposed egress route may affect residents' parking, and we request confirmation what measures the contractor will adopt to minimise risk to pedestrian and cyclist traffic.

The Outline Construction Logistics Plan does not indicate the required holding positions for site construction traffic which will need to be close to the building site. This will facilitate the construction vehicles to be called to site in an orderly "just in time" manner.

4. Working hours.

The Outline Construction Logistics Plan states that the site will be closed on Saturdays, Sundays, and Bank holidays (reference 3.3.1). Confirmation of working hours is requested as this paragraph contradicts the information in other submitted documents.

5. Construction vehicle parking.

The Outline Construction Logistics Plan in item 3.6.2 states that construction staff must not park on the surrounding highway network. However, contractors will need tools and materials which will be brought in their vans. The contractors' vans will compromise residents' parking, and we query how this will be actively managed by LBH to minimise disruption.

Comments on other submitted documents.

1. Social Impact Objectives.

The Section 3 Scoring Totals on the last page of the document indicates the Applicant's scores exceeding the stated maximum scores. The Applicant is requested to clarify whether this is a calculation or presentation error and, if necessary, submit a corrected assessment.

Conclusions.

The Application should be reconsidered with respect to its proposed design and associated construction proposals. The current design is based on the Applicant's preferred business plan and attempts to maximise the number of units on a restricted site. The design also includes 'nice to haves' such as the roof top conference

room which could have been allocated to residential accommodation. The resultant design is not sympathetic to the area and compromises the quality of life for existing residents. It is difficult to see how the submitted application provides any benefit to the community. The current design would benefit from a further review and rationalisation of requirements which would minimise the impact on residents and provide an improved townscape.

With respect to the proposed construction activities, the application provides only a preliminary level of detail. The Applicant should not rely on the Contractor to develop the technical proposals at a later date when the residents will have no input into the process or proposed solutions. The submitted information is inconsistent and requires further clarity and development to allow the Application to be accurately assessed.

Robert Adams
21 Elmfield Avenue N8 8QG
25, September 2026.