

Highgate CAAC objection to application [HGY/2023/2877](#) for Stanhope Road Bridge Stanhope Road, N6 5DE.

Summary

Highgate CAAC believes the document provided for this application is an unacceptable basis for discharging condition three of HGY/2021/2718.

Insufficient detail is provided about the precise nature of the materials to be used. The description of the railings, surfaces etc is all rather vague, and potentially inconsistent with the NMA application [HGY/2023/2878](#). There are no consistent, up to date drawings or illustrations which reflect both applications together.

There is no mention of the pond: what it will be made of, nor how it will look.

The proposals make insufficient allowance for the fact that this is a local nature reserve and SINC spanning two conservation areas, and that Stanhope Road is not “urban”. Very little account has been given to nature, ecology and climate change.

The record of/response to the two consultation meetings with HCAAC, FoPW etc is inadequate.

The application also prejudices the outcome of the recent public consultation on surfaces in Parkland Walk. This is unacceptable.

Detail

This objection should be read in conjunction with HCAAC’s objection to “NMA” [HGY/2023/2878](#).

The account of the consultation with FoPW, CASCH residents, HTP, HNF and HCAAC is rather rose-tinted. Consultees were asked for suggestions at the first meeting and at the second meeting were presented with engineering solutions mainly involving concrete. Unsurprisingly attendees were appalled. Not much notice had been taken of climate change or the fact that this is a local nature reserve spanning two leafy conservation areas. The document for the discharge of condition 3 rather skates over this.

Ramps

“Section 3 Ramps” (p 4-5) is particularly unacceptable. The proposed letter of discharge completely misses the point about the consultees’ concerns about climate change in suggesting that the concrete ramp should be faced with stone. It is still made of highly carbon intensive concrete, contrary to the wishes of consultees and

Haringey sustainability and climate change objectives etc. This not an acceptable response to our comments.

This seems all the more egregious given that the choice of concrete was determined by a very broad brush scoring method vis-a-vis other perfectly feasible, less climate damaging options. The method described at the consultation meeting allocated indicative numbers for factors such as ecology and durability etc, but the numbers so produced were then subject to a precise cut off point without an appropriately wide margin for error given the nature of the calculation. Far less damaging options which fell slightly below the chosen cut off point were dismissed with an undue amount of certainty and precision.

We believe this ramp should be constructed according to one of the considerably less climate damaging options which scored only slightly less than concrete according to the scoring method outlined at the meeting, falling well within any reasonable margin for error which ought to be applied to such a broad brush calculation.

The document provided for the discharge of condition 3 does not mention any of this.

Railings and estate fencing

The “Bridge Structure” illustration on page 2, although footnoted as “illustrative”, is potentially misleading, as it shows considerably shorter stretches of railings and/or estate fencing than the engineering drawings in [HGY/2023/2878](#).

The illustration appears to be similar to those presented at the second consultation meeting and, as such, does not provide an impression of the altered path of the stairway, the changes to slope profiles as a result of the use of “Tensartech Natural GreenSlope” on embankments or any other subsequent changes to the design.

It does however illustrate very well that the claim on page 6 that the proposed railings “respect the urban nature of Stanhope Road itself” is inappropriate. Stanhope Road is not “urban”.

As we noted in our objection to [HGY/2023/2878](#):

“Tensartech natural green slope is presumably this product, seemingly designed for motorway embankments, railway cuttings and the like:

<https://www.tensar.co.uk/solutions/wall-and-slope-systems/naturalgreen-slope-system>

<https://www.tensar.co.uk/solutions/wall-and-slope-systems/greenslope-system>

The application includes no explanation of how the use of this construction method differs from what was proposed previously nor drawings or artist's impressions of what Stanhope Road or Parkland Walk will look like as a result. On the face of it, this approach appears exceedingly bleak and not suited to a nature reserve in a conservation area."

Later in the document there is a section on "Embankment Edge Protection: Estate fencing". It is not at all clear how this relates to the engineering drawings for [HGY/2023/2878](#).

At the very least, a set of drawings, and preferably artist's impressions, should be provided showing accurately where the railings and estate fencing will be sited and how they will look from both Parkland Walk and the two conservation areas. As it is, it is completely unclear between the two applications where each of these materials will be used or what the resulting appearance will be.

Also there is insufficient detail about the exact products to be used in each case. This is not acceptable for the discharge of condition 3.

Surfaces

This document refers to "Antislip resin bonded aggregate (minimum 3mm) coating – Britany Bronze colour." (page 4) and "Coloured porous asphalt – colour buff" (page 5), but NMA application [HGY/2023/2878](#) refers to porous asphalt, Bimagrip, non-slip aggregate and Class 1 Aggregate.

Bimagrip in particular appears to be a completely different product, which is not mentioned in this application.

From our objection to [HGY/2023/2878](#):

"Bimagrip appears to be a highly industrial floor surface used on pedestrian bridges above busy roads (see <https://r1i.co.uk/products/bimagrip/>) and porous asphalt is a very ugly material used to prevent plants growing in tree pits. Neither is appropriate for a nature reserve in a conservation area."

This section is not adequate for the discharge of condition 3. More precise detail should be given about all the materials proposed in both applications, and where they will be used.

Also, this application prejudices the outcome of the wider public consultation about surfaces to be used along Parkland Walk, which is also unacceptable.

Section 4: West Access Stairs (p7)

As we noted in our objection to [HGY/2023/2878](#), there is no need for these stairs. This area could instead be planted with trees and shrubs to replace those trees cut down before the commencement date of this project, as part of the investigation into whether this project was necessary.

Even if these stairs remain, the information given in this section is not sufficiently detailed for the discharge of condition 3.

Pond

From our objection to [HGY/2023/2878](#):

“A bit of history

Haringey Highways Department and their engineering consultants WSP met with consultees from Highgate CAAC, the HNF, Friends of Parkland Walk, CASCH Residents, Highgate Tree Protectors and so-on several times, for instance on July 28th 2022 and 24th November 2022. At one of the earlier meetings consultees apparently said a pond would be a nice addition to the project. At the November 2022 meeting the Highways Dept and engineers suggested a highly formal concrete “rain garden” of the type that are installed in town centres, on main roads etc. Unsurprisingly, given that Parkland Walk is a nature reserve in a conservation area, consultees were appalled. Further, the use of highly carbon intensive concrete in numerous proposed structures was very unwelcome given the climate emergency.”

There is no mention of the pond in this document at all: not the materials to be used in its construction, nor what it will look like from Parkland Walk or the two conservation areas.

Consultation

Last but not least, HCAAC was not informed about this application as far as we are aware, only finding out about it as a result of seeing the HNF comment. Were other consultees informed so they could comment?

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, HCAAC does not believe condition 3 has been adequately met.