

20 MAR 2024

137 Hornsey Park Road

London N8 0JX

March 11th 2024

Head of Development Management and Planning Enforcement

Haringey Planning Service, River Park House

225 High Road, N22 8HQ

Re: HGY/2024/0466 157-159 Hornsey Park Road, N8 0JX

Dear colleague,

I am writing to state my objections to the proposed development. These points reflect widely held concerns in the street as a whole and particularly among the households directly affected by the proposals. I attended the Development Forum with John McCrory in November and raised most of these points then. I have read the Planning Statement and Statement of Community Involvement at <file:///C:/Users/John/Downloads/240220-Planning%20statement%20and%20statement%20of%20community%20involvement.pdf> I note the developer's dismissal of concerns raised by residents and their confidence in the support of the Haringey Planning Team, support which shows how far the Council is out of touch with residents' local experience.

Strategy

The first objection relates to the Council's strategic approach to SA21, the Clarendon Gateway. Nowhere in the developers' application are the sensitivities of this site given significant attention. These are four-fold:

- the course of the culverted Moselle Brook which national policy guidelines indicate should be restored as soon as feasible
- the need to preserve historic and ecologically important tree cover in a ward with the lowest proportion of canopy in the borough
- the closeness of the SA21 sites to the densely occupied residential street of Hornsey Park Road

- the pressures from development on traffic on Hornsey Park Road, the B138, which the council refuses to identify for weight or width restrictions.

These concerns all require engagement with community and environmental interests in SA21 to determine a sustainable profile. The Council has never initiated such a process, allowing permission for over-lofty blocks within the Clarendon development and intrusive development proposals on the 'Iceland' site. The case for conservation buffers, proposed by St William in 2017, between different sites has never been publicly discussed. (Unfeasible claims for biodiversity net gain by St William, for example, have passed unchallenged).

Being overlooked

The proposed blocks are too high, overlooking their future neighbours, and take inappropriate advantage of permission granted for other developments nearby. They are also too close and out of character with the neighbourhood. Two precedents should be followed. The profile adopted for the St William blocks backing on to 83-103 Hornsey Park Road on the Clarendon site should be adopted within SA21. The low-rise model on the Frankum and Kaye site at Crawley Road is an example of sensitive development with regard to heights that would be appropriate for this site. It is unfair and inequitable that residents in Hornsey Park do not receive the same consideration.

Site access for vehicles

I note and approve that the site will be car-free. However, vehicle access will be required whether for emergencies, refuse collection or for home delivery services. I object very strongly to the assumption that it is appropriate to continue permitting vehicle access from Hornsey Park Road, which is a heavily over-used residential street. Vehicle access should be from Brook Road and the Council needs to renegotiate the existing planning permission for the 'Iceland' site to facilitate this on a permanent basis. A ban on construction traffic for the Clarendon development using HPR has been maintained since 2015 and this sets a precedent which the Council should now ensure is followed.

Yours sincerely,

John Miles

JM: 11/03/2024