

Mr Simon Fedida
21 Barratt Avenue
Wood Green
London
N22 7EZ

Mr Laurence Ackrill
Development Management
Haringey Council
6th Floor, River Park House
225 High Road Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

3 September 2020

Re: Construction of 6 dwellings, community wildlife garden, and demolition of existing structures, Rear of 132 Station Road, N22 7SX, HGY/2020/1841.

With reference to the Planning Application for the construction of 6 dwellings, community wildlife garden and demolition of existing structures, Rear of 132 Station Road, N22 7SX, your reference HGY/2020/1841, I make the following additional comments and objections, to be read in conjunction with my previous objection letter dated 25 August 2020:

Open character

1. The site of this application is an open space in the Wood Green Common Conservation Area. This open space, or 'place' to use the Historic England term, is defined by terraces of houses that enclose gardens between Station Road, Barratt Avenue and Park Avenue.
2. There have been two refusals for development on the eastern portion of the site upheld at appeal, and one refusal for development on the central portion of the site upheld at appeal, an issue at all three appeals being the 'open' space.
3. The present application is for denser development than any of the three previous applications which were dismissed at appeal. The present application would completely clear the site of trees and insert buildings, and hard landscape such that the open character would be completely lost.
4. Since adoption of the NPPF, there have been appeals which consider 'open'. Two such appeals, both determined after implementation of NPPF 2019 include:
 - Appeal APP/K0235/W/18/3216849, Land at Bedford Road, Cople, MK44 3TP, dealt with an application for 30 houses and the Inspector dismissed the proposal on the basis of loss of open character.
 - Appeal APP/J1860/W/19/3225363, The Oaks, Bell Lane, Lower Broadheath, WR2 6RR concerned a small development which was dismissed because of loss of open character.

5. In the case of the Wood Green Common CA special character resides in the inter-relationship between areas, buildings, and open space. The proposal does not relate to the character of the CA and would gravely impact on amenity. I therefore urge that this application be refused.

Access from Station Road

6. The proposed access track to the Coach House yard has been and is subject to very light use giving access solely to the recording studio. At present there is sufficient space in the yard for a car to turn so that the driver can drive into the site, turn and drive forward out of the site. The proposal would greatly intensify the use of the access. Delivery vehicles and servicing of a group of houses, especially in totally car free developments that serve larger dwellings, can be considerable.
7. Station Road carries heavy traffic and serves two bus-routes. The road has resident parking bays along it and cycle lanes all along on both sides and across the entrance track. There would be no possibility of any size of vehicle turning within the site after construction of the proposal, so vehicles accessing the development would drive in and reverse out into the traffic. The volume of traffic and the configuration of the roadway would preclude, without the attendance of someone empowered to control the traffic, the possibility of reversing into the site. To compound matters there is a high solid fence (approx. 8 feet) enclosing the adjacent Electricity Board transformer land, blocking the driver's view of the footpath, cycle lane and oncoming traffic. This would not be safe.
8. The applicant examines how to get construction traffic into and out of the site, and these manoeuvres require up to four bankspersons per manoeuvre into or out of the site. The applicant does not consider vehicle movements as would happen and as can be reasonably anticipated with the development in use. The likelihood is that traffic movements associated with the site when inhabited and in use would be dangerous. This does not represent good design. The proposal should be rejected

Yours sincerely

Simon Fedida