

Argles James

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2021/2727
Site Address: Cranwood 100 Woodside Avenue London N10 3JA
Comments by: Margaret Pankhurst
From:
76
Church Crescent

London

N10 3NE

Submission: Objection

Comments: 1. The planned buildings are excessively tall by comparison with the surrounding buildings & there is nothing nearby that comes close to being six storeys high.

2. Regardless of whether the units are for sale or to rent, 41 units is far too many for a site this size. The site would benefit from redevelopment but not overdevelopment to this extent.

3. Parking will be a major issue. It is laudable to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport but a lot of people still depend on use of motor vehicles and the transport infrastructure is not yet adequate to remove all parking provision. The problem is just deflected onto surrounding streets to the detriment of those already living in the area. It is totally unrealistic not to provide any parking for the units apart from four wheelchair spaces. It is likely that many of the households will have at least one vehicle and these will need to be parked on the surrounding streets where parking is already difficult, even with a CPZ applying to some of the streets for part of the day. I live in a street covered by the CPZ and, other than between the hours of 11am and 1pm, it remains extremely difficult to park. We already have many vehicles parked which do not belong to people who live in our street, frequently having to park elsewhere ourselves.

4. Anyone who has tried to get on a bus to Highgate tube station (the nearest station even though the transport reports refer to East Finchley) from any of the stops along Muswell Hill Road will know that it is, at best, difficult. Once there is a greater return to daily commuting into central London it will become even more difficult and it is simply unrealistic potentially to add the residents of multiple additional units to this pre-existing overcrowding. I question the parking and public transport assessments that have taken place given what any local resident & or attentive observer - could report from their own experience and/or simple observation.

5. Haringey Council states in a newsletter, echoing some of the planning documents, that &The buildings will incorporate some of the local characteristics of the Muswell Hill area including bay windows, stepped entrances, pitched roofs and brick detailing&. This is a bland statement that could apply to a vast number of buildings. What is proposed does not appear to pick up on the particular architectural styles prevalent in the area of Muswell Hill in question. The illustrations of the proposed blocks have minimal features in keeping with the buildings in the area & if anything they appear to show buildings that are a throwback to blocks of flats of the early/mid-twentieth century including unattractive walkways. Contrary to Haringey Council&s statement that &the scheme has been carefully designed to respect the adjacent Muswell Hill Conservation Area&, the blocks would be significantly out of place in what is largely a

Conservation and/or Character Area. If the Council is not going to respect the prevalent architectural styles of the predominantly Edwardian buildings in the area, it would be preferable to adopt a more radical modern architectural style to complement the existing architecture. What is proposed is neither one thing nor the other.

6. The junction of Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue is extremely tight and congested even at off-peak times. Congestion at peak times is significant and there is increased risk to pedestrians crossing both Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue near the junction of the two roads. An increase in vehicles entering and exiting the new development would cause additional problems for everyone – particularly if vehicles are trying to turn right out of Cranwood and then right onto Muswell Hill Road.

7. The increase in delivery vehicles in local streets over the past few years has been very noticeable. They already cause traffic blockages and chaos. Deliveries to 41 car-free households with limited vehicular access and no parking would surely greatly exacerbate this problem.

8. The application makes much of planting – 46 trees – in the illustrations however show a number of these trees apparently planted very close to the ground floor windows of the proposed new units. Surely that is impractical, blocking light and becoming more problematic as the trees mature?

9. Another feature that is referred to is the provision of benches near the junction of Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue. Why would anyone want to sit here at a traffic junction when there are proper green spaces a few yards away?

10. The application also makes much of providing courtyard space and an additional route through from Muswell Hill Road (note, it is not Muswell Hill as is stated in a number of places) to Woodside Avenue for new and existing residents. Existing residents have ample outside and green space with the adjacent Highgate Woods and Parkland Walk; a relatively small courtyard area hemmed in by multi-storey blocks is unlikely to prove a significant benefit and there is already just a short pavement walk to get from one road to another.

11. The plans include new steps from Woodside Avenue down to the Parkland Walk. This again is cited as a major benefit. Why? To whom? The Parkland Walk is used by many families and walkers with pushchairs, bikes and dogs – the existing slope from Muswell Hill Road is far more practical for most people than a flight of steps and is, in any case, closer to the entrance to Highgate Woods which is where most people will be coming from/going to.

12. A public consultation was conducted in late 2020 /early 2021. It is extremely disappointing for all of us who participated in that exercise to see the apparent disregard of all the valid objections made at that stage. What has now been presented as the formal planning application appears to be barely changed from the earlier proposals. Haringey Council claims to – have refined its proposals – and to be building in – an attractive style that is in keeping with the character of the local area –; unfortunately, the plans as presented seem not to reflect any of this. The existing Cranwood building (disused care home) is ugly, out of keeping and is currently wasting valuable space but the current development plans simply go too far in disregarding the local environment and glossing over potential practical issues.

