

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: Evan and Frances Price
From:
61
Lanchester Road

N6 4SX

Submission: Objection
Comments: We object to the proposals for the Cranwood site at 100 Woodside Avenue, Muswell Hill, London N10 3JA.

We do not accept that the provision of 41 new homes on this limited site, with only 4 disabled parking spaces and no space for deliveries is either an appropriate or a sustainable development for this site. Further, we do not accept that the current proposals take into account the adverse impact of the development on the local area.

We agree that more affordable homes are needed in this area and this site is ripe for redevelopment, but this proposal is not the correct way to achieve this. We would welcome more sensible proposals for that redevelopment.

A Building height

The buildings proposed are too high. If built in accordance with these proposals, the buildings would obscure the view from the entrance to Highgate Woods and would obscure the view towards the woods from Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue. Further, the proposed buildings adjacent to Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue would dominate both roads in a way that the current structures do not.

By attempting to create a straight line from the top of the buildings to the south of the site ending with 59 Muswell Hill Road and the building to the north of the site at 73 Muswell Hill Road, the applicants ignore the natural depression in the ground that occurs between those two properties and seek to exploit it. This attempt should be resisted; not only does it appear to be deliberately misleading but it also sets an unwelcome precedent for other developers to manipulate the size and impact of proposed buildings by ignoring the natural contours of any site.

The planned buildings are also much closer to the roads than the existing structures and so completely lose the sense of openness which the existing site (with the buildings set back from the pavement) provides.

In relation to St James's Primary School, the proposed new buildings are proposed to be adjacent to the boundary of the Diocese land on which the school is built, and would significantly overlook and dominate the school's buildings and playgrounds.

As a result, the scale, massing, and height of the proposed buildings do not comply with the Policy DM1 of the local development plan and they do not comply with the requirement for any proposed development to relate positively to their locality, having regard to building heights [or] form, scale & massing prevailing around the site.

These proposals would be harmful to the visual amenity of the local and wider environment in that they would directly obscure existing sightlines and the buildings would dominate the buildings in the immediate vicinity as well.

B Inadequate parking facilities

There is already pressure on parking at the eastern end of Woodside Avenue; there are three schools there and, at certain times of day, the parking congestion reaches all the way down to , at least, the roundabout by Lanchester Road and Fordington Road, and frequently beyond. The roads on the eastern side of Muswell Hill Road are also congested by parked cars. The provision of no parking facilities on the site, save for a very limited number of disabled spaces, makes little sense when considering the pressure on parking already prevalent in the immediate area.

While car-free development is the starting point, the proposals for no parking spaces at all for residents means that those residents' needs for parking will need to be found on the street. An additional 37 cars (assuming an average of a single car per household) cannot be found in the immediate vicinity without considerable adverse impact on existing parking, which is already under pressure.

In addition, where no parking is provided, it does not appear that the Council has considered the very real need for space, off road, for deliveries.

It must not be assumed that everyone will be able to carry the things that they need on a day-to-day basis from the shops to their home. It also must not be assumed that everyone will be able to cycle and while cycling can be encouraged, it cannot ignore the fact that not everyone will be able to do so. Indeed, if either of those assumptions were made, it is seriously doubted that it would comply with relevant equalities legislation.

There are also a number of occupations for which a car is essential e.g., community midwives and nurses and other carers, as well as many other traders - and no thought appears to have been given to this.

Parking is already under pressure and regular deliveries (even ones that comply with future proposals for electrification of such transport) will require space on the site if chaos in the immediate vicinity is to be avoided. It is noted that paras 9.13 to 9.15 of the Council's Planning Statement only refers, in substance, to refuse collections on site; so this factor does not appear to have been considered properly or at all.

C Impact on local services

The potential impact on St James's Primary School is apparently something which the Council is aware. However, the impact of dominant buildings adjacent to the playground with any overlooking into the school is not addressed adequately in the Planning Statement. We suggest that, as a minimum, obscure glass should be used to ensure that there is no such overlooking in any event.

For the reasons set out above, we do not accept that the localised impacts of the proposed buildings are 'reasonable' at all.

The Planning Statement ignores the potential impact on other services that are provided locally; whether local GPs, dentists and schools have the capacity to absorb the additional people who will come to live in the area.

D Construction process.

No thought seems to have been given to how the construction of such a large project could be achieved without months or even years of severe disruption to traffic on Muswell Hill Road, Cranley Gardens and Woodside Avenue 'and as a consequence to the whole of Muswell Hill and up to Highgate Station. Unlike the Woodside Square development, it would not be possible for construction traffic to drive onto the site itself which means that there would be heavy traffic, and heavy machinery around St James School with the concomitant noise, disruption and pollution.

Any development on this site will need to ensure that it does not disrupt the local schools during school hours. Noise will need to be minimised, pollution eliminated and any builders will need to ensure that nothing escapes from the site to cause disruption to any neighbouring property or road. Further, deliveries to the site will have to be the subject of very specific restrictions so that lorries are not waiting off the site and on the road causing increased pollution, disruption and congestion. It is especially important that no traffic comes or leaves the site during drop off or collection time for St James's Primary School. A detailed plan will be required and should be presented to local people before any works commence. In addition, the Council will need to ensure that enforcement of that plan is followed without exception.

E Consultation

The consultation that was conducted was inadequate in that the area to which the consultation letters did not extend equally to all sides of the development site. No reason has been provided for this decision and it is remarkable that the Council has not attempted to explain why it chose not to correspond with people who live very near the site, on Lanchester Road or Fordington Road.

It is noted that the current proposals match almost exactly the proposals that were the subject of the consultation that did take place. These proposals were objected to by most consultees. The basis of those objections included:

- ¿ the massing of the proposed buildings,
- ¿ the inadequate provision of parking facilities and
- ¿ the adverse impact that the current proposals would have on local services including local schools.

These objections do not appear to have resulted in any meaningful changes to the plans, to the extent that one could question the purpose of the consultation other than as a tick box exercise.

Conclusion

A proposal for buildings that did not overpower this corner of Woodside Avenue and Muswell Hill Road, or the buildings and playground of St James¿ Primary School would be welcome. As would a proposal for social and affordable housing. It is the scale and size of these proposals, and the lack of any sensible approach to parking, that form the major part of our objection.