

I'm a resident of Shepherds Close for over 30 years, I strongly disagree with the planning application and hereby make my objection.

SHEPHERDS CLOSE is a small residential community of 22 compact terraced houses built in late 60's, made up from 3 groups as one unit of building, nestled together within a small land pocket aligned with the natural slope that provides a uniformity (white cladding board with dark brick) Each house, its bedrooms & bathroom are modest in size, as this development was a careful and thoughtful design providing a comfortable communal environment in a semi-urban setting, retaining a 'sense of nature/green habitat' with relationship to the overall scheme.

<1. The Main Features of Shepherds Close>

1a) A SENSE OF A NATURE in the Close, - with 3 areas of 'green features':

1. Back drop of 'Parkland Walk Nature Reserve'
2. tiny island of shrubs planted on the car park
3. 'a garden-land' with matured trees, naturalised shrubs and vegetation' which originally belonged to No.27 that was sold as 'GARDEN-LAND' that was preserved as a 'GREEN-OPEN-LAND' for 40 years which was suddenly gone in 2020, when the current owner cleared it all to claim the plot as 'a neglected/'brown-field land' (*This issue is to be discussed, 3. 'purpose of the land-use').

For more than 30 years, all the previous 'planning applications' / 'appeals' to build a house were rejected, in recognition of the small 'garden-land'/'Green-Open-Land' functions as a 'GREEN-CORRIDOR' - small 'BUFFA-ZONE' to protect the Nature Reserve, for the resident community (note: all the houses backing onto the Parkland Walk have gardens and the main houses are set back from it at least 8 to 10 meters, in contrast of 0.6/0.8 meter with the proposed house).

1b) PRIVACY / SENSE OF PRIVACY:

ALL HOUSES ARE NOT FACE TO FACE TO PROVIDE A SENSE OF PRIVACY:

All the windows are facing at 90 degrees. The two bed rooms of the proposed house directly face the neighbours' bedrooms, - No.27's bedroom faces at 7.8 meter, also No. 10 & 11's bedrooms face at 21 metre distance, and this condition would create privacy issues even having 20 meter distance, and 7.8 meter distance feels very close.

<2. QUESTIONABLE MIS-MEASUREMENTS (Floor plans/Elevation plans)>

There seems a number of miss-measurements/distortions in the proposed plans again.

2a) - Foot path pavement width: 220cm in plan (150cm actual) = + 70cm

2b) - East Land Boundary (from garage wall attach to the proposed building): 520cm in plan (4.81 cm actual) = +39 cm over reach

2c) - Length of the land to South/North: measured at edge of the East garage wall by the footpath steps - 70cm setback + 480cm building + 530cm garden = 1080cm (860cm actual) = +220cm over reach. Therefore, 7.8 meter would be the distance from the proposed building to No.26/27 (actual garden length 310cm + 470cm from pavement to no.26/27 main building), in contrast to 10m of claimed distance.

<3. CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED PLAN>

3a) UNSAFE - FOOTPATH PAVEMENT AREA

Previously pointed out in applicant's last 'appeal' March 2024, there is still a serious safety concern with PAVEMENT of the PUBLIC FOOTPATH, even the current plan made some amendments such as a window on the 1st floor, with the building set-back 0.7 metre away from the pavements, also some 'field of vision' lines are indicated in the floor plan. These considerations may appear marginally helpful, but the fundamental problem remains. The pavement under the foot-path

stairs is 'COMPLETELY BOXED -IN BY X3 TWO-STORY WALLS (x2 garages plus the proposed building), WITH A TINY PAVEMENT AREA OF 1.5m width x 2.1m (2.2m width in the floor plan, +0.7m created distortion - ref. 2a above) - it creates an unsafe environment due to the widths, lengths, heights, and volumes of the buildings.

The foot-path entrance needs a 'sufficient clearance space' for 'safety measures' which should be proportionate to the pavement area, therefore it is alarming as it could pose a safety risk to pedestrians, - e.g. if the building is set-back at the current plan (0.7m), then it maybe acceptable proportionally at the current boundary fence of 2m high maximum since it's obstructed more than enough clear 'field of sight' with extreme confinement making it feel 'unsafe' to use the foot-path. If a proposed building is 2-story high, then the sufficient clearance with a safety measured would possibly require a minimum of 5 metre setting-back/away from the north boundary of the site.

3b) POSSIBLE OVER-TAKING THE PAVEMENT (0.4 meter wide) at the East Boundary:

With the current plan still over-takes the pavement by the car park, as I observed in the last proposed plans. If so, the pavement would be reduced to 0.9m at the narrowest part (currently 1.3m to 2.2 m width) which doesn't meet a min. width requirement.

I hope that Haringey council would never consider waiving/giving away any section of this land to the applicant since we are informed by Cllr. Mr Scott Emery at a 'residents' meeting in 02/202 that there was such a possible discussion with the Planning Dept.. Any public lands & properties shouldn't ever be given or to be sold without a formal discussion process.

<4. PURPOSE OF THE LAND -USE>

As I mentioned earlier, as some residents repeatedly address in both current/previous comments, that the 'Open-Green-Land' / 'Green-corridor' is suddenly cleared by the applicant in 2020, - all the mature trees over 30ft high (which require a 'prior permission' by Haringey Council with a public notification) were cleared with all the shrubs and vegetation, without undertaking a 'formal procedure', - which some residents' have complained about. At the last 'planning appeal' in 2024, Haringey Council Planning disregarded the applicant's wrong doing, as if he followed the proper procedure, and I'm aware that one resident (no.11) has initiated an official investigation.

4a) MIS-REPRESENTATION OF THE LAND-USE:

It is crucial to follow up on this investigation about the land clearance esp. tree felling in 2020 as an incidence of misconduct which I strongly believe is relevant to the planning application.

Moreover, it is ESSENTIAL TO CLARIFY THE PURPOSE OF THE LAND-USE, - more than 30 years (sold as a 'garden-plot' with previously established trees and vegetation for 40 years), all the previous 'planning applications' and 'appeals' were rejected, due to this recognition of this a 'green-corridor' to protect the 'Nature Reserve, until applicant's action in order to claim his plot as 'a neglected/'brown-field land'. It is alarming that Haringey planning have dismissed this issue giving no regard for this long established history of the purpose of the 'land-use' failing to acknowledge 'why the land was protected from all the planning applications for over 30 years',

4b) FALSE CLAIMS ABOUT 'NEGLECT/BROWN-FIELD-LAND', 'DUMPINGS' & 'CRIME RATES':

The applicant's strategy was to make the plot appear to be 'neglected/Brown-Field-land' by his clearing in 2020, yet none of the residents' have noticed any 'significant dumping/fly-tipping' either commercial nor recognised as a 'public-nuisance' as the quantity of rubbish is negligible. As one of the residents, pointed out in her 'objection letter' about the applicant's claim for 'Crime-rates' in Shepherds Close is 'untrue', - Shepherds Close is a 'secluded, quiet and well-kept cul-de-sac' residential community where most of the residents feel 'safe' and 'content' with the

environment even in comparison with other neighbouring streets in the area eg. 'Holmesdale Road' and 'Archway Road' for the matter due to having much busier main streets near Highgate station with shops, traffic and pedestrians.

<4. 'Why is this application, also the last application to be approved'?>

4a. 'Affordable Housing scheme' to provide more houses?:

Even if the Council wishes to promote the government's 'affordable housing scheme' by creating more houses, this application provides 'only one house' which would not be 'affordably-priced house' ('premium price' in a 'premium area and location', at a high cost to the local environment/community).

<5. Other concerns>

Over the last decade, Shepherds Close is more popular for young families (currently about the half in the Close), so they require more public service facilities – over capacitating the 'available carparking spaces' and the 'Sewage/Drains' especially for the residents at lower slope/end of the Close. By creating an extra house in the close in addition to the original allocated numbers to the development ('densely populated, small pocket of the land') would 'create further problems'.

5a) The 'LAND CLEARANCE' with 'BYPASSING THE FORMAL PROCESS' of prior permission & public notification process, - the Planning dept. appears to be giving 'favourable' treatment to the applicant by dismissing the complaints against his unauthorised land clearance. There's no acknowledgement of the long history of recognition as a 'Open-Green-land'/'Green corridor' to protect the natural environment in the area that were reason for rejecting previous applications.

<FINAL COMMENT>:

Shepherds Close residents have witnessed a number of somewhat 'deceitful tactical actions' as listed earlier by the applicant who is architect/developer, creating favourable conditions for his proposals to be accepted, - I sadly hear, these are a common practice among some developers.

In conclusion, this application would have detrimental effects to Shepherds Close's well-considered the 'original character' of the design, this 'small community development' has been preserved as a 'harmonious relationship with the surrounding nature'/green-space since 1968. In all the respects such as 'public safety', 'securing for privacy', and 'over capacitating the 'public facilities/services such as 'available car parking spaces' and 'Sewage/Drains' which are increasingly becoming a serious concern. Therefore, I strongly object to the application, as it is creating one house at enormous and un-reversible negative costs/effects.

I sincerely urge Haringey Council to take serious and careful considerations to reach a wise decision to this application, - for a 'common good/well-being' of the local community and its environment, also wish for an urgent investigation to take place in due course (with the formal complaint made by Ms N Ali), so that we gain a clear understanding and clarification about 'Purpose of the Land-Use' which makes a crucial to future planning applications on this particular plot.

Y. Kakuta