

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 February 2016 15:31
To: LDF
Subject: Strategic Plan response

Response to the Strategic Plan
 Proposed development site at **72-96 Park Road N8**

In reference to the Development Guidelines on page 125.

I understand that the Plan is open to public consultation to March 4th, which I take to mean it may still be revised. I would respectfully suggest that the present draft Guidelines for the site at 72-96 Park Road be amended to take into account the following 4 points.

1 The Guidelines say *“Heights and elevation details should respond to the Park Road frontage and the established rhythm.”* The 72-96 site frontage has an established height of **2 storeys**. The Park Road frontage houses opposite the site are all **2 storeys**. Yet the proposed scheme for the site shows **5 storeys** (or by some accounts 4). This would in no way respond sympathetically to the existing frontage height.

The Guidelines go on to say *“Higher elements may be possible on Park Road marking the entrance to Crouch End District Centre”*. This is at odds with the preceding Guideline, which stipulates that heights should respond (by implication sympathetically) to the existing frontage. In any case the existing Murray Arms Pub and the building opposite already do the job of “marking the entrance” to the Crouch End Conservation Area perfectly well. A building that is anything over 2-storeys at 72-96 Park Road would considerably detract from the entrance to Crouch End village.

(The Veryan Court building to the north of 72-96 should not be taken into account in terms of its height because it is set back a significant distance from Park Road and has its own access road off Park Road. It should not count as Park Road frontage in the same way as 72-96 and the houses opposite. In any case this bland, uninspiring building should not be counted as a model for anything other than to do something different - more in sympathy with the established 2-storey Edwardian and Victorian character of the original housing in the streets around.)

2 The Guidelines state that *“the site contains a number of mature trees and these should be retained on site where possible”*. The existing green space should be retained unequivocally and, indeed, enhanced. It forms a necessary breathing space that benefits local families, individuals, businesses and people passing through alike.

3 The proposed scheme for more housing is overall too big, too ambitious. It would spoil the existing character of the area and in particular detract from the amenities of elderly people living in The Grove.

4 There is nowhere near enough provision for new parking spaces in the scheme. There is already too much pressure on existing parking space.

Philip Harland
 [REDACTED]

(I have passed this site and made use of it, front and back, almost daily for 36 years.)

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>