From: Susan Scott-Hunt

Sent: 29 February 2016 21:13

To: LDF

Subject: SA49 - response to consultation

As a resident of Lynton Road I object to the inclusion of this site within the Local Plan Site Allocation document. The council has suggested that they would 'if possible' modify the site plan so as to protect the established trees on the green at one corner of the site, across form The Grove, but this is not reflected in the plan. It makes no sense to have a vague undertaking to save the trees without any express intention to preserve the green space on which they grow. Keeping this space green is vital to preserve the public's need for some even minor relief from the intensity of the built environment in the area, which would be significantly increased by the development of the site. Drawing the site so as to eliminate this space would exacerbate the ugly imposition of a very large building on what has been a pleasant part of the area early because it preserves small scrapes of green and open space that can be used by the public. This incorporation of the green space is in my opinion the worst feature of the SA48 plan. However, there are many other reasons to require the modification of the plan.

A second reason is that the massive building contemplated would compromise the privacy of residents of The Grove, a sheltered community of vulnerable people, as well as imposing significantly upon the homes on the Park Road end of Lynton Road and to some extent also upon the rest of the surrounding area of Lynton Road, which is a conservation area. The development would bring an abrupt change in character from small cottage-type Victorian terraces, within a conservation area, to a huge towering intensively populated block building of 4-5 storeys.

A third reason is that the plan would needlessly wipe out valued non-retail industrial space that is integrated into the community and not relegated to ugly 'industrial zone'. It is a better mix of use to preserve some non-retail commercial property situated within residential areas. Doing so encourages low environmental impact employment because people employed there can continue to walk to work as many in the courtyard area do now. This type of commercial space is greatly diminished throughout Haringey. In addition, the plan would destroy attractive Victorian architecture in the courtyard.

Fourthly, the plan does not realistically take into account the impact of adding a large number of flats with no additional provision for parking, not even for potentially disabled residents. It is nonsensical to assume that future residents will not own cars. As far as I am aware, car ownership is not yet illegal and not yet entirely preserved to the wealthy. The failure of the plan adequately to take into account the provision of additional car parking shows how little real evaluation has gone into its inclusion in the site allocation document.

Susan Scott Hunt

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