

• 3 March 2016

Planning Policy Team
Haringey Council
Level 6
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London N22 8HQ

Dear Sir/Madam

**Feedback for the Site Allocations DPD: Haringey's Local Plan
SA49: 72-96 Park Road and Industrial site on Lynton Road; pp122-3**

I object to that part of the proposal that refers to the development of the Industrial site on Lynton Road and its adjoining grassed land (which I have called the 'Grassy Knoll').

I would like to make the following comments on the Council's presentation:

SA49 defined map area

The drawing implies SA49 is a single site. This is not the case. 72-96 Park Road is already under development [HGY/2011/0905] and has been for some months. And to my knowledge the industrial site adjacent to the Grove is not under the same ownership and is, therefore, from the development point of view, a separate entity. The Grassy Knoll is immediately in front of the Industrial site facing Lynton Road and is managed by the Council.

Commentary 2.140

Commentary 2.140 says "There is an existing planning consent for the western portion of this site permitting development up to five storeys on this site. ..."

Referring to the Notice of Planning Permission for HGY/2011/0905¹ [72-96 Park Road] permission is granted for "... the erection of a further two floors to existing 2 storey building ...".

¹ HGY/2008/0966 amends HGY/2006/1839; and HGY/2011/0905 amends both HGY/2008/0966 and HGY/2006/1839. And HGY/2014/1610 is attached to HGY/2008/0966. HGY/2005/1463 amends a shop front but HGY/2002/1877 proposes a five storey building

• 3 March 2016

Commentary 2.140 is therefore incorrect.

Industrial site: employment issues

Grouping together the following three paragraphs:

[Site Requirements: point 2] Replacement employment floorspace will be required to be provided to replace the number of jobs on this site.

[Development Guidelines: point 3] In line with policy SP9, if redevelopment results in a net loss of employment floorspace, a financial compensation will be required as set out in the Planning Obligations SPD.

[Development Guidelines: point 4] Any jobs lost through development of the site should be reprovided on site.

There appears to be a contradiction between points 2/3 and point 4 that requires resolution.

There are few sites that provide this type of workspace this side of the borough². There is an assumption that retail premises are suitable for all, but for some businesses, for example, computer related, a shop window is not what is required. The facilities offered by this industrial site are unique in this area.

Certainly the loss of industrial status will prevent investment in new and emerging commercial opportunities that could further benefit the borough.

With regard to SP9 it seems odd to take jobs away, to support jobs elsewhere when there is no need.

Industrial site: existing building issues

[Site Requirements: para 3] No buildings need to be retained on this site.

Removing the existing Victorian buildings is a lost opportunity. Firstly such buildings are popular³ and secondly they provide a sense of scale that some modern developments choose to ignore. However from a developer's point of view a new build may have certain advantages and hence the inclusion of this paragraph.

(the decision in this case being classified as a 'Legal Agreement'). Understandably, but unfortunately, HGY/2006/1839 does not refer to either HGY/2008/0966 or HGY/2011/0905 or HGY/2014/1610. The latest drawings are in HGY/2008/0966.

² London Borough of Haringey, Workspace Viability Assessment, December 2014

³ London Borough of Haringey, Workspace Viability Assessment, December 2014

- 3 March 2016

72-96 Park Road and Industrial site: building height issues

[Development Guidelines: para 2] Attractive street frontage could be created to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area creating a 'gateway' to it.

This statement implies more choice than there really is.

The granting of planning permission by HGY/2011/0905 has established how this development will appear facing Park Road (front elevation), Lynton Road (side elevation), the industrial estate (rear elevation) and Veryan Court (side elevation).

Consequently the only thing left is how the Industrial site interfaces with the rear elevation of 72-96 Park Road, The Grove, the Grassy Knoll, and part of Lynton Road.

[Development Guidelines: para 1] The current blank brick façade on the approach to the Church on the Grove should be replaced with active building frontages, with front doors opening onto the street.

[Development Guidelines: para 5] Heights should be restricted to protect the amenity of properties on the Grove, and heights should be restricted to the north of the site to protect the setting of the church, and preserve the amenity of the back gardens on Palace Rd.

Parallel to the brick façade is a sheltered housing complex comprising 48 two-storey flats housing elderly and some vulnerable residents. The Lynton Road aspect contains two storey houses, eight of which opposite the Industrial site have front roof conversions. Lynton Road itself is part of the Crouch End Conservation Area.

Consequently if the intention is to enhance the setting of the Conservation Area and protect the amenity of properties on the Grove, then any development onto the Grove should be no higher than two storeys.

In addition, according to HGY/2011/0905, the interfacing elevation between 72-96 Park Road and Industrial site will remain at two storeys.

[Development Guidelines: para 6] Heights and elevation details should respond to the Park Road frontage and the established rhythm.

HGY/2011/0905 establishes a maximum of four storeys on the Park Road front elevation descending to two storeys on the Lynton Road and Grove side elevations.

[Development Guidelines: para 7] Higher elements may be possible on Park Road marking the entrance to Crouch End District Centre.

This contradicts HGY/2011/0905 which has set the height to four storeys.

• 3 March 2016

The Grassy Knoll

[Development Guidelines: para 8] The site contains a number of mature trees and these should be retained on site where possible.

A cynic may say that the Council has bundled in the Grassy Knoll simply to square off the shape of SA49.

Whereas 72-96 Park Road and the Industrial site are freehold, the Grassy Knoll is managed by the Council on behalf of the public. And it should be noted that some local residents have made significant contributions to its upkeep.

At the very least the potential loss of valuable public open space should be opened up for discussion; land should not be automatically confiscated by the Council for their own ends.

As Simon Stevens, NHS England chief executive said earlier this month:

“We want children to have places where they want to play with friends and can safely walk or cycle to school - rather than just exercising their fingers on video games. We want to see neighbourhoods and adaptable home designs that make it easier for older people to continue to live independently wherever possible. And we want new ways of providing new types of digitally-enabled local health services that share physical infrastructure and staff with schools and community groups.”

SA 49: What hasn't been said

[Development Guidelines: para 9] Applicants must consult with Thames Water regarding both wastewater and water supply capacity upon the preparation of a planning application.

Water is vital, but so are the other every day things of life.

The increasing density of housing occupancy will lead to pressure on local services. As examples, the Council's stance on education is leading to bulge classes in schools. We note that there longer waiting times to see a GP. Try catching a bus? Try parking?

Please will you keep me informed about the progress of this plan.

Yours sincerely

JV Thomas