

George & Maria Plakides
23 Weston Park
Crouch End
London N8 9SY

6 April 2010

Haringey Council
Planning and Regeneration
639 High Road,
Tottenham
London
N17 8BD

By Hand, E-mail and Recorded Delivery

Dear Sir / Madam

Planning Portal Application Number: PP – 00983219

Your Ref: HGY/2010/0500

Location: Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway, London N8 9JJ

We are the owners of 21 Weston Park and also the owners and occupiers of 23 Weston Park. We wish to register our objections to the proposed development of the above named site on the grounds that we would like to safeguard our buildings and preserve the amenities we currently enjoy.

Our objections relate to specific elements of the proposed development which adversely impact on our properties as follows:-

1. **Boundary Issues** – The site plan showing the boundary lines wrongly indicates the garages to 21 and 23 Weston Park located within the development site. This error is rectified on the proposed site plan. However, the access to the garage of 21 is being blocked by what is indicated on the plans in dotted lines, suspected to be disabled parking or refuse containers. Clearly an unobstructed access to this garage must be maintained at all times.
2. **Access from Weston Park** – The “Traffic Statement” proposes vehicular and pedestrian access from Weston Park. This use will be dangerous and likely to create security and accident issues. The access way from Weston Park is being used currently to provide daytime access to light vehicles and is kept locked from about 6:00 pm until the morning and at all times in the weekends. If you refer to the photographs submitted with this application, it can easily be seen that this is a dangerous blindspot; any vehicles likely to negotiate this crossover must do so with extreme caution. We would, therefore, suggest that no vehicular access from the development is to be permitted other than daytime controlled pedestrian access. Details of this gated controlled pedestrian access to be submitted for approval. On a secondary issue, a very skilled view is being provided from Weston Park towards the

development, which selectively picks a viewpoint to show the block furthest away (Block B North Elevation) whereas the true effect of the development, as would be experienced by Block A is deliberately avoided.

3. **Privacy and Aspect** – The development has been described as five storey. However, Block B Northern part indicates six storey construction. The proximity of this development to the back of our properties is considerably less than is been promoted in the Haringey UDP Policies. The applicant in his “Final Planning Statement”, page 94, under the heading “Privacy and Aspect”, reasons that the shortcomings in overlooking are justifiable under the pretext of maximum development. This is not a justifiable reason to not comply with UDP guidelines and this issue is of such serious importance that it needs to be addressed and the proposals be made to comply even if that means a reduction to the overall proposed density.
4. **Sunlight/Daylight** – The Daylight studies produced are of little significance as they are not detailed enough to identify the true impact of the development on our properties. It is summarised in the studies that there will indeed be some loss of sunlight to the back room windows. What has not been taken into consideration, however, is that already there is considerable loss of light due to the existing Town Hall massive structure. Consequently, any additional loss of light, no matter how small it may be, will be of great consequence to our properties. In essence, our gardens will be in permanent shade and with significant loss of light to the rear rooms.
5. **Housing Density** – The document, “Haringey-Written Statement” recognised that the Hornsey Town Hall site was suitable for development and gave an indicative number of dwelling units as fifty (page 79). That would appear to be a reasonable figure. The current proposal with one hundred and twenty three units, based on site density of 450 habitable rooms per hectare, is excessive. This high density creates problems with massing, aspect, overlooking and overcrowding.
6. **Car Parking** – The “Traffic Statement” attempts to justify a lower car parking provision than UDP Policies. It fails to reasonably justify its deviation from recommended guidelines. The future occupants of the proposed development are more than likely to be car owners also and, therefore, will require the mandatory minimum parking provisions necessitated by such a massive development. Contrary to stated opinion that Crouch End enjoys an excellent public transport, in reality the opposite is true. There are only a limited number of bus routes and no underground or overground stations in close proximity. It is also well documented that Weston Park with its close proximity to the Broadway suffers from a chronic parking problem at all hours. From our personal experience, we can state that residents are reluctant to move their cars in the knowledge that the space will be taken up immediately by others and upon their return they will have to search for a space some considerable distance away.

7. **Renewable Energy Sources** – This is a general comment; we were surprised to see that this application has been accepted and registered as valid without any information relating to Renewable Energy Sources being provided. Our understanding is that applications without this information are normally rejected.

It should be noted that in principle we have no objections to the development of the HTT site provided that the development pays due regard to the Haringey UDP Policies and respects the amenities of the adjoining owners. It is all the more disappointing that in this instance the applicant, Haringey Council, is pursuing a policy of overdevelopment at the loss of amenity and expense of its residents. We trust that the Planning Department in this case will rise to the occasion and act independently of any influence by Haringey Council and process this application with the same principles which are applied to the private sector. I myself, George, being a practicing Architect, having made numerous applications in the past, I am in a position to judge where an application is being treated with favouritism or the due guidelines set by Haringey UDP Guidelines are legally adhered to.

Yours faithfully,



George & Maria Plakides

Cc Lynne Featherstone, MP
Councillor Ron Aitken
Councillor Lyn Weber
Councillor David Winskill