

Planning Sub Committee 12 February 2018

ADDENDUM (2) REPORT FOR ITEM 8

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Representation from St. William in response to Parkside Malvern Residents Association (PMRA)

The main issues that St. William have sought to clarify in response to PMRA's objection submission is the legislation that measuring water quality falls under, the most recent testing and the results to be compared with water safety standards that would allow the Moselle to be du-culverted.

The EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' (2006) is the correct governing legislation when assessing water quality. The 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' forms part of the Water Framework Directive. Annex 1 of the EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive' provide clear bathing water quality criteria for Inland Waters along for Coastal waters. The applicants have applied the Inland Water quality criteria.

The applicant commissioned further water sampling in January 2018 in line with the testing criteria set out in the EU 'Bathing Water Quality Directive'. The analysis of these results were received during week commencing 5th February 2018.

The following table outlines the Inland Waters quality criteria and the results of the January 2018 water sampling of the Moselle Brook.

ANNEX 1 OF THE EU BATHING WATER DIRECTIVE 2006 FOR INLAND WATERS

	Good Quality	Jan 2018 Sample
Intestinal Enterococci (cfu/100ml)	400	7300
Esherichia Coli (cfu/100ml)	1000	4200
Total	1400	11500

The above results from the 2018 sampling shows the current contamination level in comparison as to what is 'good quality' and it is clear that the results far exceed 'good quality' measurement.

The total combine E Coli and Intestinal Enterococci CFU count is 11,500cfu/100ml. This is some 11,100cfu/100ml higher than 'Good Quality' standard. This is eleven times higher than the EU 'Good' standard for inland waters.

The applicants conclude on this point that based on the results it would not be appropriate to pursue detailed proposals at present that would facilitate the daylighting of the Moselle Brook and introduction of a pathway to a public health hazard within a community park in the centre of a 1700 home development.

A further planning condition is proposed that imposes a requirement for an updated Energy Strategy to be submitted prior to the submission of reserved matters. This is to complement the proposed heads of terms which also require a feasibility study to be undertaken to agree the specification of the wider District Energy Network. This further clarifies the requirement to deliver a single site-wide energy network.

Local Representations

A further 46 objections have been received since the first Addendum was published. One objection replaces an earlier email of support.

The main comments include:

- The Moselle should be de-culverted;
- The height of the blocks and overall density;
- Inadequate provision for schools, open spaces, GP surgeries or any other services for new residents;
- Scheme should be reconsidered and less housing built;
- Transport impacts on local roads public transport capacity;
- The proposals for energy centres and lack of details;
- Lack of car parking spaces which will have a knock-on effect locally.

A further 2 letters of support have been received. The main comments include:

- Local businesses, start-ups and creative enterprises will be supported;
- Positive contribution to jobs and economic development;

- The scheme will provide community and open spaces;
- Meanwhile uses will be encouraged during build out.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>The following respondents objected specifically to the proposals for the Moselle (detailed below):</p> <p>78-83 Upper Thames Street, City of London</p> <p>Flat 17 Firs House, Acacia Rd N22</p> <p>30 Rosecroft, Wood Green London N22</p> <p>14 Dorset Road Wood Green N22</p> <p>99 Oakfield Rd, Walthamstow London E17 (x2 separate objections)</p> <p>Haringey Rivers Forum</p> <p>20 Cranleigh Rd, N15</p> <p>153 The avenue, Tottenham, London N17</p> <p>99 Seymour Avenue, N17</p> <p>158 Dowsett Road, Tottenham, N17</p> <p>55 Coleridge Road, Crouch End N8</p> <p>44a Napier Road, Tottenham, N17</p> <p>10 Warberry Road, N22</p> <p>49 Cranleigh Road, London, N15 3AH</p> <p>28 Albany Road N4</p> <p>12 Woodlands Park Road N15</p> <p>12 Woodlands Park Road N15</p> <p>83 Stanley Road N11</p> <p>44 Amberley Road EN1</p> <p>47 Langham Road N15</p> <p>31 Roseberry Gardens</p> <p>3 Avondale Road N15</p> <p>83 Wightman Road N4</p> <p>332 St Ann's Road N15</p> <p>91 Lausanne Road</p> <p>11 Malvern Road</p> <p>304 Mount Pleasant Road</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
<p>5 Malvern Road Flat 27, Kinneer Apartments, Chadwell Lane Craigs Road, Dumfries 28 Kirkstall Avenue 23 Passmore Gardens 16 Richmond Road 115 Seaford Road 54 Kitchener Road, London N17 6DX 16 Richmond Road London N11 2QR 115 Seaford Road (objection and requests that original email of support is withdrawn).</p>		
	<p>The respondent wishes to register an objection to the Haringey Heartlands application to build many hundreds of flats on the site of the old Wood Green gasworks. Haringey's only river, the Moselle Brook, culverted for the past hundred years, runs through this site.</p> <p>The basis of my objection is the intention of the developers to continue to keep the Moselle Brook buried.</p> <p>The Moselle Brook is a main river and part of the Thames river basin, flowing into the River Lea and on to the Thames. As it reaches Wood Green, the river is in a culvert just below the surface.</p> <p>I have recently seen the river as it briefly sees daylight arriving to the development site at the railway embankment. It had a good flow and did not smell. The developers say 'daylighting' the Moselle is not feasible on the basis of quality of water and the on depth of the culvert. These are not valid reasons for keeping this unique and valuable community resource hidden.</p> <p>Thames Water have stated the water quality is already okay. The Moselle Brook is not a drain and Haringey has the legal duty to deal</p>	<p>Under the extant permission (lawfully implementable), the Council accepted none of the alternatives available for de-culverting the River Moselle were acceptable. Officers have carefully considered the proposals against up-to-date planning policy taking into account the applicant's feasibility appraisal and alternative options submitted with this application.</p> <p>Officers have assessed the feasibility against the Council's Development Management Policies, London Plan Policy 7.28 and emerging draft policies.</p> <p>All options would require access to a channel between 2.35m & 3.6m deep. The water quality has been assessed by the developer's consultant and there is an ongoing risk of sewage effluent</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>with the illegal misconnections that are causing the poor quality. Haringey are making excellent progress on addressing these with its partners in Thames Water and expect the quality to improve significantly in the near future. The culvert is not that deep and actually just below the surface in some places on the site. The site can be contoured in other parts of the site with little effort.</p> <p>This development is literally a once in a lifetime opportunity to bring the Moselle back to life by opening it up to daylight. Doing so would increase biodiversity in the Borough and help flood prevention further downstream. It would compensate for the loss of natural habitat that the development will cause. It will lead to improvements in water quality upstream and help the clean-up of the river as it flows through Lordship Rec, and reduce pollution in the River Lea.</p> <p>Daylighting the Moselle would give Haringey's local (and future) residents a real connection with their sense of place and history, and, like neighbouring Enfield Council's Firs Farm Wetlands, it would make a green space that is vibrant and truly alive.</p> <p>Key planning guidance calls for daylighting of culverted rivers. Haringey Heartlands developers would keep the Moselle underground with an option that it could be de-culverted in the future (at no cost to them). This would truly be a case of kicking the issue into the long grass. It will not happen.</p> <p>The Environment agency has stated "we believe there is a great opportunity at the site to de-culvert the Moselle Brook and restore the designated main river to a more natural state. Naturalising rivers provides flood risk, water quality, biodiversity and recreational benefits for the area."</p>	<p>discharge to the Moselle due to storm overflows and/or misconnections. Bacteria counts in excess of 2,420mpn coliforms (most probable number) per 100ml were indicated which indicates the presence of sewage. The guide value for bathing water is 100mpn per 100ml</p> <p>Officers propose S.106 provisions that require the re-testing of water quality prior to commencement and the design allows for future de-culverting should water quality meet the agreed standard. The GLA and Environment Agency have both accepted this position.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>This great opportunity should not be missed. The culvert is over 100 years old and in poor condition in parts- it would be better to spend the money needed to repair or rebuild it on restoring it to be a natural water course that the community can benefit from and manage.</p> <p>Restoring the Moselle river is required by the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) under the Water Framework Directive (WFD) and in line with adopted local plan policy DM28. The developers should comply with this.</p> <p>The development should comply with the GLA's London Plan (currently under consultation), which promotes green infrastructure, sustainable drainage, and river restoration in its policies G1, G5, G6, SI13 and SI17.</p> <p>I object to this proposal unless de-culverting (daylighting) is incorporated into the permission to proceed.</p>	
Friends of Brunswick Park		
	<p>Friends of Brunswick Park members are frequent visitors to Lordship Rec, and have watched with interest the improvements as a result of de-culverting. The area has become a more vibrant place, the de-culverted Moselle is a beautiful central feature, and it's wonderful to see the benefits for wildlife. And as time passes, the Moselle is becoming noticeably cleaner. It's now a cherished feature of the borough.</p> <p>The East of Haringey is deficient in green space. Any opportunity to remedy this with high quality public realm must be maximised. De-culverting in Haringey Heartlands would create another high quality space that the people of Haringey, and the Council, could be proud</p>	Please see officer response above.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>of. Good for people, good for wildlife. And please remember that de-culverting is promoted in key planning guidance. It's plain to see that the arguments against de-culverting don't stack up, and delaying it to the future means it won't happen. Please do the right thing and make any approval for Haringey Heartlands conditional on daylighting the Moselle now.</p>	
Executive Director – Collage Arts, Chocolate Factory		
	<p>I am writing to inform you that we at Collage Arts give our full support to The Gas Works Project scheme planned for the Olympia Trading Estate in Wood Green. The proposed scheme is vital to the future of the Wood Green Cultural Quarter as it will lead directly to ensuring the future of over 70 creative business and over 200 full time jobs. The 70 creative business are currently located in Chocolate Factory 1, the lease for which comes to an end in summer 2018. If the proposed scheme does go ahead Collage Arts will be moving the 70 creative business into two of the warehouse units at The Gas Works Project.</p> <p>Collage Arts founded the Cultural Quarter concept in Wood Green over 30 years ago in 1985 and has been developing and managing the 3 Chocolate Factory buildings in the Cultural Quarter which are home to over 250 creative companies. The Wood Green Cultural Quarter is now recognised by Haringey Council as a key contributor to the local economy, creating over 800 full-time jobs and a massive range of services and support for local and wider community to participate in the arts, innovative learning programmes for unemployed young people, BAME Women, people recovering from mental health issues, the LGBT community and the elderly. We offer business support services for start-up businesses, and a wide range of affordable facilities and resources from recording, rehearsal,</p>	Support noted.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>dance, theatre studios to screening, training, workshop spaces.</p> <p>For the 70 creative companies and for Collage Arts, The Gas Works Project is a godsend. We can remain in the Wood Green Cultural Quarter and continue to do the sterling work that we do. Naturally, the scheme has our full and unwavering support. It has to happen. We have to protect the many and varied artistic practitioners in Wood Green who have done so much for the local community.</p>	
134 Station Road, N22 7SX		
	<p>I am objecting to the revised application for Heartlands development. The number, density and height of the homes would be of an unacceptable level and this latest application increases it yet again. I am concerned about the impact on the local area of such a large high density development. There is a lack of clarity about additional infrastructure to deal with increased traffic and pressure on local services. With the current uncertainty of the HDV due to the current political climate I am concerned that the short term solution to all of Haringey's housing problems is trying to be solved in this development to detriment of local residents.</p>	<p>The full environmental impact of the development, including social infrastructure, has been assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and is judged to be acceptable. The transport impacts are assessed in the main body of the report.</p>
67 Hornsey Park Road N8 0JU		
	<p>I object to the planning notice as I feel these 18 storey flats are going to completely block my light and be totally overbearing. I also worry about the impact it will have on the community in terms of traffic and local amenities. I fear the disruption and noise it will cause and worry about the possible danger the increased traffic will cause.</p>	<p>The full daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment is addressed in the main body of the report. The proposed development achieves a high level of adherence against BRE standards and is judged to be acceptable. The development is adequately sited away from existing residents so to avoid any overbearing impacts.</p>
8 Rhodes Avenue		

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>I object to this. This is a unique, once in a life time opportunity to unearth and expose the Mosselle river. Enlightened city authorities all over the world do this. Brings a proper sense of space to a location for future residents to enjoy and can be transformative for an area in terms of attractiveness.</p> <p>Bigger scale granted but have a look at the pictures in the attached from the town of Aarhus, Denmark where I went to university. Unearthing the river here transformed a city centre: http://m.aarhus.lokalavisen.dk/dengang-og-nuaarhus-blev-foedt-ved-aen-/20150817/artikler/708129958/1449</p>	<p>Please see officer response above.</p>
24 Park Ridings N8 OLD		
	<p>I strongly object to this development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is wholly out of character with the surrounding area. 2. The scale of the development is such that huge pressure will be placed on already congested roads and is likely to significantly negatively impact road safety and parking for local residents. 3. The size and scale of the development is such that it will lead to significant over-shadowing, intrusion into private spaces and areas and create significant disturbance in terms of noise and pollution. 4. As a consequence of the above the development will degrade the quality of life for everyone living in the area. 	<p>The proposal would result in a development of varying designs including taller buildings that would contrast with existing built form in a positive way within the locality. In tandem, the development has been designed in order to not result in any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of surrounding occupiers.</p> <p>The full transport impacts, including road traffic, is addressed in the main body of the report.</p>
Parkside Malvern Residents Association		
	<p>I write on behalf of Parkside Malvern Residents Association (PMRA), the registered residents association covering Hornsey Park Road, Alexandra Road, Park Ridings, Malvern Road, Ravenstone Road and The Avenue, N8 in response to the Council's consultation on the application. The views expressed in this letter are those of the</p>	

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>Committee and the membership.</p> <p>We would like to register the strongest possible objection to the proposed development as detailed below. The wider membership will also have individual concerns which, while not covered by this letter will have been communicated to you directly.</p> <p>We have written under separate cover with our more detailed objection and met with St. William on 6th February, 2018 to discuss them and seek to resolve as many as possible. The unnecessary and unacceptable haste with which this application has been brought to committee has prevented this essential and valuable dialogue between developer and community taking place. We also believe it is a dialogue the council should have been facilitating instead of forcing the application by reference to the Planning Performance Agreement. A summary of our objections follows:</p> <p>1. Timing: We believe the application is not yet ready for determination and requires a considerable amount of further work and review before a decision can be reached.</p> <p>We believe it is inappropriate to determine this excessively intensive and dense proposal so soon after the failure of the AAP and the failure to obtain certainty on the delivery of Crossrail 2, the major transport and infrastructure project upon which the AAP was predicted.</p>	<p>The application has been fully assessed in accordance with agreed performance standards.</p> <p>The Council is now consulting on a revised 'Preferred Options' Area Action Plan for the Wood Green Area following on from an initial 'Preferred Option' consultation in Spring 2017. The application has been assessed against the most up-to-date planning policy framework.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>2. Localism: We object to the failure of HBC and as a result of this, the failure of the application to respect the ideals and processes under the Localism Act, 2011.</p> <p>3. Development relies on/ must Include infrastructure The intensity of development relies on and will fail in the absence of essential infrastructure at the boundaries of and beyond the site.</p> <p>4. Alexandra Palace and Park We object to the appropriation of Alexandra Park as essential open space to support the proposed density of development and the failure of the application to deliver detailed, costed and legally binding proposals to create the long needed and frequently promised connection between Wood Green and the Park through the water</p>	<p>The application has been subject to extensive statutory consultation. In addition, the application is supported by a Statement of Community Involvement (by the applicant) detailing formal consultation and engagement for the revised proposals starting in January 2017. Two workshops were held, the first took place on 27 January 2017 and the second on 3 February 2017 and a presentation was given to a PMRA General Meeting on 9 February 2017. In addition two public exhibitions were held, newsletters distributed and a project website set up.</p> <p>The impact on infrastructure is addressed in the main body of the report. The application includes a substantial amount of community floorspace (D1/D2).</p> <p>The open space provision and transport impacts, including mitigation for walking and cycling improvements is addressed in the main body of the report which also includes significant bus contributions.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>works.</p> <p>We object to the adverse visual impact of the proposed tall building/ building line and mass proposed by the Outline application.</p> <p>5. Error in calculation of site area The site area incorrectly includes the area of Mary Neuner Road, a public road consented to under planning permission in 2007. The site area also includes an existing electrical substation - land owned by the Distribution Network Operator, serving the neighbouring community. Further, the space in front of the new PRS.</p> <p>6. Excessive density We calculate the area of the Detailed application to be c 1.31ha. Based on the proposed number of units being 616, we calculate this to be 470 units/ha. We calculate the area of the Outline application to be c 2.44ha. based on the number of units being 1098, we calculate this to be 450 units/ha. Both densities are far in excess of the London Plan and, given the site constraints, far beyond what is acceptable for a sustainable healthy community.</p> <p>Overall, contrary to the London plan, the application and design fails</p>	<p>Visual impact has been assessed in the THVIA section of the Environmental Assessment and considered not detrimental to neighbouring streets, nearby open spaces including Alexandra Park and on Local Views; officers agree with the assessment.</p> <p>The PRS and its environs, whilst a constraint, forms part of the masterplan and is not incorrect.</p> <p>The London Plan (paragraph 3.28) makes clear that the density matrix should not be applied mechanistically and is particularly concerned to ensure that the quality of housing output is not compromised by the need to make the most efficient use of land. Officers have reviewed the proposals in their entirety and judge the residential quality to be a significant improvement on the extant scheme.</p> <p>The employment space is welcomed and supported, providing job opportunities for the community and also adheres with planning policies.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>to address how the excessively high density will tackle spatial and environmental inequalities. The quantum of employment and other town space is excessive compared to the consented scheme and without precedence.</p> <p>Access to underground car parks, service compounds and collections points together with on street parking will have a seriously detrimental impact on building frontages and the character of the area.</p> <p>7. Failure to daylight the Moselle Brook across the Detailed Application Land Appendix 4 - Moselle Brook Daylighting Feasibility Study contains factual errors and is deliberately misleading. It refers to the site in its 2009 condition when it has since undergone ground remediation and makes multiple references to historic and not current data.</p> <p>The option to restore the river has not been clearly presented, costed, risk assessed and confirmed as deliverable. With respect to water quality, the reference year should be 2020.</p> <p>The economic case for opening the river now should have been established instead of relying on loose statements not based on fact. The technical case for opening the river now has also not been</p>	<p>The amount of space and active frontage taken up by underground car park entrances, service compounds and collection points are not considered excessive. Underground parking is preferable in design terms to large amounts of the ground and street frontages being taken up by parking. Collection points only used once every two weeks for refuse collections; designed to be pleasant placed the rest of the time. The access proposals are also addressed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>Please see officer response at front of this addendum.</p> <p>The open space and other key design</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>properly investigated.</p> <p>The suggestion that the river could be de-culverted in future is high risk, expensive and is unlikely to ever be delivered.</p> <p>8. Lack of open space There is insufficient open space for the density and intensity of development. We disagree with the Design Officer's conclusion that there is a generous range of different external amenity space - balconies, roofs, open space between buildings or Alexandra Park which is remote and not just west of the site as stated. The so called pocket park is part byway, an essential pedestrian and cycle link from the development towards Wood Green and Turnpike Lane in the east and, for the existing community Alexandra Park in the west it will be a long walk from the front doors of tall buildings and an unattractive and unviable one for people of most ages before arriving at the remotest end of Alexandra Park/Newlands Fields.</p> <p>The park either side of Mary Neuner Road is also connecting space but as part of the London wide Blue Ribbon network, of borough-wide significance, it should be provided for the benefit of Wood Green and Hornsey in addition as well as a local park for the development and play space.</p> <p>The area above the Moselle culvert at the rear of Hornsey Park Road must be included in the Detailed application, protected and delivered to perform this function at the time that the Outline application development is delivered.</p> <p>The space above the Moselle behind Hornsey Park Road has not been properly surveyed and its constraints established. It is impinged</p>	<p>proposals including the public square are addressed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>This area will be covered by Reserved Matters Applications and sufficient</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>upon by Zone D and of insufficient width to contain a viable shared surface for pedestrians and cyclists, as suggested. It should also be shown as connecting to the part of the Blue Ribbon on the adjacent Iceland site.</p> <p>We note that the word river does not once appear in the Design officer's report and the opportunity and benefits daylighting are not mentioned a telling omission.</p> <p>The Outline application fails to establish the impact of raised ground levels on proposed development in Zone D and properties in Hornsey Park Road, the potential to retain trees when the culvert requires repair and access by the public as part of the Blue Ribbon.</p> <p>The civic square within the Outline application area is pitifully small, will lack daylight and oppressive and totally lacks functionality. It will be compromised by its location above the northern energy centre. We object to any appropriation of CIL for Alexandra Park where this is the result of the deficiency of open space within the development.</p> <p>The application does not robustly respond to and ensure the delivery of the S.106 Agreement with Network Rail for the railway embankment to be an open space within Heartlands.</p> <p>9. Failure to make preserve and enhance the site's Heritage Assets. The key heritage assets of the site are still not at the heart of the proposals. The assets are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Moselle Brook and the restoration of its riparian nature b) Incorporation and celebration of the gas holder bases - http://www.ribacompetitions.com/gasholder/ c) Restoration of the polychromatic brick wall to the western 	<p>controls are considered to be in place to guide future detailed design and delivery.</p> <p>The application includes a Survey Report. The technical consultants' survey judges the overall condition to be Grade 2 (good) indicating that the asset is structurally sound with some minor defects that are not currently reducing performance of the asset.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These have already been demolished. The Cultural strategy discusses ways in which the local heritage would be interpreted and represented within the Master Plan. For example, the layout of the play fountains would reference the geometry of the gas</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>boundary of the Detailed application area</p> <p>d) Restoration of the brick abutments to the railway embankment (the rail head for delivery of coal for gas manufacture)</p> <p>e) manufacture)</p> <p>f) The retaining wall and bund between the Moselle culvert and Zone D and properties on Hornsey park Road</p> <p>g) Assimilation of artefacts from the former gas holders</p>	<p>holders (Page 36, Cultural Strategy). In addition, page 39 goes on to explain how an evocative memorial to the gas holders could be achieved throughout the development. For example <i>'The imagined reflection of the gas holders would be permanently applied to the glazing, via sandblasting, etching or a photographic interlayer.'</i> The strategy also incorporates Geodesic light projections to create the shadows of the gas holder on the Civic Square.</p> <p>The wall being referred to here is of low quality and not of sufficient heritage value apart from being a physical demarcation. It would be onerous to ask for the restoration of the wall in this instance.</p> <p>This section of the abutments are likely to be managed by Network Rail. Again, I do not think it has sufficient heritage value and that it would be onerous if we were to ask for this to be restored.</p> <p>Page 35 of the Cultural strategy states how the salvaged elements of the gas holder, in particular those relating to the patented design of Gas holder N1, will be displayed within publicly accessible spaces wherever possible. These matters are addressed</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="548 384 1361 416">10. Transport and adverse impact on Hornsey Park Road</p> <p data-bbox="548 459 1514 746">The application fails to address and correct HBC's failure to meet its commitment to the local community to ensure that traffic is equitably distributed between Hornsey park Road and Mary Neuner Road and the assertion that the lower than expected use of the latter can be a benefit taken by the proposed development. We object to the proposal to narrow Mary Neuner Road and to roadside parking and any interventions that could see its capacity to carry its fair share of local traffic.</p> <p data-bbox="548 790 1514 1045">The application has failed to identify and respond to the adverse impact of service and delivery vehicles and HGVs using Hornsey Park Road that will harm the environment and the health and wellbeing of residents The application has failed to allow for an improved junction between Coburg and Mary Neuner Road to permit traffic to flow easily between these roads as part of an equitable distribution of local traffic through the area.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1088 1514 1232">The application must include the creation of a shared service and environmental improvements between the Pocket Park and Hornsey Park Road as part of the Detailed application, to be undertaken by the developer.</p> <p data-bbox="548 1275 1514 1375">The application fails to recognise that the intensity of development requires significant improvement of the junction of Clarendon Road and Hornsey Park Road and the integration of signals between this</p>	<p data-bbox="1556 237 2002 301">elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 411 2128 512">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 778 2128 879">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 1114 2128 1214">These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p data-bbox="1556 1337 2128 1369">These matters are addressed</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>junction and those between Hornsey Park Road and Turnpike Lane. The application fails to respond to HBC policy SP7 and has an unacceptable reliance on only a commitment by HBC to promote infrastructure improvements that are not in their gift to deliver.</p> <p>We object to the conclusions of the Transport Assessment: That while the proposed development results in some addition traffic at local junctions within the study network that all of the junctions continue to work within capacity and the proposed development does not have a severe impact on their performance. That the Piccadilly line has spare capacity at peak times to accept significantly more users to and from Wood Green and Turnpike Lane stations: the experience of residents and works is otherwise. We object to the casual conclusions of the Transport Assessment with respect to the condition and capacity of existing Links and Crossings, e.g. Link 5 and Crossing 1 to function following development.</p> <p>The application fails to acknowledge and respond to the increased pressure of the CPZ in Hornsey Park Road and neighbouring streets, particularly with respect to visitors and out of hours parking.</p> <p>11. Proposed Energy Centres and strategy The application contains incomplete analysis in support of the proposed northern energy centre. This is a costly and high risk HBC project that is appropriating essential CIL funding for a purpose for which it was not intended.</p> <p>We note the proposed District Heat Network contains no resilience planning, i.e. there is a reliance of a single flow and return pipe and no ring and the network will rely on one energy building. It is unlikely</p>	<p>elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in the report and in this addendum.</p> <p>Provision for the DEN and related infrastructure forms part of the Council's CIL Regulation 123 list.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>to be an acceptable source of heat without individual developments having their own back-up. It relies on routes that are subject to consultation under the AAP and may never be created.</p> <p>Proposals for the southern energy centre to support the Detailed application are incomplete.</p> <p>Please present all the objections to the planning subcommittee member. We ask that as a minimum a decision on the application is deferred until a full and proper discussion has taken place with the community on all objections.</p>	<p>The legal agreement includes provision for a Feasibility Assessment relating to the district heat network in the north, which will assess these matters and will be subject to future detailed design. A further planning condition is proposed to secure an updated energy strategy and further clarify the requirement for a single site-wide network that connects into the Wood Green DEN. The energy centre in the south has been reduced in size and is now a temporary centre that will be decommissioned upon connection to the wider DEN.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
27 Warberry Road N22 7TQ		
	<p>I object to this application on the grounds that there have been far too many applications of this kind and while everyone understands that we need more housing, more effort should first be made to put into use houses left empty for long periods, as is already under consideration in some areas. Also, the Council rarely seems to properly consider the infrastructure to support such housing, which often remains the same: Wood Green alone has seen many developments over the last 20 years, yet the number of tube stations, bus services, GP surgeries and other vital infrastructure constituents remain the same. This all puts undue pressure on this infrastructure, leading to stress for people trying to use them.</p> <p>Another issue, though, is that such developments would be greatly improved by the factoring in of natural resources, in this case the Moselle River, which should be de-culverted as part of development if it takes place. Research has shown that being close to nature is good for our health, especially mental health, whereas living surrounded by a concrete jungle is not. Exposing (daylighting) the river would enable residents to enjoy that open space and benefit from its potential to promote connectedness within the community, besides the benefits accruing to wildlife. It just won't work to say the de-culverting would happen at a later stage, as realistically it won't happen. I urge the Council, if approval is given to this proposal, to insist on de-culverting the Moselle as a condition of such development. Thanks for reading and reflecting on our comments.</p>	<p>The application has been assessed against up-to-date planning policy at a local and strategic level. The impact on infrastructure is also assessed in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum.</p>
26 Hawthorn Road		
	<p>This is a massive overdevelopment of the land available - blocks of flats of up to 19 storeys in height are an anathema to family living.</p>	<p>Matters relating to the proposed density and design are addressed in the main</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>They increase the incidence of mental health issues and militate against safety of children and older people. Have we learned no lessons from the 1960s when such tower blocks were pulled down in favour of more human-sized building?</p> <p>The whole project needs rethinking. In any case no development on this site should take place unless the River Moselle is deculverted in order to bring back at least some refreshment and wildlife to the area.</p>	body of the report.
Books to Buy Ltd, Coburg Road		
	<p>I run a business called Books 2 Buy. We are dealing with new books also antique and rear old books. I think that The Gas Works scheme planned for the Olympia Trading Estate sounds great. It will make the area much better. At the moment there is very little going on, hardly anyone knows where we are and we don't really feel part of the community. Everything happens on the High Street and around the big council building on the corner of Station Road.</p> <p>I understand that there will be a café, a bar and public event spaces at The Gas Works that will bring lots of people to the area. This is exactly what's needed.</p>	Support noted.
11 Malvern Road		
	<p>I am writing to object to this planning application for 5 reasons:</p> <p>1. DENSITY & BUILDING HEIGHTS: The density and proposed height of buildings has increased significantly on previous applications related to this site. As a result, the quality of the development and impact on future and neighbouring residents is likely to be negative. The affordability of new properties is likely to be beyond the reach of many Wood Green families. There does need not seem to be sufficient allocations of social housing</p>	These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>needed to address Haringey's current housing needs.</p> <p>2. LACK OF OPEN SPACE: A consequence of the above is insufficient open spaces which are essential to the long term well-being of the new and existing communities.</p> <p>3. INFRASTRUCTURE: The increased number of residents will put extreme pressure on the local infrastructure housing, education, social welfare facilities, and transport. There seems to be little joined up assessment of impact of thousands of additional residents and workers coming into the new development.</p> <p>Hornsey Park Road residents will be under severe pressure and there seems to be little recognition of the consequential health and negative environmental impact on local residents.</p> <p>Local tube, bus and train services are already overcrowded.</p> <p>4. THE MOSELLE: The application makes reference to the future potential to open up the Moselle, this will not be realised if it is not part of the new development at its onset. The opening of the river would benefit this and other communities across the borough. Permission should only be granted on condition that the Moselle is opened up. Haringey needs to support local communities more proactively in their efforts to improve the environment.</p> <p>5. HEARTLANDS & AAP VISION: I acknowledge that the developer has tried to be sensitive to community concerns in many aspects of the application. However, St William are under pressure to deliver more work spaces and homes in an area where there simply isn't sufficient space. There is a real danger of the new development</p>	<p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>undermining the well-being of future and neighbouring communities. This appears contrary in many ways to the intentions and vision in the area action plan which aims to make the Wood Green area an attractive and desirable place to live and work in.</p>	
5 Malvern Road		
	<p>We object to the density of development in the outline area and lack of open space. It is not acceptable for this development to rely on access to Alexandra Park when it is so far away - it is not practical to expect residents of such a vast estate to travel 0.75km along twisting, narrow and in places unpleasant paths to get to proper open space. Worse, this open space is pretty barren and sometimes fenced off for events.</p> <p>We object to the impact the development will have on surrounding roads, especially Hornsey Park Road.</p> <p>Any proposals must include Mary Neuner Road taking its fair share of all traffic through the area (half of all traffic) and promised by Haringey when the new road was built. Proposals include Hornsey Park Road being traffic calmed and weight restrictions introduced to stop HGVs using it.</p> <p>There must be a transparent agreement on all S.106 works and application of CIL agreed with the community (not just the developer) to create the essential infrastructure needed to support this development: priorities must be a link to Alexandra park, extending the New River Path to Wood Green Common, traffic calming Hornsey Park Road and incorporation of the Coronation Sidings embankment as open space.</p> <p>The heritage assets of the site must be part of the planning of the</p>	<p>A number of improvements to walking and cycling routes are proposed as part of a range of mitigation measures. Please see transport section in main report.</p> <p>Please see transport section.</p> <p>Please see main body of report for CIL contributions and planning obligations.</p> <p>Please see response at front of this</p>

Stakeholder	Question/comment	Response
	<p>site, the most important of which is opening the Moselle Brook from as part of the Detailed phase (the southern area): we note that the application reports and data contain serious inaccuracies and that, were officers and the GLA to have examined the matter, they would have seen the errors. It is now clear that the council and developer agree the river can be opened and that the remaining concern is one of water quality. Even on this point, the application contains inaccuracies and errors and has clearly misled officers and the GLA. The errors and inaccuracies must be corrected and the GLA asked to withdraw their erroneous opinion. The daylighting must be designed and costed now and the funding of the work agreed between Haringey and the applicant and the works made a condition to be complied with within two years. The gas holder bases and wall next to the railway also need incorporating into the development.</p> <p>We object because the so called Moselle Walk has not been proposed as part of the first phase. It is an essential natural space and acknowledge buffer and screen between Hornsey Park Road properties and the dense development in the Outline area. This linear green space is also needed to connect the southern Detailed area from the point when it is first occupied and is needed by the local community which is an area of open space deficiency. As a haven for nature, for the existing and new community as it arrives and as a protection to existing properties during the construction phase of the Outline (the densest area of development) the walk needs creating in a near final form from the start of the development.</p>	<p>addendum.</p> <p>These matters are addressed elsewhere in this addendum and in the main body of the report.</p>