

Appendix 4: Neighbour representations summary

Issue and representations	Officer comment
Principal and housing	
<p>Principle unacceptable</p> <p>Loss of historic building</p> <p>Change of use</p> <p>Loss of family-sized homes</p> <p>Haringey can demonstrate same sufficiency of housing supply as argued in favour of the dismissed appeal</p> <p>Not a 'brownfield' site as claimed by applicant</p> <p>Pressure on existing infrastructure and services</p> <p>Has been rejected once already and should be again</p>	<p>The principle of the development including demolition of the existing buildings, housing provision, existing services etc was previously considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector. However, given the changes in policy context since the appeal decision, further assessment is made at section 7.3 of this report.</p>
Affordable housing	
<p>Lack of affordable housing</p> <p>No social housing</p>	<p>Affordable housing matters are assessed in detail at section 7.6 of this report.</p>
Density, size, scale, design, character and appearance	
<p>Excessive height and scale</p> <p>Out of keeping with local character</p> <p>Overdevelopment of the site</p> <p>Do not meet disabled standards</p>	<p>Character and appearance of the area and design approach is assessed in detail at section 7.4 of this report.</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
Neighbouring residential amenity	
<p>Overshadowing</p> <p>Increased overlooking/loss of privacy</p> <p>Loss of day/sunlight</p> <p>Increased sense of enclosure/overbearing</p> <p>Increased noise</p>	<p>Neighbouring residential amenity is assessed in detail at section 7.5 of this report.</p>
Energy and climate change	
<p>Greater carbon emissions</p>	<p>Energy and climate change were previously considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector. However, given the changes in policy context since the appeal decision as well as to the scheme, further assessment is made at section 7.9 of this report.</p>
Environment	
<p>Loss of open space</p> <p>Habitat for wildlife</p> <p>Loss of trees including previous removal of those TPO'd</p> <p>Increase in surface water run-off</p> <p>There is a well in the adjoining property</p>	<p>Environment matters including contamination, trees and landscaping, flooding and SuDs and ecology were previously considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector. However, given the changes in policy context since the appeal decision as well as to the scheme, further assessment is made at section 7.10 of this report.</p>
Parking, transport, access and highways	
<p>Insufficient parking provision</p>	<p>Parking, transport, access and highways</p>

Issue and representations	Officer comment
<p>Already lack of parking</p> <p>Increased road congestion</p> <p>Contrary to aims of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods</p> <p>Parking survey not representative of local conditions and methodology flawed</p> <p>Adequate access for emergency and waste vehicles to the rear</p>	<p>matters were previously considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector. However, given the changes in policy context since the appeal decision as well as to the scheme, further assessment is made at section 7.8 of this report.</p>
Construction impacts	
<p>Unacceptable dust, noise and traffic impacts</p> <p>Road not designed for weight of construction vehicles</p>	<p>Construction impacts were previously considered acceptable by the Planning Inspector. However, given the changes in policy context since the appeal decision as well as to the scheme, further assessment is made at section 7.12 of this report.</p>