

## APPENDIX 1: COMMENTS ON OBJECTIONS

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
1	Transportation	No objections as set out in paragraph 7.1	Informative attached advising on reinstating the footway.
2.	Environmental Health	No objections response set out in paragraph .	Condition 9 and informative attached as requested
3.	Waste Management	No objections	Informative in relation to bin sizes
4.	Thames Water	No objections	Informative in relation water pressure
5.	Building Control	No objections	
6.	Local Residents	<p><u>Parking and access</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal would increase pressure on parking on Queens Road, not only from the residents of the proposed building, but also from the residents of 50/52 Queens Road.</li> <li>The hard standing area currently provides off-street parking for the tenants of 50/52 Queens Road.</li> <li>Parking in this area is already a problem which will be exacerbated by this development</li> <li>The site does not allow for adequate parking provision, emergency access or refuse collection</li> </ul>	<p>Parking and access concerns are addressed in paragraph 8.15 LBH Transportation raise no objections</p> <p>The site contains lock up garages and is not the allocated parking area for 50/52 Queens Road</p> <p>Parking and access concerns are addressed in paragraph 8.15 LBH Transportation raise no objections</p> <p>London Fire Brigade Fire Safety and LBH Waste Management raise no objections</p>
		<p><u>Loss of existing garages</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowing this development would set a precedent for other proposals to remove garages and replace them with flats and houses. This would have a devastating impact on the borough in terms of environment, appearance and quality of life.</li> <li>If permission is granted it could lead to other applications being submitted on what some people might perceive to be unused land.</li> <li>There is nothing in either the London plan or in Haringey's UDP which supports the</li> </ul>	<p>Concerns in relation to the loss of garages have been address in Paragraph 8.4</p> <p>This proposal would not set a precedent for other developments on garage sites which would have to be assessed on their own merits.</p> <p>Both the London Plan and Haringey's Local Plan support the provision of housing in sustainable locations and the re-use of previously developed land.</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>replacement of domestic garages with residential housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a shortage of garages in the area.</li> <li>• All of the garages were fully occupied until 2010 when the applicant evicted a number of local residents who rented them in order to support his planning application.</li> <li>• The applicant has attempted to circumvent CW2 of the Haringey UDP</li> <li>• These garages are useful community facility for which there is considerable demand</li> </ul>	<p>This area is in close proximity to transport links with a PTAL of 5, LBH Transportation raise no objections therefore the retention of garages for parking is not considered necessary in this instance. This is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.4 notes that UDP Policy CW2 has not be 'saved' following the adoption of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Policy CW2 referred to community facilities such as health services, childcare and education facilities not lock up garages</p>
		<p><u>Unsuitable site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal will create a building with inadequate provision for space, natural light, privacy, or outside space.</li> <li>• The site in question is wholly unsuitable for residential development occupying just 0.02 hectares, with limited access</li> <li>• The site is too small for the footprint of the unit</li> <li>• The access arrangements are inadequate for emergency services</li> </ul>	<p>The design and layout of the proposed dwelling are considered in Paragraph 8.6 and the proposal would comply with London Plan Guidance and the Housing SPD.</p> <p>As above</p> <p>As above</p> <p>No objections have been raised from LBH Transportation or London Fire Brigade Fire Safety</p>
		<p><u>Environmental impact</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The gardens and open space surrounding them are home many species of birds and foxes use the area to play.</li> <li>• The site is currently largely open space bordered by trees and is used by foxes, squirrels birds and other wildlife. This enhances the local environment, unlike the proposed development which involves covering most of the site with concrete and uPVC</li> <li>• Concerns regarding the mature trees to the rear of the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 8.7 and 8.18 address biodiversity issues the site is not designated for biodiversity value and protected species or significant wildlife interest are not known or suspected to be present</p> <p>As above</p> <p>Condition 6 has been attached requiring tree protection measures</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for open space to provide a balance between the needs of the natural and the made environment.</li> <li>• The proposal makes no mention of sustainability such as sustainable building materials renewable energy and recycling rain water.</li> <li>• The applicant has amended the previously submitted plan to incorporate a sedum grass roof, this is clearly a token gesture. It does not disguise the fact that the development relies on the use of cheap, high impact, high carbon materials throughout.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal would replace an area covered by buildings and hardstanding with a dwelling with a garden area of 44 sqm which would exceed the amenity space requirement in the London Plan Paragraph 8.19 addresses sustainability issues and condition 8 has been attached to ensure that the dwelling meets or exceeds Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.</p> <p>As above</p>
		<p><u>Impact on the character of the area</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development would have a detrimental effect of the character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• The glazing, crude metal roof angled sections of the roof and proximity to neighbouring dwellings cannot be mitigated by the sedum roof.</li> <li>• If the dwelling is used for multi-occupation will create more noise and parking problems for the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Our objections are the same as previously expressed for other applications on this site whether two storey or single storey.</li> <li>• Creating such high density housing is not part of the strategic plan for the area</li> <li>• The appearance of a cheaply designed modern bungalow covered in plastic and aluminium, like some sort of alien landing craft, in the midst of this Victorian architecture will in no way enhance the aesthetic of the street.</li> <li>• The proposed building is not in "line" with the</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 8.7 considers the design of the dwelling and it is considered an acceptable design</p> <p>As above</p> <p>The dwelling is a 1 bedroom bungalow and would not be suitable for occupation by more than 2 occupants</p> <p>No response required, points noted</p> <p>Paragraph 8.6 notes that the density the density would be less than the requirement of the London Plan. Paragraph 8.7 considers the design of the dwelling and it is considered an acceptable design</p> <p>It is noted that the proposal represents backland development which is</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>existing buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed building will not merge with the environment but will be an eyesore.</li> <li>• The proposal fails to live up to the standard of other developments in the area An appeal for a similar development nearby at Shaftesbury Hall was rejected and the grounds also apply to this proposal</li> </ul>	<p>considered acceptable in this instance Paragraph 8.7 considers the design of the dwelling and it is considered an acceptable design Each application must be assessed on its own merits</p>
		<p><u>Impact on neighbouring properties</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site extends into the garden of the upstairs flat of 50/52 which represents a loss of open space and amenity to this flat</li> <li>• Noise and light pollution</li> <li>• The residents will not have privacy as neighbours will oversee their ground floor.</li> <li>• The proposal would breach of our human rights as agreed under the EU Convention.</li> <li>• The proposed dwelling will create noise nuisance and disturb the peaceful environment of gardens</li> <li>• Loss of privacy to surrounding properties through overlooking</li> <li>• The enjoyment of their garden area will be impacted by the dwelling to rear of the existing building line and close to established residential properties</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal does not include the current garden area of 50 – 52.</p> <p>There would be no vehicular access onto the site and the change from garages to residential would result in less noise to neighbouring residents and no significant light pollution The dwelling would be single storey and condition 10 has been attached requiring screen fencing to be provided to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties Paragraph 9.1 refers to the Human Rights Act 1998 There would be no vehicular access onto the site and the change from garages to residential would result in less noise to neighbouring residents The dwelling would be single storey and condition 10 has been attached requiring screen fencing to be provided to protect the privacy of the neighbouring properties There would be no vehicular access onto the site and the change from garages to residential would result in less noise to neighbouring residents</p>
		<p><u>Inaccuracies and procedural matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The garages are not in a dilapidated state or unused, until recently, the garages were all let and even now, 2 of them are being used by a builder.</li> <li>• The applicant has made a false declaration, this is ground to reject this application</li> <li>• The submission indicates that there a no trees on the site but there is a large evergreen tree</li> </ul>	<p>As noted on the officer's site visit the garages are currently vacant and the site has been subject to fly tipping.</p> <p>The applicant's information regarding the occupation of the garage appears to be correct and would not give reason to refuse the application.</p> <p>Condition 6 has been attached requiring tree protection measures</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>on the site and a number of trees adjacent to the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns that not all of our neighbours have received a letter to inform them of this application and therefore the council has acted illegally.</li> <li>• No notice has been out on lamp posts to advise neighbours of the application.</li> <li>• Complex application and should be decided by committee and not a delegated decision</li> <li>• The property is referred to as a bungalow and a house –presumably this is a bungalow ie 1 storey</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 8.21 notes that the council has notified a large number of neighbouring properties in excess of the minimum requirement to notify adjoining properties.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.21 notes that a site notice was not required as the site is not within a conservation area. The application has been brought before committee at the request of a Councillor The property is single storey</p>
		<p><u>Other matters</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is clear that the applicant is in this for profit motive only and no other reason.</li> <li>• We would also like to know why the council did not make a decision on the 2<sup>nd</sup> application after more than one year. Just after the 2nd application was withdrawn, a new one was made</li> <li>• If the property is proposed to be used to rent there is sufficient accommodation in the area</li> <li>• If the applicant has not maintained the garages properly, what guarantee is there that the new property will be properly maintained.</li> <li>• An application was made about ten years ago, and that it was rejected and therefore the council should reject this application.</li> <li>• The materials being used are the cheapest and this clearly shows the applicant does not care about the environment or the impact this building will have.</li> <li>• It has been known by the council, that the drain system being used is not very effective and using the same drain will cause problems</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that the applicant's motives for the proposal are not material planning considerations Paragraph 8.22 notes that previous applications for this site were withdrawn following officer concerns and pre-application discussions took place prior to the submission of this applicant which aims to address the previous concerns</p> <p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that the applicant's intentions to rent or sell the dwelling are not material planning considerations. The maintenance of the current property is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that any application must be assessed on its own merits in accordance with current Development Plan Policy.</p> <p>Condition 3 has been attached to ensure that high quality materials are provided</p> <p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that drainage issues would be dealt with in a building regulations application</p>

No.	Stakeholder	Comments	Response
		<p>of overflowing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed development has no affordable housing element and does not contribute the council's affordable housing target as set out in the London Plan.</li> <li>• Despite proposing the construction of a bungalow, the proposed design makes no attempt to provide the type of inclusive design which would enable a disabled person to live there, a key objective of Haringey's UDP.</li> <li>• Asbestos in the roofs should be disposed of professionally and residents should be notified</li> <li>• Bins will be left at the top of the passage way and not returned to the bungalow</li> <li>• There is Japanese knotweed on the site which should be removed by a specialist contractor</li> <li>• There is an existing problem with drains the bungalow should be connected to the main drains</li> <li>• No shortage of 1 bedroom accommodation but very few garages</li> <li>• The proposal should be 500mm lower than the existing ground level</li> <li>• A neighbour has specified a number of conditions they wish to be attached</li> </ul>	<p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that the Council's Local Plan Policy SP2 does not require affordable housing to be provided on developments of less than 5 residential dwelling and therefore there is no requirement for the provision of affordable housing within this proposal.</p> <p>The applicant has stated in its design and access statement that the proposal would comply with Lifetime Homes Standards.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that the removal of asbestos is controlled by other legislation and is outside the remit of the Planning Authority.</p> <p>Condition 5 has been attached to ensure that bin storage meets the Council's Waste Management requirements.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.18 notes that the removal of Japanese knotweed is outside the remit of the planning authority and controlled by other legislation.</p> <p>Paragraph 8.22 notes that drainage issues would be dealt with in a building regulations application</p> <p>The proposal would make a modest contribution to meeting the Council's Housing needs as set out in Local Plan Policy SP2.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to require the floor level to be lowered to achieve an acceptable design.</p> <p>The conditions the neighbour wished to be attached were considered and several similar conditions have been imposed and those which have not were not considered to meet the tests of Circular 11/95</p>