

## Appendix 2: Comments on Observations/ Objections

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
1	English Heritage	Do not consider it necessary to be notified.	Noted.
2	Garden History Society	<p>Have no observations on the current application other than to say that they are concerned that it is yet another in a series of applications for work at Alexandra Palace Park which, while individually small, have a cumulative and potentially damaging effect on the special interest of the park. They do not appear to be co-ordinated in the context of a conservation management or development plan, and they would urge the park authority to ensure that any proposals are consistent with a vision for the park which is firmly based on heritage considerations and has the support of the local community.</p>	<p>Noted - There is a Conservation and Heritage Management plan in place (2011) which outlines the landscape and its cultural and social heritage value of the park. The park is managed by Alexandra Park and Palace Charitable Trust and who are also responsible for the various outbuildings (13) in the park.</p>
3	Conservation Officer	<p>Background: Alexandra Palace and Park are situated within the London Borough of Haringey and the Park is a Grade 2 Listed Park Landscape. The site is also within the boundaries of The Alexandra Palace and Park Conservation Area and is designated as a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) and also as a Local Nature Reserve.</p> <p>The scheme seeks to alter an existing building, Little Dinosaurs, used for indoor play space and install and a wooden climbing frame within the grounds of the site. It also proposes to install Astroturf/ rubber mats in an area beneath the proposed climbing frame as well as place Astroturf in a</p>	Noted

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>small area next to the decking area where the soil is compacted and in poor condition.</p> <p>'Little Dinosaurs' is located in the south-west corner of Alexandra Palace Park in area known as 'The Grove' and which was originally the grounds of an 18th century house. This part of the park consists of many mature trees including tree lined walkways which give this part of the park a peaceful and leafy environment. The building is rectangular in footprint and has horizontal cladding to the walls and a corrugated sheet roof with verandas on three sides. The building itself replaced a previous fire damaged structure.</p> <p>Comments: The existing building is not of a high quality. The proposed alterations would not change the appearance of the building or its position or size. The scale of the proposal is such that it would have very little, if any, impact on the setting of the listed building and the park. The development would be reversible and as such would be considered to preserve the character of the conservation area and the heritage assets. In fact, the improved play provisions would facilitate the use of the site and would be considered an enhancement to the area and the heritage assets within it.</p> <p>From a conservation point of view, in context of the recent case on Barnwell Manor, the discharge of duty to ensure that development should preserve or enhance the character of heritage assets has been considered. The proposed scheme would preserve and enhance the appearance of the park and its usability. It is, therefore acceptable.</p>	

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		Conclusion: Acceptable.	
4	<b>Cllr Bloch (councillor at the time of responding)</b>	<p>The Grove is Metropolitan Open Land and should be preserved as such and be available for all users.</p> <p>The climbing frame is very prominent and high and intrusive.</p> <p>The bouncy castle shown on the drawings does not have consent</p> <p>Astroturf would be unsightly and set an unfortunate precedent within the conservation area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development is very small in nature and will not adversely affect the character of the building and the land in question; nor the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL).</li> <li>2. See response 8 below.</li> <li>3. The bouncy castle has been removed from the drawings.</li> <li>4. The Astroturf relates to a very small area and would not be visually apparent.</li> </ol>
4	<b>AP &amp; P CAAC</b>	<p>The applicant still fails to understand the sensitive nature of the site, which is Metropolitan Open Land, part of a historic Grade II listed park and within a conservation area - all of which put limitations on use.</p> <p>This proposal still runs counter to the original consent for Little Dinosaurs, which was: "specifically children's indoor adventure play area with ancillary café to be carried out within the confines of the building".</p> <p>The drawings included in the proposal continue to show the bouncy castle and roof signage for which planning consent has never been given.</p> <p>The application includes a document suggesting full support from the Alexandra Palace Charitable Trust for what is proposed. It is believed that this is an edited selection of comments that</p>	<p>Refer to Response 1 above</p> <p>The external climbing frame is not an extension of the indoor facility but rather ancillary to the main use. The children who visit the facility also play outside and cannot be prevented from doing so.</p> <p>The bouncy castle has been removed from the drawing. The roof signage is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Park Manager Mark Evison from the Alexandra Palace Trust has been notified of this application.</p>

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>go beyond the agreed views of the Trust and are therefore misleading.</p> <p>The use of Astroturf as an alternative to real grass, which in any case would become unsightly after extensive use, would be an unfortunate precedent within the conservation area.</p>	<p>The Astroturf relates to a very small area and would not be visually apparent.</p>
5	<p><b>Local Residents</b> (9 responses of objection as summarised)</p>	<p>Astroturf is unreasonable and inappropriate given the appeal decision APP/Y5420/A/12/2178737.</p> <p>The Astroturf would harm the look and amenity of the natural grassland</p> <p>The original permission relies on it being contained as an indoors climbing frame only.</p> <p>It would harm the amenity of the MOL and Conservation Area.</p> <p>It would lead to loss of natural grass land</p> <p>The Garden History Society were not consulted</p> <p>There is no information about the materials or the size of the wall or extent of Astroturf.</p> <p>It appears to be a hugely disproportionate climbing frame, completely out of character with</p>	<p>The appeal decision referred to is different in nature. The use of Astroturf here will improve the appearance of the poorly grassed areas.</p> <p>Astroturf will be placed either on existing hard surfaces or areas of poor grass conditions and are considered appropriate in terms of improving the appearance of the land.</p> <p>The external climbing frame is not an extension of the indoor facility but rather ancillary to the main use. The children who visit the facility also play outside and cannot be prevented from doing so.</p> <p>The use of Astroturf and the climbing frame would not be out of character within the MOL and recreation value of the land. The Astroturf will improve the appearance of the land affected by poor grass growth.</p> <p>No grassland will be lost as the areas to be covered in Astroturf and rubber mats are largely devoid of grass.</p> <p>The Society were consulted and have responded.</p> <p>Information regarding materials is contained in section 9 of the application form. Drawing 213001 details the finish and location of the wall. A drawing has been submitted showing the proposed wall section.</p> <p>The frame will be 2.8m high. The most visible part of the frame will be only 1.8m<sup>3</sup> in volume, less than 1% compared to the volume of the main building. It is screened to its east by trees and to its north</p>

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>openness of the parkland.</p> <p>2/3rds of an acre of parkland would be "hard-cored" over.</p> <p>Planning Inspector's Appeal Decision APP/Y5420/C/10/2128637 on 9.12.2010. The Planning Inspector upheld Haringey's Enforcement Notice to remove the paving, decking and relocate the storage areas, on the grounds that its MOL and Historically Listed Park.</p> <p>Heritage Lottery Fund should be consulted</p> <p>Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/C/10/2128637 against CON/2010/00152 supports the grounds to refuse the application</p> <p>It impacts on biodiversity or ecological conservation features</p> <p>The method of installation of the Astroturf will lead to further loss of natural grassland in the MOL.</p>	<p>by the main building.</p> <p>In total 28.3 sq.m of Astroturf and rubber mats is proposed which is significantly less than 2/3 of 0.74 acre (2995sqm or 0.3Ha).</p> <p>As set out in detail with the report this current application is materially different to the previous enforcement case. In this current application the use of Astroturf is considered to be less obtrusive than the decking and concrete paving that formed part of the enforcement appeal. In addition the proposed Astroturf will serve to improve the appearance of the areas of the ground affected by poor grass growth. The Astroturf will blend with the existing natural grass and will prevent further erosion occurring in those areas helping to improve the appearance of the land.</p> <p>The Heritage Lottery Fund were consulted</p> <p>See 10 above</p> <p>The proposed development does not affect biodiversity or ecological features.</p> <p>A condition is being imposed asking for further details, including details of installation.</p>
6.	<p><b>Local Residents</b> (49 responses of support as summarised)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements to soft landscaping and baby space will benefit everyone.</li> <li>• The outdoor space is not used to its full potential.</li> <li>• Outdoor space beneficial to those children living in flats with small</li> </ul>	Noted

No	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
		<p>gardens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvements will look better especially in summer.</li> <li>• Beneficial to little children.</li> <li>• Objections focus too much on the history of the Grove and not on the climbing frame.</li> <li>• The previous use was also for children.</li> <li>• Baby area needs improvement as it gets cramped.</li> <li>• With local government cuts this is an opportunity to support a business that benefits the community.</li> <li>• Outdoor exercise beneficial for children.</li> <li>• External environmental impacts are minimal.</li> <li>• Grounds will be reinstated once use or business ceases.</li> </ul>	
7.	Applicant	6 submissions from applicant in response to consultation comments	Noted