

**From:** LDF  
**Subject:** FW: Consultation on Sites Allocation Development Plan document

**From:** Parkside Malvern  
**Sent:** 07 March 2014 14:14  
**To:** LDF  
**Cc:** Ryan King; Polly De Boer; dorothy rose; Mei W  
**Subject:** Consultation on Sites Allocation Development Plan document

Dear Sirs,

Parkside Malvern Residents Association would like to make the following representations concerning the draft.

- 1) The consultation has not been well publicised and we believe the majority of residents affected by the large number of the sites in our area will be unaware of its existence. Further explanation and consultation is required. For the part of the association, it has coincided with a large amount of work on the S.73 Heartlands application, the Town Major Scheme.
- 2) HH4: We support the creation of the 'avenue' theme along Brook Road with a good level of high value 'green' open space. 5 to 6 storey building backing onto Hornsey Park Road properties is too high - the back gardens are short at this point. We support the opening up of the Mosselle Brook and ask that its line is made a linear public open space, in the way of the new River through parts of Islington - a pocket community park for physical, mental health and play. Existing trees and ecology must be retained and protected. New development should not create any additional traffic in Mayes Road. We would like space created for a 'community allotment: our area is one of open space deprivation and high levels of health inequality: the whole community - young, old, working and non working required such a space to exist now that they are to be surrounded by the area of intensification. Why is the business at the rear of Hornsey Park Road excluded from the site, which is entirely made up of commercial land? The space between HH4 and WG4 and WG5 should be made into high quality public realm and be traffic calmed.
- 3) HH5: We support the extension of the 'avenue' theme into Hornsey Park Road but a good level of high value 'green' open space must be created and the entrance to Hornsey Park Road made subordinate to the 'avenue'. The northern bend between Clarendon Road and Mary Neuner Road should be eased.
- 4) HH6: The north west corner should be safeguarded and a radius curve created to allow Coburg Road and Western Road to join to create a continuous highway: Western Road, north towards the schools and Wood Green Common can then be traffic calmed.
- 5) HH7: the embankment must be safeguarded as open space of high amenity value and made accessible to the public
- 6) WG1: we object to the loss of the Civic Centre building, a building of local historical and architectural interest. An imaginative scheme should be developed to retain this important building at the municipal heart of the former Wood Green Borough and distinctive area of Wood Green town centre
- 7) WG2 and WG3: a transport interchange and hub is required at the northern end of Wood Green: the transport use of this site should not be lost if it can play a part in this.
- 8) WG4: There is a good deal of affection for the Library building and its retention and enhancement should be considered, together with the removal of the adjacent 1980s building and the enhancement of the open space. A strong avenue style linkage towards the Heartlands with trees for pedestrians

and cyclists should be created, with active frontages. Consideration should be given to a 'sky level' café with views towards Alexandra Palace, as previously envisaged for the Debenhams site. We support the opening up of the Mosselle Brook but any new development should not create any additional traffic or requirement for servicing The Mall or access from Mayes Road

9) WG5: We support the opening up of the Mosselle Brook and creation of high quality public realm and linkages but any new development should not create any additional traffic or requirement for servicing The Mall or access from Mayes Road

10) HO2: We object to the proposed loss of metropolitan open land: the suggestion that the new water treatment works should, in some way justify this, is wrong. We support improved linkages from Alexandra Palace to the Penstock path tunnel.

The above are initial comments only on the sites in or directly affecting our area. We would appreciate an opportunity for residents and officers to meet at one of our association meeting, at a convenient time. They do not represent the thoughts of residents or the views of the association on other sites.

Yours faithfully  
Co-chair, PMRA

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---