

GREATER ASHLEY ROAD, TOTTENHAM HALE – ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION RESPONSES

March 2010

Summary

- This note summarises the outcome of the public consultation on the development options at Greater Ashley Road undertaken from 23 October - 31 December 2009.
- 225 responses were received to the consultation leaflet, of these 197 responses were from residents living in N15 or N17.
- Two petitions were received by the Council on 18 February 2010 with a combined total of approx. 607 signatures (overwhelmingly N17 residents) calling for Down Lane Park to be retained and improved.
- There is significant opposition from local residents to the proposal for new development – either in principle or certainly within the Park. However, there is also a smaller, but still significant, level of support for new development - including support for developing the southern part of the Park:
 - 94 questionnaire respondents (42%) oppose the ‘Park land swap’ option with development, while 87 (39%) of respondents support it;
 - 90 questionnaire respondents in N15/17 oppose the Park land swap option (including 6 of the ‘blank’ responses to the tick boxes whose written comments indicate opposition - including the Haringey Federation of Residents’ Associations) compared with 80 who support it;
 - 67 (30%) of questionnaire respondents oppose both of the presented development options &/or are opposed to the principle of new development;
 - of those questionnaire respondents who agree with either of the presented development options, more support the ‘Park land swap’ option with development closer to the Station (87) than those who support the ‘no Park land swap’ option (54) (12 respondents agree to both options);
 - the two petitions both object to development on any part of Down Lane Park (even with a compensating land swap) and want to see the Park improved

Public Consultation Undertaken

The consultation included:

- the distribution of approx. 7,000 leaflets to residents, businesses, specific landowners and statutory agencies – inviting responses to a structured questionnaire
- two evening public meetings attended by 36 people and 17 people (though with some people attending on both evenings)
- an exhibition of plans (staffed for a short publicised period) at Marcus Garvey Library (approximately 60 people attended the exhibition over the 3 days that were staffed)
- a newspaper public notice and articles in ‘Haringey People’ & Haringey Advertiser
- details were posted on the Council’s website.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

The specific questions asked in the consultation leaflet were:

Taking into account the advantages and disadvantages, which development option do you support, if any?:

Option 1: build new homes on the whole of the Recycling Centre & Depot on Ashley Road/Park View Road with no development in Down Lane Park

Option 2: focus new development closer to the Station (building on part of Down Lane Park) but not before the Park is extended (by at least the same size) on the north side when the Ashley Road depot relocates to Marsh Lane in 2012

Where would you like to see any new community buildings, eg. for meetings, informal sports or general leisure?

- *Built on the Recycling Centre & Depot site on Ashley Road/Park View Road*
- *Built on land closer to the Station*

225 responses were received (c3.2% response rate):

		Option 1: No Park Land Swap	Option 2 : Park Land Swap	New community bldgs. on Depot site	New community bldgs. closer to Station.
Agree	Total	54 (24%)	87 (39%)	58 (26%)	77 (34%)
	N17 (Tottenham) N15 (Seven Sisters)	35 16	72 8	44 10	60 11
Disagree	Total	119 (53%)	94 (42%)	76 (34%)	65 (29%)
	N17 (Tottenham) N15 (Seven Sisters)	96 12	65 19	57 11	47 11
Neither agree nor disagree	Total	19 (8%)	11 (5%)	27 (12%)	25 (11%)
	N17 (Tottenham) N15 (Seven Sisters)	11 3	8 1	20 3	18 3
Blank	Total	33 (15%)	33 (15%)	64 (28%)	58 (26%)
	N17 (Tottenham) N15 (Seven Sisters)	17 3	14 6	38 10	34 9
Total		225 (100%)	225 (100%)	225 (100%)	225 (100%)
Visit Park :	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Never	Blank
Total	83 (37%)	48 (21%)	29 (13%)	41 (18%)	24 (11%)
N17 (Tott.)	74	39	14	28	4
N15 (Seven Sisters)	3	6	13	7	5

Note: percentages may not total 100% due to rounding

INDIVIDUAL COMMENTS ON QUESTIONNAIRE

	Summary of comments 131 respondents made individual comments	Number of respondents making comment
	Principle of any new housing and adequacy of local infrastructure	
1	There should be no more housing – inadequate green space & social infrastructure	14
2	Concern at whether capacity of drainage and water supply network can cater for new development	1
3	Support no net loss of open space	1
4	Rectify existing shortage of health facilities before considering any new development	1
	Approach to the park and depot / Location of new development	
5	Leave Park alone – it should be improved &/or extended (this comment includes those who support 'Option 3' – an improved and extended park + development)	70
6	Should build on south of Park – more accessible	6
7	Develop close to the Station but maintain/increase open space too	3
8	Ensure new play area is provided before existing one is closed	1
9	Park View Road gate to the Park should be reinstated	1
10	Develop on land east of Watermead Way	1
11	Build homes on Marsh Lane	1
12	Developing on land near the Station will improve the image of the area	1
13	Build in the west of the borough	1
14	Depot site should be used for community or recreational use	1
15	Development should allow good access to the Station	1
16	Community buildings will be more accessible & cost effective on Depot site	1
17	Support new development on Depot but retain access to recycling area	1
18	Keep Depot where it is – develop TechnoPark for new homes	1
19	Building on the Park will set an unwelcome precedent	1
20	Retain existing nursery	1
21	Developing part of the Park will be an opportunity to improve the play area & sports facilities	1
22	Build new homes on top of existing retail park and on social housing estates – not in the Park	1
	Type of new development	
23	Over-development will increase traffic fumes & create new slums	6
24	Local people will not benefit from new homes	3
25	Must have new social infrastructure to support new housing	4
26	Concern at more buy-to-let homes or social housing	2
27	New development should be low rise	2
28	New development must be attractive – not like Hale Village	2
29	Build family homes – not high density housing	1
30	Should build a secondary school instead	1
31	More community facilities are needed	1
32	Concern at type of new housing and impact on community	1
33	Retain interesting buildings on Ashley Road & improve security	1
34	New development must be fully accessible	1
35	Build more social housing, sport and leisure centres	1
36	New homes must have parking spaces	1
37	Avoid over-development – smaller separate blocks are better	1
	Consultation process	
38	The consultation lacks details /is flawed/won't influence final decision	7
39	Plans should have shown Marsh Lane location for new Depot	1
40	Community should have been consulted and involved at an earlier stage	1

Depot		
41	Leave Ashley Road Depot where it is	2
42	Don't close the Depot until a replacement facility is open	1
43	Public should be consulted on moving the Depot – will lead to fly-tipping in local streets	1
44	Concern at likely traffic with new Depot at Marsh Lane & impact on Lansdowne Road	1
45	Non- car owners will not be able to use Marsh Lane – improve recycling collection instead	1
46	Oppose Marsh Lane scheme – will lose allotments	1
Approach to local industry		
47	Relocate local industry out of the area	1
48	Businesses should not be forced to leave	1
49	More jobs are needed rather than new homes	1
50	Support redevelopment of existing bad neighbour industrial uses	1
51	TechnoPark should be retained	1
52	Plans need to be sufficiently flexible if existing businesses are to be encouraged to relocate	1
Retail uses		
53	Wider range of shops are needed	1
54	Concern that new GAR development (& new retail especially) may take focus away from existing Ferry Lane retail park	1
General		
55	Improve east-west access to LVP to improve access to open space & nature	2
56	New development must blend in with the surroundings	2
57	Council capital receipts will not benefit the local community	1
58	Improve local Council homes	1
59	Plant more trees	1
60	Plans are contrary to policy	1
61	Park is used daily for prayers	1
62	Need to improve local roads	1
63	A 'Changing Places' toilet should be provided	1
64	Must fully consider impacts of new development	1
65	Rosebery Avenue suffers from traffic noise	1
66	Concern that Council won't maintain area when development is completed	1
67	New development is reliant on changing the Gyrotory to 2-way flow – businesses don't generally support the Gyrotory change	1
68	Support provision of new pedestrian & cycle links	1
69	North-south footpath through the Park must be retained	1
70	Concern at viability of proposals	1
71	Concern at inconsistencies between GAR plans and TfL's Gyrotory proposals	1

Non-resident respondents (comments included in the summary above):

- Haringey Education Business partnership
- Natural England
- Thames Water
- North London Chamber of Commerce
- CBRE (agent)
- Enfield Council
- King Sturge
- ISIS (British Waterways)
- Coal Authority
- Sustrans

Summary of key views expressed at public meetings on 2 and 4 November 2009 attended by approximately 53 people (some people attended both meetings)

- Concern about increased population (up to 3,000) in Tottenham Hale but no increase in parkland
- Concern that other community facilities (schools / health / community) not being increased in a timely way to support increased population / housing
- Neither of the consultation options are supported. There should be no development on the Park and the Park should be extended onto the site of the Depot to provide adequate open space for existing residents, let alone any new residents
- More attention should be paid to improving the park now, improving local street services (cleaning; safety; lighting) and healthcare provision
- Concern that housing development design should be in keeping with existing character of area. Development should not be too high.
- Pavillion Nursery does not want to relocate or be rebuilt
- Development proposals should be worked up in more detail before consultation to give people more fully informed choices
- Residents facing onto the existing Depot do not experience any problems from it – having an extended Park opposite their front doors may present problems

Petitions

Two petitions were received by the Council on 18 February 2010 with a combined total of approx. 607 signatures (overwhelmingly N17 residents) calling for:

Petition 1: *'We the undersigned call upon Haringey Council to drop its proposal to take away a substantial part of Down Lane Park for development but instead to adopt the principle that park land is sacrosanct and that no part of Down Lane Park should be taken away ever.'* (approx. 322 signatures)

Petition 2: *'We the undersigned demand that Haringey Council drop its proposal to build housing on the part of Down Lane Park that has the children's playground, nursery and sports facilities (even with sections of land being added as recompense at the other end of the park). Instead we demand that Haringey:*

- *adopt the principle that park land is sacrosanct and that no part of Down Lane Park be taken away ever;*
- *fulfil its promise made in the Tottenham Hale Masterplan 2006 (not kept yet) to create "a new children's play area and new youth facilities".'* (approx. 285 signatures)

KEY CONSULTATION RESULTS:

- The overwhelming majority of questionnaire respondents (193 out of 225) live in either N17 or N15, with the majority of those living in N17 (159 in N17; 34 in N15). Some respondents did not give their address. Other respondents include statutory agencies, corporate landowners or agents.
- 94 questionnaire respondents (42%) oppose the 'Park land swap' option with development, while 87 (39%) of respondents support it
- 54 (24%) of questionnaire respondents support the 'no Park land swap' option while 119 (53%) are opposed. However, many of the latter are opposed because they do not want new development either in principle or unless there is also a larger Park.
- 67 (30%) of questionnaire respondents oppose both of the presented development options and /or are opposed to the principle of new development.
- Of those questionnaire respondents who agree with either of the presented development options, more support the 'Park land swap' option with development closer to the Station (87) than those who support the 'no Park land swap' option (54) (12 respondents agree to both options).
- 90 questionnaire respondents in N15/17 oppose the Park land swap option (including 6 of the 'blank' responses to the tick boxes whose written comments indicate opposition - including the Haringey Federation of Residents' Associations) compared with 80 who support it.
- The two public meetings were attended by people (53 people in total though some people attended on both nights) who were strongly opposed to any development in the Park and, perhaps to a lesser degree, opposed to any further development at all. There was strong support at both meetings to the demand to increase the size of Down Lane Park and improve the facilities in it.
- The majority of questionnaire respondents (58%) say they use the Park at least once a week. 18% say they never use the Park (including the statutory agency and landowner respondents).
- The 607 signature petitions call for the Park to be retained and improved with new play/sports facilities rather than being used in any 'land swap' with new development .

NEXT STEPS:

Taking the consultation results into account, the Council's Cabinet on 23 March 2010 will be recommended to agree that new development should be focused on existing developed land, retaining all of the existing Down Lane Park.

The first phase of improvements to Down Lane Park will be designed and implemented in 2010 /11 in consultation with the Friends of Down Lane Park using allocated funding of £255,000. Further improvements will be dependent on securing additional funding, including from developments (via section 106) in the Tottenham Hale area.

A detailed strategy to guide the development of new homes, shops, business space, community infrastructure and open space improvements will be presented to the Council's Cabinet in Autumn 2010.

