

To LB of Haringey Planners - Comments to Regulation 19 of The Draft Local Plan ending 4/3/2016

Submission From Lynne Zilkha, [REDACTED]

1. Further to my response of the 27th March, I don't believe that the points have been addressed with regards to the Proposed Alterations to Haringey's Adopted Strategic Policies – Partial Review and "preferred option" Development Management Plan.
2. Site Allocations Development Plan- SA53 Alexandra Palace

In my view the Council has not properly considered the consultation responses in relation to Alexandra Palace and grounds. I attach my earlier response, for ease of reference.

I refer the Council to the link

<https://historicengland.org.uk/listing/the-list/list-entry/1001253>.

It is clear that the palace and grounds should be preserved and that only this would be consistent with the Council's sustainability policy in relation to open spaces. Preservation includes of its environs and views.

There should be no major change to Alexandra Park and Palace without full London-wide consultation, since the amenity and its preservation are London-wide, if not national, concerns and enshrined in its own statutes.

I note that there is a further consultation being carried out in relation to Wood Green (Area Action Plan), which includes consideration of where the Cross Rail 2 stations might be. It is difficult properly to comment when two consultations overlap and in my view it is relevant to the Local Plan and the future of Alexandra Palace and Park and to air quality in the area that there should be excellent public transport links. For that reason the preservation of Alexandra Park and Palace should include enhancing access for the public and planning for a new station there.

No decisions which affect the Wood Green area should be taken without waiting for the full responses to the relevant consultation later in March.

Furthermore, full account should be taken of the fact that consultations have been held on Cross Rail stations, and a station at Alexandra Park and Palace is supported, as is stated in the Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations document pages 28, 31, 32. Page 33 para 10.14.6 "will help to ensure the

regeneration of Alexandra Palace...given the introduction of CR2, to support the development of restaurant and hotel”.

As far as matters of detail are concerned, in relation to **SA53 - Alexandra Palace -**

- 1) address is incorrect
- 2) planning designations header should include 'Grade 2 listed Historic **Park**' (palace is mentioned but not the park)
- 3) 'unified public ownership' should be clarified. It is very important to understand that it's a charitable trust *for the benefit of the people of London* and governed by its own statutory instruments. It is for that reason that the Council should or will have to consult more widely on changes which have a major effect on the Palace and Park.
- 4) Where it is said "Indicative Development Capacity- none identified" – this should be changed to make it clear that none is appropriate for the Palace and Park.
- 5) Clause 2.151 any works to open space must be consulted upon London wide according to dedicated Acts of Parliament. Improvement should be subject to taking on board the advice of the Garden History Society, as it's a listed historic garden as statutory consultees. Works should have a historic restorative context.
- 6) 'opportunities to improve open space will be supported' - again as above, subject to it's historic designation, listed status and guidance from the Garden History Society.
- 7) "the site is the centrepiece of the Alexandra Park and Palace Conservation Area.." This is not strictly correct and indicates an insufficient understanding of the APPCA. The site is not the centrepiece, but is one and the same as the APPCA.
- 8) "Alexandra Park is a historic park and opportunities to enhance its setting should be explored". I would support enhancing its setting - subject to the restoration or conservation guidelines of The Garden History Society and Historic England. For this reason, developments which are detrimental to the view from and of the Park should not be permitted.

Finally, **I am of the view that the Coronation Sidings development proposed in SA25 SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD DOCUMENT** has not been properly thought through in relation to the APP and contradicts other policies. It is said that "...a development that marks the entrance to the foot of the Penstock Tunnel linking Wood Green and Alexandra Park and Palace will be supported". This conclusion is inconsistent with a policy of protecting and enhancing the park and its environs.

Alterations Document – ALT22 section 1.3 para 1.3.62

“Council is exploring opportunities to *create* a Cultural Area at Alexandra Palace to link up with the existing Cultural Quarter at Wood Green”

This isn't strictly correct as Alexandra Palace has a long standing tradition as a leading music, entertainment and leisure use from inception to this day.

3. Air Quality

I am pleased to note that it is proposed that AQ assessments should be done for all major developments. It is becoming increasingly clear that air pollution in London is a serious problem, leading to ill health and early deaths. Planning has a vital role to play in driving down air pollutants.

I enclose a legal opinion made available by the campaign group Clean Air in London. It shows that development which leads to a breach of limit values should not be permitted. This is relevant to any development or plan which would lead to an increase in congestion (such as the increasing number of basement excavations in already trafficked roads, the trafficked Wood Green High Rd and developments in areas near SINCS, woodland and parks)

It is said that Air Quality is better in the West of the borough (**The Sustainability Appraisal of Site Allocations document- Page 36 para 10.19.1**) but no evidence has been provided to show this. If there is that evidence, then please provide it to me under the Environmental Information Regulations. If not, then this should not be included as fact.

4. Miscellaneous additional points

In the Alterations Document **ALT53 Para 3.2.29**

Haringey Housing Estate Renewal there should be added a provision which will adopt a policy of providing equivalent property for leaseholders who are displaced in the estate or the area and to offer independently assessed market rates for the leases. Anything less would be unfair and unlawful.

5. Basements - DM18 of Development Management DPD Document- page 36

The Haringey LPA has indicated at Local Plan consultations that it intends to follow the lead as set by other LAs namely Kensington & Chelsea. On comparison with K&C basement policy CL7 adopted in January 2015, I welcome the not more than 50% garden rule. However, after comparison, it stops short on several key points. Haringey's DM18 is more generally worded and open to interpretation while K and C's policy is more specific and less open to interpretation.

The parts highlighted in yellow below are the elements which differ from Haringey's draft basement policy, my comments are in blue. We ask that Haringey LPA includes these points as they had said they would at planning forums etc.

Kensington and Chelsea, Policy CL7, Basements (attached)-

The Council will require all basement development to:

a) not exceed a maximum of 50% of each garden or open part of the site. The unaffected garden must be in a single area and where relevant should form a continuous area with other neighbouring gardens. Exceptions may be made on large sites;

b) not comprise more than one storey. Exceptions may be made on large sites; (comment- Haringey LPA could be more bullish, and confident- why not copy this example to limit the impact of super basements)

c) not add further basement floors where there is an extant or implemented planning permission for a basement or one built through the exercise of permitted development rights;

d) not cause loss, damage or long term threat to trees of townscape or amenity value;

e) comply with the tests in national policy as they relate to the assessment of harm to the significance of heritage assets;

f) not involve excavation underneath a listed building (Haringey could be more prescriptive they're policy just refers to the historic environment) (including vaults);

g) not introduce light wells and railings (Haringey could extend this definition to include railings or glazed balustrades, the draft policy just refers to lightwells) to the front or side of the property where they would seriously

harm the character and appearance of the locality, particularly where they are not an established and positive feature of the local streetscape;

h) maintain and take opportunities to improve the character or appearance of the building, garden or wider area, with external elements such as light wells, roof lights, plant and means of escape being sensitively designed and discreetly sited; in the case of light wells and roof lights, also limit the impact of light pollution ([Haringey's policy could refer to light pollution](#));

i) include a sustainable drainage system (SuDS), to be retained thereafter; ([perhaps Haringey should also include the provision of SuD's in all basements as best practice](#))

j) include a minimum of one metre of soil above any part of the basement beneath a garden; ([Haringey's policy simply refers to 'adequate soil depth' again, why not be precise and actually refer to a minimum depth of 1m?](#))

k) ensure that traffic and construction activity do not cause unacceptable harm to pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and road safety; adversely affect bus or other transport operations (e.g. cycle hire), significantly increase traffic congestion, nor place unreasonable inconvenience on the day to day life of those living, working and visiting nearby;

l) ensure that construction impacts such as noise, vibration and dust are kept to acceptable levels for the duration of the works;

m) be designed to safeguard the structural stability of the existing building, nearby buildings and other infrastructure including London Underground tunnels and the highway; ([Haringey's draft policy does not refer to the underground](#))

n) be protected from sewer flooding through the installation of a suitable pumped device. A specific policy requirement for basements is also contained in Policy CE2, Flooding.

In addition, K & C have a Basements SPD which will provide guidance for the information that will need to be submitted with basement application, including the following:

- - Accompanying (but not part of) a planning application, a construction method statement (CMS) will need to be submitted by an appropriately qualified civil or structural engineer, which will contain a report into the ground and hydrological conditions of the site including groundwater flow and explain how these matters will be dealt with during the construction of the site. The CMS will also demonstrate how the excavation, demolition and construction work (including temporary

propping and other temporary works) can be carried out whilst safeguarding structural stability. The structural stability of the development itself is not controlled by planning but through Building Regulations. The Party Wall Act is more suited to dealing with damage related issues.

- - ways to minimise disturbance be included in the CMS. Detailed matters to include the drilling of boreholes; impact on trees; the sequence of temporary works to minimise the effect on neighbours; water flow; the consideration of related cumulative impacts; the link between a basement and the host property and the need for professional verification of certain works. Guidance relating to safeguarding amenity, that is noise, vibration and dust from construction works be included.
- - a draft construction traffic management plan (CTMP) be required to be submitted with the application and where planning permission is granted, the Council will attach a condition requiring a full CTMP. The CTMP will address issues relating to highway safety, the freeflow of traffic, noise associated with/from construction vehicles and availability of parking. Detailed matters will include vehicle stationing, manoeuvring and routing, parking suspensions and issues in relation to residential and workplace disturbance, arising from vehicle stationing, loading and unloading and movement.

**To LB of Haringey Planners re LB of Haringey Local Plan Consultation
ending 4/3/2016 Comments to Regulation 19 of The Draft Local Plan**

From

Lynne Zilkha, [REDACTED]