

Appendix C - Summary of Consultation Responses

Response	Type of respondent	Key points	Council response	Conservation Area
1	Individual	<p>Support the new direction for Rookfield Estate, especially the expansion of the geographical extent of the direction.</p> <p>Noted that Etheldene Avenue has already suffered damage.</p>	Support noted. However in light of other consultation feedback this Article 4 Direction is not recommended to be confirmed at this time.	Rookfield Estate
2	Individual	<p>The Council needs to give greater attention to enforcing against planning contraventions in the Tower Gardens Conservation Area.</p> <p>Several households have removed hedges from their front gardens which is detrimental to the special character of the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. An updated Article 4 direction will support robust enforcement.</p> <p>It is noted that the condition of some front gardens (including loss of boundary hedges) has caused detriment to Tower Gardens Conservation Area in particular. The important contribution that landscaping, planting and green space makes to the special character of the Conservation Areas is noted, however works to hedges (as well as other gardening and planting works) are not classed as development and therefore cannot be controlled via an Article 4 direction or any other form of planning control.</p>	Tower Gardens
3	Individual	Support expansion of geographical extent of direction for Tower Gardens. The Council needs to be proactive with enforcement in the Conservation Area. Homes for Haringey properties contribute to much of the harm to the Conservation Area.	Support noted. Homes for Haringey will be notified of the new Article 4 directions.	Tower Gardens
4	Individual	Broadly support the extension of the geographical scope of the direction but concerned about the increased costs and delay associated with having to make planning permission applications for straightforward maintenance and improvement	Support noted. However, in light of other consultation feedback this Article 4 direction is not recommended to be confirmed at this time. A 4-page informative was sent to residents as part of	Rookfield Estate

		work to a property. Traffic in the Conservation Area is a particular issue.	the consultation to provide support and advice in submitting planning applications.	
5	Individual	Generally support the changes for Rookfield Estate but concerned about this discouraging the installation of solar panels. It is important to protect the character of the estate but not at the expense of supporting renewable energy.	Support noted. However in light of other consultation feedback this Article 4 Direction is not recommended to be confirmed at this time. The important balance between conserving and enhancing the Conservation Area and supporting renewable energy is noted.	Rookfield Estate
6	Individual	Strongly favour the extension of the Tower Gardens direction to cover the entire Conservation Area. Would like the direction to be amended to include gas supply pipes.	Support noted. It is noted that the installation of gas supply pipes on street elevations has caused detriment to Tower Gardens Conservation Area. The new Article 4 direction will remove permitted development rights relating to the installation, alteration or replacement of a chimney, flue or soil and ventilation pipe on a dwellinghouse (Class G of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the GDPO).	Tower Gardens
7	Individual	Seeks clarification on the justification for extending the direction for Tower Gardens to cover the entire Conservation Area, in particular, the inclusion of part of The Roundway. Many of the properties which are not subject to the current direction but would be captured by the extended direction are subject to unsympathetic alterations already Questions what support is available to residents on low incomes who may find themselves in need	The Council's evidence base has identified harm from unsympathetic alterations to parts of the Tower Gardens Conservation Area that are not covered by the existing Article 4 direction. Replacing the existing direction will generate significant benefits for the Conservation Area as a whole and help to prevent further unsympathetic alterations. The extension of the boundary will improve clarity for residents and support robust enforcement.	Tower Gardens

		<p>of replacing wood frame windows or other features.</p> <p>Raised issues of road safety and refuse management along the Roundway and Tower Gardens more broadly. Not, in principle, against the extension of the Article 4 expansion but frustrating to receive limited communication with regard the impact of this type of change. Also, concerned that local issues being considered silos and not in a manner that would be beneficial to residents.</p>	<p>A four-page informative was sent to residents as part of the consultation to provide support and advice in submitting planning applications.</p> <p>The Council is currently preparing a New Local Plan which will seek give consideration to the full range of planning and development issues facing the borough in a joined-up way.</p>	
8	Organisation (Natural England)	No comments		Tower Gardens
9	Organisation (Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee)	Supportive of the changes, in particular the extension of the Article 4 boundary in the case of Tower Gardens.	Support noted	Tower Gardens
10	Organisation (Rookfield Management Ltd)	<p>The consultative leaflet issued by the Council states that the new Article 4 direction varies from the current direction in two ways. This is an error. It varies in three ways. The new Direction states that it will only apply to the street elevations of the properties. This is a significant variation to the existing Direction, which is not limited a particular part of a house. No explanation or justification has been advanced to support this change. It is completely at odds with the objectives underlying the other measures in the revised Direction.</p> <p>Welcome the revision and extension of the Article 4 Direction but do not support the simultaneous loss of the control which the revised Direction would result in. Because of the unique layout of the Estate, badly designed and unsympathetic extensions to the side and rear elevations of a house could have a severely detrimental effect on</p>	<p>In light of this consultation feedback, it is not recommended to confirm the Article 4 direction for the Rookfield Estate at this time. This will enable the Council to give further consideration to the scope of the replacement Article 4 Direction and will allow regard to be had to the Rookfield Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) which is currently being drafted and is due for consultation and completion in 2021. The existing Article 4 Direction for the Rookfield Estate will remain in effect and continue to provide protection against some of the potential harms from permitted development.</p>	Rookfield Estate

		<p>the character and appearance of this important Conservation area.</p> <p>The revised Direction, by limiting its effect to the “street” elevation, significantly reduces the amount of control the Council can now exercise in respect of unsympathetic changes to houses on the Rookfield Estate.</p> <p>Request that the revised draft be modified to remove the new limitation of the Direction to street elevations.</p>		
11	<p>Organisation (Chine and Cascade Residents Association)</p>	<p>The consultative leaflet issued by the Council states that the new Article 4 Direction varies from the current Direction in two ways. This is an error. It varies in three ways. The new Direction states that it will only apply to the street elevations of the properties. This is a significant variation to the existing Direction, which is not limited a particular part of a house. No explanation or justification has been advanced to support this change. It is completely at odds with the objectives underlying the other measures in the revised Direction.</p> <p>Welcome the revision and extension of the Article 4 Direction but do not support the simultaneous loss of the control which the revised Direction would result in. Because of the unique layout of the Estate, badly designed and unsympathetic extensions to the side and rear elevations of a house could have a severely detrimental effect on the character and appearance of this important Conservation area.</p> <p>The revised Direction, by limiting its effect to the “street” elevation, significantly reduces the amount of control the Council can now exercise in</p>	As above	Rookfield Estate

		<p>respect of unsympathetic changes to houses on the Rookfield Estate.</p> <p>Request that the revised draft be modified to remove the new limitation of the Direction to street elevations.</p>		
12	<p>Organisation (Muswell Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee)</p>	<p>Generally welcome the revisions in regard to the Rookfield Estate direction. Note however that the new direction will only apply to the street elevations of the properties in the Rookfield Estate. This is more permissive than the existing direction which applies to all elevations of houses.</p> <p>The layout and topography of the Estate is such that houses can be seen from many different points and it is important that the direction continues to reflect the fact that the houses can be seen (and enjoyed) “in the round”.</p> <p>It is generally agreed that the existing Direction has been an effective way of stopping development that would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. There is concern that a street elevation requirement will reduce its effectiveness by severely hampering the ability of the Council to be able to prevent unwelcome changes to houses.</p> <p>The CAAC formally request that the Direction be amended to remove its limitation to street elevations.</p>	As above	Rookfield Estate
13	Individual	<p>It is important that planning applications required as a result of the direction properly balance impacts on the special qualities of a Conservation</p>	<p>In light of consultation feedback this Article 4 Direction is not recommended to be confirmed at this time.</p>	Rookfield Estate

		Area with changes supportive of a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions.	The important balance between conserving and enhancing the Conservation Area and supporting renewable energy is noted.	
14	Councillor	Support the proposals	Support noted	All
15	Councillor	Support the proposals	Support noted	All
16	Councillor	Support the proposals	Support noted	All