

Finsbury Park, London N4 3PP

15 October 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

Site Allocations FP13 - Tesco, Stroud Green Road

Please read this in conjunction with my previous replies to your consultations in March 2018 and January of 2019. I shall not repeat the same points here but please take it that all of them still pertain as far as I am concerned.

Since writing these replies I have become increasingly sceptical, not least because of the Council's poor handling of developments at Finsbury Park. The policy here seems to have been one of neglect since the closure of the Wells Terrace station entrance some years ago. Since then, thousands of people every day are funnelled along inadequate pavements with a bizarre fence on one side to narrow the pavement and a cycle lane on the other in order to reach the station. This pedestrian 'provision' under the bridges at Finsbury Park, through what is possibly one of the poorest quality urban spaces in London, leave me full of doubt about the Plan you are putting forward. What residents and others who use the station regularly have been asked to tolerate in the last few years to service the largely private developments taking place in the vicinity suggest that the words of the plan, the re-assurances, checks and balances referred to, may come to mean very little as things transpire.

I live at the above address immediately adjacent to Site Allocation FP13. Since this is the third time I have been asked my views about the Allocation, I find it inconceivable that the sum of all the Council planning department knows about the likely development at FP13 can be written on a side of paper and request that you are transparent about Tesco's plans and your responses to this corporation.

In the meantime, and in the absence of detail, residents are invited to read a huge Plan to sift out the character of what actually is being proposed. I have identified information about facing windows on p.19, light levels for new developments, p.79 and private outdoor space on pp 84-5.

One of the details which particularly concerns me is the phrase:

ensuring a minimum distance of 18 metres between windows of habitable rooms, to protect privacy for residential developments and existing residential properties. p.19

A further section also gives clues as to what would be built on p. 79.

H. All new residential units should be dual aspect, unless provision of dual aspect is demonstrated to be impossible or unfavourable. Where such circumstances are demonstrated, all single aspect units must:

- (i) provide a good level of daylight for each habitable room, and optimise opportunity for direct sunlight;*
- (ii) ensure that the aspect is not predominantly north-facing and does not face onto main roads or other significant sources of air pollution and/or noise and vibration, which would preclude opening windows;*

(iii) provide a good level of natural ventilation throughout the dwelling via passive/non-mechanical design measures; and
(iv) ensure that future occupiers have a good level of privacy and do not experience adverse impacts from overlooking.

And on pp84-5

All new residential development and conversions will be required to provide private outdoor space, in the form of gardens (for houses and ground floor maisonettes) or balconies (for upper floor dwellings).

Piecing together these three elements, it seems that the allocation is likely to mean that the Tesco site will be redeveloped as commercial space, presumably a smaller shop but with other business on the ground floor? This will be topped with an undisclosed number of storeys of flatted accommodation which would have large windows, some with balconies, overlooking my house and garden, and those of my neighbours and these could be as near as 18 metres from the rear of my home. Your laudable emphasis on high ceilings would mean that even a few storeys would not only overlook my house and garden directly but reduce the light still further in our garden.

Please note the Plan also states that:

Homes should be designed as a place of retreat and as such must contribute to improving the health and wellbeing (both physical and mental health) of residents.

This should also apply to existing homes in the Borough as well as new ones, otherwise the gain from living in new accommodation will just be at someone else's expense. This is unfair and the central tenet of all your planning seems to be on fairness for all.

I hope you will take these views into account.

Yours faithfully,

██████████