

## SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

# PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

**Thursday, 17th March, 2022, 7.00 pm - Tottenham Town Hall, Town Hall Approach Road, London, N15 4RY**

**Members:** Councillors Sarah Williams (Chair), Sheila Peacock (Vice-Chair), Gina Adamou, Dhiren Basu, Luke Cawley-Harrison, Emine Ibrahim, Peter Mitchell, Liz Morris, Reg Rice, Viv Ross, and Yvonne Say.

**Quorum:** 3

### **7. HGY/2021/3175 - HIGH ROAD WEST, N17 (PAGES 1 - 46)**

**Proposal:** Hybrid Planning application seeking permission for:

- 1) Outline component comprising demolition of existing buildings and creation of new mixed-use development including residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business & service (Use Class E), leisure (Use Class E), community uses (Use Class F1/F2), and Sui Generis uses together with creation of new public square, park & associated access, parking, and public realm works with matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping, and access within the site reserved for subsequent approval; and
- 2) Detailed component comprising Plot A including demolition of existing buildings and creation of new residential floorspace (Use Class C3) together with landscaping, parking, and other associated works.

**Recommendation:** GRANT

Conditions to follow.

Fiona Rae, Acting Committees Manager  
Tel – 020 8489 3541  
Email: [fiona.rae@haringey.gov.uk](mailto:fiona.rae@haringey.gov.uk)

Fiona Alderman  
Head of Legal & Governance (Monitoring Officer)  
George Meehan House, 294 High Road, Wood Green, N22 8JZ

Wednesday, 16 March 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

# **LATE BUSINESS SHEET**

**Report Title: Agenda Item 7 - HGY/2021/3175 – High Road West, N17**

**Committee: Planning Sub Committee**

**Date: 17 March 2022**

## **Reason for lateness and reason for consideration**

Appendix 3, Appendix 11 (Quality Review Panel – 17 September 2021), Appendix 12 (Plans and Documents List), and Appendix 12 (Quality Review Panel – 2 March 2022) provide neighbour representations, the report of the Quality Review Panel from 17 September 2021, a plans and documents list, and the report of the Quality Review Panel from 2 March 2022 in relation to planning application HGY/2021/3175.

Under s100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion that the appendices should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency by reason of special circumstances. These circumstances are so that the additional information can be considered by the Planning Sub Committee at its meeting on 17 March 2022. This was agreed by the Chair on 16 March 2022.

**Haringey**  
LONDON

### Appendix 3: Neighbour Representations HGY/2021/3175

Commentator	Comment	Response
THFC Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="768 210 1630 309">• The applicant chose not to undertake any meaningful pre-application consultation with THFC prior to submission of the High Road West Application.</li> <li data-bbox="768 651 1630 817">• The degree of flexibility sought in both the composition of the uses within the scheme, the lack of any meaningful detailed design information, and the minimal commitment to the delivery of leisure and social infrastructure, raises fundamental concerns about what will actually be delivered.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1653 210 2060 609">The applicant has responded to say “<i>Lendlease strongly refutes the suggestion that it has not met with THFC, nor provided crowd flow information in a timely manner. Multiple meetings have been held since the summer of 2021 followed by long periods of inertia from THFC.</i>” Officers consider the obligations under Policy DM55 have been met.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 625 1684 641">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 651 2042 912">A level of flexibility allows for detailed testing at RMA stage to further inform the massing and architectural approach so as to best respond to contextual and climatic conditions at the point of application.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 954 2060 1423">The Socio-Economic Chapter of the ES (paragraphs 3.21 – 3.24), states in the methodology section at paragraph 14.2.9 that ‘The assessment presented in this Chapter is based on the worst-case scenario which assumes the lowest-possible quantum of employment floorspace and maximum number of residential units being delivered pursuant to the Proposed Development’.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="770 820 1630 916">• The lack of certainty and commitment makes it impossible to properly assess the impacts of the application and the public benefits it will actually deliver.</li>   <li data-bbox="770 1230 1630 1358">• CROWD FLOW ISSUES - THFC is currently reviewing the Crowd Flow submissions and will comment further in due course but are concerned about the lack of assessment of the interim impacts.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1653 140 2060 810">Paragraph 3.25 refers to the loss of the Tottenham Health Centre and the associated 0 sqm minimum floor area. THFC have recently secured reserved matters consent for several thousand sqm of healthcare floorspace as part of the THFC stadium consent and alongside approved space at 807 High Road. Lendlease are committed (through the S106) to ensure a continuity of GP service either on site or very close by. If other already consented developments deliver this floorspace the minimum figure would avoid an over provision of this type of floorspace in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 820 1688 842">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 852 2056 1187">The Socio-Economic Chapter of the ES (paragraphs 3.21 – 3.24), states in the methodology section at paragraph 14.2.9 that ‘The assessment presented in this Chapter is based on the worst-case scenario so officers are satisfied that the impacts have been adequately addressed.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1197 1688 1219">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1228 2038 1388">An absolute level of certainty will be achieved when all the detailed areas are approved through the reserved matters process.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1426 2002 1487">The applicant’s crowd flow submissions have been</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMPOSITION OF THE APPLICATION SCHEME - there is no actual guarantee that a large number of the proposed uses will actually be delivered. The objection raises concerns over the perceived low minimum floorspace requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>independently peer reviewed and whilst aspects such as queuing numbers and queueing density will need to be agreed between the applicant and the club, the peer review concludes that if refinements are made any issues can be satisfactorily addressed.</p> <p>Conditions require this information to be submitted and agreed at the RMA stage.</p> <p>---</p> <p>For any given reserved matter application, the proposal must accord with the Parameter Plans &amp; the Design Code &amp; the Development Specification.</p> <p>Whilst there is no minimum B2/B8 floorspace, there is a large area of Class E floorspace that is proposed. Given the changing nature of employment floorspace as a consequence of Covid and other factors plus the introduction of Class E which also incorporates elements of light industrial, it is considered entirely possible that flexible Class E floorspace might only be required in the future but the option to utilise other land-uses exist depending on demand.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compliance with the TAAP and High Road West Masterplan Framework – the proposal fails to deliver the objectives of the TAAP and the HRWMF</li> </ul>	<p>Other permissions may deliver on healthcare provision and so flexibility is required to ensure that there would no be overprovision through unnecessary minimums. Obligations in the legal agreement would ensure continuity of provision and the delivery of sufficient services should it be necessitated.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Concerns are noted regarding a purported lack of leisure uses and amount of retail. The retail numbers take account of the very large quantum of retail floor area contained in the existing B&amp;M out of town style, car dependent superstore in the north, which is being replaced by high quality, local, town centre focussed leisure uses centred in the main around Moselle Square.</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan is not for approval it simply shows potential layouts and buildings. The Printworks site that sits partially within the masterplan contains a multi-screen <u>cinema</u> which members resolved to grant this year.</p> <p>Leisure includes a variety of uses that the scheme proposes such as indoor sports provision as well as food and beverage, potential</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
		<p>cinema space, the library, all the potential outdoor facilities, Moselle Square and Peacock Park. There is a diverse range of leisure proposed which caters for many different groups.</p> <p>At first glance community uses could be seen to be reducing but this does not acknowledge the relocation of the Grace Organisation to the nearby Irish Centre on Pretoria Road. New floorspace is also being proposed which would result in a benefit in this regard.</p> <p>The HRWMF is an important guidance document but is not written as advice rather than mandatory rules. The proposed application has high levels of conformity with Policy NT5 and the HRWMF. Where there are deviations, these are justified in the report. The numbers of homes and heights in places exceed the minimums in the framework but this has to be balanced against other public benefits such as the delivery of affordable homes including Council Housing which outweigh the lesser provision of leisure uses</p> <p>---</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan has been used to show certain positions such as density in a</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTS OF THE APPLICATION - In several instances, it appears that the applicant has relied on the illustrative scheme, rather than the maximum scale of development to show more advantageous outcomes. In this case the extreme degree of flexibility sought by the applicant is too great to allow the likely significant effects to be properly assessed. There are too many potential outcomes that need to be considered, that have not been assessed in the submitted Environmental Assessment (and Addendum)</li> </ul>	<p>more practical way as the maximum parameters could not be delivered given the limits and rules contained across the control documents. It has also been used as a tool to demonstrate an approximate understanding of aspect.</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan proposes a scheme that seeks to show a policy compliant iteration that can be costed – The applicant has stated this is why it has been used for viability purposes. The applicant has committed to 35% affordable housing by unit as well as viability reviews within the legal agreement to secure any potential uplift.</p> <p>The submitted ES explores the relevant maximum and minimums where necessary and satisfactorily assesses the likely significant effects.</p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan has been used for the wind assessment as it is more reflective of a likely policy compliant proposal. However, wind assessments would be required with each RMA that would need to show acceptable comfort levels.</p> <p>---</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="770 209 1630 408">• ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC BENEFITS AND MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS - THFC considers that the degree of flexibility (and corresponding lack of certainty over the delivery of public benefits) is so broad that the Council is unable to lawfully discharge its duty pursuant to Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act.</li> <li data-bbox="770 483 1630 647">• ASSESSMENT OF HERITAGE IMPACTS - due to the uncertainty surrounding the composition of the scheme, it is equally impossible for the Council to quantify the public benefits that the scheme will deliver. The Council is therefore unable to carry out the necessary balancing exercise.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1653 140 2051 371">The report has assessed the planning balance of the scheme against the relevant maximum and minimum parameters. The officer recommendation is based on this assessment.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 384 1686 403">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 411 2051 711">The control documents outline the parameters for what can be proposed within the RMAs – these parameters enable an assessment of heritage impacts. The design code has specific heritage sections and outlines the limits that would minimise harm on assets.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 751 2051 1153">The Design Code places mandatory requirements for various plots to step down in height within the maximum parameter extents. The specific location of these steps is not defined so that RMAs would be able to best respond to contextual and climatic conditions at the point of application.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1193 2051 1489">Officers are satisfied that the heritage impact will be less than substantial based on the information provided in the max parameters and associated control documents. And that any harm would be outweighed by the significant public benefits.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="770 277 1630 480">• DESIGN ISSUES - DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE DESIGN CODE AND PARAMETER PLANS - In a number of instances, the Design Code advocates mandatory lower heights than the parameter plans. If the provisions of the Design Code are actually mandatory there is no reason for the parameter plans to seek additional height at this outline stage.</li>   <li data-bbox="770 756 1630 884">• DESIGN ISSUES - THE HTVIA AND THE DESIGN QUALITY OF THE APPLICATION - THFC does not consider that the HTVIA robustly or credibly assesses the full potential impacts of the application.</li>   <li data-bbox="770 995 1630 1187">• APPROACH TO CUMULATIVE ASSESSMENT – The Printworks permission has neither been included as a committed scheme for the purpose of cumulative assessment, nor has it been included within the second scenario. This is important as the Printworks scheme extends beyond the High Road West Application redline boundary.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1653 150 1688 165">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 177 2063 576">The parameters, design code, and development specification, in combination, set the controls to guide a form of development that officers consider to be acceptable on balance. Further plot testing and detailed design work would be required at RMA stage which the plans seek to support but not hamper through overly prescriptive controls.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 592 1688 608">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 619 2033 815">The HTVIA is sufficient to allow officers to come to an informed judgement on heritage effects and this has been appropriately assessed in the planning balance.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 831 1688 847">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 858 2063 1353">Although Members resolved to grant the Printworks scheme, it has not yet been granted as the legal agreement is still being negotiated. As such, the applicant has not included the Printworks scheme as a cumulative scheme for the purpose of the Environmental Statement or Addendum. The applicant has stated that the scheme can be incorporated and accommodated within the proposals should it be permitted and delivered.</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1369 1688 1385">---</p> <p data-bbox="1653 1396 2018 1485">The control documents and supporting submissions are sufficient in order for the</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>THFC does not consider that it is currently possible for the Council to lawfully assess and determine the High Road West Application.</li> </ul>	<p>Council to come to an informed judgement on the proposals and balance benefits against harms.</p>
<p>Headcorn, Tenterden, Beaufoy &amp; Gretton Roads RA (HTBG)</p>	<p>Concern with encroachment onto parts of our estate both during construction and thereafter permanently, as it seeks to include land which is currently included in the definition of the estate contained in leases of properties within our estate</p> <p>The design and scale of the proposed development of Whitehall Mews is out of character with existing premises on Headcorn and Tenterden Roads.</p> <p>The height and style of the proposed development of Plot A known as Whitehall Mews overshadows and overlooks our properties. Their design does not reflect our architecture and is out of keeping with our homes in all respects.</p> <p>Construction noise, dust and general disturbance. Loss of natural light</p> <p>Lack of parking provisions for the new development.</p> <p>The grass area is within the definition of our estate, our residents wish to enjoy exclusive use.</p> <p>Crowdflow impacts</p>	<p>Please refer to the design, character, appearance, and amenity section of the delegated report for further detail.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Amenity impacts are considered in the report.</p> <p>---</p> <p>This can be controlled by condition.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposed units will be car free and those spaces that are proposed will be controlled. The site has a good level of public</p> <p>---</p> <p>There will be no encroachment onto this land.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposal will enhance Crowdflow management</p> <p>---</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
TAG Love Lane	<p>Concerns with existing buildings and access</p> <p>The scale of the proposed development known as Whitehall Mews would have an oppressive impact on our homes and is considered overbearing. As it lies to the east of our properties we would be particularly impacted during the early part of the day.</p> <p>Support objections lodged by local traders who will be displaced by the proposed development.</p>	<p>This is not a consideration of this proposal.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Amenity impacts are considered in the report.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposed development looks to provide business and residential use classes where existing businesses and residents will have the option to relocate within the new development or have support in relocating elsewhere within the surrounding area.</p>
	<p>Concerns about the ballot process and re-housing.</p> <p>Concerns with previous development by the applicant, and implementation of levels of affordable housing.</p> <p>False promise to Council</p> <p>Unrealistic and vague time frames</p> <p>Damages mental health</p> <p>An anti-child, anti-family plan</p>	<p>This is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Concerns in relation to the developer are not material considerations. Affordable housing will be secured through a S106 legal agreement</p> <p>---</p> <p>Phasing will be controlled by condition.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Construction impacts will be controlled by condition</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposal include a significant proportion of family homes and space for play areas</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>Environmental catastrophe</p> <p>Unaffordable 'affordables'</p>	<p>---</p> <p>The impact on the environment is assessed in detail in the report.</p> <p>---</p> <p>There will be a significant proportion of affordable housing at Council rent and income level secured for Shared Ownership housing.</p>
<p>Haringey Cycle Campaign (HCC)</p>	<p>HCC were consulted in 2018 and again in 2021 on the plans for this development. We emphasised the need for cycle routes serving identified destinations, routed directly and clearly defined for legibility and to avoid pedestrian conflict. We also commented in 2021 that the main public open space should be more generous.</p> <p>The scheme now submitted proposes virtually invisible cycle routes that wander aimlessly to the North of the site and in a slightly less aimless fashion to the South. The Mayor's London Plan Guidance has statutory weight in planning decisions and makes it clear that development plans should “protect and improving existing cycle routes and create new strategic routes and local links”, as the extract below. Additionally the statutory guidance in LTN1/20 makes it clear that cycle routes should be direct and easy to follow, as the core design principles (below left) and makes clear, wherever there are high pedestrian numbers, cycles must be physically separated from pedestrians, as the summary principles, below right.</p> <p>The development is planned to have 2,869 new homes and at least 7,225sqm of commercial, office, retail and community uses and there will be considerable pedestrian traffic, generated both by the development and in the surrounding areas. The development is not a small housing estate where limited shared use might be acceptable.</p> <p>The Site Plan below shows the circuitous cycle routes proposed by the applicants, together with routes proposed by HCC, which we suggest would be better used and could give compliance with LTN1/20.</p>	<p>The application submitted in outline form and cycle routes and landscaping will be dealt with at reserved matters stage.</p> <p>Overall and on balance, the design of the cycle parking stores complies with the London Cycling Design Standards. A specific cycle parking details condition for Plot A will ensure that the cycle parking and access arrangements are delivered in accordance with these standards.</p> <p>The masterplan remains illustrative for now, and the detail of the cycle routes will be reviewed in detail at Reserved Matters stage and the mechanism for this secured via the Future Connectivity and Access Plan in the Section 106 agreement associated with the planning permission, should it be</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>The Design and Access Statement includes details of path surfacing that make no allowance for safe cycle use and do not comply with LTN1/20. Cycle users are given no indication of where they are meant to cycle and pedestrians will have no idea of where to expect cycles. In fact the proposed cycle routes will be virtually invisible.</p> <p>Although not directly a cycling matter, we would point out the main public space, Peacock Park has shrunk in size since the competition winning design of 2018. We suggest the wedge shaped park, narrowing to a point and hemmed in by tall buildings on all sides, will feel uncomfortable and should be redesigned to give a more relaxed and generous space.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you could register Haringey Cycling Campaign's objection to the proposals and in particular our objection to the cycle routes, which will not comply with current standards and good practice.</p> <p>Legible, safe and direct cycle routes are essential, which will serve increasing cycle use by residents and the wider community, improve health and mobility and help in the fight against climate change.</p>	<p>granted. The Future Connectivity and Access Plan is a plan to be prepared by the applicant setting out how the Development shall be constructed to allow for potential future pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access across the Development to and from any development on Adjacent Land and how they will work with the Council and any Adjacent Developer to try to secure (where appropriate) the following:</p> <p>(a) Pedestrian, cycling and vehicular access across the Development to and from any development of the Adjacent Land;</p> <p>(b) Pedestrian cycling and vehicular access for occupiers of the Development to and through any development of the Adjacent Land;</p> <p>(c) Temporary uses, landscaping, and access arrangements during the construction of any phased development of the Adjacent Land;</p> <p>(d) Appropriate boundary treatments and materials to facilitate mutual access arrangements;</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
		<p>(e) how the plan shall be reviewed in the future as other developments come forward on the Adjacent Land to ensure that connectivity is provided at the earliest possible date taking into account relevant construction programmes.</p> <p>A number of off-site contributions towards the delivery of the Walking and Cycling Action Plan will be sought, in particular towards the High Road (A1010) Protected Cycle Track, "a new cycle route will need to balance the needs of existing bus infrastructure on the A1010 with new cycle facilities. The design focus would be on the introduction of protected cycle facilities along the A1010 from Seven Sisters station to the borough boundary with LB Enfield."</p>
Peacock Estate Management Limited	<p>The loss of the Peacock Industrial Estate and the failure to provide appropriate mitigation/safeguards for displaced business owners</p> <p>Proposals appear contrary to Council planning policy</p>	<p>The proposed development looks to provide business and residential use classes where existing businesses and residents will have the option to relocate within the new development or have support in relocating elsewhere within the surrounding area.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The loss of employment space in assessed in the report.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>Public Sector Equality Duty</p> <p>Absence of part of the Environmental Impact Assessment</p>	<p>---</p> <p>Equalities impacts are adequately assessed</p> <p>---</p> <p>The EIA regulation have been complied with.</p>
<p>Whitehall &amp; Tenterden Centre Whitehall Street</p>	<p>Grace Organisation was founded in 1983 by the late Daphne Marche MBE. Location from inception is at Whitehall and Tenterden Centre, Whitehall Street where proposed regeneration is targeted.</p> <p>We are not opposed to regeneration but believe it is important to retain the identity of Tottenham, the positive community spirit and not destroying the historic core of Tottenham.</p> <p>Grace is here for the community and the upheaval of relocation, even though, we have been offered alternative premises this is causing distress to our clients. Many of whom have written letters of discontent to us which we are happy to forward to you. Researchers have identified that relocation is a stressful life event, and even more so at an older age ' consideration needs to be taken into account the impact this will have on our clients. Many family members have expressed this especially those who have Alzheimer's/ Dementia.</p> <p>Grace has been recognised as a valuable provider by Haringey Council and provides a much-needed service to a vulnerable community that needs accessibility. We are a well utilised service with hundreds of families being supported by our service. It continues to grow with more and more families accessing our services.</p> <p>Retention of our building with necessary upgrade to the site, in our opinion, would be best for our clients and for the continuation of our service.</p>	<p>The Grace community will look to be relocated and those members will have support throughout the process.</p>
<p>GRACE, Whitehall &amp; Tenterden Community Centre</p>	<p>Concern with the proposed relocation of the Grace Organisation</p>	<p>The Grace community centre will be relocated, and those individuals will gain support through the moving process.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
<p>Tottenham Biz Representing the interests of businesses on Tottenham High Road, on White Hart Lane, in the Peacock Industrial Estate and in Nesta Works.</p>	<p>Businesses have the right to remain, in the Tottenham High Road area consistent with the views of local residents,</p> <p>Concern with the ballot process and consultation</p> <p>Loss of employment space is contrary to policy and concerns with the consultation on the site allocation.</p>	<p>The proposed development looks to provide business and residential use classes where existing businesses and residents will have the option to relocate within the new development or have support in relocating elsewhere within the surrounding area.</p> <p>This is not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>This is addressed in para 7.32 – 7.37 of the report.</p> <p>Given the Site Allocation NT5 seeks to deliver new high quality workspace and the proposed scheme incorporates flexible commercial space, including some replacement employment floorspace (as discussed below) the loss of existing office, light/general industrial floorspace is acceptable in principle.</p> <p>Further details of the relocation strategy will be secured by S106 obligation.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>There is no guarantee that all such businesses will be offered a right of return or be accommodated. Or how they will be accommodated during construction.</p> <p>The tenure of new space is unlikely to be the same or affordable.</p> <p>The applicant's planning statement incorrectly states that the application site is not designated as a Local Employment Area. That is incorrect. Policy SP8 makes clear that the site is both a Local Employment Area and a Regeneration Area.</p> <p>Equalities impacts</p> <p>Grant funding has not been taken into account in viability</p>	<p>This is a private matter and therefore not a material planning consideration.</p> <p>The proposal is a Local Employment and Regeneration area and assessed under Policy DM 38 in para 7.32.</p> <p>This is assessed under heading 28 in the report.</p> <p>This is assessed in the viability report which has been reviewed by the Council's 3<sup>rd</sup> part assessor.</p>
Haringey Defend Council Housing	<p>Uncertain quantum of development</p> <p>Undersupply of family sized housing</p> <p>Single aspect homes</p>	<p>Whilst there is flexibility the quantum of development is control by the design code and development specification. Viability reviews will capture any uplift in development.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposal includes an indicative dwelling mix of 16% which is high for a high density development.</p> <p>---</p> <p>There are a high proportion of dual aspect homes and this will be controlled by reserved matters.</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>Excessive proximity to the events stadium</p> <p>Environmental damage</p> <p>Undeliverable Decant Strategy</p> <p>Viability and the likelihood of diminished social benefits over the lifetime of the development</p> <p>Faulty consultation</p> <p>Gentrification and area impact</p>	<p>---</p> <p>Noise levels have been assessed in the reports.</p> <p>---</p> <p>This is considered in the report.</p> <p>---</p> <p>This will be controlled by condition.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Viability reviews are secured by S106</p> <p>---</p> <p>This is not a material planning consideration</p> <p>---</p> <p>The aim of the development is for high quality places that promote mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods supporting an attractive town centre with jobs and services for its communities; places that help meet people's wider needs and aspirations: for economic security; for health and well-being; for arts and culture; for safety and security; and for links to family and community</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of community</li> <li>• Gentrification</li> </ul>	<p>The aim of the development is for high quality places that promote mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods supporting an</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
		attractive town centre with jobs and services for its communities; places that help meet people's wider needs and aspirations: for economic security; for health and well-being; for arts and culture; for safety and security; and for links to family and community
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Proposal brings opportunities</li> <li>• Support for the regeneration</li> </ul>	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of shops and restaurants</li> <li>• Loss of chicken and chip shop</li> <li>• Loss of DW Timber and adverse effect on local businesses</li> <li>• Loss of livelihoods and lack of alternative opportunities</li> <li>• Loss of employment opportunities due to loss of Peacock Estate</li> <li>• Loss of small businesses</li> <li>• Loss of industrial space</li> <li>• Lack of high quality jobs in and from the development</li> <li>• Loss of employment on other sites</li> <li>• Loss of investment in premises</li> <li>• Contrary to employment policies</li> </ul>	The proposed development will provide business space, where existing businesses will have the option to relocate within the new development or have support in relocating elsewhere within the surrounding area
	Lack of leisure uses	Floorspace for leisure uses is provided within the proposal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No community facilities- GP etc.</li> <li>• Strain on existing facilities</li> <li>• Promises of space for craft and education must be provided</li> <li>• Exercise space must be provided</li> </ul>	The proposed development looks to incorporate community uses, shops, surgeries, and services to cope with the additional housing. The surrounding schools also have capacity for new residents.

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns with density</li> <li>• Loss of high road character</li> <li>• Development is out of scale with the surrounding area</li> <li>• Plot B, D and F which blocks all views when approaching the stadium from the east</li> </ul>	This is addressed in the design section of the report.
	The proposal should contain houses	The proposal provides a mix of housing typologies and sizes including duplexes and family sized units
	<p>Lack of car parking</p> <p>Loss of matchday parking</p>	<p>The level of parking will be adequate due to the good public transport links and the surrounding area will be controlled parking zones.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Matchday parking is a temporary arrangement and not protected by planning policy</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of a home</li> <li>• Housing should be renovated</li> <li>• Upheaval for families in homes to be demolished</li> <li>• Loss of affordable housing</li> <li>• Concern with share equity affordability</li> <li>• Re-housing concerns</li> </ul>	The proposal has satisfied London Plan Policy H8.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor doors</li> <li>• Segregation</li> </ul>	The proposal will be tenure blind and include mixed blocks of private and affordable housing
	Housing should accommodate disabilities	The proposal will include 10% wheelchair accessible homes.

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>Residents must have outside space</p> <p>Not enough outside space for new residents</p> <p>Biodiversity and ecology</p> <p>Lack of sport facilities</p>	<p>Proposed housing will comply with London space standards for outdoor amenity space</p> <p>---</p> <p>Significant new public space is provided.</p> <p>---</p> <p>The proposal provides enhancement to Biodiversity and ecology</p> <p>---</p> <p>Sport provision can be accommodated within the development. A variety of recreational and other facilities are proposed and, in any event, there are a number of sites within the vicinity of the masterplan area that provide sports facilities.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of affordable housing</li> <li>• Will housing be affordable</li> </ul>	<p>The proposal provide a significant quantum and mix of affordable housing</p>
	<p>Tall buildings are too high close to Rivers apartments</p> <p>Development too close to Rivers apartments</p> <p>Loss of sunlight</p>	<p>The building closest to Rivers apartment reflects the existing permission for this site in which the impacts were found acceptable.</p> <p>Daylight and sunlight assessment has been carried out and is considered in amenity section of the report.</p>
	<p>Concerns with quality of life during development</p>	<p>This would be a temporary impact and can be mitigated by conditions</p>

Commentator	Comment	Response
	Carbon emissions from demolition and construction	A whole life carbon assessment has been carried out and found to be in line with London Plan Policy.
	Loss of the Grace centre	Alternative provision will be made off site to accommodate the Grace Centre.
	The cycle routes are not good	This will be addressed by further details in reserved matters applications
	Proposal benefits THFC	The proposal follows the principles of the High Road West Masterplan Framework and site allocation which require a new route from White Hart Lane Station to the High Road and stadium,
	Concerns over racial discrimination	An EQIA has been carried out and found significant equalities impacts.
	Concerns with ballot process	This is not a planning matter.
	Private land should not be provided to a developer Concerns with CPO process	AAP Policy AAP1 support site assembly and use of CPO powers where necessary.
	Concerns with engagement process	The engagement process is set out the applicant's statement of community involvement and has satisfied the planning requirements.
	Concerns with existing estate maintenance	This is not a consideration of this planning application.
	Concerns around funding for the development	This is not a material planning consideration
	Concern around profits for private company	This is not a material planning consideration

<b>Commentator</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Loss of income from property	This is not a material planning consideration

**CONFIDENTIAL**

FRAME PROJECTS

**Haringey Quality Review Panel****Report of Formal Review of High Road West (Lendlease)****Friday 17 September 2021**

Zoom video conference

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
 Hugo Nowell  
 Tim Pitman  
 Andy Puncher  
 Lindsey Whitelaw

**Attendees**

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Graham Harrington	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Kate Trant	Frame Projects
Marina Stuart	Frame Projects

**Apologies / copied to**

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey

**Confidentiality**

This is a pre-application review and therefore confidential. As a public organisation, the London Borough of Haringey is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI) and, in the case of an FOI request, may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

## CONFIDENTIAL

### 1. Project name and site address

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

### 2. Presenting team

Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Alix Roberts	Studio Egret West
Nick James	Studio Egret West
Duncan Paybody	Studio Egret West (for presentation 3)
Chris Miele	Montagu Evans
David Taylor	Montagu Evans

### 3. Planning Authority briefing

The High Road West site, measuring approximately 8.55 hectares, is located in the Northumberland Park ward in north Tottenham and sits between the Great Anglia railway line and the High Road, and adjacent Tottenham Hotspur Football Club.

North Tottenham is a diverse neighbourhood with many different characteristics, land uses, typologies and a rich heritage. The High Road West site itself, however, is characterised by a fragmented urban form with a poor street and block layout and a lack of connections. Parts of the site also fall within the North Tottenham Conservation Area, which includes a number of Statutory and Locally Listed Buildings.

The northern part of the site is predominantly occupied by a number of local industrial businesses (forming the Peacock Industrial Estate), as well as a supermarket and large car park adjacent to the recent 22-storey Brook House development.

The southern part of the site is mainly characterised by the Love Lane Housing Estate, which has 297 properties. The estate was built in the 1950s and includes three 10-storey 'Y'-shaped blocks and several four-storey blocks set in areas of grass and landscaping.

White Hart Lane runs east–west across the centre of the site and is characterised in this location by a range of older and smaller properties including The Grange, a Grade II Listed Building. White Hart Lane Station at the western end of this section of the Lane has been upgraded as part of major transformation by London Overground in accordance with the site allocation for this element of the allocated site.

A significant section of the site adjacent to the railway is currently being used as a temporary construction compound for the stadium development and contains other business uses.

Part of the site, known as Whitehall Mews, also falls the other side of the railway to the west off Whitehall Street and currently accommodates the Whitehall and Tenderden Estate community buildings.



## CONFIDENTIAL

The ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority-funded estate regeneration process ran between 13 August and 6 September 2021; the outcome was positive, unlocking Council funding and increasing certainty that the project can move forward.

The applicant team is looking to submit a hybrid application in October 2021 (subject to review), which will consist of a part outline, part full application, with a view to starting on site in spring 2022.

There have been several pre-application meetings since the last review to discuss land uses, affordable housing, scale and massing, heritage and views. Amendments to the southern and northern parts of the masterplan, and to the public realm, movement and landscape have been made since it was last reviewed by the Quality Review Panel on 23 June 2021.

Officers asked for the panel's consideration of the following matters:

- advice on the proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—south of White Hart Lane
- advice on the proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—north of White Hart Lane
- advice on public realm, movement and landscape.

This full-day review was divided into three sections:

- Presentation 1: southern part of masterplan
- Presentation 2: northern part of masterplan
- Presentation 3: public realm, movement and landscape.

#### **4. Quality Review Panel's views**

##### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to comment on the development of the High Road West scheme since the last review on 23 June 2021, which examined proposals for Whitehall Mews, Plot F and Plot D. The panel thanks the applicant for the set of three presentations, and for the time committed to a full-day review.

With this review looking firstly at the southern and northern parts of the masterplan, the panel identifies several fundamental issues yet to be addressed; the third presentation of the day, which looked at the public realm, movement and landscape across the scheme, gave the panel greater confidence in the quality of the scheme as a whole. However, the panel thinks further work is needed before submission of a planning application, to achieve a high quality of life for future residents.



## CONFIDENTIAL

Despite commending elements of the overall site layout, the panel is concerned about the density of the scheme as well as the amount of green space. The new neighbourhood could be 9,000–10,000 residents, and the panel is not convinced that the proposals will provide a liveable environment, particularly in the context of the latest revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework, which stress the importance of high-quality design and creating liveable places.

The panel's primary concerns are as follows:

- the current density of the proposal, especially in relation to the provision of public green space and other resident amenities such as internal courtyards
- deliverability and phasing
- liveability
- the challenges of ensuring sufficient public and private open space, in relation to the density of development, for each of the proposed phases
- the scale, massing and height of the proposed buildings, for example, the taller towers in Blocks B and F.

As such, the panel cannot support the proposal as it stands. It asks for further design work to address its concerns, particularly those to do with the balance between open space and development density, building scale and heights. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Planning process*

- The panel recommends that further design work is needed before a planning application is submitted, to address the issues raised at the review.
- The outline application needs to pin down the maximum floor space allocation and unit numbers in each block across the masterplan.
- The panel questions the wide latitude shown in the draft parameter plans, which does not provide the certainty needed to ensure a high quality development.
- The panel recognises the design and conservation challenges caused by nearby consented towers, particularly to the north of the site. These will result in a significant variety in design and height across the area.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel highlights that Peacock Park is envisaged as providing public open space that will be crucial to the success of the scheme as a whole. The panel asks the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life.
- It also recommends that the planning authority considers the use of mechanisms such as Section 106 agreements and Grampian Conditions to provide certainty about the delivery of open space for each phase of development.
- In the panel's view, the area south of White Hart Lane is the most challenging in terms of the proportion of open space to the number of homes proposed. The character of the public space in this part of the masterplan is also likely to have a more civic / less residential character, because it is on the route from the station to the stadium and high street.
- Proposals for the area to the north of White Hart Lane show a more convincing balance between the quality and quantity of open space and number of homes.
- The panel emphasises the importance of design codes, which will be especially important for the tall buildings across the proposal, in particular in relation to distances between blocks, how blocks coalesce or maintain visual separation, and the material difference between blocks.

### *Presentation 1: southern part of masterplan*

- The panel thinks that, while the layout of the southern part of the masterplan appears to be reasonably logical and effective, if only this first phase of development is delivered, the open space will be insufficient for the population density.
- The panel also thinks that building heights of over 30 storeys will create a townscape character more appropriate to a metropolitan centre, than the town centre context of this part of Haringey.

### *Layout*

- The panel has significant concerns about the impact of the 27-storey building on Block F on the setting of The Grange on White Hart Lane and this part of the conservation area. This was not fully covered at the previous review and the panel requests close scrutiny of this relationship, suggesting that a significant reduction in the height of Block F will be needed.
- As regards the tall building on Block B, the panel feels that the sheer 27-storey wall rising from the small internal courtyard will have a negative impact on the quality of that courtyard for residents.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel's general view is that there is a role for one tall building to mark White Hart Lane station, and that the tall building on Block D is the logical candidate—if it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative environmental impact at ground level.
- To create a more generous internal courtyard at Block C, the panel proposes removing the central leg of that block, which would enable workable internal amenity space at podium level.
- The panel refers to Block J, which has similar dimensions to Block C, yet feels more comfortable, offering a more generous and appropriate space for play.

### *Pedestrian wind comfort*

- The panel stresses the importance of ensuring that the route to and from the station is comfortable for users.
- It is concerned that the heights and relative positions of the buildings in Blocks D and F are likely to create uncomfortable wind conditions.
- Similarly, it is concerned about draught wind where the 14-storey wall of Block D (not fully covered in the previous review) creates a narrow gap on the route from Moselle Square towards White Hart Lane station. The panel suggests a reduction in the number of storeys to six or eight.
- The panel notes that the Technical Summary relating to wind indicates speeds at ground level, pointing out that wind speeds at higher levels will be greater, and will be exacerbated where there are 'pinch points' between buildings.
- In general, the panel is interested to view more detail on the wind, sunlight / daylight, overshadowing and micro-climate considerations for the full scheme.

### *Conservation and heritage*

- The panel recognises that the new THFC stadium has changed the context for this part of the High Road Conservation Area and accepts that it is appropriate that the conservation discussion should take account of this new context.
- The panel feels that the most challenging element of the southern masterplan from a conservation and heritage perspective is the heights of the buildings on Block F as they relate to The Grange and the White Hart Lane section of the conservation area.
- The panel believes that the location of the 27-storey block at the corner of Block F will profoundly harm The Grange and this part of the White Hart Lane conservation area and that full consideration must be given to reducing the scale of the tower.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel asks for confirmation of the distances between blocks in terms of overlooking, where, for example, the north side of F1 appears to include units with an eight-metre distance from the adjacent block.

### *Residents' amenities and public space*

- Moselle Square has the potential to be an important civic space on the route between White Hart Lane station and the stadium. It will be animated by the surrounding ground floor uses and, whilst this promises to be a high-quality urban space, it is unlikely to act as a residents' space.
- The panel is concerned that residents will be reliant on small-scale amenities or courtyards at first floor level that will be in shady conditions for a considerable part of the day.
- The panel is also concerned that the play provision within the sunlit podium areas will clash with other users of the sunny areas, and that, overall, the scheme will be relying considerably on Peacock Park to the north for green space.
- The panel suggests looking at examples of open space provision in successful developments of similar population size for comparison.

### *Presentation 2: northern part of masterplan*

#### *Layout*

- In general, the panel feels that the layout of the northern part of the masterplan is working logically.
- However, the panel recognises the challenge of the alternative live Tottenham Hotspur Football Club application for the K1 / Printworks site. Similarly, the existing planning permission for this part of the site has a bearing on the current Lendlease proposals.
- There may be a need to revise the Lendlease masterplan if the alternative K1 / Printworks scheme is approved. The Printworks scheme has not been reviewed by the Quality Review Panel, and an opportunity to comment on it would be welcomed.
- Notwithstanding this, the panel questions the viability of the two narrow alleyways north and south of the K1 site that link it to Tottenham High Road.
- The panel questions how the road layout on the west side of K1 will be resolved and managed in terms of service and delivery access, and pedestrian elements, suggesting a reconsideration of the layout in order to avoid the park being effectively surrounded by vehicles.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel is not yet convinced as to the legibility of the desire lines leading south through the park to White Hart Lane station and suggests that this may be handled through the public realm work.
- The panel likes the way that the building massing around the park steps down in height towards the park's narrower, southern tip.
- However, building heights are considerably greater than those adjacent on the High Road, and the panel would like to be reassured about the 'back-to-back' relationship between the new and existing buildings. For example, will there be a five-storey blank wall facing the existing buildings?
- The panel is interested to see more detail on the proximity of units in a number of locations in the northern part of the masterplan. For example, it appears that Blocks K1 and K2 are very close together, which the panel feels may cause issues with privacy in relation to the units that face each other across the relatively narrow alleyway.

### *Introduction of deck access*

- With the proportion of single aspect units currently around 50%, the panel suggests that the proportion of dual aspect units could be improved significantly if the majority of the units in this section of the scheme became deck access.
- The panel also suggests that making Blocks L2 and J2 shallower in plan, creating deck access at the rear and moving the blocks a small distance westward, would extend the park size along that frontage. Taking Block M3 back slightly would also achieve more space for the park.

### *Presentation 3: public realm, movement and landscape*

- The panel applauds the presentation, which demonstrates a compelling narrative and an aspirational vision, with an admirable play strategy, and looks forward to more detailed proposals.
- The panel enjoys the qualities of the different spaces throughout the scheme, particularly the connection through the park down to Moselle Square. Where it had earlier concerns about the planting in Moselle Square, the panel now feels that the proposed planting scheme appears robust.
- The panel still has concerns as to the extent to which the circulation and servicing across the scheme is compatible with the planting.
- The panel endorses the proposal to drain Moselle Square water gardens on match days to accommodate the increased number of people crossing the square to the stadium.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel is heartened by the park proposals, which present shared routes, and the introduction of swales, though the likely extent of the roads surrounding the park remains a concern.
- The panel's main concern is the delivery of these ambitious proposals, as well as the importance of high-quality management and maintenance.
- The panel points out the critical need for the rain gardens to look good all year round, and that this form of sustainable urban drainage requires considerable maintenance.
- The panel stresses the value of reorientating Block K1 in order to add space to the park, adding that further benefits will be achieved from continuing the connection from the park further into the southern part of the masterplan.
- The panel enjoys the proposals for the Block D1 courtyard, which look convincing. However, it questions whether this approach will work as well for some of the smaller, more constrained courtyards.
- The panel suggests further investigation into how issues such as micro-climate and overshadowing might impact on the quality of the spaces being created.
- The panel has some anxiety in relation to the park being viewed as a destination and the associated number of visitors this will attract to the area, and would like to see more consideration of how the more private courtyard spaces will cater for residents' needs.
- The panel expresses how critical lighting will be to safety and placemaking, throughout the development, particularly in Moselle Square.
- Overall, the panel feels that the demands placed on the open spaces across the scheme by the density of development, and match day crowds, are considerable. Ensuring that this remains in balance will be key to the success of the proposals.

### *Next steps*

The panel is unable to support the proposals in their current form and considers that they represent a significant overdevelopment of the site that would create a generally poor quality living environment.

It recommends further work before a planning application is submitted, in light of its comments above.

In particular, it highlights the need for the applicant to demonstrate adequate open space for all phases of development—bearing in mind the risk that later phases may not be delivered.



## CONFIDENTIAL

### Appendix: Haringey Development Management DPD

#### Policy DM1: Delivering high quality design

##### Haringey Development Charter

- A All new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will support design-led development proposals that meet the following criteria:
- a Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
  - b Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
  - c Confidently address feedback from local consultation;
  - d Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
  - e Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

##### Design Standards

###### Character of development

- B Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:
- a Building heights;
  - b Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;
  - c Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;
  - d Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;
  - e Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;
  - f Active, lively frontages to the public realm; and
  - g Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.





## **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

### **Report of Chair's Review Meeting: High Road West**

Wednesday 2 March 2022

The Grange, 32–34a White Hart Lane, London N17

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Tim Pitman

#### **Attendees**

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Matthew Maple	London Borough of Haringey
Oskar Gregersen	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Kate Trant	Frame Projects
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects

#### **Apologies / copied to**

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Elizabeth Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Stéphane Pietrzak	London Borough of Haringey

## 1. Project name and site address

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

## 2. Presenting team

Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Alix Roberts	Studio Egret West
Greg Greasley	Lendlease
Michelle Letton	Lendlease
Prue Hay	Lendlease
Tom Horne	DP9

## 3. Planning Authority briefing

The scheme for the High Road West site was last reviewed by the Quality Review Panel on 17 September 2021. Officers have met the applicants a number of times since the last review, and issues discussed include parameter plans, development specification, block-by-block maximum heights and block deviation, final refinements to the detailed design element, illustrative scheme options, heritage assessment and views.

The ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority (GLA) funded estate regeneration process resulted in a vote of approval for a scheme of this form and quantum of development. The proposals have also been reviewed by GLA officers who welcomed all aspects of the proposals including form, layout, density, height and affordable housing provision.

The previous concerns of the panel are noted, and the applicant has sought to address these concerns where possible. They have submitted work that indicates how the scheme is comparable to similar developments in the capital in terms of open space provision and which shows how comfortable distances between plots, with generous public space benefiting from good sunlight and daylight, would be achievable.

The applicant has also sought to show how plots have been appropriately tested to ensure blocks avoid overlooking and promote privacy and views over animated open spaces. This work also seeks to show how the number of dual aspect homes could be maximised and how the parameters and control documents would allow for improvements in these and other aspects.

The current proposals have not sought to address the broader concerns around density. The development density is comparable to other London developments with similar characteristics. Officers consider it to be appropriate given the aspirations of the site allocation to create a new leisure destination and local centre, good transport links, and location at the centre of a key growth area.

Officers believe that a liveable scheme with high quality residential environments, public realm, and open spaces is possible within this development density if well



designed. Therefore, the council would welcome commentary that focusses on the tools that will be used to shape future reserved matters applications (RMAs).

This includes the development specification, design code and parameter plans. The council seeks the panel's guidance on whether these documents will provide the necessary confidence that the outcomes proposed will be delivered. There will be further opportunities with each RMA for the panel to shape and finesse designs as they come forward, allowing further scrutiny of the liveability of particular phases and individual buildings.

The applicant team has submitted a hybrid application, part outline, part full, consisting of:

- illustrative scheme for 2,615, maximum parameters up to 2,929 homes
- target of 40 percent affordable housing, with minimum of 35 percent (including 500 Council-owned homes to be let at target rents)
- buildings up to 29 storeys
- new public park (approximately 5,300sqm) and civic square (approximately 3,500sqm)
- a library and learning centre
- new shops, civic, leisure and business space
- energy centre (DEN)
- detailed scheme (full) for new buildings of 5–6 storeys comprising 60 homes for social rent (to west of tracks on Whitehall Street).

The panel's consideration is sought on the applicant's response to concerns raised in previous review meeting:

- whether the control documents such as the development specification, design code and parameter plans provide the necessary confidence that the outcomes proposed will be delivered
- advice on proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—south and north of White Hart Lane
- advice on public realm, movement, and landscape.



## 4. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The panel appreciates that this is a very important scheme for the area and for the borough. While the panel supports many aspects of the proposal, in particular the detailed proposals for Plot A west of the Overground line and the general layout and public realm proposed in the outline application, it still has concerns about the proposed density of the development – from 1400 homes in the adopted AAP to the current figure of 2,900 – and the impact that this is having on several aspects of the overall scheme. It is thus unable wholeheartedly to support the application in its current form.

The panel is broadly supportive of the proposed development north of White Hart Lane, where it feels that the scale, layout and emerging architecture and landscape designs seem appropriate. The panel's primary concern on this part of the scheme is the viability of the delivery of the key public space, Peacock Park, given uncertainties about acquisition of this land and its proposed delivery as one of the final phases of development. It also feels that there are still issues around service access to this area, and its impact on the public space.

The key concern regarding the area of the development on the south side of White Hart Lane relate to the exact location, the heights and massing of the tall buildings, particularly on Plots B and F, as well as the relative heights of the tall buildings down this western side of the scheme.

The panel has not yet had the opportunity to look in detail at the design code but feels that the architecture emerging in the illustrative plan is encouraging.

Further details on the panel's views are provided below, and comments made at previous reviews that remain relevant are repeated for clarity.

### *Planning process*

- The panel understands the rationale for flexibility within parameter plans but highlights a number of areas where it would encourage a greater level of 'fix'.
- The current illustrative scheme accompanying the outline application has many positive qualities—but there is a risk of these being diluted if there is too much flexibility in the parameter plans and design code.
- For example, the panel feels that combining Plots B and C in defining maximum floor space is problematic. The constraints of Plot B may lead to greater floor space being placed in Plot C, impacting on the conservation area.
- The exact position of taller elements on Plots B, D and F will be a significant factor in their impact on the townscape. The parameter plans should carefully define shoulder height elements on key street frontages such as White Hart Lane, Whitehall Street and Brereton Road where these would play an important role in creating a human scale and mitigating wind impact.



- Similarly, the three-storey link blocks to the south of Plot C are crucial to let sunlight into the courtyards—but as proposed the parameter plans would allow these to be taller.
- The panel asks planning officers and the applicant to consider areas where greater certainty about the scale and massing of the development is needed to safeguard quality of life, and the scheme's relationship with the conservation area.
- The delivery of Peacock Park will be crucial to the success of the scheme as a whole. At the previous review, the panel asked the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life. However, the application confirms this will not be delivered until phase 6 out of 8, and then only if a compulsory purchase order (CPO) process is successful.
- The panel would support the planning authority in the use of mechanisms such as Section 106 agreements and Grampian Conditions to provide certainty about the delivery of open space for each phase of development, including Peacock Park.
- Similarly, the planning process should ensure affordable housing is not allocated to the blocks that receive low daylight and sunlight levels.

### *South of White Hart Lane*

- The panel is broadly supportive of the layout plan of development south of White Hart Lane but continues to have concerns about its scale and massing.
- It understands that, in addition to Moselle Square, this area of the masterplan is close enough to Bruce Castle Park to meet open space and play space requirements.
- The panel does not object in principle to the 'marker building' on Plot D opposite White Hart Lane station, signalling the route through Moselle Square to the stadium. However, the presentation acknowledged that this will have a negative impact on the environmental quality of Moselle Walk, requiring wind mitigation.
- The appropriateness of Plot D as a location for the tallest building is enhanced by its configuration, with a courtyard opening onto Whitehall Street allowing light into this space.
- The panel encourages the idea of an architectural competition for the site's marker building. It also supports the idea of an architectural competition for the library building.
- The panel feels the role of the marker building on Plot D would be strengthened if the tall buildings on Plots B and F were significantly reduced in height.



- In particular, the panel highlights the overpowering relationship of the 27-storey tower on Plot B in relation to its internal courtyard. The quality of the courtyard and daylighting of some of the homes at lower levels will be poor.
- The panel is also concerned about the impact of the 25-storey tower in Plot F because of the harm that it will cause to the setting of the Grade II-listed Grange and to the Conservation Area. Although its impact could to some extent be mitigated by an amendment to the parameter plans that would require, say, a 10-storey 'shoulder' building fronting White Hart Lane, the impact would still be significant.
- The panel would be open to considering a modest increase in the height of the 'marker building' in Plot D if it helped to offset a reduction in the height of the proposed towers in Plot B and Plot F.
- The panel is broadly convinced by the form of Plot C—subject to the comment recommending that the floor area schedule separates Plot C and Plot B.
- The panel admires the proposals for Moselle Square, particularly the way that it has been considered both for match days and for general use throughout the week, and its role as part of the development's play space provision.
- The panel also remains concerned about the wind mitigation across the scheme, particularly the area south of White Hart Lane, and urges further detailed consideration of this aspect of the proposal.

### *North of White Hart Lane*

- The panel is broadly supportive of the area of the development north of White Hart Lane, the scale, layout and emerging architecture and landscape designs.
- It notes that the tall buildings shown in the illustrative scheme to the west of the site reflect an extant planning approval, and this was therefore not discussed at the review.
- The panel's concern remains the delivery of Peacock Park, which is dependent on the acquisition of Peacock Industrial Estate. At the previous review, the panel asked the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life. However, the application confirms this will not be delivered until phase 6 out of 8, and then only if a compulsory purchase order (CPO) process is successful.
- Open space provision is therefore the main risk for the northern area of the masterplan, which is further from Bruce Castle Park than the southern area.



- The high density of development, including a high proportion of affordable housing, creates requirements for play space that are challenging to accommodate. This makes the delivery and quality of open space a critical requirement, as noted above under planning process.
- The panel feels that there is a possibility that the service access required, particularly on Parkside West, will reduce the quantity of green space provided, and suggests further consideration of measures to address this.
- The panel recognises that there is limited vehicle access to Parkside East—where access will be needed to service the buildings with no rear access—and recommends further examination of this aspect.
- As detailed designs progress, it will be important to ensure that circulation and servicing is compatible with the proposed amenity and play space of Peacock Park.
- At reserved matters stage, the panel encourages further work to increase the proportion of dual aspect units, as recommended at previous reviews.

## *Next steps*

While the Quality Review Panel admires many aspects of this development proposal it is unable to support the application wholeheartedly in its current form on grounds of overdevelopment, excessive heights of the tall buildings in Plots B and F and the lack of certainty about the provision of essential greenspace on Peacock Park.

The panel recognises that the planning authority will need to consider its advice in the context of wider planning policies and is available to support the continuing design process.



**Appendix: Haringey Development Management DPD**

**Policy DM1: Delivering high quality design**

**Haringey Development Charter**

- A All new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will support design-led development proposals which meet the following criteria:
- a Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
  - b Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
  - c Confidently address feedback from local consultation;
  - d Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
  - e Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

**Design Standards**

Character of development

- B Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:
- a Building heights;
  - b Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;
  - c Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;
  - d Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;
  - e Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;
  - f Active, lively frontages to the public realm; and
  - g Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.



## Appendix 12: Plans and Documents List

### Documents

- Affordable Housing Statement (dated October 2021)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (dated October 2021)
- Basement Assessment Impact (BIA) 1 of 6, 2 of 6, 3 of 6, 4 of 6, 5 of 6 and 6 of 6 (dated October 2021)
- Biodiversity Net Gain Design Stage Report (dated November 2021)
- Circular Economy Statement (dated October 2021)
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) – Form 1: CIL Additional Information (dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2021)
- Construction Environmental Management Plan (dated October 2021)
- Covering Letter (dated 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2021)
- Covering Letter (dated 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022)
- Crowd Flow Study (dated 3 March 2022)
- Delivery and Servicing Plan (dated October 2021)
- Design and Access Statement (dated October 2021)
- Design Code
- Detailed Circular Economy Statement (dated October 2021)
- Development Specification
- Economic Benefits Statement (dated October 2021)
- Energy and Sustainability Statement (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 1: Main Document (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 2: Figures (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 3: Heritage Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 2 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 7 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 8 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 9 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 10 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 11 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 13 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 14 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 4: Chapter 16 Appendices (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Volume 5: Non-Technical Summary (dated October 2021)
- Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 1: Chapters 01 – 018 (dated February 2022)
- Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 2: Chapters 01 – 018 Figures (dated January 2022)
- Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 3: Heritage Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment (dated January 2022)
- Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 4: Appendices Chapters 2, 7, 9,10 and 13 (dated January 2022)
- Environmental Statement Addendum Volume 5: Non- Technical Summary (dated January 2022)
- Equalities Impact Assessment (dated October 2021)
- Equalities Impact Assessment (dated 17 February 2022)
- Fire Safety Statement (dated October 2021)
- Financial Viability Assessment Redacted For Publication (dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 2021)
- Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Part 1 of 9, 2 of 9, 3 of 9, 4 of 9, 5 of 9, 6 of 9, 7 of 9, 8 of 9 and 9 of 9 (dated October 2021)
- Framework Travel Plan (dated October 2021)
- Geotechnical & Geo- environmental Desk Study (dated October 2021)
- Health Impact Assessment (dated October 2021)
- HRW Advice Note Natural England – Habitat Regulations Assessment (dated January 2022)
- High Road West Crowd Flow Study (dated 8 February 2022)
- High Road West Policy NT5 and Arup Masterplan Note (dated 25 February 2022)
- Inclusive Design Statement (dated October 2021)
- Interim Scenario Equalities Assessment (January 2022)
- Interim Scenario Rapid Health Impact Assessment (January 2022)
- Interim Scenario Site Suitability Noise Assessment (January 2022)
- Illustrative Area Schedule – Residential (dated October 2021)
- Lighting Masterplan and Planning Guides (dated October 2021)
- Operational Waste Strategy (dated October 2021)
- Planning Statement (dated October 2021)
- Planning Note (Dated 25 February 2022)
- Plot A Area Schedule (dated October 2021)
- Plot A TM59 Overheating Report (dated February 2022)
- Residential Travel Plan (dated October 2021)
- Response to Comments Letter (dated 28 February 2022)
- Retail Impact Assessment (dated October 2021)

- Site Suitability Noise Assessment (dated October 2021)
- Site Waste Management Plan (dated October 2021)
- Statement of Community Involvement (October 2021)
- Statement of Community Involvement Update (February 2022)
- Socio-Economic Benefits Statement (January 2022)
- Sunlight and Daylight Report (dated October 2021)
- Sustainability Statement (dated October 2021)
- Transport Assessment (dated October 2021)
- TM59 Overheating Assessment (dated October 2021)
- Utilities Statement (dated October 2021)
- Ventilation and Extraction Statement (dated October 2021)
- Whole Life Carbon Report (dated October 2021)
- Whole Life-cycle Carbon Assessment – Plot A (dated October 2021)

<b>DETAILED</b>		
<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Drawing Title</b>	<b>Revision</b>
HRWPA-PTE-A1-0-D-A-022000	Plot A - Building A1 - Plans - Level 0	P5
HRWPA-PTE-A1-ZZ-D-A-022001	Plot A - Building A1 - Plans - Level 01-02	P5
HRWPA-PTE-A1-ZZ-D-A-022002	Plot A - Building A1 - Plans - Level 03-04	P4
HRWPA-PTE-A1-ZZ-D-A-024000	Plot A - Building A1 Elevations - East and South	P5
HRWPA-PTE-A2-ZZ-D-A-024004	Plot A - Building A2 - A3 - Elevations - West and North	P5
HRWPA-PTE-AX-ZZ-D-A-011000	Plot A - Site Plan - Level 0	P6
HRWPA-PTE-AX-ZZ-D-A-011001	Plot A - Site Plan - Roof Plan	P6
HRWPA-PTE-XX-ZZ-D-A-008000	Plot A - Existing Elevations & Section - 100 Whitehall Lodge	P4
HRWPA-PTE-XX-ZZ-D-A-008001	Plot A - Existing Plan & Elevations - Community Centre	P3
HRWPA-PTE-XX-ZZ-D-A-008002	Plot A - Existing Plans - 100 Whitehall Lodge	P3
HRWPA-PTE-XX-ZZ-D-A-008003	Plot A - Existing Plan - Community Centre	P2
21-01	Summary Schedule of Accommodation	-
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L-007100	Plot A_Landscape General Arrangement	C03
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L-007101	Kerbs and Edges General Arrangement	C03
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L-007102	Boundaries General Arrangement	C03
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L-007103	Soft Landscape & Tree Planting Character Plan	C03
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L007200	Site Sections	C03
HRWPA-SEW-ZZ-GF-D-L-007301	Typical Soft Landscape Details	C03

<b>OUTLINE - PARAMETERS</b>		
<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Drawing Title</b>	<b>Revision</b>
0311 -SEW-ZZ -ZZ -DR-T -000001	Site Location Plan (For Approval)	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001002	Parameter Plan 02 – Proposed Development Plots Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001003	Parameter Plan 03 - Horizontal Limits of Deviations Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001004	Parameter Plan 04 - Building Heights Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001005	Parameter Plan 05 - Basement Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001006	Parameter Plan 06 - Access & Circulation Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001007	Parameter Plan 07 - Public Realm & Open Space Plan	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001008	Parameter Plan 08 - Ground Level Land Uses Plan	P3
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001009	Parameter Plan 09 - First Level Land Uses Plan	P3
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001010	Parameter Plan 10 - Second Level and Above Land Uses Plan	P3
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001011	Parameter Plan 11 - Demolition Plan	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-001012	Parameter Plan 12 - Development Zones	P2
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-002300	Existing Site Elevations - High Road	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-002301	Existing Site Elevations - White Hart Lane	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-002302	Existing Site Elevations - Brereton Road	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-T-000034	Constraints Plan - THFC Ownership within Application Boundary	

<b>ILLUSTRATIVE</b>		
<b>Drawing Number</b>	<b>Drawing Title</b>	<b>Revision</b>
0311-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-A-001100	GA Illustrative Floor Plan - Level 00 (Ground)	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-00-DR-L-001100	GA Illustrative Landscape Masterplan - Level 00 (Ground)	P1

ILLUSTRATIVE		
0311-SEW-ZZ-01-DR-A-001101	GA Illustrative Floor Plan - Level 01 (First)	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-03-DR-A-001103	GA Illustrative Floor Plan - Level 03 (Typical)	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-40-DR-A-001140	GA Illustrative Floor Plan - Level 40 (Roof)	P1
0311 -SEW-ZZ -B1 -DR-A-001199	GA Illustrative Floor Plan - Level B1 (Basement)	--
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-002004	Proposed Site Levels Plan	P1
0311-SEW-ZZ-ZZ-DR-T-002008	Illustrative Phasing Plan	P1

This page is intentionally left blank