

# Addendum

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADDENDUM REPORT****UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8**

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2022/0823	<b>Ward:</b> White Hart Lane
<b>Address:</b> Broadwater Farm Estate, London, N17 7AB  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of the existing buildings and structures and erection of new mixed-use buildings including residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business and service (Class E) and local community and learning (Class F) floorspace; energy centre (sui generis); together with landscaped public realm and amenity spaces; public realm and highways works; car-parking; cycle parking; refuse and recycling facilities; and other associated works. Site comprising: Tangmere and Northolt Blocks (including Stapleford North Wing): Energy Centre; Medical Centre: Enterprise Centre: and former Moselle school site, at Broadwater Farm Estate.	

**Amendments to Recommendation (Section 2 of the Officer Report)**

The recommendation in Section 2 of the officer report is **amended to recommend deferring the decision** to provide additional time to consider and address the material change in circumstances arising from the recent listing of the mosaic mural on the Tangmere building.

Paragraphs 3.21 and 6.99, set out that an application for listing of the mural was being considered by the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) following a recommendation by Historic England. On 5<sup>th</sup> October 2022 the Council received confirmation from DCMS that the mural is now listed for its special architectural or historic interest under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The listing is at Grade II. Details of the listing are attached to this Addendum at Appendix A.

Consideration of the impact on this heritage asset is now required for this application. An assessment of the significance of the listed mural and the impact of the proposal has not been possible in the time since the listing. Deferring until a later sub-committee date allows for consideration of the impact on the listed mural and the preparation and submission of an application for Listed Building Consent.

**Amendments to the Officer Report**

Paragraph 6.220 (Fire Safety) has been included in error and must be removed, para 6.221 set out the HSE's position correctly.

In this regard since publication The Council's Head of Building Control has reviewed the application and states that, in respect of fire safety *"the engineered solution as currently designed as proposed is achievable and this will be checked in full detail at the Building Regulation stage."*

The fire safety elements of the proposed development will be reviewed further as required under Approved Document Part B of the Building Regulations. The Council's Building Control team has reviewed the application and is satisfied that the development design and fire safety strategy are acceptable.

The Greater London Authority's Stage 1 comments also raised no objections in respect of fire safety. Further detailed analysis of fire safety provisions will be secured by condition.

## Appendix A

Official list entry

Heritage Category:  
Listed Building

Grade:  
II

List Entry Number:  
1482419

Date first listed:  
05-Oct-2022

Location Description:  
Statutory Address 1:  
Tangmere House, Broadwater Farm Estate, London, N17 6HF

### **Location**

Statutory Address:

Tangmere House, Broadwater Farm Estate, London, N17 6HF

The building or site itself may lie within the boundary of more than one authority.  
County:

Greater London Authority

District:

Haringey (London Borough)

Parish:

Non Civil Parish

National Grid Reference:

TQ3294490128

### **Summary**

Mosaic mural by Gülsün Erbil, 1986-1987, titled Equality-Harmony.

## Reasons for Designation

The mosaic mural at Tangmere House, 1986-1987, by Gülsün Erbil, titled Equality-Harmony, is listed at Grade II for the following principal reasons:

### Architectural interest

- \* as a striking and technically accomplished work of public art; richly coloured and detailed, it combines figurative, abstract and symbolic motifs in a lively composition;
- \* for its celebration of universal values of peace, equality and harmony, alongside depictions of the diverse cultural life of the Broadwater Farm estate, and aspects of youth culture more broadly in 1980s Britain;
- \* as a work of community art, exemplary in its degree of survival, scale and artistic quality; commissioned, designed and executed within the Broadwater Farm community.

### Historic interest:

- \* commissioned in the wake of the Broadwater Farm riot, an event of national significance in the history of race relations in the UK, the mural stands as a tangible marker of community resilience in the face of violence and disadvantage.

## History

Equality–Harmony was created in 1986-1987 in the aftermath of the Broadwater Farm riot of 6 October 1985. Broadwater Farm estate was the flagship housing project of the new London Borough of Haringey, created under London's local government reorganisation of 1965. The estate was designed by the Borough Architect's Department (principal architect S M El Doori) and built from 1967-73. A recurring criticism of the estate was the lack of community facilities and services, this was particularly acute for young Black people. Residents sought to address the issue with the formation of the Broadwater Farm Youth Association (BFYA) in 1981 to campaign for greater facilities. In the following years the Association successfully campaigned for a community centre, a day nursery and women's centre and a children's play centre on the estate.

On 6 October 1985 Broadwater Farm made national headlines as the scene of a riot. Existing tensions between the Black community and the police were ignited by the death of Cynthia Jarrett the previous day during a police search at her home. In the ensuing disturbance on the estate PC Keith Blakelock was killed. Over the following months tensions remained high as police maintained a substantial presence at the estate and a series of contested criminal trials proceeded at the Old Bailey. An independent inquiry chaired by Lord Gifford QC convened in February 1986, publishing its findings that July. A follow-up report was published in 1989. Lord Gifford identified racism as 'a running theme throughout', that 'discriminatory attitudes and policies have affected policing, education, employment prospects,

housing allocation and media reporting.’ (Gifford, Second Report, 1989, p 123).

The riot was one of several episodes of civil unrest occurring in the early 1980s against the background of economic inequality and institutional racism faced disproportionately by the Black and multi-ethnic communities. The event is a milestone in the history of race relations in the UK.

In response to the events of October 1986, Haringey Council began a coordinated programme of investments in the estate to address what had been identified as underlying factors behind the riot. Some took the form of community initiatives in which local residents’ groups were involved. Haringey’s housing department in cooperation with the BFYA coordinated a package of improvements which included commissioning two external community murals and two landscaped gardens.

The artworks were Equality-Harmony, the mosaic mural at Tangmere House, 1986-1987, by Gülsün Erbil; and the Peace Mural, a painted mural on the end wall of the Roachford block, 1987, by Anthony Steele.

Gülsün Erbil was a resident on the Broadwater Farm estate and a witness to the events of October 1985. Erbil recalls being given the latitude to suggest her own location and subject, and after providing a sample mosaic panel, she was provided with a vacant unit on the Tangmere House shopping precinct in which to set up a workshop. Erbil chose the concrete shaft for the waste chute on the north elevation of Tangmere House as the location for the mural. The chute ran from the first-floor deck level to above the sixth, top, floor of Tangmere House. She was assisted by Mahmut Bozkurt, a graduate from the Istanbul State Academy of Fine Arts, and for a shorter period by Aydin Ayan, another Turkish artist. Estate residents, especially schoolchildren and young people, were encouraged to participate in the creation of the mural panels and were taught aspects of the mosaic technique. Two other residents assisted with mounting, cementing and grouting the mosaic panels.

Erbil used a Byzantine mosaic technique to create the mural, involving irregularly shaped and hand-cut glass tesserae. She employed what is sometimes described as the ‘reverse method’: outlines of the design were drawn in reverse on sheets of backing paper approximately 1.2m x 1m in size. The tesserae were then mounted face-down onto the backing with paste. The resulting mural panels were then bonded onto the wall with cement. After approximately 48 hours the backing papers were removed and the mosaic was grouted. The mosaic covers an estimated total area of 100m<sup>2</sup>.

The mural’s overarching theme, as Erbil describes it, is one of ‘reconciliation between the races’. It was created as part of a process of social reconciliation in the wake of the riot, designed and made by the community that witnessed it. Through its depictions of cultural and community life on the estate, the mural celebrates the grass-roots activism which helped shape it and counters a narrative of disaffection associated with the estate. The work was featured on the front cover of the second Gifford report of 1989, although the report failed to credit Erbil as the project artist.

Further investments in the estate were undertaken in the early 1990s and a third mural, by Bernette Hall and Donald Taylor, was completed in 1991. A capital works

programme executed between 1993 and 2002 resulted in the removal of some of the estate's raised walkways and the insertion of secure entrances at ground floor level. It was during this programme that the wide pedestrian walkways which connected Tangmere House and the area around the base of Erbil's mosaic mural with other parts of the estate were removed. A ground-floor entrance was inserted beneath the base of the mural and its lower part was enclosed within a first-floor glazed corridor.

Gülsün Erbil (1948-) is a Turkish artist known for her abstract works that take inspiration from the Sufi mystic Mevlânâ. She has worked in a variety of media including oil paint, textiles, ceramics, mosaics and stained glass. Born in Izmir, Erbil studied painting at the Istanbul State Academy of Fine Arts (now the Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University) in 1966-71. She completed a master's degree in ceramics at Goldsmith's College in 1983-4, studying under Ken Bright and David Garbett, returning to Goldsmith's in 1993-4 for a master's in textiles. In 1998 she founded Gallery X in Harlem, New York and returned to Istanbul in 2002, founding a gallery of the same name in the city's Beyoglu district.

Prior to the Tangmere house project, Erbil completed several mosaic murals in Turkey, many of them in the same Byzantine mosaic technique. Her only other mosaic work in the UK dates to 1988-1989, a mural of about 4m<sup>2</sup> at the entrance to the Saudi American Bank, 65 Curzon Street, Mayfair, London (probably lost).

### Details

Mosaic mural by Gülsün Erbil, 1986-1987.

MATERIALS: glass tesserae.

DESCRIPTION AND SYMBOLISM: the mural covers an estimated area of 100m<sup>2</sup>; it is approximately 5m wide, including side returns, and over six storeys high. It covers the concrete refuse chute which served Tangmere House.

The mural is named Equality–Harmony and its overarching theme is one of 'reconciliation between the races'. The unifying device of the composition is a musical stave which runs from a treble clef at the top, merging into a piano keyboard at the bottom of the work. The musical notes on the stave represent the first line of the carol 'Joy to the World' and this has sometimes been taken as an alternative title. A spiral, a key motif of mysticism in Erbil's work, is incorporated into the treble clef. A rainbow (in Turkey a symbol of change, but in other cultures a symbol of peace, unity, fortune or LGBTQ+ pride) is interwoven with the stave, terminating in a white prism on the right-hand return.

Towards the top of the composition are a series of images which place the artwork in its geographical location. Twin hemispheres depict the western and eastern worlds (and with Turkey picked out in red). Underneath, Great Britain is outlined in green on a swirling blue background. London is next to be depicted, bisected by the distinctive blue line of the Thames and with the location of Broadwater Farm indicated by a circle. Beneath that are the buildings of the estate, including Tangmere House (with the mural shown in miniature), the distinctive curved boiler house and the red



triangular structure and swings of the children's play centre. Views of the estate continue on the right-hand side.

The lower half of the panel depicts the residents' recreations and amenities, including (from top to bottom) snooker (a popular pastime at the Youth Centre), chess, books at the library, a personal computer, the estate's Shell Theatre, breakdancers and spectators, kettle drums and a track runner, symbolising the nearby New River Sports Centre. Other imagery includes a black figure holding up a dove of peace, the moon piercing the sun and further mystical spirals. At the base of the mural is a black and a white hand playing the black and white keys of a piano, representing racial equality and harmony. Erbil notes that the hands are a symbol of the working class. The chute outlet at the bottom is in the position of the piano player's head.

The lower part of the mural is enclosed in a later, roofed, corridor (not part of the listed building). A narrow strip of the mural is now hidden by the depth of the roof as it meets the face of the building.

This page is intentionally left blank

**ADDENDUM REPORT****UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 9**

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2022/0967	<b>Ward:</b> White Hart Lane
<b>Address:</b> 313 The Roundway and 8-12 Church Lane, London, N17 7AB  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new Class E/F1 floorspace at ground floor and residential C3 units with landscaping and associated works.	

**Additional Consultation Comments (Amendments to Appendix 3)**

**TFL** - have confirmed their support for the application subject to conditions and legal requirements. These comments are reported below:

*Your approach to conditions is acceptable to TfL, with regards to Road Safety Audit, they will as part of the Section 278 with TfL needed to address the safety concerns raised in the RSA Stage 1 and provided a Stage 2 audit and designers response. Subject to securing appropriate condition, TfL has no objection to the Council approving this application.*

**LBH Transportation Officer** - has also provided additional comments set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

*Transportation still do not support this application given the shortfall in meeting London Plan standards for blue badge parking. It is acknowledged that there is a neutral effect on the cycle and pedestrian facility along Church Lane. The servicing arrangements are not optimal either from the transportation perspective.*

**Amendments to the Committee Report****Description of the development:**

The description of the development (see box above) has been amended as follows (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**).

*Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new Class **E/F1 floorspace** at ground floor and residential C3 units with landscaping and associated works.*

This change is to reflect the flexible nature of the ground floor uses being extended following discussions with the applicant to include those uses within Use Class F1 (which includes galleries/museums). This could facilitate the use of the non-residential space for purposes related to Bruce Castle Museum.

**Paragraphs 6.23 and 6.24:**

Amended to reflect the use class changes referenced above, as follows (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**).

*The proposed development would provide 600sqm of new employment space in the form of flexible Class E/**Class F1** floor space. This is currently anticipated to be in the form of workspace, **retail space or exhibition space**. The applicant has requested flexibility in the exact final uses to ensure the **new units** would be occupied. It is understood that these end uses would provide **up to** 50 new jobs at the site **depending on the exact final uses**.*

*Despite the overall reduction in floorspace it is considered that the proposed development would maximise the new employment on site by providing flexible Class **E/F1** uses along the whole available street frontage on the Roundway. The number and quality of jobs would significantly increase, as described above. The environmental quality of the site would improve substantially. Residential amenity would be protected through conditions and the functionality of existing employment activities respected. Broadband connections would be secured through condition.*

**Paragraphs 6.62 – 6.64:**

The inclusion of paragraphs 6.62, 6.63 and 6.64 are a typographical error and are hereby removed from the report.

**Paragraphs 6.136 and 6.145 (Transportation Section):**

Following the revised comments from the Transportation Officer as described above the following paragraphs of the committee report are hereby amended:

**Paragraph 6.136 (Servicing)**

*Two loading bays of 12 metre length would service the development – one on The Roundway and one on Church Lane. Both bays could accommodate waste vehicle and large delivery vehicles. The bay on Church Lane requires 3 metres of clear space at either end to allow ease of access. The siting of these service bays is supported in principle by the Council's Transportation Officer and Transport for London. Further discussions are required in order to ascertain the most efficient loading bay layout and management arrangements. This matter can be resolved through condition.*

**Paragraph 6.145 (Cycle Parking and Infrastructure)**

*The lack of car capping for this development given the 'event day' nature of the local CPZ means that a significant increase in local on-street parking would be expected. Much of this is expected to be accommodated on Church Lane. Church Lane is part of Cycle Superhighway 1 and the cycle lane is contraflow in this area. As such, it is an important piece of Haringey's cycling infrastructure. The provision of four new parking spaces and a loading bay (in*

*place of three parking spaces and two vehicle access points) on Church Lane would, when all parking spaces and the loading bay are occupied, reduce the space available for cyclists to safely find refuge if required when vehicles are passing (which would occur in a southerly direction only in this street as it is one-way only). However, it is expected that the loading bay would not be occupied at all times and it would provide a large space suitable for waiting cyclists when vacant. Furthermore, the development would remove two vehicle access points from the existing site which currently permit vehicles to turn from the existing commercial premises into oncoming cycle traffic, which itself is a significant safety concern. The Council's Transportation Officer has provided revised comments on this application, which state that the development would have a neutral impact on the cycle infrastructure adjacent to the site.*

### **Amendments to Heads of Terms**

Discussions with the applicant on the proposed heads of terms have continued since the committee report was published. The following amendments and additional heads have been agreed (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**):

#### **5) Highway works to be secured through a s278 agreement (**in consultation with Transport for London**)**

- Works shall include relocation of variable message sign on The Roundway, if required

#### **9) Employment and skills plan**

- **Including a contribution towards employment and skills initiatives of £34,400**

#### **11) Monitoring**

- 5% of total financial heads (excluding carbon offset)
- £500 per non-financial head
- **Estimated £5,720**

#### **12) Council to have first option to purchase the proposed affordable housing**

### **Amendments to Condition 11 (Appendix 1)**

Condition 11 has been amended since the committee report was published following the revised comments from the Transportation Officer (new wording and changes **in bold and underlined**):

**11) The approved development shall not be occupied until a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London. The DSP shall include details of alternative loading and servicing arrangements, if feasible, following**

**consultation with the Council's Transportation Officer and Transport for London.** The DSP shall be updated in writing and re-submitted to the Local Planning Authority within the first six months of occupation or at 75% occupancy, whichever comes first. The development shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

## **Appendix 1- Additional transportation comments**

*Considering the assessment of existing versus proposed highway arrangements with respect to the cycling facility for CS1.*

*At present there is two way cycling along Church Lane, which is one way southbound for vehicles from All Hallows Road, so northbound cyclists are cycling contraflow to vehicular traffic.*

*The assessment considers the conditions for contraflow cycling without a formal contraflow cycle lane.*

*TfL's London Cycle Design Standards and the DFT document LTN 1/20 consider the appropriate arrangements for this situation, and essentially, they require a minimum overall carriageway width of 4.6m for the situation within Church Lane (as in contraflow cycling taking place without a formal cycle lane and parking to one side of the road). There is also reference to the streets needing to have low vehicle flows as well. There is no traffic flow information provided by the applicant however anecdotally it is considered to be a lightly trafficked street.*

*At present, the 4.6 overall width is achieved along Church Lane, and with the current configuration between 2.4m and 2.8m of clear width carriageway is available adjacent to parking bays.*

*With the proposed arrangements revising the parking and loading arrangements along Church Lane, including inseting the footway and loading bays by 1 metre, there is between 2.9 and 3.0m clear carriageway width provided adjacent to the edges of the parking bays along the development boundary. it reverts to the existing 4.6m overall width north and south of the site. Therefore, there is very slightly more clear carriageway width than at present along the boundary of the development.*

*Whilst the length of kerbside that has parking bays along it will be reducing (within which cyclists can take refuge) it is acknowledged that the redevelopment and associated reinstatement of crossovers to full height kerb and footway will remove entry and exit manoeuvres along Church Lane.*

*To summarise with respect to consideration of the existing/proposed cyclist facility for CS 1, Transportation consider that there is no real tangible benefit arising from this redevelopment but equally there is no detriment compared to present. So in balance there is no objection to this aspect of the proposals. It should be noted though that the Borough's Walking and cycling action plan does seek for development to contribute towards delivering improvements in walking and cycling infrastructure and it is disappointing that the opportunity has not been taken to improve the situation.*

### **Footway changes**

*The footway/pedestrian facility along Church Lane will benefit from the reinstatement of crossovers along it, however it is also noted that the footway will narrow to the immediate north end of the development to 2.0m wide, plus need to*

*realign to suit the insetting of the highway to accommodate parking and loading. In balance this is considered neutral by Transportation.*

#### *Loading arrangements*

*The applicant has proposed changing their proposals for Church Lane from an 18m loading bay to implementation of double yellow lining with associated 'blips' to prevent any loading or parking activity between the AM and PM peak periods. This is a preferable arrangement to implementing a formal loading bay for a very low number of delivery and servicing movements, as it will keep this length free of vehicles during the AM/PM peak periods and provide opportunities for cyclist refuse during the traditionally busiest periods of the day.*

*Overall, with respect to loading the transportation view is still that this is an inefficient way of dealing with delivery and servicing movements as one loading bay would suffice for the whole development or alternatively off street servicing should be taking place.*

#### *Blue badge parking*

*This development proposal still does not meet the London Plan requirements for blue badge parking as previously detailed and discussed.*

#### *Summary*

*The latest note from the applicant's transportation consultant has been read and reviewed.*

*In balance, Transportation still do not support this application given the shortfall in meeting London Plan standards for blue badge parking. It is acknowledged that there is a neutral effect on the cycle and pedestrian facility along Church Lane. The servicing arrangements are not optimal either from the transportation perspective.*