

Kodi Sprott, Principal
Committee
Coordinator

020 8489 5343

kodi.sprott@haringey.gov.uk

01 August 2024

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Thursday, 1st August, 2024

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

8. HGY/2024/1008 TOTTENHAM HOTSPUR STADIUM, 748 HIGH ROAD, TOTTENHAM, LONDON N17 0AL (PAGES 1 - 12)

Proposal: Minor Material Amendment application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for the variation to Condition B9 (Major Non-association Football Events) (MNFEs) of the hybrid planning permission HGY/2023/2137 (as amended from HGY/2015/3000) for amendments to allow up to 30 major non-association football events including music concerts; and other associated changes.

Yours sincerely

Kodi Sprott, Principal Committee Coordinator
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

1. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**
2. **FIELD_PAGE_RANGE**

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 1 August 2024

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No.

Reference No: HGY/2024/1008	Ward: Northumberland Park
Address: Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, 748 High Road, London N17 0AL	
<p>Proposal: Minor Material Amendment application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for the variation to Condition B9 (Major Non-association Football Events) (MNFES) of the hybrid planning permission HGY/2023/2137 (as amended from HGY/2015/3000) for amendments to allow up to 30 major non-association football events including music concerts; and other associated changes.</p>	
Applicant: Tottenham Hotspur Football Club	

*To note: the numbering as set out in this addendum corresponds with the numbering of each section within the Officer committee report. Additions are in **bold** and deletions ~~struck~~.*

Amendments to the report:

Page 1 - Summary of Key Reasons for Recommendation - Second bullet point:

Clarification - There can only be two weeks every year where there are either 4 consecutive events in a week and/or 5 events in a week.

Page 2 – Summary of Key Reasons for Recommendation - Penultimate bullet point:

Clarification - *If the impact is considered to be significant then LBH could require further mitigation or require the number or concentration of events to be reviewed down from 30 after one year **with a guaranteed minimum of 20 MNFEs***

Page 2 – para 2 – Recommendation:

~~Delete: following referral to the Mayor of London
The application is not referable to the GLA~~

Page 2 – para 2.1 - Recommendation:

Update - *That the section 106 legal agreement referred to in resolution (2.1) above is to be completed no later than **16 August 2024** or within such extended time as the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning, Building Standards & Sustainability shall in her/his sole discretion allow*

Page 4 – 2.4 - Review Mechanism

iv (before a) the insertion of “socio-economic impacts”:

Review of impacts (both positive and negative) on local residents and businesses taking into account the following factors (quantified wherever possible to reduce subjectivity):

(a) Socio-economic impacts

(b) ASB/street urination/MNFE toilet provisions

(c) MNFE noise impacts (as currently measured)

(d) Littering/street cleanliness

- (e) Car parking/enforcement (linked also to TP/mode share targets but also LBH Code of Enforcement)*
- (f) Road closures/traffic management issues*
- (g) Station queue management*
- (h) General compliance with LAMP*

Page 5 – point 9 Free tickets

Clarification - *Minimum 100 tickets per MNFE*

Pages 5, 10, 31, 41 and 57 – 2.4 (10), para 6.5.7, 6.6.28, 6.6.30 & para 6.12.3 - Community Fund:

Correction – this is secured by a Unilateral Undertaking by THFC instead of a Head of Term for a Section 106 planning obligation so is not part of the planning balance.

Page 10 Proposal

For clarity the revised wording of the amended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 on page 94

Page 17 LBH Licensing

Correction - *As such, additional resourcing will be required of £4,000 per event (Officer Response: The existing baseline is for 16 MNFEs so it is not reasonable to require additional payment for this. However, any additional MNFEs will be subject to ~~the~~ a £1,000 fee)*

Page 31 para 6.5.8 Review Mechanism

Correction - *in the worst case scenario would reduce the cap back to ~~46~~ 20 events*

Page 47-48 para 6.8.7 Nuisance and ASB

Correction – **Regulatory Services advise** *Increasing the number of MNFEs will require additional resources in the form of 9 officers for larger events larger events, 6 of which would be working between 1pm till 23.30. The cost of enforcing these additional events is estimated as £4,000 per event. Regulatory Services ~~will therefore require~~ **have requested** mitigation in the form of a revised management and monitoring strategy to be included in the new LAMP to deal with this issue and for adequate resources to be secured as part of this planning permission to deal with these issues*

Page 55 new para 6.9.37a Cumulative Impacts

Measures are already in place to ensure events at the Stadium are coordinated with transport requirements of other major events nearby such as at Drumsheds, Alexandra Palace, Finsbury Park, Emirates Stadium and the London Stadium. For example, there are measures through Planning (including the LAMP), Licensing (sometimes requiring bespoke transport plans) and through the Safety Advisory Group (SAG) via Building Control where transport operators can ensure safe operation. The planning application does not remove any of those safeguards. Whilst an increase in the number of events will apply some extra pressure, those safeguards still exist and will continue to operate. Formal consultees have not raised concerns regarding any possible clashes. The applicant has stated that as a responsible venue operator, it liaises with other venues within the sphere of operation, primarily to avoid direct clashes, and that the risk of potential clashes is also flagged by the Metropolitan Police and/or TfL (within and outside of the SAG process). In respect of Finsbury Park and the annual Wireless festival in particular, the applicant has stated that it would normally block out those dates as not being available to prospective MNFE holders in order to avoid any direct clashes and undue strain on the transport network.

Page 56 para 6.9.38 Cumulative Impacts

TfL comments have highlighted there will be a requirement for additional staffing for the MNFEs for queue management and associated operations. This has been detailed as £675,000 per annum, for at least 10 years for London Underground staffing, £241,548 per annum for 10 years for London Overground staffing and further funding for of £9,290.30 per event for Arriva Trains. However, the applicant has advised that such resourcing should come from their own budget and any increase in users will correspond with associated expenditure. ~~The applicant has referred to the GLA letter of support as an indication that the obligation from TfL is not supported at a strategic level.~~

TfL have since provided additional comments as follows:

Taking on board the applicants concern about the scale and relationship of the suggested contribution to the number of events, we have reviewed the request for resourcing needed per event as follows:

£9,290.30 (index linked) per additional event for LO

£9,000 (index linked) per additional event for LU

An assessment of the merit of these contributions is provided below

Page 56 new para 6.9.38a Cumulative Impacts

When considering potential planning obligations, including financial contributions, it is important to apply the 3 statutory 'tests' which require that planning obligations must be:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*
- b) directly related to the development; and*
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*

These are considered in turn as follows:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;*

The existing stadium planning permission which included a larger-capacity for a wider range of major events than existed previously did not include contributions towards direct staffing costs for public transport operators. Existing events are managed within the capacity of the existing network. Existing planning and non-planning mechanisms and safeguards to coordinate safe travel already exist and would continue to exist and are not removed by this application. These mechanisms include through planning (the LAMP and other transport mechanisms), licensing (such as requiring bespoke transport plans where necessary) and 'safety of sports grounds' legislation (Safety Advisory Group, SAG, meetings chaired by building control) which involve all necessary stakeholders, including transport operators and TfL.

TfL's statement that it absorbs the cost of current events is acknowledged, but it also secures a degree of extra income from fares from additional journeys made to and from existing events, and will do so for future permitted events also.

It is accepted that TfL states that fare revenue is used for operations at the network level, does not cover the full costs, cannot be broken down or ring-fenced to a particular location, has to take account of travelcards, caps,

concessionary fares etc, but this is a matter for how TfL manages fare income and deployment of resource based on known and expected pressures. Events are planned well in advance and the above-mentioned mechanisms for stakeholder involvement mean that resources can be deployed appropriately.

With the above complexities about TfL fare income in mind, an indicative cautious calculation of an average of £2.50 per journey with 10,000 people from a MNFE using the Victoria Line multiplied by 2 journeys each provides an indicative figure of £50,000 per MNFE. For most events it is likely this figure will be higher, with fare income also captured from Overground routes, but is provided to give a cautious indication of the quantum of fare income compared to the scale of the TfL request.

As introduced earlier, London Plan Policy T4 'Assessing and mitigating transport impacts' states that, where appropriate, mitigation will be required to address adverse transport impacts. There is currently no evidence of adverse transport impacts arising from the existing events that are not already mitigated by existing operations and resources, as set out above, which will continue.

Therefore it is not accepted that the requested contributions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

- b directly related to the development; and*
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.*

The £675,000 per annum requested is a flat annual rate and does not reflect the proposal of 'up to' 30 MNFEs per annum, which is likely to fluctuate significantly between years. TfL state the justification for the £675,000 is to cover an additional eight staff plus a supervisor. That request and the additional request for £9,290 per MNFE above the original limit of 16 are not supported by evidence on how these relate to fare income (see above) and how these directly relate or fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposal. The request and are not considered to meet these tests.

Whilst TfL has highlighted the principle of securing some contributions at other venues in London, each case must be considered on its own merits, and those examples are not directly related to this proposal, due to different local contexts and circumstances.

Therefore it is not accepted that the requested contributions directly relate or fairly and reasonably relate in scale and kind to the proposal.

It is also relevant that the proposed 'review mechanism' includes 'Station queue management' as one of the key impacts to be assessed, so if there is non-compliance from adverse impacts, either further mitigations will be required to be put in place, or the number of MNFEs is reduced.

CONDITIONS

Page 59

Point of clarification – Whole site-wide conditions are in **Appendix 1**

Page 93

Point of clarification – Stadium site conditions are in **Appendix 2**

APPENDIX – CONSULTATION RESPONSES FROM INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Page 100 – table – LBH Licensing (Regulatory Services)

Correction – *Noted and HoT for ~~£4,000~~ **£1,000** per event for regulatory enforcement is recommended*

Appendix 1 Final consultation response from Transport for London (TfL) dated 29 July 2024.

Transport for London



To:	Samuel Uff/ John McRory
From:	Melvyn Dresner
cc	Patricia Charleton, Neal King, Christopher Barry, Alan Smart, Sara Shoukris
Borough Ref	HGY/2024/1008
Email:	melvyn.dresner@tfl.gov.uk
Date:	29 th July 2024

Tottenham Hotspurs Stadium – Extra Events

Overview

In response to TfL request for funding of LU and LO staff for additional events, Quod's letter of 23rd July 2024, explains why the TfL request does not meet the relevant tests for planning obligations. It raises four points:

1. No adverse transport impact/ insufficient capacity – major events already permitted at the stadium do adversely affect the transport network and existing passengers; TfL successfully manages this impact by resourcing extra staff on event days. TfL's request for additional funding is to deal with further additional impacts, to assist with increased footfall from stadium visitors and to ensure any potential adverse effects on stations do not occur.
2. There is no correlation between the fixed contribution being sought and the number of events taking place and therefore staffing requirements - this is addressed below in more detail.
3. Farebox – it is assumed that about the farebox revenue would be more evenly distributed throughout the year and help create a more even pattern of staffing requirements. This is also flawed and is considered below. .
4. TfL did not seek contributions for funding with the original application and refers to TfL current financial position not being relevant to planning. The funding requested is based on TfL's assessment of the development impact on the transport network of additional events including cumulative impact - Policy T4 C and E. The package of mitigation secured with the original NDP proposal considered the transport impacts assessed and the maximum number of non-football major events proposed (10 major and 6 concerts with a maximum capacity of 55,000 persons). This is considered below along with points 1 and 2.

The principle that TfL can secure section 106 funding for new or additional major events from venues throughout London has already been established at various venues. TfL secured or agreed mitigation for the ABBA Arena at Pudding Mill Lane, Madison Square Gardens (subsequently refused) in Stratford, and at Wimbledon (Tennis – forthcoming Mayoral hearing).

Development, Site Description and Transport Context

The application is for a minor material amendment under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act for the variation to Condition B9 (Major Non-association Football Events) of the hybrid planning permission HGY/2023/2137 (as amended) for amendments to allow up to 30 major non-association football events including music concerts, and other associated changes. This compares to 16 currently permitted, so an additional 14 major events per year.

The site is located close to the A1010 High Road, which forms part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The A10 Bruce Grove / A1010 High Road junction and the A406 North Circular Road / A1010 Fore Street junction are approximately 1km to the south and 1.4km north respectively and are the nearest points of vehicular access to the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) from the site.

White Hart Lane station (London Overground and Greater Anglia services) is located 500 metres to the north-west of the site, and Bruce Grove station, is 900 metres south. Northumberland Park station (National Rail services) is located 800 metres to the east.

The nearest parts of the London Underground network are accessible by train or bus at Seven Sisters station (Victoria Line and London Overground) which is over 2km south, and Tottenham Hale (Victoria Line), which is 2.3km to south west.

The nearest bus stops to the site are located along the High Road served by 149, 259, 279, 349, and N279, other bus routes can be access at Northumberland Park (341, 476, W3). The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 5, where 0 is the least accessible, and 6b the most accessible.

Public Transport Improvements

There have been several transport improvements since 2015, which TfL acknowledges, this has been primarily funded to support regeneration and growth in the local area, including the stadium and its masterplan, major housing proposal, as well as development in the wider Upper Lea Valley. Some of the growth has come forward, some under construction and much in the planning pipeline (committed development and allocated sites).

Northumberland Park station was upgraded in 2017, as part of the wider improvement to rail capacity between Stratford and Angel Road, including a third track. Angel Road Station was replaced by a new station called Meridian Water in May 2019, which is located closer to the stadium. Phase 1 of Meridian Water is only beginning to be occupied. It is worth noting that major events at the Drumsheds are restricted due to potential conflict with events at the Stadium.

TfL completed improvements to White Hart Lane Station in August 2019, creating step free access from street to platform for the first time, in addition to a better access via a new station forecourt on Love Lane and towards the High Road. They have improved access from the stadium and wider masterplan including sites close to the station and within wider corridor such as High Street West.

At Tottenham Hale, TfL altered access and built a new bus station, and upgraded the taxi rank. TfL created new landmark entrance to the station, enlarged and integrated station concourse to reduce crowding and queuing. Network Rail created step-free access to National Rail platforms via two new lifts and a bridge. TfL replaced the existing lift to the Tube to create step-free access from street to train. These works were completed in November 2022. Plots in the wider masterplan plan are being developed.

Haringey Council has also introduced improvements to public realm on White Hart Lane and around Northumberland Park.

Tottenham Hotspur's Stadium Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) has been introduced as part of the stadium planning permission. This has been in practice since 2019, and subject to refinement. This has been designed to limit impact on residents and businesses; when there are event days, as well as to manage flows to and from the stadium.

TfL and other transport operators have invested in the transport network. TfL's request for funding relates to what we need to cater for further major non-football events, noting that it already absorbs the cost of current events. TfL's advice set out below is that extra events generate impacts that require funding for staff. TfL requests that either that the planning condition restricting number of events remains, or if the Council decides to allow more major events that extra funding for staffing is required for both LO and LU.

The transport network is put under strain when events are hosted at the Stadium. The experience of a recent non-football event (the Travis Scott concert on 11th July) showed loadings on the network well in excess of capacity before and after the event concerned. It is therefore reasonable to request mitigation for this as the strain exerted would not be present without the event. This is particularly the case where non-football events are concerned, with event attendees who may be making an ad hoc trip, are less familiar with the transport connections available and are therefore more likely to rely on the most obvious routes to access the stadium e.g. via White Hart Lane station. This puts more pressure on specific routes with mitigations being required from staff to help manage queuing and to direct unfamiliar customers to alternative routing options to minimise crowding levels and customer journey times. Additional events do generate extra staff and resource requirements as each event requires a significant resource on the ground to manage customer flows.

Impact of extra events on transport network and mitigation required

Planning conditions have already been imposed to restrict the number of non-football and concert events per year to mitigate adverse impacts on the local area and on the transport network. Neither the original TA in 2015 or the current application consider the cumulative effect of additional non-football events. TfL has considered this aspect in our response, and identified this as transport impact that needs addressing, and has proposed mitigation that is considered necessary and reasonable. There is no dispute that major events at the stadium can be accommodated on the transport network. However, the acute impact of increased number per year at local stations is a major concern for TfL.

LU uses Special Requirements Team (SRT) for certain major events such as football matches to complement other background station staff, and when the number (and regularity) of such events increases, then the ability of this team to mitigate the impact is reduced.

Additional LU station staff for Tottenham Hotspur Stadium events are supported by LU Special Requirements Team (SRT) resources, reflecting the infrequent occurrence for station design and the management requirements overlay for Tottenham Hotspur Stadium events and to be in line with the station Congestion Control and Emergency Plan (CCEP). Existing station staff are required to make the station operate safely, including regular security checks, and to escort disabled people between platforms and entrances.

As stated in the planning statement: during major events, the Stadium is served by four stations (White Hart Lane (LO), Northumberland Park (NR), Tottenham Hale (LU + NR) and Seven Sisters (LU+LO)) with shuttle bus services connecting a further two (Wood Green (LU) and Alexandra Palace (NR) stations).

Certain local roads (including the High Road) are closed for a period prior and bus routes are diverted. This can cause delay to local buses (and inconvenience for passengers), and it takes time for the bus network to recover from each closure. Crowds exiting and queuing around all the stations can also impact on bus operations and existing customers accessing our services.

For LU to process customers through the station in the most expedient and safe manner and to prevent congestion around the escalators, Underground Ticketing System (UTS) gates are

routinely left open during events, therefore somewhat negating any additional revenue (more about farebox later).

Both LU and LO need to deploy extra staff at their station when there are major events (non-football and football). The cumulative effect on existing operations, existing major events and with additional events at the stadium means that it may not be possible with current staffing levels to cover all the proposed future events, TfL is seeking funding to mitigate that risk. TfL will make practicable measures to staff these additional events. However, without funding that is less likely, and the potential for more adverse effects meaning the increased risk that we will not be able to stop trains at some or all of the stations and transport operators may need to restrict access to the stations, which could affect the popularity and experience for visitors to the Stadium as well as other “background” users.

LU and LO aim to be cost neutral whilst ensuring that sufficient staffing levels are available for every event at the stadium. Currently, it is not always possible to cover existing events on overtime or altered working let alone, these additional events make reaching appropriate staffing less easy.

To increase from 16 to 30 major events at Tottenham Hotspur Stadium would require a more regulated pattern of staffing, and less reliance on SRT. To establish that, TfL has requested for LU services additional eight staff plus supervisor, £675,000 per annum contribution being sought by TfL (for least 10 years).

Arriva Rail London (London Overground); in order to safely manage crowds on the London Overground network during THFC Stadium events, ARL incurs additional costs of £9,290.30 per event. TfL are asking for this amount of funding for every THFC Stadium non-football event above the original 16 non-football events. This request would be indefinite (or for as long as the licence is agreed for the 30 x non-football stadium events) as we would be incurring these costs for the life of the stadium.

Policy T4 of the London Plan (Assessment and mitigating transport impacts) states that, where appropriate, mitigation will be required to address adverse transport impacts (criteria c). To emphasise, we already provide extra staff on the LO and LU for major events at the Stadium to manage demand in line with requirements. Without additional funding as requested we will not be able to do that for any additional major events, whereas with secure funding package we could.

Farebox

The assumption that TfL’s additional costs could be met by the farebox is flawed for the following reasons:

1. It mis-understands the context of fares and how the finances of TfL, as an integrated transport authority, operate. Fares revenue is used to cover the general operation of the transport system at the network level. Fares income does not cover the full costs of running, maintaining/renewing or investing in the system.
2. Revenue cannot be broken down or ring-fenced to a particular station – that is not how an integrated transport system works. Fares income is a complex result across the network of the many different journeys passengers make in the course of a day. Many of the journeys will be on travelcards or in the context of a daily cap or could be concessionary fares, and we have the added issue that we need to keep gate lines open for major events, compromising revenue protection.

3. While more people overall on the system generate more fares they also generate more costs and operational, maintenance challenges – extra development cause impacts on the system that need to be mitigated.

In this context it is impossible to argue that any additional revenue could be used in such a way. That is not a mitigation for the impacts and does not provide a mechanism to mitigate the impacts or safely operate stations in the context of the very specific and additional demands that will be placed on it by the development by additional major events.

Summary

To conclude, a contribution towards additional staff to manage further additional non-football events is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms because, event day demand will have an adverse impact on the transport network. The nature of demand (additional footfall and crowding) arises directly from the development, and the amount requested is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

Notwithstanding the above, we will wish to openly discuss payments and review mechanism to help ensure there are sufficient staffing resources to safely and effectively manage additional major events at the stadium. We would want to ensure that there is a positive experience for visitors to the Stadium, and for background users, and the continued success of the development, and the capacity and safety of the transport network will be a crucial part of this overall experience.

This page is intentionally left blank