

Appendix 9 – Neighbour Representations

Commentator	Comment	Response
Flat 1, Mallory Court, resident.	As a resident of Mallory Court, my flat is south-facing (views out of the windows look out to the stadium) which will be adjacent to the proposed new high-rise block of flats. My concern is such a high-rise tower will block the natural sunlight coming into the flat which will cause my flat to become naturally darker meaning the need to turn the lights on during the day, increasing my energy bills. This demand in unnecessary energy use will put extra pressure on the wider grid and exacerbate climate change. Has Haringey council and the developers thought about local residents (particularly Mallory Court residents) who will be living in the dark and in the shadow of this monstrous high-rise block of flats for years to come?	The proposed development would impact on daylight and sunlight enjoyed by residents of Mallory Court. This is considered in detail in the report.
14 Cooperage Close, resident.	I have examined the planning application and I wish to offer my full support to the proposed regeneration. This development will provide a much-needed facelift to this neglected part of the capital as the current appearance of the area is in need of substantial revitalisation.	
28 Rivers Apartments, resident.	I fully support the planning application. As a lifelong resident in Tottenham, I fully understand the need to redevelop the area, in order to bring prosperity to a part of London that has been neglected since I've lived here. The plans for new residential homes, retail/cafe use and a new public open space will have far reaching benefits to current and new residents in Tottenham, and will help to transform the area.	
38 The Lindales, Grasmere Road, Resident.	Objection – I have no further comments at this time.	
Flat 45, Lorenzo House, 9 College Road, resident.	Concern at accident on a building site in the past that resulted from scaffolding not secure enough.	
58 Newbury House, residnet	<p>TENURE SEGREGATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the indicative area schedules in Appendix 1 to the Financial Viability statement, we can see how the architects have artfully separated the housing tenures in this proposed development. • Blocks A and B are 100% market homes, Block C has market homes accessible by the core, and 2 accessible intermediate and 1 accessible social rent homes which do not use the lifts. Block D has 16 market and 16 intermediate apartments in separate wings (D1 and 	

D2) which use the core, and 6 accessible social rent homes which do not use the lifts. Block E is 100% social rent homes, Block F has 6 intermediate dwellings, and Block G has 23 intermediate dwellings, with 2 accessible market homes which do not share the core or lifts.

- Therefore, no Market and social rent resident will ever use the same core and lifts. This is social segregation, which is unacceptable.
- Presumably the developer believes that owner occupiers and private renters are prejudiced against social renters, and unwilling to share any internal communal spaces with them. We do not believe that this is true.
- As we have seen at Welborne at Tottenham Hale, this segregation is likely to mean that internal finish and standards in the communal areas will be lower in Block E (100% social rent homes), and this is unacceptable.

ADDRESSING LOCAL HOUSING NEEDS

- This application does not comply with the Local Plan in that it provides only new (23% affordable homes by number of dwellings (and 25% by habitable room) as opposed to the policy requirement of 40%.
- This proposal would tend to price local people out by over providing unaffordable housing, tending to increase house prices and market rents in the surrounding area. The applicant should demonstrate its commitment to the area by proposing a policy-compliant scheme.
- The affordable housing tenure split used in this application, a 60:40 preference for intermediate rather than low cost rent, does not address local housing need.
- Intermediate affordable housing requires deposits or advance payments, in a borough where 48% of households have no savings or are in debt, according to Haringey Council's most recent Housing Needs Survey (2013).
- Nor does it address the equalities issues, where the Housing Needs Survey shows that by ethnicity of household reference person, 74% of households headed by an Asian person have no savings or are in debt; 69% of households headed by a black person have no savings or are in debt; and 61% of households headed by someone of mixed heritage have no savings or are in debt.
- The GLA's most recent Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment shows a net annualised requirement for 65% affordable housing, consisting of 47% low cost - social - affordable rent and 18% intermediate. This is the minimum provision needed to begin to address local housing need.
- Low Cost Rent and Affordable Rent must mean Social Rent, in accordance with the amended Appendix C of Haringey Council's Housing Strategy.
- The social housing provided should be in the form of Council housing with secure permanent tenancies and Social Rents set according to the government's social rent setting

	<p>Guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Haringey Council has started a Full Scrutiny Review of the High Road West project. This will consider the issues of affordable housing and the gentrification effect, and this present application should be paused until the Full Scrutiny Review has been completed. 	
<p>Brook House Primary School</p>	<p>Tottenham Hotspur have been highly proactive in building relationships and working in collaboration with Brook House Primary School to positively impact our children's education and create memorable learning experiences. We have already received many benefits, including high quality coaching from their youth development team, for our children as part of the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation community offer. As a Primary school, we sincerely believe that the new residential development would further increase their capacity to further build upon their already strong community links and offer more services; which would ultimately contribute and impact the aspirations of our children positively.</p> <p>In addition, their proposals would have a wider impact for our community including a new public square to be enjoyed by local residents and promote increased community cohesion, new cafes, multi-use games areas and events and community programmes. The plans will undoubtedly provide new jobs and employment opportunities to promote community aspirations and contribute to an increased sense of pride, community spirit and cohesion.</p> <p>As a neighbouring Primary School to the proposed development, we wholeheartedly support their application.</p>	
<p>Cannon Road Residents' Group</p>	<p>Proximity of Mallory Court to the new building proposed directly south (Block D), appears to be in places as tight as 10m away, which seems uncomfortably close, from both a privacy and sunlight perspective. If it's essential to have some areas as close as this, can we confirm on the new build it will be low use spaces at these 'pinch points' that retain privacy e.g. stairwells without windows. If not, we would ask to alter the design to reduce this impact. Otherwise, sunlight reports indicate a notable impact on Mallory Court, so we would ask about brightening/reflective exteriors to bounce light between Mallory Court and block B. The same comment goes with block C: use of a lighter exterior than shown in the plans to aid natural brightness, especially for residents towards the bottom floors of Rivers Apartments.</p> <p>We recognise several resident concerns around height of the tallest building and obstruction of views. Plans here significantly differ from the tapering of height implied in the original masterplan. We request information on distance between south facing wall of Rivers Apartments and the north face of Block B, alongside an indicator of the 'degrees' of view that</p>	

will be restricted by the new building, to truly understand this impact.

The positioning proposed for Block B feels messy, not fully aligned with other high-rises in the vicinity, as first indicated in the master plan. Understanding that this is mostly down to National Rail ownership of a small triangle of land along the rail track, it seems sensible that National Rail would be approached to take control of this space into the development. Repositioning this tower would provide a better visual cohesion between all the developments in the high road west plans, which is sensible given the significant long term investment being made here. Alongside, the lack of practical usage National Rail will ever have of this land (it doesn't seem to currently have a use or a foreseeable use), makes its lack of inclusion in the development even more frustrating: By adding this land to the site, further provision could be provided, such as bike racks, outdoor café seating, car club parking etc.

(Electric) Car club spaces - car club spaces were indicated on the Cannon Road site in planning stages but never delivered. In a development where parking facilities are not available to all this has a notable impact and should be implemented here to future-proof the community.

We also request for pre-school facilities to be integrated in the plan, as our development is working through family stages and there is lack of choice very locally.

Regarding the park and pathway leading to the station, security is a concern - lighting and CCTV feels essential for these areas to be a success.

The current site boundary wall and its importance for security on the Cannon road site - both to underground parking areas and resident gardens will need more detailed consideration. Our residents group would like to be involved in the decisions being made here when appropriate.

We also welcome an ability and intention to collaborate with Cannon Road services where possible to reduce service charges for both existing and new residents – notably here, standing charges on the heating systems and a shared concierge service. If the role of a shared concierge is taken, it will be critical to provide a post storage space for this role to be valued by new residents. Currently, concierge on our site are unable to take parcels for residents due to a lack of storage facilities. With proliferation of online retail this is an essential concierge service for residences - it may have been an oversight in building Cannon Road, but shouldn't be for future developments.

Although this comment mostly contains criticism and suggestions for improvement, it should be

	<p>noted that we are broadly in favour of the changes proposed and welcome positive impacts from redevelopment here.</p>	
<p>Newlon Housing Trust</p>	<p>As the scheme's immediate neighbour, we welcome a residential led planning application. The proposed scheme is well designed and will integrate our affordable housing estate (Cannon Road) into a completely rejuvenated neighbourhood;</p> <p>In particular, we support and welcome the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing superstore and car park have been a source of Anti-Social Behaviour. This has noticeably improved in the last two years but it is still an inhospitable area at night and a source of concern for some residents. A residential led scheme will transform the area, making it safer and much more welcoming. • The new scheme will link into Cannon Road and will result in the opening up of Newlon's roadways and access routes, leading to the integration of our estate into the wider masterplan area. Our residents will have access to new landscaped areas, better connectivity to public transport and community resources. This was part of our s106 commitment and we welcome its implementation. • Getting rid of the wall between Cannon Road and the proposed scheme will perhaps be the biggest improvement. The previous site owner refused to lower the wall and, due to its condition, we were forced to build a false wall to protect our estate. With hindsight this is quite ugly, it also blocks light and creates a huge barrier. Our residents will strongly welcome this aspect of the proposed scheme. • We also welcome the proposed playground extension as this will transform the Brook House School's ability to access safe play areas. The school is an important community asset and hub for our residents and the proposed facilities will further strengthen community relationships. • Finally, the proposed scheme is also an opportunity to share resources, which will benefit residents of both developments. For example, our 24-hour concierge service and CCTV at Cannon Road can be extended to residents of the new scheme. This would generate economies of scale and assist in reducing costs and service charges for both residential schemes. 	