

Appendix 3: Internal and External Consultee Representations

Commentator	Comment	Response
<p>Cannon Road Residents' Group</p> <p>(see also re-consultation on design revisions below)</p>	<p>I would like to confirm that Cannon Road Residents' Group strongly object to these new plans. Core reasons for this objection are outlined in sections below.</p> <p><u>High rise positioning and density:</u> The previously accepted plans, which we had no overall objection to and saw as being balanced and reasonable were at our realistic limit in what level of height and distance we'd be comfortable to have another high rise in relation to the Rivers Apartments building. The previous plans, to confirm, were 50m away, façade to façade. This distance in the new application has now reduced to 30m and will have significant impacts on both privacy and direct light for our residents, especially on the lower levels of Rivers Apartments, where BRE recommended light levels will not even be reached under this new plan.</p> <p>Even though the developer has worked on slim and reflective design for these new buildings, there is nothing they are able to do to make a living room window that is 40% closer not appear 40% closer.</p> <p>The applicant has also been exceptionally considerate in how the three NEW skyscrapers will be positioned in relation to each other, to maximise 3 factors - privacy, light and south facing views. Yet, for the only existing building (Rivers Apartments) there has been no regard for this at all - decisions involving light, privacy and south facing views are almost as bad as you could practically choose to make for our building. We would expect the developer to be as conscientious about maintaining a level of quality housing in existing homes as they are being with the future buildings, but from every angle we look at the changes made in this new application we can't see any attempt at this.</p> <p>Given the Goods Yard is cleared and first to be developed, there is plenty of space between the two pieces of land to look at shifting the Depot building (and other high rises) further south in the proposal, to be more similar to the previous planned layout. We believe the applicant could still provide the same quality of design and similar number of homes while keeping at least 50m distance between us and the next skyscraper, and we are not in a position to accept any plans that do not consider this.</p> <p>We don't believe we are being unrealistic here. We know aspects of the area need development. We know Haringey needs more homes and the developer is required as a</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>business, with shareholders, to make an amount of money from development of this land. However, the new proposal and the changes being suggested fundamentally mean the applicant is making additional money from this development at the expense of Rivers Apartments leaseholders.</p> <p>As you progress through our other comments you'll notice that are other factors, aside from our light and privacy, which will also make this building more sensible and liveable for new residents if it is further South from the Rivers Apartments building.</p> <p>Having been in pre-application conversation where this positioning change was discussed, the reasoning for putting all the high rises closer together and further towards the North of the site was for what appeared to be only explained as 'heritage reasons'. This does not feel justified given the impact on lives and privacy of both our residents and new residents for as long as these buildings stand (hopefully several generations). The liveability of homes built in the area should surely be a higher priority for both developer and Haringey council than any of these buildings sitting 20m closer to a listed/heritage building, which is visually sheltered from all surrounding buildings by trees anyway. Choosing to make residents live in below BRE recommended light conditions for the sake of some historic bricks not being a bit closer to new tiles and glass seems a poor decision for people that actually live in Haringey, participate in the local community and economy and pay council tax. There is of course a balance to be made here, and if it is required that the South Goods Yard high rise will need to be shorter to accommodate this, then that should be the solution here, especially given the original HRW plan was for buildings that scale down in size drastically more than is being suggested here.</p> <p><u>HRW guidelines and Depot positioning:</u> Previously on a pre-application call with application architects, the applicant indicated that the Depot high rise positioning had been done in this way (i.e. Not the closest building to the train line or aligned with the other high rises, as would be expected given HRW guidelines) to reduce wind tunnel impact on the Rivers apartments roof garden. We haven't been able to find anything in the wind report files that substantiate this claim, and would expect any reason provided to build against the HRW guidelines would come with robust documentation and a rationale that has a net benefit for the existing community. Our opinion, having looked at previous and updated plans in detail, is that the key change between the previous application and the new application provides ALL south facing windows on ALL three new high rises access to 'profit inducing' views and that is the real driver behind the updated application ' more views' and more flats with these views.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>The applicant provided images to us, at Rivers Apartments, of what our 'view' would look like with the new buildings. However, they have only provided this view from the very South East corner of our building. We are certain that if the same image was created for the South West corner, what would actually be seen by our residents is TWO high rises, both 29+ stories high. Our residents have always expected to be built in front of, but given the clear building positioning guidelines provided on HRW plans and the consistent community feedback that the visual impact of high rises should be limited and aligned with the train track, we never envisaged that a proposal with buildings so blatantly out of step would even be considered by Haringey council.</p> <p>We understand and accept there is no such thing as a 'right to a view', but equally, the applicant actively going against the HRW guidelines to provide a city view to more future owners, and putting two high rises in our eyeline to do so should not be accepted by Haringey council either.</p> <p>The previous application justified the Depot tower positioning in this way because they intended to have a path to White Hart Lane running to the West of the depot tower. It is sensible for safety and security reasons to have moved this in the new application, but to have left the building out of alignment, and build shorter properties in this space instead, this needs correcting.</p> <p><u>Noise impact assessment:</u> Noise disruption is a significant issue already for residents at Cannon Road, and given our proximity to the new development, especially The Depot tower, in its new position just 30m away, we would expect that our feedback on significant noise issues would have been integrated into the noise impact assessment work so that historical mistakes would at least not be repeated, and at best, might even reduce sound impact on our existing residents. Many residents are already at breaking point with some disruption we deal with, so to find that nothing has been added to the report, even though the applicant AND Haringey Council have been informed in BCLG meetings we find completely unacceptable. (we will happily share more details on this outside of the planning comments in BCLG meetings).</p> <p>To be specific, there are two core issues here that we believe make the noise impact assessment completely null and void.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>1. Lanhedge Lane industrial estate CO2 Gas Company N18 2TQ:</p> <p>This is a company situated just north of Cannon Road. The nature of their work causes extremely sudden and distressing gas noises which have been known to occur at any time of day, and day of the week (e.g.5.30 am on a Sunday). The sounds are loud enough to be heard and wake someone through closed windows. Knowing that you might be woken at 5am by a noise that resembles someone spraying deodorant in your ear is not a good way to stay healthy, nor an attractive feature for a high end flat to be sold at full market value. I have measured the noises from a bedroom, with window ajar and its often +15dB on the base level sound. Residents on the East side of our development are most impacted, with 90% of those who replied to us saying the business impacts their ability to sleep.</p> <p>Having raised this business and the problems we face with the applicant and councillors (BCLG) in February 2020 and asking why planning permission was granted to convert the Cannon Road site into residential (from industrial) given this type of work there was a bit of an apology and suggestion that sometimes things get missed. This is understandable, but to miss them now, when you've been informed by existing residents is not. Above this, Jennifer Barratt had been in discussion with us about this business since 2020 and when emailed by the noise impact assessor for this application she did not even reply. Anyone with regard for the future residents of the Depot site should have requested the business be included in an assessment, given the East façade of the Depot tower will have direct sight of this noise source too. Although this business is not in Haringey, it has a significant impact and must be considered.</p> <p>Fundamentally, even with the best window systems in the world, the outdoor amenity spaces on the Depot will often be a struggle to enjoy and the best solution for all parties might be to work with the gas company to support relocation, if they are willing.</p> <p>In the previous application this Depot building was 20m further away, which would have reduced the impact. With the previous location Ambrose Court would have also acted as more of a sound blockade and limit direct sound waves from the noise source too. In the new positioning the whole East side of the depot tower will have direct visibility of this business.</p> <p>2. Train stock change in 2020 and impact on both noise and vibrations from trainline:</p> <p>The vibration assessment in section 8 of the document was taken in 2017. On 22nd December 2020 I raised with the applicant (BCLG with Haringey council members present) that in recent</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>months our building had started having physically notable vibration issues. With investigation, we understand this is as a result of the change in train stock on the Overground Line. The new trains are 50% heavier than ones used before 2020, and in combination with a local defect on the rails situated somewhere between our building and where the Depot building would be, it is causing both audibly louder noise with trains passing and these vibrations.</p> <p>With this information, the vibration assessment is clearly inadequate and out of date - Carried out in 2017, but also at a location halfway down the Goods Yard, and nowhere near the local defect that causes vibrations, it does not reflect the current scenario and puts the developer at risk of building homes on the Depot site that vibrate unreasonably, perhaps even worse than ours given the slender design of these new buildings. In personal correspondence with Network Rail to understand the issue, they have implied that the local defect is due to have some work done in ‘a couple of years’, but they can’t say whether this will improve the vibration impact on our building, and therefore the vibration impact on any future buildings either.</p> <p>From our perspective, the vibration calculations need to be redone at the top West corner of the Depot site. If there are concerns about vibration here the council/ applicant will need to work with Network Rail to bring that rail defect fix in as early as possible so accurate checks for the longer term vibration risk can then be undertaken.</p> <p>Noise created at this track defect is also louder now than it has been in the past. Given the noise experienced by our residents at this track defect, we are somewhat surprised that only cat 3 glazing is proposed for the west side of the high rise in the depot site.</p> <p>The previous plans had this building 20m further south, and further away from the local track defect, which would reduce the risk of vibration impact. However, given the significant change in conditions since 2017 we would still suggest this is checked again, even with the previously accepted plans.</p> <p><u>Plant noise limits:</u> IF this application is approved, it is essential that the definition of ‘affected façade’ here is clarified and aligns with the experience of NSRs. For us, this means measuring the noise impact at a balcony on the south side of Rivers Apartments, 5-14 floors up, and determining that the noise limits of 37 and 34 dB are also held from this position. The current location of ST4 is not adequate at all, especially for the first phases of this development : the B&M building will shelter ground level monitoring from the majority, if not all of the noise from development</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>work. Meanwhile, our residents will be able to actively see the noise sources of all this development work for the next 7 years. (Seeing a noise source makes it significantly more likely you'll be able to hear it, from our basic understanding of physics and living in a high rise in this area for 6 years).</p> <p>Once work on the Depot high rise starts there will be additional impact from noise reflected back at Rivers Apartments from the newly build Goods Yard high rise. The ST4 position probably won't pick up the nature of this either. Measuring must be done fairly and accurately here.</p> <p>We also want to understand over what timeframe the dB Max. Lar threshold is calculated as this doesn't seem to be noted. We would request that this information is recorded and published to us and council at both the minute and hourly level and a minute based reasonable limit is also set, to ensure intermittent very loud noises aren't ignored by an average calculation. You'll be aware from above comments on gas noises that we find this form of sporadic loud noise extremely challenging already.</p> <p>The fact the shipping containers have already been located at the far end of the site implies to us that the developer are expecting to need to mitigate breaches in these noise limits, knowing they will not keep to them at all times. These shipping containers will do basically nothing to protect residents above the second floor of a 21 storey building with direct views of all building areas, so we would like to ask that further mitigation is put in place to allow our residents to continue with their normal activities as much as possible without disruption.</p> <p>There is nothing in the noise document that indicates what mitigation measures would be used during the 2022-2028 construction phases, but we would like to see this and understand how many would work practically for a high rise. Alongside, we would like to propose a suggestion for mitigation - taking two of our ground floor 'business spaces', (which to date have had no business use outside cladding replacement), and converting them into workspaces with noise insulated booths and community space for residents on Cannon Road to use during construction hours. Given the number of residents that expect to work from home at least 40% of the time post-pandemic and the number of years over which this development disruption is going to take place, we are concerned that it will have a lasting impact on the mental, physical and financial health of residents, where career and educational progression is stifled. We also have a number of children on the development that, over the next 7 years will develop into teenagers and need to make decisions about the value of education in their futures. To be able</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>to create a suitable space for them to do homework, away from distractions at home, and make connections with professionals also using the workspace; this would be the kind of investment in the local community we'd expect the developer to consider a valuable long term contribution anyway. Newlon have also suggested recently that the spaces could be used rent free if there was a compelling resident use for them.</p> <p><u>Air quality:</u> The documents suggest at least two locations for air quality monitors - given the SW prevailing wind direction we would expect one of these to be located on the roof of the B&M building, and then during demolition move to the perimeter wall of Mallory court private gardens, at the end closest to the B&M building.</p> <p><u>Concluding Statement:</u> We hope these comments and observations will be helpful in making a decision on this new planning application. We will again reiterate that we are not against development of these areas, however it must be done with a high level of consideration for, and learning from, the existing community. We have not seen that in this planning application. We object to this application.</p>	
Lawrence Road resident	<p>Obviously, there are concerns about the viability of future phases because I assume that Spurs have much of the more lucrative residential uses in their section. It'd be disappointing if this application justified its design within a masterplan which couldn't be delivered when ownership is split this way. But I do support the densification of housing and a mix of tenures in this area for reasons of economic, environmental and community sustainability.</p> <p>There is a lack of east/west connection and pedestrian permeability at the north end of the site, which is understandable (due to the railway), but a problem. Ideally something could be done about that with the introduction of a subway at College or Durban Roads.</p> <p>The lower rise buildings vary a lot in styles which is a bit odd, but is presumably an effort to add diversity. Buildings fronting White Hart Lane are the most successful with relevant nods to local historic typologies. Most are decent enough efforts although many are rather generic and Block E in the Depot is probably the worst. Not to say that its form is terrible but it does feel like they had run out of time when they came to designing it. Something of a more tectonic expression, or some mannerism in the treatment of openings might help lift it from being very generic and poor. There's a bit too much reverence for Hawkins Brown and Morris and Co, when you'd</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>hope that the architects might be looking at slightly more interesting work, whether past or present. Stephen Taylor is the better precedent that's shown but the scheme doesn't take any of the lessons of that project (e.g. of detail and specificity).</p> <p>I object to the facade treatment of the three towers, in that they are to read so individually, both from each other and from the rest of the city. Clearly they differentiate themselves anyway by being tall, but that isn't necessarily a problem per se. I quite like the massing, form and clustering (including the modulation of heights) of the towers, but the surface treatments are just that; a shallow, wallpapering exercise which shouts much louder than its substance warrants. The careful form, mass and heights are enough of a statement already, they don't need to be three different colours and then have that awful, 'semi-revealed sheath' expression which shows the grey tiles to the tops. There is little great precedent for that in architecture, so it draws huge attention to a purely graphic gesture which is therefore both metaphorically and physically shallow. The interesting tiling that's proposed to lower levels of these towers, with its texture and articulation in the facades is much more successful and probably enough (with some additional variation between ground and top) to carry the full facades of all three. In my view all should be in a single colour which relates back to the surroundings (i.e. like the redder, brick-like colour of the southernmost tower), or at least three subtly different tones of the same colour. Making each tower a contrasting colour seems again to be an exercise in drawing attention to each constituent part of a cluster which will already get plenty of notice because of its height. The cluster should be considered not as a feature in itself but as part of a whole. There are numerous other tall buildings on the skyline and they don't/shouldn't all compete for as much attention as possible. When they all shout loudly we end up with a chaotic zoo of iconic gesturing on what should be (for the most part) a background. So, I would very much prefer the simplification of the facade treatment of these towers.</p> <p>The landscaping seems decent although there's always a sense (like many similar schemes) that the dial on the amount of planting is always turned down slightly. In a climate emergency we should be dialling it up and making a virtue of it. Developers rarely commit to more than the minimum planting because they think of it only as a cost that they can't sell on, rather than as an asset that will raise the value of the parts that they can. I wonder if they're hitting their Urban Greening Factor target and if not, they should be required to.</p>	
Love Lane Residents' Association	In the Love Lane Residents' Charter (February 2014), we stated that the following design principles should apply to the High Road West Regeneration:	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our residents do not want to live in a high rise and high density 'concrete jungle' of poorly designed housing, with poor local facilities and badly maintained open spaces. • Return to a more traditional street layout, opening out on to the High Street. • Buildings of a traditional design. • Mix of different types and sizes of homes, including the provision of houses with gardens. • A mix of housing tenures owner-occupiers, private rented and social housing, the majority of which need to be affordable to local people in order to avoid social polarisation. • That it should not be possible to distinguish between the different tenures, which should be mixed within the buildings and floors. On the Love Lane Estate council tenants live side-by-side with temporary tenants, private tenants and owner-occupiers and that helps to foster a socially integrated community. <p>We do not consider that the scheme(s) proposed fulfil those criteria.</p> <p>In particular, we are concerned about the following matters:</p> <p><u>Proposed building heights.</u> At least one high rise building of 32 storeys is proposed in the planning application and that is out of character with the area. If approved, it will lead to more high-rise buildings being built in the High Road West area. The maximum heights of housing should respect current heights and not be above ten stories.</p> <p><u>Density levels.</u> The current housing density on the Love Lane Estate is around 90 dwellings per hectare. This proposed development will be well in excess of that figure, setting a pattern of much higher housing densities in the area. It will create a densely packed neighbourhood in an area that is already cramped and crowded.</p> <p><u>Travel.</u> The increased capacity of the new Spurs Stadium and the increased number of events planned has had a dramatic impact on the everyday lives of our residents. Pre-covid, it is virtually impossible on match days for our residents to move around the area freely on foot, bicycle, car, and on public transport. Indeed, many of residents are unwilling to venture out at those times and they are effectively trapped within their homes. More residents will make an already bad situation much worse.</p> <p><u>Affordable housing.</u> The scheme does not provide sufficient housing – particularly of social rented housing – that the local community can afford to live in. On the Love Lane Estate, there are 80+ homeless households who have placed in homes that are below their assessed</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>housing need – in other words, living in overcrowded conditions. There are also many hidden households on Love Lane (adult children still living with their parents and unable to find a home of their own). Council housing across the neighbourhood is in very short supply.</p> <p><u>Lack of green space.</u> Green and open space is already at a premium in the area. Recent Research by Friends of the Earth (2020) has placed the Northumberland Park Ward amongst the worst “green-space deprived” wards in England. The green space proposed in the planning application does little to address the problem of the lack of public open space. Very few, if any, private gardens are provided by the proposed scheme. The Covid-19 pandemic has shown how important public and private green space is for people’s well-being.</p> <p><u>Pressure on local services.</u> The rise in the numbers of properties proposed on both sites will increase the population of the area, placing additional strain on already stretched local services – e.g., the transport infrastructure, health facilities, child-care provision and local schools.</p> <p><u>Overlooking and loss of daylight.</u> The height of the taller buildings will create overlooking and overshadowing problems for neighbouring properties.</p>	
9 River Apartments	<p>I live at flat number 9 RIVERS APARTMENTS and work from home, we need a further review of the building application not to mention the noise disruption that will come from a seven year building site, also the new tower will block most of the sun light (BRE RECOMMENDED LEVELS)coming into my flat as well as the view.</p> <p>I feel this will affect my health both physically and mentally, in order for this application to be approved I feel the tower should be built further away from rivers apartments.</p>	
11 River Apartments	<p>I am not sure it is the case but We would like to have a through road access to White Hart Lane station from Rivers Apartments. Not having to go to High Street and back to White Hart Lane and then to the station when we walk will save as a lot of time.</p>	
26 River Apartments	<p>I am broadly in support of development and regeneration within this area but would like to raise some points identified within this consultation for the proposed developments at The Goods Yard and The Depot.</p> <p>I note that your noise and vibration survey was predominantly based on assessments undertaken in 2017 and 2019. This does not take into account the change in rolling stock for</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>the train line which has resulted in significantly greater noise and vibration levels when Overground trains pass through, felt and heard within our existing building, which will be a similar distance from the railway line as at least one of the new tower blocks. It is particularly noticeable and disruptive when trains pass over a defunct railway signal.</p> <p>The noise assessment did not factor in any noise from the light industrial units to the north of the Cannon Road development. There is a particular issue with one of the units (a CO2 gas supplier) who often starts working approximately 0600hrs. The noise emitted by the compressors is loud and piercing, enough to wake residents through closed windows. Due to the position of the new towers (particularly the one in The Depot) they may be affected due to noise travelling through the corridor formed by the proposed extension of Cannon Road into the new development. It is already disruptive to any resident with either north or east facing aspects in Rivers Apartments, and in upper floors of Ambrose Court on Cannon Road.</p> <p>The final issue I would like to raise is the amended position of the tower block for the Depot development. Under previously agreed plans, the tower was 50m from Rivers Apartments and not in a direct line. This allowed some distance and increased both privacy and light levels for residents of both blocks. The current plans have The Depot tower block only 30m away, and in a direct line. It also appears to be taller than the original plans, creating a greater shadow and visual footprint. The effect of these three changes will reduce privacy for those residents in south facing Rivers Apartments and north-facing Depot flats. I am also concerned that this will bring natural lighting levels below that recommended. It does not appear to have been considered as an impact on existing buildings, with current reports only identifying impacts for the new development.</p>	
35 River Apartments	<p>Our reasons for objecting to the planning application as it stands are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are already severely impacted by the vibrations from the train line next to Rivers Apartments (RA). The vibration assessment that was submitted within the application is from 2017, before the train stock change that happened in 2020 which causes the vibrations to River Apartments and therefore other buildings along the line. The track defects should be fixed with immediate effect before a current analysis can be run again to ensure the new building does not shake. • The new proposed closer proximity is not acceptable as it will leave residents on the lower floors with light levels below the recommended BRE standards. It also means our communal garden will now be overlooked by a loom 29 storey tower offering us no privacy. 	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South facing residents of Rivers Apartments will now have their view severely impacted by not one but two 29 storey buildings. We had always been told that RA would be the tallest building and that any further purpose-built flats in the surrounding areas (moving down towards the stadium) would not be as tall or impact so negatively on the RA views. This has been completely disregarded in the current proposal. • The coronavirus pandemic now means that many residents with RA will have some sort of flexible working policy and be able to work from home on a regular basis. We have recently been impacted for three years by our own remediation works and to put residents through this again for a further seven years is not acceptable. It will increase noise levels and affect our ability to work from home with ease and in turn potentially affect our mental health and work / life balance. • The previously agreed proposal was a lot more reasonable and considerate to local residents as opposed to the new proposed plans which directly contradict what was set out before with no consideration to how this will affect others. It's clearly now about making as much profit as possible by proposing huge towers which will seriously effect residents of RA way of life and will devalue the properties of those most affect by the new proposal. 	
<p>43 River Apartments</p> <p>(see also re-consultation on design revisions below)</p>	<p>When I bought my flat back in 2015 the plan was building 1 tower in the south yard as high as River Apartments.</p> <p>Now the plan changed for 2 huge towers (way higher then RA).</p> <p>I'm completely against it as will change my south views. Moreover, I'm against because if this was the initial plan I wouldn't have bought this flat.</p> <p>I wasn't consulted on the changes and I don't agree with them.</p>	
<p>44 River Apartments</p>	<p>When I moved to Rivers Apartments several years ago I was well aware of the planned building of new housing in The Goods Yard, however the original proposals have changed well beyond what they originally were and seem to show continued little consideration for existing residents. The proposed scheme will both block light from the Rivers Apartments building as well as provide reduced privacy both for those currently in the building as well as those in proposed new buildings. For those currently living on Cannon Road, we can no doubt expect that work times will bend to whatever whim is convenient for Tottenham Hotspur as well rather than the local residents given that the stadium building works appeared to consistently operate</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>outside reasonable and permitted times. I would appreciate if someone is able to explain why these plans have so consistently changed and why the current plans are deemed necessary?</p>	
<p>47 River Apartments</p>	<p>I am concerned that the building site is not fit for purpose due to the noise already in the area.</p> <p>The CO2 company in the Langhedge Lane Industrial Estate emits high pitch whistling noises when they are filling the tanks. This noise can begin before 6am, and is loud enough to be heard when the windows are closed. We have complained multiple times to the council which has not had any impact.</p>	
<p>48 River Apartments</p>	<p>While I completely support the redevelopment of the area, the welfare and rights of current residents are being overlooked. The towers being proposed will block light and infringe on the privacy of residents in Rivers Apartments. The position of the taller buildings is directly in front of Rivers. Surely there can be compromise and the taller buildings positioned in a staggered manner or closer to the high road? They should not all be clustered together when there is ample space. This will definitely impact on the wellbeing and mental health of residents who have shown commitment to the redevelopment of the area. We have endured stadium construction delays with additional noise and disruption. Cladding issues and noise pollution from the general area. What sort of equality impact assessment has been done to address the mental health impact on Rivers residents around light and privacy as well as the impact on property value as the views are now obstructed and just of another building. Additionally, the area infrastructure such as transport, safety and pollution cannot, I feel, support tripling of population without upgrades. Rivers currently shakes significantly with passing trains. The position of the towers nearer the rail line will bring similar issues and safety concerns there. Given tragic events such as Grenfeld and the Miami building collapse, there must be a conservative approach to building towers. I strongly urge all involved to compromise and position the taller buildings in a more reasonable space.</p>	
<p>69 River Apartments</p>	<p>The proposed plans have not considered the health and privacy for the future and existing residents of this development, I object to the new proposed plans for several reasons:</p> <p>1. 30m distance from facade to facade is too close for a directly adjacent high rise and will affect the light levels on the lower levels of Rivers Apartments to below the minimum BRE values. This will affect the health and well-being of these people.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>2. I live on the south west corner and have not been provided with an image of the view from this side. I believe this has deliberately not been provided as from the plan view it seems I'll be in view on two individual high-rises along a train track. This layout is against Humans Right Watch guidelines for high rise positioning, where they should be placed in a direct line as shown on the previously approved scheme.</p> <p>3. Noise assessments have not considered key sources of noise in the area, most important being the Snell's park industrial estate (CO2 gas company) which are a nuisance at 5am for any north facing apartments. Assessment should be revised.</p> <p>4. Having a neighboring high-rise directly perpendicular and only 30m away will take away people's privacy and bring noise disturbance for both parties, again effecting their health and welfare.</p> <p>I object to the proposed plans and believe the existing proposal was borderline acceptable. It's seems we have given an inch and a mile has been taken, please reject this proposal for the well-being of new and existing residents.</p>	
78 River Apartments	<p>I'd to like firstly state that I strongly agree with all the comments that the Cannon Road Residents' Group has already provided on this planning application.</p> <p>I appreciate what the regeneration vision is trying to achieve, however, I object to these plans. These plans, and the recent changes to them, will be of detriment to me, many of my fellow residents of Rivers Apartments and the surrounding communities. Ultimately they will impact the quality of our lives and the enjoyment of our homes.</p> <p>1. High rise buildings positioning The buildings were initially planned to be 50 metres away from Rivers Apartment and in these proposed plans, they are only 30 metres. This significant change will greatly impact the residents in this block.</p> <p>It's clear the buildings have been repositioned in order to have attractive views of the city, privacy and light to achieve the best possible price for Spurs and the developers. This repositioning however, will affect the enjoyment, privacy and light for many flats in Rivers Apartments. The buildings will be both overbearing and overshadowing and the impact on our block hasn't been considered here. Consideration has been given to future residents to fund</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>Spurs developments at the expense of the Rivers leaseholders (and also others who hold investments in this building such as Newlon Housing Trust).</p> <p>For some flats this new positioning means that they will be left with light levels below BRE recommended levels. For some other flats, this means that views from their flats will be of two of the high rises. This goes against the High Road West planning guidelines which advises that all high rises should be in line against the train track. The High Road West plans also advised there would be a scaling down of the high rise blocks but again this is now minimal.</p> <p>There must be a way that the blocks can be positioned in such a way that we all benefit from this regeneration.</p> <p>2. Noise, vibrations & disruption 2.1 . CO2 Gas Company noise The CO2 Gas Company has been disturbing the sleep and general comfort levels of many residents for several years now. They operate six days a week often before 7am, have been known to operate on Sundays and also in the early hours of the morning (2am/3am).</p> <p>The noise can be heard even with the windows closed and attempting to sleep in an extremely well insulated (unfortunately not for noise) apartment means that it can get very hot, especially in the summer. It creates quite an unbearable environment. New buildings are not built for the heat and as we've seen this week, we are experiencing more and more high temperatures and hot weather and this will only continue. This will be an issue for all people living in new high rise blocks, including those in this is planning application. This noise will impact the east side of the Depot high rise and therefore those residents will have to experience the same challenges we do.</p> <p>A possible remedy to this situation would be for the CO2 Gas Company to be relocated from Langhedge Lane Industrial Estate. Until this happens Haringey council should not be permitting further residential units in its proximity. You can see from the planning application documents that have been uploaded that Jennifer Barrett from Haringey Council was contacted by the noise impact assessor about this proposal and didn't even reply. There's been a complete lack of regard to include this company in the assessment. Haringey Council know this is already impacting a large number of us in Rivers Apartments and Cannon Road properties so it seems incomprehensible to me that they haven't included them.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p data-bbox="409 140 555 172">2.2 Trains</p> <p data-bbox="409 177 1682 248">The vibration and noise from the trains is an ongoing concern for Rivers Apartments. If it's affecting this block, it will most certainly affect these proposed new builds.</p> <p data-bbox="409 288 1760 472">The documents shared show that the vibration assessment that was undertaken was from 2017; that's four years ago. This was before the new rolling stock was introduced in 2020 which is much heavier and causes considerable vibrations to our building (the building shakes when the trains pass). The ongoing impact of these vibrations will likely cause damage to the building and will only do the same to any new structures.</p> <p data-bbox="409 512 1722 584">The track defect needs to be fixed and this should be completed before a new assessment is undertaken to ensure that there is no future impact to the new buildings.</p> <p data-bbox="409 624 1218 655">2.3 Building work impacting the ability to work from home</p> <p data-bbox="409 660 1686 804">Many of us are now working from home more than we are in the office and are therefore impacted more from the day to day noise in the area. Noise and disturbance from the area bounces off the local buildings (including from the CO2 Gas Company) and is incredibly disruptive.</p> <p data-bbox="409 844 1760 995">Even if the building works for these proposed plans are carried out during 'reasonable hours', many of the residents will be impacted by the ability to do their jobs due to this disruption and disturbance. This noise disturbance (and no doubt pollution from the works) is likely to go on for several years – approximately seven - which is an extremely long time to have to endure this.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1035 1749 1251">As such many residents would benefit from a secluded space to work from. A possible solution to this would be to use the empty units at the bottom of Rivers Apartments. This would require some investment and is something that no doubt Spurs could support given all the disruption that they'll be causing the local residents. This would also benefit the local community by providing space for families and other residents to use. We know Spurs are keen to support this kind of activity, given their commitment to their corporate social responsibility.</p> <p data-bbox="409 1291 1722 1394">In conclusion, I hope that these comments and others that are received on the planning application from local residents will be factored into the decision making to achieve a fair and equitable outcome that benefits all parties.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
82 River Apartments	<p>I believe the change in the location of the building from 50 meters away to 30 meters away from Rivers Apartments was not communicated to the residents upon purchase. The closer proximity of the building will in turn cause a number of disruptions to the residents with regards to blocking of light and views. Where this may not affect those of us on the North side of the building, what is concerning is the level of noise, debris, and dust that may result from the building works being closer. Furthermore, the period of seven years allocated for the building works will provide very uncomfortable living conditions. Given the ever increasing ;working from home culture; the ability to carry out office calls, concentration on tasks or education and training at home etc will be difficult. Enjoying my balcony is currently a rare occasion due to excessive noise of the industrial estate close by anyway, the added noise pollution of building works would make this near impossible.</p> <p>Noise pollution at Rivers Apartments has been an increasing issue. Vibrations and noises from the trainline add to this and are profoundly noticeable, a further assessment/analysis of this is required after fixing the track defect should a new development be considered.</p> <p>The CO2 Gas company located at 12-13, N18 2TQ, has been an incredibly problematic issue with regards to noise for the residents of Rivers Apartments, and it will no doubt cause issues for the new builds. Work is carried out from 5am in the morning, continuing late into the evening. Short, but astoundingly loud bursts of gas being expelled or topped up from cylinders can leave residents startled. It's an uninviting early morning alarm which is causing a lot of anxiety and sleep deprivation. Given the uncomfortable levels of heat in the building, windows are required to be left open, so avoiding the noise is impossible. The level of noise that is experienced from the building leads me to believe that a thorough analysis of environmental impacts to the building were overlooked when planning the building proposals of Rivers Apartments, would these have also been overlooked for the new builds? The purchasing of property with knowledge of these noise issues would not be favorable, and should be highlighted and made transparent to those thinking of investing. A level of regret in deciding to purchase in such as area is definitely present given the issues described.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the gates of the estate are left open at night, providing an optimal area for prostitution. I have personally seen prostitutes leading clients to the site, again providing a very undesirable residential area for high end builds.</p>	
88 River Apartments	I would like to begin by saying how supportive I am of the ORIGINAL plans that have already	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>been approved. I believe that the area does need new homes, and redevelopment of unused land.</p> <p>However, the recently submitted updated plans we cannot support, and strongly object to.</p> <p>My main point of concern is reducing the distance between the existing Rivers Apartments building and The Depot tower by 40%, from 50m to 30m. The Depot tower north elevations not only moves that much closer, but also now runs completely parallel to, and in front of the Rivers Apartments building. This will have a HUGE impact on privacy for anybody living in a south facing apartment in Rivers Apartments, and anybody moving into a north facing apartment within The Depot tower.</p> <p>There is no good reason for moving the tower this close to Rivers Apartments, and directly in front of it, other than to ensure the south facing Depot Tower view is unobstructed by The Goods Yard towers, in the hope that the view will increase sale prices.</p> <p>The previous plans positioned all of the new towers in reasonable positions so that new residents would benefit, and existing residents would not have privacy or access to daylight impeded. This has been totally disregarded in the updated plans at our expense for the developers profit.</p> <p>There is enough room on the site to position all of the towers equally without having such a drastic impact on the existing residents and environment, you have just chosen not to do so in order for a higher return.</p> <p>It is clear from the plans that NONE of the new towers will have sides of the buildings that directly face one another, providing an acceptable level of privacy and access to direct light. Why is it that existing residents should lose privacy and sunlight for the benefit of these new buildings?</p>	
96 River Apartments	<p>As a resident of Rivers Apartments on Cannon Road, I'm alarmed at these revised plans which are so far off the original plans that were disclosed to us when investing in our property in 2015-2016 that they are virtually unrecognisable.</p> <p>The original plan had Rivers Apartments as the highest building in the surrounding area, with other buildings tapering down as they got closer to White Hart Lane, in order to allow for a</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>fairer share of sunlight and views of London, as well as minimising privacy intrusion. In fact, originally these newer buildings were meant to comprise one taller (max 18 stories) and a smaller one in between Rivers Apartments and the taller one.</p> <p>Subsequent plans always allowed for a smaller building in between Rivers Apartments and the new taller building. I must challenge not only the positioning of the new buildings but also the height. It is absolutely absurd to place a taller building on the southern (S, SE, SW) side of another, thus obstructing daylight and creating a shadow over it. This will have a significant impact on the wellbeing of residents and schoolchildren on the entire Cannon Road complex: Rivers Apartments, Mallory Court, Ambrose Court and Brook House. Note that for the following flats at Rivers Apartments the new building work will leave them with light levels below BRE recommend levels: flats # 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14.</p> <p>This project began with the aim of improving the area and creating a better living space for residents of various income levels. Whereas now it is becoming obvious that the plans are going to be detrimental especially to residents who are in social / shared ownership housing, as well as the school-children in the local school, in favour of private buyers of the newly planned buildings.</p> <p>Any building that you are planning should not be so significantly tall and should be 18 stories or lower as originally planned for.</p> <p>The revised plans that you are proposing are now changing the entire complex by making a tall building even taller (either 29 or 31 stories, it is unclear from THFC's communications) and placing it approximately 40% closer to Rivers Apartments, i.e. from 50m to 30m.</p> <p>The plan states that the updates will create more considered spacing between the taller buildings, which helps the buildings complement each other better and allows for more sky and sunlight to be seen between them when looking at them from the ground level.</p> <p>The above statement negates the existence of Rivers Apartments and totally ignores the detrimental impact on our privacy, light and increased wind. In addition, we have a shared terrace space on 2nd floor which is now going to have a 29-storey building a mere 10 metres away, rendering it useless as it will no longer be a peaceful & private place to unwind.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>In addition, views from at least 20 flats (all ending with 4 or 9) will now be of two 29 storey buildings. This goes against HRW planning guidelines which intended for all high rises to be in a line against the train track. If this were followed then the above flats should only be able to see one.</p> <p>The new positioning of the two buildings means that Rivers Apartments will have the entirety of the view of London obstructed, which was never in the plan. Once again this is an example of Spurs' greed, ignoring the promises they have made previously and having a significant impact on the wellbeing of residents who also live on the complex.</p> <p>In addition, Rivers Apartments was planned as a shared-ownership-only building in order to help first time buyers onto the property ladder. These new plans will negatively impact the value of the properties at Rivers Apartments, therefore further penalising all the first-time buyers which the Spurs project was supposedly meant to help by building Rivers Apartments. It appears that Spurs' benefactory intentions to help the under-privileged is clearly a facade and the main objective is to make as much money as possible without any regard for existing residents.</p> <p>Note that the majority of residents at Rivers Apartments, including myself at #96, are impacted by the vibrations and noise coming from the train track. The vibration assessment presented by THFC Future Plans is from 2017, before the 2020 train stock change that causes the current vibration. It is imperative that they should fix the track defect and then run the analysis again to make sure the new building doesn't shake.</p> <p>Another factor that has not been taken into consideration is that - along with many other residents at Rivers Apartments - I am now working from home indefinitely. With the new buildings scheduled to take at least 7 years, the noise impact from prolonged living next to a building site will severely impact my ability to work, potentially my career progression, and certainly my mental health. Especially with buildings now so close to Rivers Apartments.</p> <p>Finally, the reports about sufficient public transport being provided for the area do not seem to match the reality of living here. The Overground is already full at peak travel times and it cannot accommodate many more commuters, let alone the hundreds of people that the new apartments are going to be housing. There doesn't seem to be sufficient consideration made for this.</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
20 Cannon Road	Finally. Excellent for the area! Well done!	
15 Cooperage Close	I wish to offer my full support for this planning application.	
38 The Lindales	There's no sufficient amount of affordable housing for those on low income or on UC.	
45 Pretoria Road	<p>I am providing some feedback on the planning application as an owner of property that will be potentially affected by the development and as a resident of the area for well over twenty years.</p> <p>My feelings towards the Goods Yard and Depot are generally positive, and I welcome any regeneration that provides good quality housing, jobs, business, entertainment and inspiration for the area. I do, however, have some concerns.</p> <p>In your Affordable Housing Statement you state that your scheme will provide 36% of affordable housing, which to me is already a rather small number, but from what I can tell only 40% of these will be 'low-cost'. This to me seems to be an overall rather minimal effort to tackle the issue of people who cannot afford homes that will likely be 80% of the market value, which I expect to be already way out of their reach.</p> <p>I also noticed a lack of any shared ownership options in your scheme that would aid those who would not have the income to rent or purchase property in the development as well, and find it rather odd given that this was offered before in the Cannon Rubber Factory development a few years back.</p> <p>I also feel that the 61 places offered to residents of the Love Lane estate (whose properties are currently under threat of demolition due to the ongoing HRW Masterplan that this development falls under) to be rather inadequate given the current circumstances, and there seems to be a lack of info as to who is eligible for those places.</p> <p>Another concern is a more personal one. The tower on the Depot development in the current plan will be situated directly opposite the front of my property in Pretoria Road, and I am concerned that it may negatively affect the view from there and also the resale value of my property and those of my neighbours along the same stretch of road.</p> <p>I understand that the placement and size of the towers have been designed to be as non-disruptive as possible, and I am happy and grateful for the effort, but looking through the maps,</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>visualisations and TVIA documents haven't really helped ease my concern. The existing New River apartment tower has in my eyes at least been really well designed to give some consideration to the light quality and field of view, and I hope that the final design of the 3 towers will attempt to do the same.</p> <p>I hope you will appreciate my concerns for the effect that this development will have for myself, my neighbours and the surrounding community, and I look forward to further news and info on the progress of the Goods Yard and Depot project.</p>	
61 Durban Road	<p>The parking situation in this road already suffers from commuters(using White Hart Lane Overground) taking up any available parking spaces when those in Pretoria Road are full.</p> <p>Now we are moving back to normal working patterns this is becoming increasingly noticeable during the week. I have already expressed a strong preference for a residents parking permit scheme for Durban Road in a survey of parking requirements undertaken by Haringey some time ago. The situation is bad.</p> <p>This is not about being able to park outside my house (which I know is not a right) but being able to park somewhere on the street. I often park 100/200 meters away which is not ideal when something has to be loaded /unloaded.</p> <p>With this development I am assuming that there will be sufficient parking for the new residents/ business and business customers so that there is no overspill into this already crowded area. If this is not the case, then I would be interested to know</p> <p>However, looking back to the last major development in the area (the Stadium) the road was full of worker trucks and cars* to the extent that parking became impossible (not just very difficult) (* or at least at the time judging by how many cars did not have a Tottenham Events day parking sticker which is a good indication whether the vehicle is resident)</p> <p>Therefore, my concern is that there is enough parking for workers on the development during its process.</p>	
Norfolk Avenue (Wood Green)	<p>No. This is getting ridiculous. Please, please please STOP BUILDING HIGH RISE PROPERTIES. Why do Councils believe that people will be happy in them, given that so many have been demolished? Why are you intent on building tomorrows slums today? This is</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>another example of Haringey thinking they can solve any housing crises by building horrible little places that one person can barely move in, let alone a potential family. What will happen is that people may buy pool together to buy, but not live in them - they rent them out at over the cost of the mortgage. When they are rented out, you will have over population of the properties, people moving in and out constantly. Then you will have the associated mess with those people moving in and out. Of course, there are never enough parking spaces, so all those extra people who move in will cause parking issues and the police will have even more disturbances to try and calm down.</p> <p>Will the water system be able to stand up to it? But Haringey don't care, they went ahead with 550 White Hart Lane in spite of the Water Board having fears. I await to see what issues will occur, the properties there will soon start to tilt and crack, as the properties at Thetford Close did 40 years ago. You just do not care. All you see is quotas. This used to be known as one of the greenest boroughs, you are turning into a concrete abyss. Pretty much like Tottenham Hale is. Dreadful place.</p> <p>Not to mention, where are the extra people going to send their children to schools? There are not enough spaces now, the bus route W3 is packed, even with the school service running, I don't even want to imagine the High Road at peak times. Will the existing GPs be able to cope with the extra influx?</p> <p>How many of Haringey's councillors are living near this site? Any? I'd be surprised if they were. Because I can't see that anyone with sense would be happy for this to go ahead. The site at the old Cannon Rubber Factory is bad enough, this is more of the same.</p> <p>No No NO NO NO !!! Stop it!</p>	
Re-consultation on design revisions		
Cannon Road Residents Association	<p>The way these changes have been communicated, it doesn't seem to be an active attempt at consultation with local residents, but perhaps you do other work here that I'm unaware of? From a quick poll of our residents, we're seeing 93% preferring the previous design of the scheme... That's not exactly a marginal result!</p> <p>From our perspective, the main part of the application where we had nothing negative to say was on the cladding design. It seemed modern, innovative in use of glazed ceramic and appropriate in the context of our building, Tottenham's heritage and the stadium design. For our</p>	

Commentator	Comment	Response
	<p>residents specifically, the blue and silver finish on the depot building would have made its position in the sky less intrusive when viewed from our windows against the sky. Glazed tiles were also chosen by the developer to reduce light impact from the very close positioning by reflecting sunlight back into our homes.</p> <p>So, replacing this design at the Depot building with the darkest matt terracotta shade possible is very concerning residents, some of whom will already be subjected to light levels lower than BRE guidelines with this new development. I didn't ever expect that the council would have less regard for these factors than the developer making the application, yet this is perhaps the case?</p> <p>And even on the broader street view - there are several updated rendered images that 'coincidentally' block the view of our building using kebab shops and trees, so you might be forgiven for thinking it looks fairly nice, which as a contained design without context of our building, it does. I have attached the one view provided that is best representative of what it will actually look like overall, before and after... The new version is so obviously jarring against our building I'm almost speechless than anyone with a design background would approve. Given our building is currently spaced with these buildings in a way that implies they are connected and we are often referred to by the developer as being part of this 'high rise family' I am struggling to see any awareness of this at all in the design change request. We have no doubt that this new design would have to be positioned further away from our building to seem even a vaguely sensible change.</p> <p>Given the sporadic (and many locals would even say bad) design cohesion at Tottenham Hale we want to understand the council rationale for wanting to make these changes before 8th November, when we will be objecting to the application and this amendment at the planning meeting.</p> <p>At what date and in what format was the design team able to raise concerns with the developer? What were those concerns? Were they raised in relation to comments made on the application and after the initial consultation deadline? Were concerns about other aspects of the application able to be raised at the same time, and were any raised, came what where they?</p>	
43 River Apartments	Initially only one building was planned to be built on this site. Now there's two, even higher buildings. I'm against it from the beginning.	

Commentator	Comment	Response
20 River Apartments	Thank you! Please start ASAP. Great for the area! Bought the flat because of the area regeneration but nothing yet. Please make this happen ASAP.	