Development Management Forum 25 May 2021 – (a) The Depot (Nos. 867-879 High Road & B&M store & land to rear); (b) The Goods Yard (Nos. 36 & 44-52 White Hart Lane & land to rear) and (c) The Printworks (Nos. 819-829 High Road & land to rear).

Updated overall proposals are: Refurbishment of High Road & White Hart Lane frontage buildings (although demolition of No. 829). New buildings of 4 to 32-storeys to provide approx. 940 homes (mix of private & affordable), with commercial uses on some ground floors. Plus, a new park, streets/open spaces, cycle & car parking.

A virtual MS Teams Development Management (DM) Forum was held on 25th May at 7:00 PM.

The key planning issues highlighted at the meeting by individual residents and councillors were as follows (these have been grouped and are not necessarily in the order in which they were raised):

- Building heights, location, design & impacts
- Relationship with LB Haringey/Lend Lease emerging proposals
- Affordable Housing
- Number of homes, dwelling mix & quality
- Loss of business space
- Child yield & infrastructure
- Heritage considerations & proposed loss of No.829 High Road
- Car parking
- Access to proposed open space
- Construction impacts
- District Energy Network & low carbon energy
- Programme

Relationship with LB Haringey/Lend Lease emerging proposals

- How do these proposals relate to those by Lend Lease for approx. 2,600 homes? Does Spurs intend to act as developer? What levels of public subsidy are expected? What discussions have there been with owners of the Peacock Industrial Estate? Applicant response: These are separate proposals from Lend Lease. It would be Spurs and/or a private developer and the only expected public subsidy relates to possible grant to help deliver affordable housing. Spurs leases a unit of the Industrial Estate and has met with owners at the Business & Community Liaison Group and individually. There is a need to comply with the London Plan 'agent of change' principle (not prejudicing continued use of the Estate).

Building Heights, location, design & impacts

- Proposed additional height was a ‘step too far.’ Northern most tower would be approx. 40% closer to Riverside Apartments than the approved tower. Appreciate that residents do not have a right to a view, but proposed location and spacing of the proposed three towers appears to favour future residents (they should be in a line). Applicant response: Reduction in height to proposed northern block made following discussions with residents, proposed podium building next to boundary lower than consented, lower buildings to help ensure appropriate wind conditions, each tower (including Riverside Apartments) would be spaces approx. 30m apart – details to be set out in application).
- Proposed towers look over bearing.
- Proposed towers would ‘stick out like sore thumbs’ – why not more subtle?
- On western side of site – what would overshadowing impacts be on proposed open spaces?
- Concerns about fire safety – design materials and management.
- Applicant response: Proposed towers sit broadly where identified in the adopted Masterplan. They would help ‘optimise’ development potential and free up land for open space as part of a design-led approach – there would be intensification, but not doubling. Detailed design & materials are still under development. Location, height and shape of proposed towers has been informed by initial overshadowing studies to ensure they meet guidelines – planning application will be supported by detailed studies. Design incorporates non-combustible cladding, evacuation & fire lifts & sprinklers – proposals need to comply with London Plan Policy D12 and (from 1 August) the Health & Safety Executive is to be a statutory consultee.

Affordable housing

- Where is the social housing?
- What is proposed split of different types of affordable housing?
- Applicant response: Aim is to submit a ‘scheme that provides 35% affordable housing (rising to 40% if grant), based on 40:60 split (low cost rented and shared ownership). Opportunity to help facilitate decant of residents in Love Lane Estate.

Number of homes, dwelling mix & quality

- How many homes would there be?
- What would the dwelling mix be?
- Concern at lack of family housing.
- How big would the homes be?
- Concern about loss of families in the borough and effect this is having on communities, school rolls etc. Reports of London losing 800,000 people during pandemic (bigger issue, not just this scheme).

- Quality needs to be high if family-sized private homes are to sell.
- Applicant response: Currently proposed 867 homes on Goods Yard and Depot and 70 on Printworks. Goods Yard = 97 x 1-bed, 214 x 2-bed, 53x3-bed and 4, x 4-bed. Depot = 141 x 1-bed, 268 x 2-bed, x3-bed and x 4-bed. Overall, 17% family (3-bed+) sized homes for private and affordable homes. These would all be additional, as no existing homes would be lost. Sizes of homes and bedrooms would meet London Plan standards.

Loss of business space and non-residential uses

- Concern at loss of 'old industries' and replacement with cafés and bars.
- The development is referred to as a new 'neighbourhood', but there is not much proposed for families.
- Applicant response: Peacock Industrial Estate would remain in 'meanwhile' condition, application would allow for some business/employment and child care facilities as well as jobs from food & beverage uses.

Child yield & infrastructure

- No mention of children. What about play areas?
- How has 'child yield' been calculated? Is LBH developing its own methodology?
- What about local infrastructure – is Spurs looking for Lend Lease to provide?
- What about health facilities?
- Applicant response: Updated GLA calculator has been used to estimate child yield. Proposed dedicated play areas (including Northern and Southern Squares and Peacock Park) as well as in communal podium spaces (approx. 2,900sqm), designed aimed at different age ranges plus incidental play opportunities. CIL & s106 financial contributions would be paid to help provide additional social infrastructure.
- Officer response: LBH was considering an alternative child generation approach, but this was pre updated GLA calculator. Principle of proportionate payments established at Goods Yard Pubic Inquiry would be applied.

Heritage considerations & proposed loss of No.829 High Road

- Concern at proposed loss of No.829 High Road – no justification other than to make a wider road.
- Strong objection to the above, plus proposed works to White Hart Lane buildings.
- Query as to how sensitive potential impacts on 'heritage assets' are balanced with potential impacts on people

- Applicant response: Avoiding harm to 'heritage assets' is an important policy consideration. However, so too is safeguarding residential amenity – including relationship with Riverside Apartments. A balance is needed.

Car parking

- What would parking levels be – sounds like less than approved?
- How many car club spaces would there be?
- Applicant response: Approved levels of residential car parking = 0.16 for Depot and 0.25 for the Goods Yard. The proposed level of residential parking for the combined site is 0.16. The Printworks would have a ratio of just 0.1. Four car club spaces are proposed (two on Goods Yard and two on The Depot).

Access to proposed open space

- Would the proposed western green walkway be open to the public?
- Would it improve biodiversity?
- The importance of open space is a lesson from the COVID pandemic.
- Applicant response: The walkway would be a secured area, open to all residents on the Goods Yard site only (the proposed streets, squares and park would be the public spaces). Intention for this area to be biodiversity rich.

Construction impacts

- Concern at adverse impacts during demolition/construction – including cumulative impacts.
- Applicant response: Expect impacts to be managed by management plan, secured by planning condition.

District Energy Network & low carbon energy

- What about District Energy Network (DEN) – would there be different networks for Lend Lease? Some DENs have not performed well/expensive for residents (e.g. Sutton). What is fall back? Need to maximise on-site renewables.
- Heat from waste is not zero carbon (involves burning plastics etc.)
- With increase in recycling, there may not be enough waste in the future.
- The private communal heat network for the Cannon Road development is not successful. They are not regulated by OFGEM, residents are stuck in a contract and have had to fight to get contract delivered.
- Applicant response: Looking at two potential DEN connections, with PVs also being proposed (together with very high building insulation and façade design to minimise overheating). Targeting Net Zero Carbon.
- Officer response: s106 obligations likely to require connection or additional carbon offsetting contributions if not. Officers are actively pursuing DEN

options for the borough and will be briefing Members shortly. Private DENs are not regulated, but the Government is considering bringing in regulations. Where the Council commissions or operates, it is likely to maintain a degree of control (e.g. price & performance standards)

Programme

- What is the programme?
- Applicant response: Submission of Goods Yard/Depot planning application very soon. This application would have a 16-week statutory determination period (could be longer). Printworks application to follow. Current anticipated earliest start on site = Quarter 2022.

Meeting concluded at 8.45 PM
GH 26.05.2021