

Planning Sub Committee 8 November 2021

## ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEMS

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

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2021/1771	<b>Ward:</b> Northumberland Park
<b>Address:</b> The Goods Yard and The Depot, 36 & 44-52 White Hart Lane (and land to the rear), and 867-879 High Road (and land to the rear), N17 8EY.	
<b>Proposal:</b> Full planning application for (i) the demolition of existing buildings and structures, site clearance and the redevelopment of the site for a residential-led, mixed use development comprising residential units (C3); flexible commercial, business, community, retail and service uses (Class E); hard and soft landscaping; associated parking; and associated works. (ii) Change of use of No. 52 White Hart Lane from residential (C3) to a flexible retail (Class E) (iii) Change of use of No. 867-869 High Road to residential (C3) use.	
<b>Applicant:</b> Tottenham Hotspur Football Club (THFC).	
<b>Ownership:</b> Private	

### Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

*The site*

Add new Paragraphs. 3.32A as follows:

3.32A A valid planning application by Lendlease for a wider High Road West site (including the Goods Yard and The Depot site) was received on 8 November for the following:

“Hybrid Planning application seeking permission for 1) outline component comprising the demolition of existing buildings and for the creation of a new mixed-use development including residential (Use Class C3), commercial, business and service (Use Class E), leisure (Use Class E), community uses (Use Class F1/F2) and *Sui Generis* uses together with the creation of a new public square, park and associated access, parking and public realm works with matters of layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and access within the site reserved for subsequent approval and 2) detailed component comprising Plot A including the demolition of existing buildings and the creation of new residential floorspace (Use Class C3) together with landscaping, parking and other associated works.”

## 4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

Both Thames Water and Historic England archaeological service (GLAAS) have confirmed its previous comments that are set out under Para. 4.2 and in Appendix 2.

## LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

In total, four additional comments from local people have been received since the report was finalised. Summaries of these additional comments are added in **BOLD** below to the comments from re-consultation set out in Para. 5.7 of the report. These additional comments are set out in full in an update to Appendix 3.

### Objections:

- Insufficient consultation on revisions.
- Very concerned at change in proposed external material a dark matt terracotta.
- Updated rendered images are misleading.
- Additional tall buildings.
- **EXCESSIVE BUILDING HEIGHT – ESPECIALLY THE NORTHERN ONE – LOSS OF PRIVACY, VIEWS, DAYLIGHT, SUNLIGHT, ADDITIONAL WIND EFFECTS (RESIDENTS & SCHOOL CHILDREN)**
- **LOCATION OF TALL BUILDINGS NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH HRWMF – MOVED CLOSER THAN ORIGINALLY APPROVED.**
- **MAXIMUM HEIGHT SHOULD BE 18-STOREYS**
- **NOISE FROM RAILWAY & EXISTING CO2 COMPANY ON LANGHENDE INDUSTRIAL ESTATE NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.**
- **DISRUPTION FROM CONSTRUCTION.**
- **IMPACT ON PEOPLE WORKING FROM HOME.**

### Support:

- General support

### OTHER

- **GENERALLY SUPPORTIVE (INCLUDING OF POTENTIAL FOOTBRIDGE TO PRETORIA ROAD) – BUT CONCERNED THAT, WHILE IMPROVED, THE NEW COLOUR CHOICES NOW HAVE AN OVERALL DARKER AND MORE OVERBEARING HUE.**

## 6.9 Heritage Conservation

Amend Para. 6.9.49 as follows:

6.9.49 Officers are bound to consider this strong presumption in line with the legal **and policy** context set out above. The proposed scheme would retain, **preserve** and enhance the heritage assets within the site – returning the Listed Buildings at Nos. 867-869 High Road to residential use and providing gardens to the rear, enhancing their immediate setting and **the** converting and restoring the **locally listed Station Master's House**). **This would enhance**

**the appearance, character and setting of both the heritage buildings and the North Tottenham Conservation Area.** However, officers consider that the proposed tall buildings would cause some ‘less than substantial harm’ to the wider setting and significance of **the North Tottenham, Bruce Castle and All Hallows and Tottenham Cemetery Conservation Areas and a number of other** assets. This harm has been given significant weight, **and but, in accordance with guidance in the NPPF paras (202 and 203)** is considered to be outweighed by substantial public benefits **including the refurbishment and re-use of Listed and locally listed buildings**, provision of much needed housing and affordable housing and publicly accessible open space. ~~Given this, officers conclude that, the proposals would preserve and enhance historic qualities of the relevant heritage assets and comprise well managed change in accordance with Policies SP12, DM6, AAP5 and Site Allocation NT5 and guidance in the HRWME.~~

### **6.10 Impact on Amenity of Adjoining Occupiers**

The applicant has provided further clarification on likely overshadowing of the existing River Apartments amenity space. Add new Para. 6.10.19A as follows:

6.10.19A The above assessment is based on a particular time (12.00 noon) on 21 March. The applicant has since further clarified that a BRE two-hours sun-on-ground test shows that the application scheme would result in 92% of the amenity space receiving at least two hours sun throughout the day on 21 March, which is significantly above the 50% minimum called for in the BRE guidelines. By comparison, the existing baseline allows 97% of the space to receive at least two hours of sunlight on this day. The resultant 6% reduction in sunlit area between the existing baseline and the application scheme is significantly less than the 20% reduction allowed for by the guidelines.

### **6.12 Energy, Climate Change and Sustainability**

Amend Para. 6.12.16 as follows:

6.12.16 Carbon Offsetting. Despite the adoption of the ‘Lean’, ‘Clean’ and ‘Green’ measures outlined above, the expected carbon dioxide savings fall short of the zero-carbon policy target for proposed domestic and non-domestic uses. Overall, the amount of carbon to be offset (once connected to the proposed DEN) would be 372.2 tonnes per year. Based on 30-years of annual carbon dioxide emissions costed at £95 per tonne, this amounts to £1,066,865 (or £1,166, 866 including a 10% management fee). It is recommended that s106 planning obligations secure this sum (including 10% monitoring fee) **or any different agreed sum, subject to that may be appropriate any in the light** of additional carbon savings that arise from more detailed design agreed with the LPA, by way of s106 planning obligations.

## 6.23 Conclusion

Add new Para. 6.23.3A as follows:

6.23.3A This application is subject to the Housing Delivery Test. The 2020 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results were published on 19 January 2021 and as a result the LPA is now subject to the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' and paragraph 11d of the NPPF is relevant. The Council's delivery of housing over the last three years is substantially below its housing target and so paragraph 11d) of the NPPF is engaged by virtue of footnote 7 of the NPPF. Nevertheless, the proposed development has been found to be in accordance with development plan policies and therefore consideration of para 11(d) is not required in this instance.

## Appendix 3: Neighbour Representations Update

Commentator	Comment
45 Pretoria Road	<p>As stated before, I am largely in support of the new development in terms of offering better quality housing, new opportunities for business and employment, and a much needed modern uplift to the area.</p> <p>I approve of the effort to attempt to unify the general feel of the development so that it's more in tune with existing and future developments. I appreciate that this should help propagate a more communal and less segregated feeling in the White Hart Lane area, which will also be helped by the removal of the boundary wall south of the Cannon Road estate and more direct access to the Overground Station from there. I always felt that the Cannon Road community have been practically cut off from the rest of the neighbourhood and would strongly support any movement to further integrate them into the surrounding areas.</p> <p>I still feel that the current size and placement of the Depot tower may have detrimental effect on the quality of life for those living in existing properties nearby, including those in the Rivers Apartments, Cannon Road and on Pretoria Road N17. I feel this even more so with the revised tower design - the new colour choices while improved now have an overall darker and more overbearing hue. On viewing the designs prior to the first batch documented in this planning application, while I do not like the overall look it seems like they would provide much better light quality and be less overbearing. I'm not at all asking to revert to the previous design, just to try for one that is more considerate of the existing neighbourhood.</p> <p>Also I know that at this stage it is provisional, but I do support the construction of a footbridge linking the Goods Yard/Depot area to Pretoria Road and Durban Road as this will provide further community integration and access to the high road from these</p>

Commentator	Comment
	<p>areas, which could prove very important on match/event days for crowds from the new stadium using Silver Street as an alternative travel option. It would also help form a more integrated and inclusive feel to the general area.</p>
<p>9 River Apartments</p>	<p>General anger on tall building being moved from 50m away to 30m away.</p> <p>Flats 3,4,8,9,13,14: the new building work will leave flats with light levels BELOW BRE recommend levels.</p> <p>Flats ending in 4 or 9 - we believe views from your flat will 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 you should only be able to see ONE.</p> <p>Anyone impacted by vibration/noise from the Trainline: Their vibration assessment is from 2017, before the 2020 train stock change that causes the vibration. They should fix the track defect then run the analysis again to make sure the new building doesn't shake (Hopefully a track fix will fix it for us too)</p> <p>Working from home/being at home during typical work hours - this development work is going to be happening for the next SEVEN years! The noise impact from prolonged living next to a building site could impact my ability to work, career progression, education or health.</p> <p>GAS company - even though spurs and Haringey council know about this company causing noise issues for us they hadn't included it in the noise assessment. The new high rise will be 30m away and also in direct eyeline of the noise source on its East side. I work from home and the noise from construction will deeply impact the well being of both my career and family.</p>
<p>20 River Apartments</p>	<p>Thanks very much! Finally some regeneration for this terrible area.</p> <p>NOTE – THIS SUPPORT DUPLICATES WHAT IS ALREADY REPORTED IN APPENDIX 3 &amp; HAS NOT BEEN COUNTED AGAIN FOR THE UPDATE SUMMARY ABOVE</p>
<p>89 River Apartments</p>	<p>We do not agree with many of the proposals. Our residents' group (incl Georgina Sapsted) will be attending the next meeting.</p> <p>We live near the top south side of the rivers development and are appalled by the height of the buildings especially the one proposed directly in front of our living room! The distance is too</p>

Commentator	Comment
	<p>close!!! I could go on but don't feel that this is right for us residents immediately impacted (views etc).</p>
<p>96 River Apartments</p>	<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 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 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. 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 schoolchildren in the local school, in favour of private buyers of these newly planned buildings.</p> <p>Any building that Spurs 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 being proposed are now changing the entire complex by making a tall building even taller (29 stories) and placing it approximately 40% closer to Rivers Apartments.</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</p>

Commentator	Comment
	<p>privacy, light and increased wind. In addition, we have a shared terrace space on 2nd floor 2 which is now going to have a 29-story building mere metres away, rendering it useless as it will no longer be a peaceful &amp; private place to unwind.</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. At least 22 flats at Rivers Apartments will be significantly impacted and the views from their flat will 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, we should only be able to see one building. 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>For the duration of the building works to erect this new and much closer high rise building, the 15 apartments on the first four floors at Rivers Apartments will be significantly impacted for years due to low levels of sunlight. They will be left with light levels below BRE recommend levels and thus have grounds to sue.</p> <p>As someone who now works 100% from home during typical working hours and with no plan to return to the office, I am seriously concerned about the noise impact from prolonged living next to a building site and the impact it will have on my ability to work, my career progression, and mental health. My building is full of hard-working families who are from under-privileged backgrounds and I know that I'm not the only one working from home. The impact of such continuous noise and disruption to our lives could hinder our chances further in the workplace and that goes against the plans for this building and area. Surely our mental health and ability to work to the best of our abilities should be safeguarded. If the original plan was followed, the building works and sound would be further away and thus have a reduced impact on our work &amp; home lives.</p> <p>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>

Commentator	Comment
	<p data-bbox="451 237 1366 488">Finally, one thing that needs to be pointed out for the benefit of the new buildings is that my apartment is significantly impacted by the vibration and noise from the train track. I notice that the vibration assessment posted by Spurs is from 2017, before the 2020 train stock change that causes the vibration. Spurs should fix the track defect and then run the analysis again to make sure the new building doesn't shake.</p> <p data-bbox="451 528 1342 707">Also, Haringey council is aware about the gas company to the north of Rivers Apartments causing noise issues for us but this hasn't been included in the noise assessment for the new development. The new high rise will be 30m away and also in direct eyeline of the noise source on its east side.</p> <p data-bbox="451 748 1337 891">I look forward to attending the planned meeting this week to voice my concerns further and hear what you plan on doing to truly improve the plans for the good of the entire area, and not just Spurs' pockets.</p>