

#### Appendix 4: Neighbour representations

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
<b>Argent Related</b>	Concern with 24 storeys of development less than 10m from the northern façade of the North Island building.	The development has been revised with a cut back being introduced so that the majority of the building is 13m from the North Island building (Building 3).
	The siting of the Proposed Development will create an unacceptable impact on the amenity of residents of the North Island building, in particular daylight, sunlight and overlooking.	As set out in detail in the report the impacts are considered to acceptable given the proximity of the North Island building to the boundary and the urban, district centre location. The established BRE test for this scenario where the proposal is compared to a mirror massing building find the mirror building would have more adverse impacts than the proposed building.
	For the North Island Building, the Daylight and Sunlight Report shows how Vertical Sky Component (VSC) light levels would be reduced by up to 100% in some cases with the residual VSC levels reduced to zero in the worst case. Light levels would commonly be reduced by around 70% to 80%.	The impacts are acceptable given the proximity of the North Island building to the boundary and the urban, district centre location. A mirror massing building would have more adverse impacts than the proposed building.
	These reductions should be viewed in the context of the BRE Guidelines, which recommend no more than a 20% reduction.	Natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city. Therefore, full or near full compliance with the BRE Guide is not to be expected. The BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations.
	In simple terms, this level of reduction and the residual light levels would effectively result in	This would also be the case for many of the lower floors if the Argent masterplan building for this location was constructed. Rooms would still have

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
	some main rooms in the North Island building receiving no direct daylight or sunlight.	light and these lower levels are to be expected in these scenarios where developments are constructed close to common boundaries in urban locations. The existing building 3 was design anticipating that these windows would look onto a courtyard of some form.
	The Daylight and Sunlight Report has not undertaken any analysis of the impact of the Proposed Development on the Ashley Road West and Ferry Island plots, or on the external amenity and play areas attached to North Island.	These studies were lcarried out and the impacts are considered to be acceptable.
	The proximity of the Proposed Development will also lead to an equally unacceptable impact on the privacy and outlook of the North Island building residential units.	Following amendments the distance has been increased to 13m. The closest elevation would have a window serving a corridor and a secondary window to a living space on each floor. The secondary window would be set forward of the North Island building elevation and views from these windows would be oblique as a result. As set out in the report greater separation distances are provided between other windows akin to a residential street relationship.
	A masterplan has not been submitted as required by TAAP policy AAP1 and the site allocation.	This is the last parcel of land on the island to be developed and the documentation submitted alongside the application shows how the building would integrate with other buildings in the area.
	Criteria of Part D of Development Management DPD Policy DM6 (Building Heights) include that tall buildings in close proximity to each other should avoid a canyon effect and avoid	There is already coalescence on the island between Millstream Tower/1 Station Square, the hotel and Building 3/ The North island building. The proposal forms part of a cluster of tall buildings that are

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
	coalescence between individual buildings. Given how close the Proposed Development is to the North Island, we cannot see how the Proposed development complies with these policy requirements.	located close to one another. However, care has been taken to address microclimatic and daylight/sunlight issues and allow for appropriate and reasonable spaces between buildings whilst optimising sites. The distances between Building 3 and the proposed building given the proximity of Building 3 to the common boundary and the dense urban form of development that is being delivered in this location.
<b>Sage Housing</b>	The proximity of the proposed 24-storey structure will have a severe and detrimental impact upon the health and wellbeing of our residents given the 8.5m distance between the windows of the flats on the north-western elevation.	The distance has been increased to 13m. This elevation would have a window serving a corridor and a secondary window to a living space on each floor. The secondary window would be set forward of the North Island building elevation and views from these windows would be oblique as a result.
	The significant loss of sun and daylight and restriction of outlook by the erection of a 24-storey structure would diminish the future enjoyment for residents. The proposal would result in an adverse impact to residential amenity and create unfavourable living conditions for residents.	This would be the case for many of the lower floors if the Argent masterplan building for this location was constructed. Rooms would still have light and these lower levels are to be expected in these scenarios where developments are constructed close to common boundaries in urban locations.
	The outdoor communal amenity courtyard area would be enclosed to the north by the proposed much larger structure, resulting in the effect of being at the bottom of a canyon and consequently this would vastly diminish its role as a pleasant usable outdoor space.	This would be the case if the Argent masterplan building for this location was constructed. A degree of enclosure is unavoidable if the application site is to be brought forward for development. The proposal has been shown to in fact not reduce the sunlight to this courtyard in the relevant BRE test.

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
	The proposal comprises inappropriate massing and scale that is contrary to the aspirations of the masterplan and would dominate the corner of this block, constructing a poor standard of urban design. The failure to integrate with the wider masterplan would cause overdevelopment and inappropriate intensification at too great a density.	The massing and scale is appropriate for this district centre location and reflects the ambitions for the site in the district centre framework, albeit made larger to address the current context and height increases on the island. The design proposes high quality materials and would optimise a constrained site. The building would complete the cluster of tall buildings in a sympathetic way.
	Haringey is strongly encouraged to carry out an independent sun/daylight analysis based upon the approved and implemented plans for block 3 allowing for a full and thorough assessment of the proposal against current best practice standards including the BRE Guidance.	This has been carried out and the review accepts mirror massing can be used in order to judge the acceptability of light impacts.
	A smaller block comprising approximately seven stories would harmoniously and elegantly engage with the approved and existing development which would result in an acceptable level of impact to residential amenity. The current proposal is jarring and out of context contrary to the aspirations of the masterplan.	This would be lower than the masterplan proposal provided by Argent and would not optimise the site and may be unviable. The impacts on residential amenity by the proposed building are acceptable given the circumstances (distances to boundaries) and district centre location. The building would complete the cluster of development on the island in a sympathetic way.
<b>Neighbour objections</b>	There is a danger that this area will be an ugly and unwelcoming cluster of ridiculously tall buildings with no relief between them. I would support a version with less floors.	The DCF along with the site allocation and other planning designations has identified this site as suitable for a tall building. The taller buildings provide the optimum number of homes in a district centre near to excellent transport links. A lower building would provide less housing and would not optimise the site. The building is also well designed

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
		and has been shown to have acceptable impacts on neighbours and the surrounding townscape.
	Increase in traffic	The development would be car free, and the student occupants would not be able to apply for resident car parking permits. There may be increases in traffic during construction, but this is likely to be negligible given the context and, in any event, would only be for a temporary period.
	Noise and pollution	As with any development, construction work will result in some noise and disturbance, this would be mitigated by conditions requiring a CEMP.  However, the site is located next to a busy road and works would be temporary.
	Affordability of new flats	The building would not include any properties for private sale. The rooms would be for students attending higher education. The proposal would make a significant contribution towards affordable housing through a payment in lieu.
	Loss of the existing shops	The retail space would be re-provided retained, and the current occupants could occupy these spaces.
	Lasting impact on local resources i.e. local parks, GP surgeries.	The proposal would contribute to local infrastructure which could be used to invest in the nearby Down Lane Park. A new GP surgery is to be delivered in the bottom of the nearby Wellbourne development to meet the needs of growing population in this area.

Stakeholder	Objection/Support/Comment	Response
<b>Neighbour support</b>	<p>It is clear that the proposal is in line with the regeneration of the area which is currently taking place anyway.</p> <p>It will replace old but non-character buildings with much more useful spaces for the community and also create additional student accommodation so much needed in London. With the old owners of the shop who will apparently remain within the new building this application also shows support for the local business.</p>	Noted.
	Bringing students to the area would have positive benefits and the active ground floor should help to improve the public realm.	Noted.