

Appendix 3: Internal and External Consultee Representations

Commentator	Comment	Response
<p>Cannon Road Residents' Group</p>	<p>I would like to confirm that Cannon Road Residents' Group object to these plans. Core reasons for this objection are outlined in sections below.</p> <p>High rise positioning and density:</p> <p>The previously accepted plans from 2019, which we had no overall objection to and saw as being balanced and reasonable, were at our realistic limit in level of height and distance we'd be comfortable to have another high rise in relation to the Rivers Apartments building. These previous plans, to confirm, were 50m away, façade to façade.</p> <p>The rejected application (HGY/2021/1771) reduced this to 30m. It was in part rejected due to unacceptable density and massing of high rises. To now come back with an application that only marginally changes this spacing to, to just 33-37m is not at all adequate, especially given it was a HRW key principle that 'Taller buildings located to minimise overshadowing of adjacent development'. We are especially unimpressed that developer community information leaflets reported this increase in space as actually being 6-7m, which is obviously incorrect and misleading for local residents.</p> <p>So with this minor edit, to 33m, the Depot building position will continue to have extra 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 at some windows and there will be drastic reductions in light. There is nothing they are able to do to make a living room window that is 34% closer not appear 34% closer. 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 little regard for this - decisions involving light and privacy are still unacceptable 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 a true attempt at this.</p> <p>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. We don't believe we are being unrealistic here. We know aspects of the area need development. We know Haringey needs</p>	<p>The northernmost tower in the proposed scheme has been moved 1 metre further away from this building when compared to the allowed appeal scheme (HGY/2021/1771) which was found to have acceptable impacts on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.</p>

more homes and the developer is required as a 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 still making additional money from this development at the expense of Rivers Apartments leaseholders.

We are also concerned that even with a statement of rejection on HGY/2021/1771 due to impacts on Heritage buildings on White Hart Lane, the developer has, in this update, made aspects of the Goods Yard South building even taller! The noted reasoning for this being 'to improve perception of height and proportion when considered collectively against the other changes'. To be quite honest, I have no idea what improved perception of height would really mean apart from a tall building looking tall, and why this would be a good thing to do is beyond us. To us, this change shows there is minimal interest from the developer in creating a site where massing of high rises falls towards White Hart Lane, which is a key principle for HRW. Instead, the focus continues to be on maximum density and profitability.

Depot alignment:

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. 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. The 2019 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. This latest iteration the developer has conceded slightly and moved the Depot Building 2m further West with an alternative base plate geometry, but there is definitely scope for this to be moved further West and align properly with the HRW key principle that 'Taller buildings should form the 'edge' to the development'.

Basement plans:

Given how little the basement plans have been covered in previous application summary documents and visualisations, it is only since the planner report for HGY/2021/1771 that we have been aware of how close this is planned to be to our building and the potential structural effects of this. The basement report states that, even with maximum mitigation, the settlement impact on our building could be 2-5mm. To us, it's inappropriate for a deep basement to be

	<p>developed right on a boundary line, next to a tall building that already has experienced substantial settling issues since 2015. For example, several residents have been trapped in their flats by warped door frames and stuck doors. Even if damage to our building is only expected to be 'slight' that might still be enough to cause costly impacts for leaseholders. With 100 flats this could easily run into hundreds of thousands of pounds in repairs. We would argue, given the amount of space there is on the development site, there is plenty of scope to shift this basement plan several metres further South, away from the site boundary wall. This would appropriately mitigate risks to the Rivers Apartments building.</p> <p>Visual design:</p> <p>The vertical core of the tall buildings being lighter is a definite improvement for Rivers Apartments being more cohesive in design with these new buildings. However we still feel it's entirely at our detriment that the darkest of the brick shades is put at the Depot positioning. Rivers Apartments is the only tall building with unavoidable direct out of window views of any of these tall buildings at a close proximity - it should be given more consideration for impact on perceptions of light and space from within our homes, especially where an expected 50m distance isn't being provided. We truly believe the previous aspiration for quality coloured glaze tile facades would be a more distinctive, modern and appealing approach, if glare issues could be mitigated.</p> <p>We 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. The developer should also take on board the reasons for rejection of their previous application. We do not believe they have been sincere attempts at either of these in the new planning application. This application has only made token edits rather than the genuine changes needed to reach a reasonable and balanced proposal that reflects HRW key principles. We object to this planning application.</p>	
Academia Way	<p>I object to the development of buildings that would dwarf Riverside apartments and dominate the skyline. The tallest of the proposed tower block has been amended by one storey. That isn't enough. It will ruin the view towards the high street from my perspective.</p> <p>Tall buildings of that height are not in keeping with the local listed buildings and are definitely not in keeping with the area. The plans aim to dominate rather than complement the neighbourhood. There are no tower blocks that high round here and in fact Haringey's project with the love lane estate aims to produce lower level housing. So this development will not flow and will ruin the look and feel of the area in terms of overshadowing and diminishing the</p>	<p>Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.</p>

	<p>heritage buildings in the area.</p> <p>Not only that but the existing community of local Tottenham businesses will be decimated. The aim should be improved and develop in keeping with the area not destroy.</p> <p>These plans are destructive and instead of creating spaces that endear nature and removed the clogged design that urban areas can have it will increase it ten fold. No I object.</p>	
11 River Apartments	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.	There is potential for new routes to be opened up in the future. The existing arrangement requires access via the High Street.
20 Rivers Apartments x2	<p>Yes please start as soon as possible Tottenham looks terrible we been promised a regeneration please the area has to change and this will make the difference</p> <p>Certainly please start the work asap Tottenham really need this big change also we moved because the development project. Please keep the promise to improve the area as at the moment I don't want be here.</p>	Noted.
26 River Apartments	<p>I am broadly in favour of the Good Yard development and was happy with the original planning application which was previously approved. I have some concerns about the amended application that is being submitted.</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 the train line which has resulted in significantly greater noise and vibration levels when Overground trains pass through, felt and heard within River Apartments, 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. I commented on this during the last application and do not see any updated noise assessments to demonstrate any change.</p> <p>I am concerned about the amended position of the North tower block for the Depot development. Under previously agreed plans, the tower was 50m from Rivers Apartments and not in a direct line.</p>	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.

Commentator	Comment	Response
33 Rivers Apartments	The development is too densely populated with flats. The buildings are too close together. The Heritage element has not been given enough thought and consideration.	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions. Heritage was dealt with in detail at the public inquiry and the proposals were found to be acceptable.
43 River Apartments	<p>I'm still not happy with the distance between RA and the proposed new building. 50meters should be taken in consideration. The changes made to this proposal are minimal.</p> <p>I've got doors rubbing the floor, windows that scratch the frame, my front door has been changed, all due to subsidence. Meaning that, if the proposal of a basement close to RA goes ahead, I preview more issues with subsidence. Increasing the distance needs to happen.</p>	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.
48 River Apartments	Building and plans not different from original plans. Will completely obstruct views and light in Rivers Apartments. We have no assurance on how the tall buildings will affect already bad wind conditions, making balconies unusable. The position can be changed so that the buildings do not completely infringe on other buildings in the area.	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.
49 Rivers Apartments x 3	<p>North tower on the Goods Yard was planned at 50 metre away from my buildings and that's ok. 37 metres is very close and would be an infringement of privacy of people living at rivers apartments.</p> <p>I disagree with the plannings on the BM site</p> <p>The Changes proposed in this updated application do not deal meaningfully with the reasons committee rejection of HGY/2021/1772 in November 2021. The depot building has only moved 3-6 meters further away from Rivers Apartments to 33-36 meters where current approval is at 50 m. This application should be refused and depot building should be built further away at accepted 50 m positioning for my ability to enjoy my home in privacy and minimise overshadowing of Rivers Apartments.</p>	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.
53 Rivers Apartments	Spurs are trying to swat away the residents of Rivers Apartments with a frankly laughable set of proposed 'changes' which provide no meaningful mitigation to the intrusive nature of this	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the

	<p>development.</p> <p>What difference does it make removing a single storey from one new building only to tack it onto another when all three new buildings will be taller than ours anyway?</p> <p>And moving the closest building from 33 to 36 metres away? Again, the absolute bear minimum of effort. At these distances the tower will STILL obliterate light and it's residents will STILL have birdseye views of our homes.</p> <p>Also:</p> <p>Has the structural impact of excavating the nearest tower's basement so closely to our own building been adequately assessed? Rivers Apartments may well experience significant movement. In this event, who will be responsible for the internal/external repair of our homes?</p> <p>Noise pollution:</p> <p>We've already discovered that Spurs conducted their noise pollution test from behind a brick wall. Have they now conducted a proper test, overseen by the relevant authorities, to determine just how much noise the construction of this development is going to generate? I am a freelancer working from home on audio projects for public broadcast. Excessive noise will rob me of my livelihood.</p> <p>It's as though Spurs have decided that - in the pursuit of maximum profits at all costs - an entire building of human beings with very real concerns about this development are to be patted on the head and shooed away.</p> <p>Disgraceful.</p>	<p>proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.</p>
<p>54 Rivers Apartments</p>	<p>The new proposal does not address the previous objections raised by the committee. The so called 'Depot' building is still too close to Rivers Apartments, and the height has not been reduced adequately. Subsequently severely impacting the view and creating issues regarding privacy. Until this is addressed it is my firm belief the new proposals should be rejected.</p>	<p>Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.</p>
<p>59 Rivers Apartments</p>	<p>The changes proposed in this updated application do not deal meaningfully with the reasons for committee rejection of HGY/2021/1771 in November 2021. The Depot building has only moved 3-6m further away from rivers apartments - to 33-36m, where current approval is at</p>	<p>The distances are slightly further way when compared to those allowed at appeal by the</p>

	50m. This application should be refused, and depot building should be built further away, at the accepted 50m positioning, for my ability to enjoy my home in privacy and to minimise overshadowing on Rivers Apartments.	Inspectorate.
60 Rivers Apartments	Support improvement to desirability of area.	Noted.
77 River Apartments	<p>The changes proposed in this updated application do not come close to addressing the reasons for committee rejection of HGY/2021/1771 back in November 2021. The Depot building only plans to move location a staggering 3-6m further away from the rivers apartments - this would mean a distance of 33-36m, where the current approval stated 50m. The proposed reduction in building height is insulting as it is still way above the original height proposed (it has been raised 50% since original plans) and would continue to dwarf our tower. If built at the 50m distance as previously stated and with the number of storeys vastly reduced this will reduce the impact of the shadows cast on rivers apartments and reduction in our privacy.</p> <p>In addition, the 5m deep basement that they also intend to build will be right on our boundary line and could cause 2-5mm of further settling disruption in our building. Natural settling already causes enough issues as it and our homes barely have enough spacing in our frames to cope with that, where doors sticking and trapping residents in their flats is commonplace.</p> <p>On the whole the refusal to make a genuine attempt to acknowledge the issues raised and these minimal modifications show genuine disregard for us and the wider neighbouring community. This application should be refused.</p>	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.
79 Rivers Apartments	The changes proposed in this updated application do not deal meaningfully with the reasons for committee rejection of HGY/2021/1771 in November 2021. The Depot building has only moved 3-6m further away from rivers apartments to 33-36m, where current approval is at 50m. This application should be refused and depot building should be built further away, at the accepted 50m positioning, for my ability to enjoy my home in privacy and to minimise overshadowing on Rivers Apartments.	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.
82 Rivers Apartments	<p>Following a further review of the updated plans to carry out the development of 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), it seems as though there is not much change in the new proposals.</p> <p>The change in the location of the building from 50 meters away to 30 meters away from Rivers Apartments has been proposed again. As highlighted in my original statement he closer</p>	Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.

	<p>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>Plans to build a 5m deep basement right next Rivers Apartments may also significantly affect the building, potentially to causing 2-5mm of further settling disruption.</p> <p>Furthermore, the style of the buildings (colours etc) do not seem to be in line with our current scheme, any further developments should be designed to allow our development to look as though we are part of the wider structure.</p>	
<p>88 Rivers Apartments</p>	<p>Given the serious concerns raised by myself and other members of the community at the previous planning submission, I'm extremely surprised to see this application, and how little it does to address the clear and obvious problems that were raised.</p> <p>My main concern was that of privacy, and light for existing residents of the area.</p> <p>The original approved plans that were roundly accepted as fair, respecting current leaseholders of Rivers Apartments whilst building new homes that are needed, had the northern most tower of The Depot at 50m from the south elevation of Rivers Apartments, the second plans reduced this to 30m, which was unacceptable, and rightly not approved.</p> <p>The developers have updated their most recent plans by moving the building a mere 3-6m further away, to 33-36m. This is still FAR too close, and is an insult to suggest that they have taken local residents concerns into account, or the issue of privacy that will affect future residents of the new building.</p> <p>This application should be refused immediately, and The Depot Tower built at the perfectly acceptable position it was originally intended for, at 50m away.</p> <p>At 50m distance, myself and other residents can expect a reasonable amount of privacy, and minimal overshadowing. At 33-36m, I fear that we will be unable to enjoy our homes, and</p>	<p>Given the similarity to the approved scheme, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to appropriate mitigation through conditions.</p>

	<p>neither will the new residents who face Rivers Apartments.</p> <p>There is no good reason for The Depot Tower to be built this close to Rivers Apartments, other than to increase sale prices and profits for the new towers south of Rivers Apartments.</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>The lack of consideration for an existing community in the pursuit of profit was shocking in the first instance, but the resubmission of these plans that do not fully acknowledge our concerns is even worse.</p> <p>3-6m adjustment in distance is insulting, and it is barely even a token gesture.</p> <p>These plans should be refused immediately, and the developers should stick to their original plans, which were accepted by the council, and the community.</p>	
<p>89 Rivers Apartments x2</p>	<p>I would also like to use some comments previously raised by other residents:</p> <p>PROXIMITY</p> <p>- Unacceptable proximity to Rivers Apartments:</p> <p>The depot building consent is currently 50m away from Rivers Apartments, the rejected plan is 30m, and this new plan is now at 33-37m away. I'd like to highlight that the latest booklet that Spurs provided is misleading because it states that it has moved the building 6-7m further away, while in reality it would be 3- 7m away. Such close proximity would have severe impact especially to all south-facing apartments for the duration of building works, with noise disruption impacting residents' ability to do their job successfully when working from home. From a long term perspective, this distance is insufficient to allow for proper privacy, sunlight access and creates a total view obstruction.</p>	<p>Concerns are noted. The scheme is similar to that approved at appeal by the Inspectorate who found all these aspects to be acceptable.</p>

- Change in building size in proximity to Cannon Road development:

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. Plans always allowed for a smaller building in between Rivers Apartments and the new taller building in order to allow for privacy and sufficient sunlight exposure.

- Quality of life:

The revised plans that they are proposing are changing the entire complex by making a tall building even taller and placing it approximately 40% closer to Rivers Apartments. 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.

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-story building a mere 13 metres away, rendering it useless as it will no longer be a peaceful & private place to unwind.

HEIGHT

- Light, privacy & view:

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 school-children 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 school-children in the local school, in favour of private buyers of these newly planned buildings. Any building that is being planned should not

be so significantly tall and should be 18 stories or lower as originally planned for.

- Increase in height:

The application was rejected a few months ago partly due to issues with the height of the buildings, but the new plans are showing the shoulder of the Goods Yard South tower even taller vs the rejected proposal. This is unacceptable and clearly not respecting the councillors' feedback and concerns

Heritage sites:

The new plan shows buildings even closer to some heritage settings, which was a reason for the rejection a few months ago. Again, another example of flagrant disregard for the feedback provided as part of the rejection

DENSITY

One of the concerns that led to the rejection of the latest plans was around density of population within this estate, and its impact on surrounding areas. The reduction from 867 to 844 residential homes does not come close to addressing or solving this issue.

OPEN SPACE

The proposal has decreased the total amount of site-wide open space by 20sqm, with a slight increase in provision per residential home overall (from 18.1sqm to 18.5sqm). This does not respond to the concerns raised during the rejection around insufficient provision of publicly accessible open space for the estimated resident population.

IMPACT ON RIVERS APARTMENTS

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.

In addition to all of the above, would it not make complete sense to flip the entire plan around

	<p>and have the tallest building next to white heart lane station at the other end as opposed to right next to the south side of rivers apartments?</p> <p>This would avoid possible movement to our building, no longer obstruct our views as badly, negate our privacy (both in apartments and roof terrace on second floor) along with our constant refusal of these 'so called' changes/updates to proposal that will not make many of us change our minds.</p> <p>Do the right thing and think this through properly this time! Take into consideration what i have said, we have all said and do the right thing. Third time lucky am guessing but please make sure you inverse the plan</p> <p>We object to the new proposals as we had to the original ones. There is hardly any change, so please do not lull the wool over our eyes!</p> <p>No thanks to any more subsidence, we already have ample cracks etc in our apartment and any new buildings so close to rivers apartments will amplify these and create more</p> <p>A low key scheme would be more than welcome but not more than 10 stories. Being in the south side upper floors we do not wish to have an eye sore directly in front of us! No need for such a tall building.</p> <p>Tottenham needs change but why try and get so many apartments in to one area, seems like it all boils down to profits!</p> <p>Please have consideration for established residents of the immediate surrounding area (rivers apartments block).</p>	
<p>94 Rivers Apartments x2</p>	<p>The changes proposed in this updated application do not deal meaningfully with the reasons for committee rejection of HGY/2021/1771 in November 2021. The Depot building has only moved 3-6m further away from rivers apartments - to 33-36m, where current approval is at 50m. This application should be refused and depot building should be built further away, at the accepted 50m positioning, for my ability to enjoy my home in privacy and to minimise overshadowing on Rivers Apartments.</p>	<p>As above.</p>
<p>96 Rivers 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. There are also barely any changes of significance</p>	

versus the plans that were rejected by councillors just a few months ago.

PROXIMITY –

Unacceptable proximity to Rivers Apartments:

The depot building consent is currently 50m away from Rivers Apartments, the rejected plan is 30m, and this new plan is now at 33-37m away. I'd like to highlight that the latest booklet that Spurs provided is misleading because it states that it has moved the building 6-7m further away, while in reality it would be 3- 7m away. Such close proximity would have severe impact especially to all south-facing apartments for the duration of building works, with noise disruption impacting residents' ability to do their job successfully when working from home. From a long term perspective, this distance is insufficient to allow for proper privacy, sunlight access and creates a total view obstruction.

- Change in building size in proximity to Cannon Road development:

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. Plans always allowed for a smaller building in between Rivers Apartments and the new taller building in order to allow for privacy and sufficient sunlight exposure.

- Quality of life:

The revised plans that they are proposing are changing the entire complex by making a tall building even taller and placing it approximately 40% closer to Rivers Apartments. 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.

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-story building a mere 13 metres away, rendering it useless as it will no longer be a peaceful & private place to unwind.

HEIGHT

- Light, privacy & view:

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 school-children 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 school-children in the local school, in favour of private buyers of these newly planned buildings. Any building that is being planned should not be so significantly tall and should be 18 stories or lower as originally planned for.

- Increase in height:

The application was rejected a few months ago partly due to issues with the height of the buildings, but the new plans are showing the shoulder of the Goods Yard South tower even taller vs the rejected proposal. This is unacceptable and clearly not respecting the councillors' feedback and concerns.

- Heritage sites:

The new plan shows buildings even closer to some heritage settings, which was a reason for the rejection a few months ago. Again, another example of flagrant disregard for the feedback provided as part of the rejection.

DENSITY

One of the concerns that led to the rejection of the latest plans was around density of population within this estate, and its impact on surrounding areas. The reduction from 867 to 844 residential homes does not come close to addressing or solving this issue.

OPEN SPACE

	<p>The proposal has decreased the total amount of site-wide open space by 20sqm, with a slight increase in provision per residential home overall (from 18.1sqm to 18.5sqm). This does not respond to the concerns raised during the rejection around insufficient provision of publicly accessible open space for the estimated resident population.</p> <p>IMPACT ON RIVERS APARTMENTS</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>	
<p>98 Rivers Apartments</p>	<p>The changes proposed in this updated application do not deal meaningfully with the reasons for the committee rejection of HGY/2021/1771 in November 2021. Spurs have shown a complete disregard for the residents of cannon road. They are trying to push the limits to see if they can get away with it. The Depot building has only moved 3-6m further away from rivers apartments to 33-36m, where current approval is at 50m. This application should be refused and the depot building should be built further away, at the accepted 50m positioning, for my ability to enjoy my home in privacy and to minimise overshadowing on Rivers Apartments.</p>	<p>The proposal is now 1 metre further away than the approved appeal scheme which was found to be acceptable.</p>
<p>78 River Apartments</p>	<p>Firstly, I'd like to advise that I strongly agree with all the comments that the Cannon Road Residents' Group has submitted on this new planning application.</p> <p>As advised in my previous objection, I appreciate what the regeneration vision is trying to achieve, however, I object again to these 'revised' plans. These plans will again 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 and positioning</p> <p>The application prior to this most recent one was rejected for including excessively tall buildings. The shoulder of the south building is now even taller and close to some heritage sites which was also a reason for the rejection.</p> <p>Current approval for the buildings is 50 metres away from Rivers Apartments. In these most recent revised plans plan the proposal is still too close at 33-36 metres. The Depot building has</p>	<p>Concerns are noted. The scheme is similar to that approved at appeal by the Inspectorate who found all these aspects to be acceptable.</p>

only moved a further 3-6 metres. Moreover, the booklet that was distributed to residents and other impacted parties states it's now 6-7 metres which is misleading (and still too close to our building).

The buildings continue to be positioned in order to have attractive views of the city, privacy and light to achieve the best possible price for Spurs and the developers. This position will however, 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 continues to be overlooked. Consideration has been given to future residents to fund Spurs' developments at the expense of the Rivers Apartments leaseholders (and also others who hold investments in this building such as Newlon Housing Trust).

Some flats will be left with light levels below BRE recommended levels. For some other flats, this means that views from their homes 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 still minimal.

There must be a way that the blocks can be positioned in such a way that we all benefit from this regeneration.

2. Colour and design of the building

The proposed external facade of the building does not align with our building or other local buildings. The proposed design and materials fail to be of sufficiently high architectural quality expected of such prominent buildings.

3. Basement

The 5 metre deep basement that is proposed to be built right next to Rivers Apartments is also likely to cause issues with our building. Many residents, including myself, have significant issues with sticking front doors and plasterboard cracks and this has great potential to cause an additional 2-5mm of settling disruption.

It's hard to understand why this basement is being built so close to our building.

In conclusion, I hope that these comments and others that are received on the planning application from local residents and other affected parties will again be factored into the decision making to achieve a fair and equitable outcome.

--	--	--

Commentator	Comment	Response
20 Cannon Road	Please go ahead with the work asap! We full support the planning application that's why we invested in the Tottenham flat. Please do not break the promise you made to all of us and start this asap ! Thank you david waiting 4 years for a better area where to leave! B	Noted
93 Cannon Road	The three propose building are too high and too close to Rivers Apartments cutting the sun light to the flats on the side of the proposed new development. Those new buildings should be a bit more away from Rivers Apartments. It will be nice to add more green areas and small shops to promote more healthy habits and support small businesses. Also, the trains in White Hart Lane should increase frequency if the amount of residents will increase. Finally, some solutions should be included to reduce the issues with prostitution and drug sales around this area.	Concerns are noted. The scheme is similar to that approved at appeal by the Inspectorate who found all these aspects to be acceptable.
45 Pretoria Road	<p>While I support the regeneration and new housing in the area in general, I still have concerns about this updated development plan.</p> <p>I do appreciate the effort to address the concerns highlighted by the council and the existing community in the area with regards to the previous plan (HGY/2021/1771). In particular I'm pleased that the colours of the towers are now of a lighter and less overbearing tone than before. Also that the width of the towers have been reduced with the depot tower further away from the Rivers Apartments building giving more light and less shadow between those two towers.</p> <p>However, the measurements do not seem to go far enough to allay my overall concern that the towers would still affect quality of life negatively for the neighbouring residents around the development. Certainly removing only one storey from the tallest tower and instead heightening the sleeves of the other tower seems to do the opposite of what it aims to do in terms of lessening the effect. Also the gap between the north GY tower and the Depot tower seems like it would be narrower with the latter moved closer towards the former and the railway, which I feel would reduce the benefit of adding 7m of distance from Rivers Apartments somewhat.</p> <p>All in all it seems like the adjustments made to the layout of the plan is more of a 'nip-and-tuck' to appease the planning department than a genuine effort to address the real concerns of the council and residents, which led to the previous proposal being rejected in the first place. Even with the obvious age in design it would seem that something more closely aligned with the extant plan that was approved in 2019/20 would be more favourable in general.</p> <p>I'm also rather concerned that the reduction of completion time in the building schedule would</p>	<p>Support for the design changes are noted.</p> <p>The proposal is now 1 metre further away than the approved appeal scheme which was found to be acceptable.</p>

	<p>lead to compromises in build quality of the overall project. I understand the need to meet deadlines, but I would hope that there has been consideration for adjustment between this planning application's schedule and the previous, where it looks like completion times have not changed despite the start time being delayed by at least 10 months.</p>	
--	---	--