

Appendix 5a Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies and individuals.

No.	Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	INTERNAL		
	LBH Transportation	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 6 of this report	Comments noted and conditions have been imposed as recommended. A legal agreement is also recommended in order to secure the provision of mitigation measures as set out in report.
	LBH Conservation Officer	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix7 of this report.	Comments noted and conditions imposed as recommended.
	LBH Head of Carbon Management	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 14 of this report.	Comments noted and a legal agreement is also recommended in order to secure the provision of mitigation measures as set out in report.
	LBH Senior Drainage Engineer	Drainage strategy is acceptable subject to conditions.	Comments noted and conditions imposed as recommended.
	LBH Env Hlth – Lead Officer Pollution	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 13 of this report.	Comments noted and conditions imposed as recommended.
	EXTERNAL		
	Transport for London	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 10 of this report. However, no overall objection subject to working closely with TfL on required measures and the imposition of conditions etc.	Comments noted and addressed in additional information submitted, and by conditions and s106/278 HoTs set out in the report.
	Thames Water	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 15 of this report. However, no objection subject to conditions.	Comments noted and conditions imposed as recommended.
	Environment Agency	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix16 of this report. However, no objection.	Comments noted.
	Council for British Archaeology	A revised scheme. Our previous objections in terms of loss of heritage assets and destruction of the street scene remain. Although the new stadium may be claimed to outweigh these disadvantages on the grounds of community use / benefit, it would be possible to provide a new stadium without destroying local character. The scheme therefore remains	Comments noted.

		unacceptable.	
	Historic England – Archaeology	Having considered the proposals with reference to the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant effect on heritage assets of archaeological interest.	Comments noted.
	Historic England	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 8 of this report.	Comments noted and responded to in detail in the Heritage section of this report.
	Haringey Irish Cultural and Community Centre	Supports the application for a new stadium. The Centre relies on the football club for customer trade. The new stadium creates significant benefits for the local community and public in general. The new public realm welcome as people would likely stay longer within the area.	Comments noted.
	Lea Valley Estates	Supports the scheme as it will benefit the local community with trade, leisure, health and general quality of life. Creating the opportunity for people to invest in the area – the sports facility, including NFL will also provide economic benefit which extends beyond premiership football.	Comments noted.
	London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority	Following the submission of revisions - no objection and are satisfied with the proposals for fire fighting access.	Comments noted.
	Lord Triesman	Supports the planning application for a new stadium for the benefits it will bring for the community e.g. job opportunities and businesses.	Comments noted.
	National Football League (NFL)	Supports the scheme to meet the growing enthusiasm for American Football and will deliver huge benefits for local community and businesses.	Comments noted.
	Natural England	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 17 of this report. However no objection.	Comments noted.
	Historic Buildings and Conservation Committee	Objects to the scheme on scale and unsuccessful public realm works	Comments Noted
	Haringey Mencap Ltd	Supports the proposed development.	Comments noted.
	UEFA	Supports the proposed development, which will deliver huge benefits for local people and businesses.	Comments noted.
	Tottenham Hotspur Supporters Trust	Supports the proposed development as it will provide new sport in NFL, a quality design, and provide benefits	Comments noted.

		to supporters, local people and the area generally.	
	Tottenham Conservation	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 21 of this report. Objects to the proposed development as it results in the demolition of buildings which should be retained.	Comments noted.
	Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 18 of this report. Objects to the proposed development as it results in a loss of buildings and will adversely impact on the Conservation Area.	Comments noted.
	Tottenham Business Group	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 22 of this report. Objects to the scheme on loss of building, design scale etc out of keeping in context of the surrounding area, impact on parking and transport generally – impact on the conservation area.	Comments noted.
	The Victorian Society	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 19 of this report. Objects to the scheme on loss of buildings, design scale and impact on the conservation area.	Comments noted.
	Our Tottenham	Objects to the scheme. Raise a number of points and make recommendations but not directly objecting to the proposed development.	Comments noted.
	London First	Supports the proposed development for the benefits it would provide and for the regeneration of the area generally.	Comments noted.
	London Borough of Waltham Forest	No objection to the proposed development.	Comments noted.
	London Borough of Camden	No objection to the proposed development.	Comments noted.
	Greater London Authority	This stakeholders comments are set out in full in Appendix 9 of this report. No objection – generally complies with the strategic objectives but the scheme is not fully policy compliant.	Comments noted.
	Barnet, Enfield and Haringey NHS Trust	Supports the proposed development as it will provide improved leisure facilities, job opportunities, new community healthcare facility and regenerate Tottenham.	Comments noted.
	Metropolitan Police	No objection subject to a condition imposed requiring applicant to incorporate secure by design	Comments noted.

		measures.	
	Premier League	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Newlon Housing Trust	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	North London Chamber of Commerce	Supports the development and the regeneration it will have on the area.	
	Basket Ball England	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Ahmed Mohammed	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Ashley Kirby	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	B2B Engage	Supports the proposed development –The proposal provides significant public and community benefits.	Comments noted.
	Eric Palmer	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Jubed Bashir	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Lauren Black	Supports the proposal for the clubs participation in and support of young people in the local community.	Comments noted.
	Candy Amsden	In favour of a new stadium but not to decimate North Tottenham. Impact on small businesses, the council housing and the historic local buildings in this locality. Loss of light to its neighbours.	Comments noted.
	Robert Lindsey Smith	Objects: Effect on local amenities; disruption to local transport. The use for NFL and other events would mean that there would be little respite for local residents during the summer. Loss of light and privacy of neighbours. St Paul's school and the Adventure Playground would be in shadow from the tall residential blocks. The blocks would overlook these two playgrounds, causing child protection concerns. The flats on the south side of Park Lane would also be overlooked. Noise and disturbance resulting from new uses. Effect on vitality and viability of shopping centre. Effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of an area. It is not acceptable to lose the three locally listed building on the High Road. There is no social housing in this application.	
	Catherine Collingborn	Objects - Loss of three locally listed historic buildings. 3. The scale and height of the	Comments noted.

		development would cause loss of light and shadowing, dominate the skyline, out of scale and character with the High road. It would set a precedent for similar developments elsewhere in the borough. It will not offer housing to those who really need it.	
	Margaret Burr	Objects - Loss of three listed buildings	Comments noted.
	A Fairer Chance Community Interest Company Ltd	Supports the proposal for the benefits that it would provide.	Comments noted.
	Alex Skorecki	Comment: The plans should incorporate more solar power or other renewable energy.	Comments noted.
	Allen O Shaughnessy	Comment – no support or objection significant improvement is needed to the rail service to this area. Reliability of the line needs to improve.	Comments noted.
	Andrew P	Supports the proposed development and the benefits it will have for the local area.	Comments noted.
	Andy Hoare	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Anne Duffy	Requests to be kept up to date with the planning application	
		Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
		Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	4 Anonymous	Objects on demolition of listed buildings	Comments noted.
	10 Anonymous	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	2 Anonymous	Neither objects or supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Barnet Southgate College	Supports the proposed development for what benefits are proposed	Comments noted.
	Bill Brown	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	BL Wheatley	Supports the proposed development	
	Bob Hyde	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Bob Joseph (x 2)	Neither objects or supports then a second email received supporting the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Bob	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Brian Daly	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Brook House Primary School	Supports the proposed development for the benefits that it would deliver for the local community.	Comments noted.
	Catherine Suttle	Objects to the demolition of buildings	Comments noted.
	Christiana Flynn	Supports the proposed development for the benefits that it would deliver for the local community.	Comments noted.
	Christina Protz	Objects to the demolition of buildings and the scale of the proposed	

		development.	
	Colin Hall	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Connifers Care	As a local care provider, supports the proposed development as the club works and supports the care facility.	Comments noted.
	D, Dwoob	No objection to the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Danny Blanchflower	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	David Cracknell	Generally supports the scheme but objects to the loss of buildings and general upheaval in terms of noise and impact on transport movement / parking that will result from construction etc	Comments noted.
	David Matzdorf	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	David Spanu	Objects to the scheme and the stadium should be built elsewhere.	Comments noted.
	Children's and young person's Services	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided for young people.	Comments noted.
	Gladsmore Community School	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided for young people and the general regeneration of the area.	Comments noted.
	Epping Forest College x 3 representations	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area which will benefit local businesses. Club and facilities support the students.	Comments noted
	Haringey Sports Development Trust	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area.	Comments noted.
	Haris Setyo Utomo	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Hiremech Ltd	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area which will benefit local businesses.	Comments noted.
	IPS LLP	Supports the scheme which will be beneficial for the local area.	Comments noted.
	J Baker	Objects to the proposed development on the loss of buildings.	Comments noted.
	James Reiff	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Jenny	Neither supports nor objects but suggest the club be relocated to an industrial area.	Comments noted.
	Joyce Rosser	Objects as it does not meet targets for renewable energy	
	Jubed Bashir	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Julie K Wilkinson	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Karin Lock	Objects on design, impact on amenity	Comments noted.

		and loss of buildings	
	Keith Eldridge	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Kevin Field	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Kyriacos tryfonos	Objects on design, impact on amenity and loss of buildings	Comments noted.
	Marina	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Mark Serlin	Objects on grounds of lack of renewable energy measures.	Comments noted.
	Mark	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Mary Powell	Change the character of the area, loss of buildings and businesses, increase in noise and transport.	Comments noted.
	Matthew Koushi	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Michael Cordwell James	Neither supports nor objects to the proposed development – comments that there should be more sustainable measures.	Comments noted.
	Moira Jenkins	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	C M Hobbs	Objects to the demolition of buildings	Comments noted.
	Neil O'Meara	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Peter Corley	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	Peter Swan	No objection or support but comments that there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	Phoebe Swan	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	Quentin Given	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	Richard Allcock	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Richard Desforges	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Robert Clark	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Ruth Schamroth	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	Ruth Tastaban	Objects to the proposed development as there should be more sustainable measures within the proposal.	Comments noted.
	S Bond	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Samantha Moran	Objects to the proposed development as the stadium is out of character with the local area.	Comments noted.
	Save Britain's Heritage	Objects to the proposed development on grounds of loss of heritage buildings and the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area.	Comments noted.

	Sophie Severs	Objects on the loss of the heritage buildings and impact on character and appearance of the local area.	Comments noted.
	Steve Pilborough	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Stuart Matheson	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Tommy Baily	Objects on the loss of the heritage buildings and impact on character and appearance of the local area.	Comments noted.
	Tottenham Business Group	Objects on loss of heritage buildings, loss of parade of shops / buildings, stadium will be overbearing, out of character and will affect the setting of listed buildings, loss of sunlight and daylight, unacceptable impact on transport, movement and parking, will blight nearby business and is not the centre of regeneration for Tottenham	Comments noted
	Whittington Health NHS Trust	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area which will benefit local businesses.	Comments noted.
	William Severs	Objects to the proposed development on the loss of buildings.	Comments noted.
	Gareth Jones	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area which will benefit local businesses.	Comments noted.
	P Johnson	Objects to the proposed development on the loss of buildings.	Comments noted.
	Kevin Field	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted.
	Oluremi Abati	Supports the scheme for the benefits that would be provided local population and the general regeneration of the area which will benefit local businesses.	Comments noted.
	Catherine Collingborn	Objects to the scheme as it does not meet 20% renewable energy measures and should seek to provide a district energy centre	Comments noted
	Dermot Barnes	Objects as the scheme does not meet sustainable development principles and fails to deliver adequate renewable energy measures. Also, the councils commitment to reduce carbon emissions by 40% by 2020 wholly undermined by the scheme	Comments noted
	Mustafa Suleman	Objects to the loss of listed buildings	Comments noted
	Nadhir Choudhury	Supports the stadium and will regenerate the area	Comments noted
	Robyn Thomas	Objects as the renewable energy measures not adequate and should	Comments noted

		be providing district energy centre	
	Jeremy Cassidy	Energy, renewable and efficiency all inadequate and the developer should be improving the measures	Comments noted
	Roru Lulham	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted
	Bryan Wood	Supports the proposed development and the enabling of learning towards obtaining 'football badges'.	Comments noted
	Bushra Aden	Neither supports or objects but supports the wider benefits that the proposal will provide	Comments noted
	Katrina Heal	Neither but supports the plans	Comments noted
	Louise O Mahony	Supports the proposal and the benefits it will bring with the NFL and regeneration and opportunities locally	Comments noted
	Sophia Bowes	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted
	Angela Demetriou	Supports the proposed development and the opportunities it will provide	Comments noted
	Anna Jozefowicz	Supports the proposed development and the regeneration that will occur	Comments noted
	Arther Chance	Objects to the proposed development – a 'pinch point' created, attract too many people, loss of listed buildings	Comments noted
	Bruce Goddard, Head Teacher, Highlands School	Neither objects nor supports the proposed development – the club provides facilities for the pupils which are welcomed.	Comments noted
	Cara Jenkinson	Objects to the proposed development on grounds of inadequate energy measures	Comments noted
	George Hyslop	Supports the proposed development for the facilities that are offered for the community	Comments noted
	Ilja van Holsteijn - The Johan Cruyff Foundation	Supports the proposed development for the significant benefits in terms of regeneration and sports / education facilities that will be provided	Comments noted
	Jess Khanom	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted
	Kate Turnpenney – Headteacher Wilbury Primary School Wilbury Way Edmonton	Supports the proposed development for the support and training that the club provides to support the school	Comments noted
	Lucy Peirce	Neither support nor objects the proposed development but praises the impact on regeneration and opportunities that will arise.	Comments noted
	Raluca	Supports the proposed development	Comments noted
	Sarah Howe	Supports the proposed development for the educational benefits and opportunities generally for local people	Comments noted

	Tan Radan	Supports the proposed development for the regeneration and wider benefits this will provide	Comments noted
--	-----------	---	----------------