

Development Management Forum 13 October 2021 – High Road West site (land at Whitehall Street and between the railway and the High Road from Brereton Road in the south and the B&M supermarket in the north), N17.

Overall proposals are: Demolition of most buildings and the retention of others; redevelopment to provide approx. 2,600 new homes (including 60 homes on site of No. 100 Whitehall Street & Whitehall & Tenterden Community Centre), shops, leisure, community and business uses in a range of buildings between 2 and 32-storeys, together with a new park and public square.

A virtual MS Teams Development Management (DM) Forum was held on 13 October 2021 at 7:30 PM.

Three local residents/interested people and Councillors John Bevan, Erdal Dogan, Sarah Jones and Yvonne Say logged on to the meeting. Also attending were members of the applicant team and Haringey officers. Attendees were advised that the meeting was being recorded. One local person had microphone problems and officers read out his questions from the meeting chat to ensure that they were able to make all the points they wished to make.

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

- Workings of the area on stadium event day
- Density, privacy and overlooking, daylight and sunlight
- Affordable housing, Council rents and service charges
- Private housing sale values & marketing
- Housing service charges to cover costs of managing & maintaining proposed spaces
- Flooding and drainage
- Transport – ability of area to cope, cycling & parking
- Land in third party ownership

### **Workings of the area on stadium event day**

- Concern that the proposed Moselle Square and surrounding area needs to be suitable for large crowds on stadium event days and also provide a space for residents. Also concern that the proposed new library would be located in this area, which could be difficult to access at such times. Local people need to feel safe.
- The issue is less about football crowds (who tend to be regular and know how the area works on event days), but crowds for other events – such as NFL games and boxing. The area suffered badly during the recent boxing match (when capacity was increased to 67,000) – with the area in ‘gridlock’ until

1.00am, people using gardens and spaces as a toilet and rubbish everywhere etc. Concern that emergency vehicles could not get through if they needed to, ability of local people to get off trains and safety of women walking home.

- Applicant response: Moselle Square and other spaces are being designed first and foremost for residents. Intention is to create spaces that help manage crowds better and increase the capacity of the area to cope – not to encourage crowds to gather (spaces and widths have been sized to cater with people walking through). Met. Police Design Out Crime Officer and others consulted.
- Officer response: The Council as Local Planning Authority needs to scrutinise proposals and consider whether they would improve the current situation on event days (on-going discussion in other forums).

### **Density, privacy and overlooking, daylight and sunlight, play space**

- Concern at proposed high density – both number of proposed homes and height of buildings have continued to increase over the last few years (questions over whether this is the type of place that local people have been saying they want).
- Serious concern at overlooking across spaces and between homes themselves – with the proposed tall buildings being close to each other. Also concern about inadequate daylight and sunlight (particularly on lower floors and overshadowing of spaces and general ‘liveability’ of the scheme).
- Concerns that the proposed tall buildings would overwhelm and overshadow the Headcorn and Tenterden area to the west of the railway. People here feel forgotten/excluded from regeneration.
- Concern over whether proposed play space is adequate for the density
- Applicant response: The proposals include a range of heights, including low-rise (5-7-storeys) as well as taller buildings. Focused taller buildings to the west, around the station and next to the railway and away from the High Road and its heritage buildings.
- The scheme would benefit from large spaces (above the railway lines and proposed new Moselle Square and Peacock Park).
- Lots of testing of daylight and sunlight has been undertaken – informing the size of streets and courtyards (not fixed, but likely to vary – with some streets about 11-12m and others about 18-20m and courtyards ranging from 21-37m) to ensure good levels of daylight for homes. Seeking to establish principles at this stage. There would be lots of opportunities to work with local people on detailed designs if ‘outline’ permission were to be granted.
- There would be some impacts on surrounding areas, but seeking to minimise.
- Officer response: An ‘outline’ permission would establish parameters – this is a large scheme that, if approved, would come forward in phases and there would be more time to discuss and consider detailed proposals.

## **Affordable Housing, Council rents and service charges**

- Questions about affordable housing and whether rents would be the same as Council rents. The offer is for rents to be 'only' 10% above existing rents – but this is only for existing Love Lane Estate residents. Concern, that local people do not know how much higher rents would be.
- Applicant response: Not the place to discuss commitments given by the Council during the ballot process. The applicant is trying to balance affordability with aspirational change. Also considering affordability/rents of commercial spaces.

## **Private housing sale values & marketing**

- Concern at the impact the scheme would have on rents and values in the surrounding area.
- Would the applicant be willing to market homes to local people first, before marketing to others (including those living abroad)?
- Applicant response: Intending to build a mix of homes (rent and for sale) that would be affordable. It has already given a commitment to the Council to market locally before more widely.

## **Housing service charges to cover costs of managing & maintain proposed spaces**

- Concern that new high-quality spaces (welcome in principle) could result in high service charges for residents. Want the Council as Local Planning Authority to cap service charges.
- Applicant response: The applicant wants a well-managed estate and is trying to design homes and landscaping with relatively low management and maintenance requirements (e.g. ability to clean windows from inside homes).
- Future management would be the responsibility of a management company – that would include representatives of the developer, Council and residents. Opportunities for income generation to help keep down service charges

## **Flooding and drainage**

- Concern at prospect of increased rainfall and flooding of White Hart Lane. Recent works not attractive (weeds), cannot cope with rain and road markings not clear – so difficult to know where to cross etc.
- Applicant response: A comprehensive approach should help to manage flood risk and aim is to improve the existing situation by additional planting as well as improved conventional drainage.

### **Transport – ability of area to cope, cycling & parking**

- Concern at ability of the area to cope with proposed increase in density? What are proposals for cycling and car parking?
- Applicant response: Recent improvements to White Hart Lane Station means it would have capacity to serve the proposed development. Looking to incorporate good cycling routes. Commitment to re-provide car parking for existing residents – but other than that the focus is on providing accessible Blue Badge spaces. Cycle route designed into proposal.
- Officer response: The Council as Local Planning Authority has strong policies to encourage active travel and will be scrutinising the application to ensure that it supports walking and cycling.

### **Land in third party ownership**

- How would land not owned by the Council or developer be used?
- Concern that the proposals amount to a 'land grab.'
- Applicant response: Council owns most of land south of White Hart Lane – where early phases would be focused. There is time to keep talking with Tottenham Hotspur FC, Peacock Industrial Estate and other land owners about their land (the proposed scheme allows for the Spurs owned land to be developed by them).

The applicant thanked people for comments and assured the meeting that they would take away issues and consider. The applicant also provided an email address for people to send further comments and signalled willingness to keep consulting and discussing the scheme. Officers noted that a number of planning and other issues had been raised and that they will consider further.

Meeting concluded at 8.55 PM

GH 15.10.2021