

VCR: Ulrich Wehner  
Date: Friday, 10 March 2017  
Location: Chamber, City Hall  
Hearing: Representation Hearing

Start time: 11.30am  
Finish time: 1.35pm

Speakers:

Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London  
Esther Thornton, Principal Solicitor, Property and Planning Law (Legal Adviser)  
Katherine Wood, Senior Strategic Planner, Greater London Authority (Case Officer)

Michael Orr, Development Director, Muse Developments (Applicant)  
Chris Bearman, Allies and Morrison Architects (Applicant)  
Sean Bashforth, Project Manager, Quod Consultancy (Applicant)

Natan Doron, Councillor, Haringey Council (Objector)  
Anna Povey, The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village (Objector)  
Archie Maddan, The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village (Objector)  
Lynn Tank, Resident, Hale Wharf (Objector)  
Gordon Ifill, Stonebridge Boaters Association (Objector)  
Del Brenner, Regents Network (Objector)

VCR: Ulrich Wehner  
Date: Friday, 10 March 2017  
Location: Chamber, City Hall  
Hearing: Representation Hearing

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK, it is 11.30am now. Hi and welcome to City Hall. I will begin by opening this Mayoral Representation Hearing into the planning application which I have called in at Hale Wharf in Haringey. I will begin by getting my Legal Officer, Esther Thornton, to set out the representation hearing procedure and we will then move on to my officer's presentation of the case. Esther?

**Esther Thornton (Principal Solicitor, Property and Planning Law, Greater London Authority):** My name is Esther Thornton and I am the Legal Adviser to the Mayor today. I would like to begin by setting out some formalities.

This is a meeting held in public and it is open to anyone to attend. We are following an agenda this morning and I hope you all have a copy of this. If not, you will find copies, together with copies of the report and the addendum report to the Mayor on the application, on the desk near the entrance to the Chamber.

The Mayor made a site visit to the application site on 3 March this year. The Mayor was accompanied by Greater London Authority (GLA) officers, representatives from Haringey Council and the applicant. The site visit was conducted in accordance with the GLA's procedure for Representation Hearings.

All speakers today have been given an allotted time to speak as set out in the agenda. When it is your turn to speak, you will be asked to come forward to the table. A transcript of the proceedings today is being produced and it would be helpful, when you come forward, to clearly introduce yourself before you begin to speak.

Speakers should confine their comments to material planning considerations and ensure that their comments do not conflict with the GLA's Diversity and Equality Statement. All speakers will be notified 30 seconds before their time is due to run out. When speakers have finished addressing the Mayor, there will be no further opportunity to speak unless the Mayor asks a direct question. If a member of the public interrupts the hearing at any point, the Mayor will warn them and may order their removal from the Chamber. On this occasion, the Mayor has used his discretion to extend those time limits to ensure, as far as possible, that he hears from as many interested parties as possible.

Having heard all the representations, the Mayor may decide he is able to make the decision today. However, if the Mayor decides he needs more time to consider the application, he will make his decision within five working days of today and the decision will be posted on the GLA's website.

Finally, we are not expecting an evacuation alarm today, but in the event that the alarm sounds during the hearing, you will be directed towards the nearest evacuation point.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thank you. I am now going to ask my Case Officer, who is the Senior Strategic Planner, Katherine Wood, to talk about the case.

**Katherine Wood (Senior Strategic Planner, Greater London Authority):** Thank you, Mayor and Esther. For the purpose of the record, my name is Katherine Wood and I am a Senior Strategic Planner here at the GLA.

The content of my presentation will set out the site and the surroundings, the application, the spatial planning context, the proposed development, the response to public consultations, Haringey Council's reasons for refusal, the key planning issues to consider and the recommendation to the Mayor.

Starting with the site and the surroundings, the site which is highlighted here in red is located in the far east of the Borough of Haringey, close to the borough boundary with Waltham Forest. It sits on a narrow peninsula, separated from land on two sides by waterways. The River Lee Navigation and Pymmes Brook flow to the west of the site. The River Lee Flood Relief channel flows to the east of the site and that separates the site from The Paddock, which is a community park and nature reserve. Further to the east is a network of reservoirs in the Borough of Waltham Forest. Tottenham Hale town centre is to the west of the site and the station is within 300 metres. The site therefore records an excellent public transport accessibility rating, particularly at its southern end.

The current application site comprises four existing light industrial office and restaurant buildings and associated yards. There are also three moored barges in the west of the site which have lawful business use. The application site also extends westwards across the Lee Navigation and Pymmes Brook to include a landing point for two proposed pedestrian bridges which would link the site with Hale Village.

These are a couple of photographs of the existing buildings taken from the River Lee Navigation towpath and looking towards the north and east. These are some photographs of the Hale Village development, which lies to the west of the site. These are wider views, looking towards the site from within the Lee Valley Regional Park. Images 1 and 2 are taken from the River Lee Navigation towpath and from Tottenham Marshes, looking south. Image 3 shows a view from the towpath, looking north.

We will briefly look at the spatial policy context. The site, which is highlighted in red here, falls within the Upper Lee Valley Opportunity Area as defined in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on the London Plan. Opportunity Areas have been identified because of their significant capacity to accommodate new housing and other development. Tottenham Hale is in a transport growth corridor and is a proposed station on the route for Crossrail 2. The area is identified in the Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) as a growth point which will provide at least 5,000 new homes, 4,000 new jobs and high density housing with

tall buildings. The site also falls within the Tottenham Housing Zone (THZ), which was designated by the GLA in 2015 and is expected to deliver around 2,000 new homes in Tottenham Hale by 2025. The green areas shown on the plan are designated Green Belt and that includes the reservoirs in blue.

This is an extract from Haringey Council's local plan. This shows the site outlined in black here within a growth area, which is the orange, and outlined in purple is the emerging district town centre boundary to the west of Tottenham Hale station. The map also shows the Blue Ribbon Network, which runs to the north and south, a dotted blue line to the east and west of the site. The site is also within the Lee Valley Regional Park and land to the northern tip of the site and to the east and west is part of a metropolitan Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The wider site is also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Parts of the site to the north and east are included within the boundary of designated Green Belt and I will refer to that in more detail later on.

At a site-specific level, the Hale Wharf site is part of an allocated development site within Haringey Council's adopted Tottenham Hale Urban Centre Masterplan and its emerging Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP). This image shows the emerging site allocation, which includes The Paddock and the adjacent garage site to the east and the Lock Keeper's Cottage to the west. These are not included in the current application site which is outlined here. The site allocation in total envisages a comprehensive redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed use residential, employment and leisure destination.

I will now take you through a very brief planning history of the application site. This is the first application on the site which has proposed comprehensive redevelopment. Following pre-planning application discussions with the Council and the GLA in 2015 and 2016, the current application was formally validated by the Council in June 2016. Haringey Council resolved to refuse the application against officer recommendation in November 2016. In January 2017, the Mayor decided to take over the application for his own determination.

Since then, the scheme has undergone a few amendments. Firstly, the affordable housing offer has been increased to 35%, which I will refer to later on. Secondly, the scheme has been revised to amend the extent of development zones and to remove any built development on designated Green Belt. In this slide, you can see the original and revised drawings and, as you can see, one of the indicatively proposed buildings in the northern part of the site has been removed and replaced with landscaped open space. Again, as shown, the northernmost block on the revised scheme has been omitted from the proposal. The omitted floor space has been redistributed into three of the other buildings proposed in the outline part of the scheme. Those blocks become one storey taller but remain within the maximum height parameters that have been applied for, which is indicated there by the blue line.

I will now describe the current proposal. The proposed development is a hybrid application comprising detailed and outline elements. It would provide up to 505 residential units and up to 1,600 square metres of retail and business floor space and new landscaping and pedestrian bridges in the public realm. The detailed application component comprises of two blocks of 16 and 21 storeys which provide 249 residential units and commercial space. The outline

application comprises blocks of between 3 to 10 storeys, providing up to 256 residential units and up to 1,300 square metres of office space.

This is a parameter plan showing the outline elements of the proposals in the development zones, and the part of this I outlined in purple is a detailed element of the scheme. The parameter plan will set the maximum development zones and building heights with minimum gaps between the blocks, and the two pedestrian bridges are part of the outline proposal.

This is a proposed illustrative ground floor plan, indicating how the blocks could be laid out in accordance with the parameter plan. The two blocks within the purple line again are in the detailed application although they would be built exactly as shown. This is the phasing plan, indicating how the development would be delivered in three phases.

The next two slides show the floor plans for the (Inaudible) forming part of the detailed application. This is the ground floor plan. Block A in the southern part of the site closest to Ferry Lane would provide a commercial unit at ground floor level and 141 dwellings above. Block B to the rear would be a block providing 108 residential units for private rent and a commercial unit at ground floor level. The public open space proposed for the wharfside would come forward in phase 1. This is a typical upper floor plan showing the arrangement of the residential units in each block.

This is an indication of the building height and the outline part of the scheme is shown shaded. The detailed application, as I say, provides a few tall buildings, block A being up to 21 storeys and block B up to 16 storeys. The maximum height for the blocks in the outline element of the scheme would be ten, seven and storeys in the western part of the site and four to five storeys in the eastern part of the site.

This is a three-dimensional (3D) representation of the buildings. Hale Village is shown on this drawing at the bottom of the image here. That development comprises buildings of predominantly 9 up to 10 storeys and there is outline planning permission for an 18-storey building shown in the foreground here. This is not yet built. We have looked past it on the site (Inaudible).

These are the detailed elevations of blocks A and B from the south and from the west and this is an illustrative view of the site looking towards the wharf. Blocks A and B towards the right-hand side of the image are shown as they would be built. The other blocks, as I say, are in outline form, but this is a view of how they could appear in accordance with the parameter plan and the design codes that would have been secured. This is a view of the proposed blocks A and B as viewed from the south.

We will now look at a summary of the response to the consultation process. The full details of the consultation responses and representations are included within the hearing report and addendum.

The Mayor was initially consulted at Stage 1 of the process and responded on 18 August last year with his views on the proposal's compliance with the London Plan. The response

concluded that the land use principles and design were supported. A number of strategic issues were identified as needing further attention before the application could be recognised as being compliant with London Plan policies. That included the requirement to increase the affordable housing from the level of 9% originally proposed as well as climate change and transport issues.

These are a selection of statutory consultation responses and responses from community groups. Again, a full list of groups that responded is listed in the hearing report. The Environment Agency and Natural England have not objected to the proposal. The Lee Valley Regional Park Authority has raised objections to the height of the proposed buildings, particularly the tallest, Block A, and the visual impact on the park.

The Inland Waterways Association, the Commercial Boat Operators Association and The Regents Network oppose the application due to the potential for negative impact on waterways and the use of the wharf site. The Tottenham Civic Society objects to the height and the design of the proposed buildings.

In response to the initial consultation on the application and as reported in the Stage 2 report, Haringey Council received 166 objections to the scheme. The Mayor also received 46 direct objections prior to his decision at Stage 2. Since his decision to take over the application, including the responses to consultation on the revised plan that was carried out, 66 objections have been received directly to the Mayor and 3 representations in support.

A summary of the key points of objection from all stages of the consultation process are listed here and further details are provided in the hearing report. They include excessive building height, particularly of the two tallest buildings; the impact on the local environment; adverse residential amenity impact; adverse impact on boats and the loss of the wharf; the loss of employment uses; and the lack of affordable housing and community benefit.

Moving on to Haringey Council's reasons for refusal, 11 reasons were included on the Council's draft decision notice and I will summarise those in the next few slides. The full reasons for the policies listed are set out in the hearing report.

Reason for refusal 1 related to the height, design and visual impact of the proposed buildings and the impact on open space and the wide area.

Reason for refusal 2 related to car parking, specifically the lack of general car parking on the site and the potential impact on parking stress in the area.

Reasons 3 to 11 concerned the absence of an agreed section 106 legal agreement which could have secured measures to mitigate the impact of the development. Points particularly addressed related to affordable housing, employment, securing pedestrian bridges, transport issues and energy and sustainability.

In light of the consultation responses and Haringey Council's reasons for refusal, the Mayor should consider the following key planning issues. These are the land use principles; the

Green Belt open space; the urban design; the housing and affordable housing; the amenity impact and the environmental issues; transport and parking; and mitigating the impact of development through planning obligations. I will go through each in turn, highlighting the key aspects of the scheme. Again, full assessment of the relevant policies and proposal's compliance with those policies is set out in detail in the hearing report.

Turning first to the land use principles, as I have set out already, the site is located within an Opportunity Area and a Housing Zone. It is an allocated development site within the emerging Tottenham AAP with aspiration for a significant amount of new homes and replacement employment uses. The scheme will provide up to 505 residential units as well as flexible commercial space. It also provides public open space and footbridges.

The redevelopment of the site for a residential-led mixed use development is promoted by strategic and site-specific policies. The redevelopment of the previously developed site to provide a significant amount of new housing is strongly supported, especially in view of the Opportunity Area and the Housing Zone allocation.

Although the amount of floor space and employment use would be reduced compared to the existing site, the scheme would make provision for a replacement number of jobs in flexible commercial uses that would be compatible with the new residential uses being provided. Block K which is proposed in the outline scheme would be marketed as business use but it would revert to residential use if there is no demand after active marketing which would be secured in the section 106 agreement. The proposal would also retain and restore the existing business barges for employment use.

Whilst leisure use is linked with the park are not proposed as envisaged by the site allocation, this is acceptable because of the overall regeneration benefits the scheme provides and the contribution the scheme makes towards this, undertaking access into the regional park spaces, including a financial contribution towards improving The Paddock which is part of the regional park.

In terms of the London Plan's Blue Ribbon Network policies, the site is not a protected wharf and the adopted and emerging site allocation policies do not promote the continued use of the wharf for freight. The redevelopment for mixed use redevelopment and employment development is consistent with adopted and emerging planning policy. The proposals also protect the waterways and enhance the waterfront, including the biodiversity of the site. The proposals are therefore consistent with the Blue Ribbon Network policies.

In summary, the GLA strongly supports the land use principles.

I will move on to consideration of the proposal's impact on Green Belt and open space. When GLA officers reported the case to the Mayor at Stage 2, it was noted that the northern part of the proposed development zone extended into designated Green Belt and therefore constituted inappropriate development which would need amending. The Green Belt boundary is not clearly defined by a line on Haringey Council's proposals map. GLA officers have worked with Haringey to agree a boundary defined by the base layers underpinning the

proposals map and all parties have agreed that the Green Belt boundary is as shown in the image on the left. The image on the right shows the same line as it relates to the application site.

As I set out earlier, the plans have been revised to remove any inappropriate development on Green Belt. The plan above shows the agreed Green Belt boundary line in yellow and, as can be seen, all parts of the proposed site to the north and east of that line would form landscapes/open space. For reference, the image to the right shows the existing northern part of the site which is currently covered in hardstanding and pallets.

To summarise, the proposals do not involve inappropriate development on designated Green Belt. Thus, they comply with the national and strategic policy regarding Green Belt, the aim of which intends to avoid the spread of development by preventing designated land from being built upon. The proposals would also enhance the Green Belt land which lies within the site by replacing hardstanding with landscaped, planted open space and creating biodiverse edges to the site.

In terms of the wider impact on open space, the proposed buildings would be visible from areas of open space, including areas of surrounding Green Belt. As I have mentioned, whilst there is no conflict with the national and strategic Green Belt policy, the visual impact on open space is a policy consideration in Haringey Council's local policies. The next few slides will show the proposals and views from some of the surrounding open spaces. This view shows the proposed site looking west from the Walthamstow Reservoirs. The buildings at Hale Village are currently visible in this view. The proposed development would appear in front of this with the two taller buildings shown in green. If you can make out the (Inaudible) tower in outline, the 18-storey building at Hale Village also appears in orange in this view.

This is the view from Tottenham Marshes looking south. Again, Hale Village is also visible in this view to the right of the path and the approved tower would rise above the existing development. The proposed Hale Wharf development would appear on the left-hand side, with the height of the tallest building broadly similar to the Hale Village tower in this view but taking a more slender form.

This is the view from the Lee Navigation towpath noted here on the site, looking south towards the development. The outline parts of the development are shown in blue and the approved Hale Village tower would also appear in this view to the right-hand side. This is the view from the entrance to The Paddock to the east of the site. The taller buildings would rise up and be visible on the edge of the space.

As can be seen from the preceding images, the proposed buildings would be visible from several long-range and close-range views from open space and would clearly involve a significant degree of visual change in some of these views. However, it is by no means unusual in London to see tall buildings from open spaces and from urban edges. The impact of the change should be seen in context with the surrounding emerging growth area around Tottenham Hale in which taller buildings will be located.



The open spaces can continue to be enjoyed for their open character and natural environment. The proposals would, indeed, contribute towards the improvement to open spaces by contributing financially to The Paddock, making landscape improvements to the site and its biodiversity and enhancing the connectivity into the Lee Valley Regional Park by way of the pedestrian bridges.

As set out in the hearing report, the impact on open space is considered acceptable by GLA officers.

Moving on to urban design principles, the scheme has been designed within the context of the aspirations contained in the Council's Tottenham Hale Urban Centre Masterplan and the emerging Tottenham AAP. It makes connections to and through the Lee Valley Regional Park, linking green spaces to Tottenham Hale using the emerging Green Link which runs through Hale Village. A future pedestrian and cycle connection would be provided from Tottenham Hale station right through to the waterfront using this link and also then through the site and to The Paddock beyond. Public open space on the waterfront would be provided and a public route through the site linking to the Green Belt land to the north.

In terms of tall buildings, Tottenham Hale is identified in the strategic and local planning policy as an area suitable for tall buildings, as can be seen in these extracts from the OAPF in Haringey's emerging Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD). The tallest buildings on this site would be positioned in the south of the scheme alongside Ferry Lane which we think is an appropriate response to the scheme. In the view here from Tottenham Hale station, the approved Hale Village tower, which is also positioned on Ferry Lane, would rise in the foreground of the view.

This is the overall massing strategy again. As described, the tallest buildings would be positioned to the south of the site, marking the more urban context. Then the height of the buildings would drop down towards the north where they adjoin ecologically sensitive areas. The six, seven and ten-storey buildings alongside the western edge of the river are a broadly similar massing to the Hale Village blocks opposite and the eastern part of the scheme would comprise buildings of a lower scale, addressing the parkside setting. This is the view from Ferry Lane, looking westwards towards the scheme. The tall buildings here would mark the entrance to Tottenham Hale and would be seen in conjunction with the approved Hale Village plan.

Also to mention, this view shows the Grade II-listed Ferry Boat in and the impact on heritage assets is set out in detail in the GLA's report. It is not considered that the proposals would adversely affect the setting of this listed building or any other heritage asset.

As previously mentioned, the proposal involves two pedestrian bridges which would be delivered as part of the outline phase of the development and also land and space for a third footbridge to The Paddock is secured on the parameter plan. The images shown here are artist's impressions of how the bridges could be design, but the final design would be submitted at the detailed reserved matters stage. A series of bridge design principles are secured within the information submitted with the application. They would be secured by

condition, including the fact that the main bridge would be accessed by steps and lift access at either side, which is shown on the impression images here.

If the current application is approved, the outline elements of the scheme would be subject to reserved matters applications that would cover the detailed design of the buildings within the extent of the parameter plans that have been applied for. A series of detailed design codes would be secured within the current application that would guide future reserved matters applications and these fix the parameters for building use and typology, roof design, appearance, materials and minimum gaps between the blocks and the width of the public realm. These design codes would ensure that a scheme of a high quality would be delivered.

These are close-up images of the architectural detail of the two blocks within the detailed part of the scheme. The materials for these blocks and also for the buildings proposed within the outline parts of the scheme would be predominantly stock brick. The architectural aesthetic and detailing has been designed to evoke an historic wharfside building to respond to the wharfside setting. The quality of the detailing and the materials would be secured by condition and the architecture here is robust, distinctive and of high quality.

The conclusion on the urban design principles is the layout and the massing strategy has been well considered and responds to the emerging context of Tottenham Hale as well as the presence of open spaces in ecologically sensitive areas. The tall buildings are positioned appropriately to the south of the site. Whilst it is acknowledged that they would have a major impact on the townscape and the surrounding area, the development would be part of an emerging context of tall buildings along Ferry Lane and would create a distinctive and high-quality landmark that would benefit regeneration in Tottenham Hale. The materials and detailing would be of a high quality, and design codes would ensure that the quality of the development is built forward when the outline elements comes forward.

In summary, the design of the development is supported.

I will now move on to the affordable housing that would be delivered in the proposals. I have said the scheme would provide up to 505 residential units in total of which 177 would be affordable units and a mixture of shared ownership and affordable rented homes. The scheme also provides a private rented sector (PRS), housing which is supported by London Plan policy and is addressing housing needs and supporting housing delivery. As outlined in the hearing report, the scheme would provide good quality housing which meets relevant standards.

To summarise the affordable housing, the original application proposed 9% affordable housing and, as mentioned earlier, the Mayor in his Stage 1 response considered that the scheme should provide more affordable housing. Following further discussions with the GLA during the application, the applicant increased the affordable housing offer to 30% with a review to achieve up to 35%. Since the Mayor took over the application, GLA officers have negotiated further with the applicant to receive 35% affordable housing with a review mechanism for the delivery of up to 50% should viability improve.

The affordable rented units provided will be provided at the rent shown here. You see in the scheme the affordable rented units would be all two and three bedroom units so would be provided at 65% of the market rent or below. The shared ownership units would be offered in line with Haringey Council's income priority bands which would prioritise the provision of housing for those with lower incomes. In any case, none of the units would exceed the maximum household income thresholds as set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG. These thresholds would ensure that the housing offer is affordable.

To conclude on affordable housing, the viability of the scheme has been independently reviewed and officers' assessment find that it delivers the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing in line with London Plan policy.

The impact of the proposals on amenity are again set out in detail in the GLA's report. I will focus here on the daylight and sunlight impact and then we will move on to a summary of the other amenity considerations. By way of context, the site is separated from neighbouring buildings by the waterways and road. The nearest permanent residential properties are the Lock Keeper's Cottage to the west of the site and Thistle Court to the south of the scheme and these are more than 50 metres away from the nearest proposed building. Flats in Hale Village to the west are more than 80 metres away from the proposed buildings opposite.

The daylight and sunlight impact on permanent residential properties have been assessed using accepted Building Research Establishment (BRE) assessment criteria. There are only minor transgressions in the accepted standards experienced by some properties, the most affected property being one of the dwellings within the Lock Keeper's Cottage building. However, this property would continue to receive acceptable daylight and sunlight conditions according to the BRE guidance. Due to the nature and orientation of the scheme for a large scheme in an urban area, the proposals actually have relatively little effect on daylight and sunlight to surrounding properties.

There are also boat moorings along the Lee Navigation to the west and north of the site as shown here and the overshadowing effects of the development have been considered in relation to these moorings. At a fixed point of measurement, the amenity space on the towpath side has been assessed for sunlight, shown here. The overshadowing assessment shows that there would be full compliance with BRE guidance regarding the preservation of good sunlight conditions for the assessed amenity spaces.

Just to illustrate this further, these shadowing diagrams show the shadow of the buildings at spring equinox, the midpoint of the year. As the tall buildings are located to the south, the greater shadow is cast north when it is into the site itself and then from late morning onwards, no shadow would be cast towards neighbouring residential properties or moored boats. This illustrates that the sunlight conditions to moored boats and permanent residential properties would be acceptable.

To conclude on daylight and sunlight, the overall impact on neighbouring properties would be acceptable. The development would not cause unacceptable overshadowing.

To summarise other amenity impacts, in terms of wind conditions a full wind assessment was carried out by the applicant, verified by independent consultants appointed by the Council. This has confirmed that the development would not cause adverse wind conditions on or surrounding the development, which includes the towpath and the locks. The mitigating measures would be designed into the scheme to ensure that the development does not have an adverse effect in this regard and these would be secured by condition.

The proposals do not cause unacceptable loss of privacy because of the distances to the nearest neighbours. Mitigation measures would be put in place throughout the construction and operation period to ensure no unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties in terms of noise and light pollution. The impact of the proposals on amenity are therefore acceptable.

We briefly summarise the other key environmental issues. The proposed development, as I have set out, is partly within and surrounded by ecologically sensitive areas. These proposals include detailed measures to protect wildlife and the natural environment throughout the construction period. The completed development would involve enhancement of biodiversity on the site.

As set out earlier, Natural England has been consulted and has not raised objection to the proposals in terms of their impact on the natural environment. The protection and enhancement measures would be secured by condition and officers are confident that the proposals would not adversely affect wildlife or biodiversity.

In terms of sustainability and climate change, the proposals achieve a 35% reduction in carbon emissions compared to the baseline Building Regulations standard. Acceptable measures have been put in place to ensure that the proposals do not increase flood risk and contribute positively to sustainable drainage in line with London Plan policy.

Moving lastly to transport issues, the key issue to address here as raised in the Council's reasons for refusal is the amount of car parking on the site. Fifty-eight car parking spaces are proposed in total, making this effectively a car-free development apart from the required disabled parking spaces, two car club spaces and retained spaces for the business barges.

The principle of car-free development is appropriate and strongly supported in this location which is highly accessible to public transport and measures to address any overspill parking are proposed in the application. These include the monitoring of any parking overspill in nearby residential estates and investigation of extending the controlled parking zones if necessary with funding agreed for this if it proves to be necessary. Additionally, the pedestrian bridges would increase pedestrian and cycle accessibility to public transport and therefore support the car-free development.

A section 278 agreement would be entered into with the Council to ensure the necessary highways works associated when the development are implemented. The proposals are expected to reduce the existing vehicle trips to and from the site with many associated benefits of the highway network.

In summary, the transport issues are acceptable.

Those conclude the main planning issues raised by the application. There are of course many other planning issues associated with the case which, for reasons of time and relevance, I have not focused on here. All relevant planning issues are fully addressed in the hearing report and addendum.

I will finally outline the heads of terms for the section 106 legal agreement which have been agreed.

Obligations will be secured concerning the delivery of the affordable housing and the review mechanisms; the management of the PRS housing; the phasing and delivery of the development overall; the employment uses and training initiatives; a package of transport mitigation measures and; securing a revised energy strategy. These obligations will address the Council's reasons for refusal which refer to the absence of a legal agreement.

In addition, these financial contributions have been agreed in order to mitigate the impact of the development, totalling £590,000. That is in addition to the borough and Mayoral community infrastructure levy (CIL) which would be levied on the development to fund social infrastructure and Crossrail.

Having now considered the policies, I can confirm the GLA officers' recommendation to the Mayor which is that the Mayor agrees with the recommendation as set out in the officers' Representation Hearing report and grants planning permission for the application at Hale Wharf for the reasons set out in the report and subject to the conditions set out in the appendix and subject to the prior completion of the section 106 agreement.

Thank you, Mayor. That concludes my presentation.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thanks, Katherine. We now have Haringey Council. Councillor Doron and Emma Williamson, the Assistant Director of Planning. I think you have five minutes between you. I will make sure you know when there are 30 seconds left, if that is all right.

**Natan Doron (Councillor, Haringey Council):** Thank you. It will just be me speaking.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK.

**Natan Doron (Councillor, Haringey Council):** Good afternoon, Mayor, Deputy Mayors and the GLA team. My name is Natan Doron and I am the Labour councillor in Crouch End and also chair the Planning Committee in Haringey. I want to briefly today set out the context of the scheme and give you a flavour of what happened at the Planning Committee and then say a couple of things about Haringey's position on the revised scheme.

Haringey has been seeking development this site for 15 years. The site has been allocated as a site for mixed use development for some time, first in 2006 Tottenham Hale Urban Centre Masterplan, more recently in the Tottenham AAP, which is shortly to be adopted.

The site is on a Housing Zone where 5,000 new homes are planned in an area where Haringey has designated for tall buildings. As I say, Haringey is a Labour council with a shortage of housing growth. This is demonstrated by our plans for Tottenham Hale and ambitious plans for 7,800 new homes in our Wood Green AAP which we are currently consulting on. Over the last year, the Planning Committee has passed resolution to grant over 1,200 new homes.

This planning application came to the Committee in November last year and was recommended for approval by officers, which was overturned on a split vote. It is one of only two overturns for major applications in the last three years in Haringey. The matters raised by the Committee included whether the application responded positively to the neighbouring environment, whether the site was suitable for a tall building on the scale proposed. The fact that the density is above the London Plan matrix meant there was insufficient play provision and poor quality design.

The Committee and Haringey are pro-growth and support the need for increased housing and employment space in London. However, in this instance the Committee felt the proposal was a step too far, design was not of sufficient quality and the proposal was too tall for this location, especially as we have heard, because of the closeness to the Green Belt.

The reasons for refusal, as we have heard, include height, design because of impact on the Green Belt, detracting from the openness and character of the adjacent Green Belt as well as insufficient parking spaces.

At the Committee meeting, given the level of interest in the scheme, I agreed to increase the number of speakers allowed. We had four local residents speaking objection to the application as well as two councillors from the local ward and also Councillor John Bevan who sits on the Haringey Council but also the Lee Valley Regional Park Authority. There is a large amount of local opposition to the scheme, which you can see demonstrated by the attendance of the local community today. You will hear a bit about that later from them as well.

With regards to the revised scheme, Haringey supports the increase in affordable housing to 35% and the inclusion of review mechanisms, giving the potential for the level of affordable housing to increase to 50%. Haringey will be looking for any additional uplift to be provided on site and for units to be reserved for this purpose as a reserved matters applications move forward.

The certain tenure of the affordable housing unit fits in with the portfolio approach to affordable housing on site in the Housing Zone as advocated in the Tottenham AAP. This would deliver 40% affordable housing, split 60/40 in favour of intermediate units.

Haringey also supports the mechanism for securing the delivery of the bridges which are fundamental in opening up access to the site and improving the relationship between Tottenham and the Lee Valley Park. But - and it is worth stressing this - this revised scheme does not address the issues raised by the local residents or address the reasons for refusal by the Planning Committee.

In summary, Haringey's position is that although it supports growth, this scheme by virtue of its height and overbearing design on the edge of Tottenham Hale and the Green Belt is not acceptable. The Mayor is urged to uphold the Planning Committee's decision and refuse the application.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much, Councillor. Now is the time for objectors, a total of 20 minutes. The first objector I have down is Anna and Archie from The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village. If you can keep your comments to five minutes, please, because we have other objectors as well.

**Archie Maddan (The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village):** Thank you. Mr Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Archie Maddan and I am one of the local residents. I live on the other side of the river in the Hale Village development, as you have seen on the plan. My task is briefly to outline to you some of the more technical reasons why we say that this development is inappropriate and leads also, Mayor, to the reasons which you have just heard from the chair of the Committee in terms of why the Committee took that view first time round back at Haringey.

The first of three issues will be the issue of the real nature of the affordable housing offer; secondly, the tall building massing issue which you have heard is a really big issue; and thirdly, some general comments about the quality of design and the deficiencies there.

Turning first to the affordable housing, although as we have heard from your planning officer the affordable housing meets your threshold target, the devil is in the detail. If you drill down into it, the issue here is the different bands within it. The real concern which is still there is the amount of actual affordable rented housing and that element is in our respectful view too small. I would invite you to note page 47 of your report where table 3 shows that in detail. There is simply not enough affordable rented housing nor for social housing, as has been described.

The Haringey target for this - I was talking to one of the Haringey councillors - is 40%. The offer here is no more than about 19.2%. That is simply not enough in the context of a seriously economically deprived area such as Tottenham which is going through regeneration. What that does not offer is the ability for local people who may be economically disadvantaged to have access in a real financial way to housing in their area. That causes problems going forward in terms of the balance of the community which must be preserved in an area like Tottenham. We need growth, we need new people, but we need to allow real economically viable access to the existing community. That, frankly, is not sufficiently allowed for within the banding. The 35% is an overall figure; it is the detail which matters.

If I can then turn secondly to the tall building and massing analysis which you have heard is a major concern here. The issue here is that Tottenham has its own existing area study that sits on top of the Tottenham Hale Urban Characterisation Study, which was an academic study which then fed into the policy. The policy there is AAP6. The findings and the recommendations in Haringey's own policy guidelines here were that the criteria should be no more than 11 storeys at the lower end of this peninsula site. At the northern end, the more rural end - it has been described as less urban - it is six storeys. This development is more than double the height at both sectors. The big towers are the real concern. We are looking at over 20 storeys here. The guideline, based on a detailed survey by the Council's own officers was no more than 11 and you can see for yourself in the images why that would be; that it is overbearing.

The other concern there, as you will hear from Anna, is more about the scaling. This is an outline. Tottenham Hale will have tall buildings; it needs tall buildings. We need to develop the urban centre here, but it must be in a balanced way. The problem with these tall towers is that they sit on the fringe of the Tottenham Hale development and they fill up the balance of the entire Hale development. The buildings should be massed in the centre around the existing urban hub, around the train station and so forth. This suddenly pops up and right in the Green Belt. We can have development there but not on this scale. It throws the whole development and the whole area out.

Turning then lastly to the issues of the design, there are concerns about the daylight factor. Only 80% of the proposed units, the people who would actually be living on this new development, would have the minimum average daylight which is in the national and recommended guidance. That cannot be acceptable. We are building, as has famously been said, "the slums of the future" here. That is not acceptable. We are building in problems for the future and 20% of these units do not have enough daylight.

Then there is the issue about the privacy. These are a large amount of buildings, crammed into a relatively small site. That needs to be thought through more carefully. Finally, you have heard that there are concerns linked to that about the amount of open space, (Inaudible) space and play space for children of local residents. That simply is not addressed in this plan.

The general overall design therefore is, I am afraid, not of a high enough quality and you have heard that that was a concern for the Planning Committee. I would say that on behalf of those whom I represent there are good, core technical planning reasons which remain valid, were valid before the Planning Committee at Haringey and remain valid.

**Anna Povey (The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village):** Thank you, sir. I am Anna Povey. I would like to start with looking at the objections that have been made to this development. Firstly, all three local Tottenham Hale ward councillors have objected to this development. Our local GLA member has objected and our local Member of Parliament (MP) has objected. In addition, you heard Councillor John Bevan who is with us today and is the design champion for Haringey has objected. You heard from Councillor Doron that it was a split decision at Haringey Council that was split seven/two who objected. There were 166



objections to the initial Haringey planning consultation and those 166 constitute the highest ever number to any Haringey planning consultation.

As Archie touched on, I am going to look now at stepping down. We have the massing of tall buildings around the station and Hale Village, as you may have seen when you visited the area, is then designed to have the tallest buildings at the station and steps down towards the river, which is exactly what Hale Village does. By the River Lee Navigation is The Pavilions, which is ten storeys. It will then in this shoot up to more than twice the height on the other side of the river by the Green Belt land and then plummet down to wetland and open space. That is clearly not in line with any stepping down approach.

Finally, the effect of these buildings, as can be seen in this image, which was part of the presentation that the case officer gave us, is that this is an enormous wall on the edge of Tottenham. When you are coming in from Walthamstow, you come past all the reservoirs and all the wetlands and then you will be greeted with this. If I may, can I ask for that to be handed up to the Mayor? The Pavilions, which is ten storeys at the moment, is circled in red, as a comparison between those two heights. Also, it is a wall that will face Hale Village and the whole of that community to barrier them off from their previous green space.

It is for all those reasons we would invite you to also reject this application. Thank you.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thanks, Anna. Thanks, Archie. Lynn Tank.

**Lynn Tank (Resident):** Hello.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Hello, Lynn.

**Lynn Tank (Resident):** I have lived in Tottenham for the last 24 years and lived in the Hale Wharf area for the last 22 years. I live on a boat down there. It is an established thing that I am 100% in favour of the regeneration of Tottenham. We want to regenerate the area. You have been and you have seen that we are regressing right now. I just cannot see how this development, as is, is regeneration because it would allow oversized towers to literally cut us off from Bream Close. It is not going to regenerate. To regenerate an area, there has to be a general mix of employment, housing, education and leisure activity, an active, intrinsic community offering all-round opportunities for people.

We do need housing. We are concerned with the current plans as they fail to offer what the area needs. They are unsightly and unacceptably intrusive to the local landscape, especially the river. This is the wrong environment for this project, just like the questions of wharves. A wharf is traditionally used for industry so it has a unique site available that could include modern purpose-built warehouses and workshops where people can not only have sustainable employment but training and new skills to set them up for life away from potential poverty which the area has a lot of at the moment. This is an ideal site for new business opportunities, start-up, affordable mixed workshop/retail site. This could be a piece of London's history that we keep alive while embracing the future. There is a lot that we could offer there.

The wildlife on, in and around the river is vast. It is an amazing and educational experience for all of us who take an interest. A visitor centre would be amazing to attract even more people to come and enjoy the river and everything it has to offer, The Paddock and the wetlands, which will be opening in September, I believe, rather than just the financially elite few who can afford to take in that view.

The recent development across the river promised new homes. When they promoted the homes, they did not promote Tottenham; they did not promote how good Tottenham was, how amazing Tottenham could be. What they promoted was how close they were to the Tube station, the train station so they can get out of Tottenham. What worries me on that is that we are going to end up with a dysfunctional area where there are more people living but there is no society and there is no heart to the area because people (Several inaudible words) in terms of their activities and their social activities.

To regenerate Tottenham, you need to build communities. We need Bream Close, Ferry Lane, Hale Village and Hale Wharf to function together, embracing the nature habitat rather than working against it. The Paddock, the marshes generate long-term reward and employment where community can socially mix and therefore grow.

How amazing would it be if we could invite locals to initiate and design of a financially viable, sustainable project that offers true regeneration, regeneration that we are going to see in the years to come. We can look back and see where this had a pivotal point, something that people will be proud of now and in the future.

Do not underestimate the consequences of such a huge decision that will affect the direction and the demographics of the area for generations to come. We are not talking about the next 10 or 20 years, we are moving on as far ahead as we can look. It would be a perfect opportunity - and I address the Mayor on this - for you to show you care about London and that you were serious when you promised when elected as the Labour Mayoral candidate that you would be the greenest Mayor. That is what we are asking for and to ensure that everybody in London has the opportunity to thrive. That is what you can do in Tottenham; that is what the opportunity is there for. I ask you to please give us a chance to let us work together and together we can change Tottenham. If we can change Tottenham, we can change London and we can achieve what I believe we elected you in for because we believe that you can do that. Thank you.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thanks, Lynn, and thanks for taking in it time as well. Gordon, from the Stonebridge Boaters Association.

**Gordon Ifill (Stonebridge Boaters Association):** Good afternoon.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Hi.

**Gordon Ifill (Stonebridge Boaters Association):** I am just taking on the part of the Stonebridge Boaters Association. We are a group that formed in order to provide a stakeholder body that represents the interests of individuals who have been moored on that

site for a considerable period of time, 48 boats in total. As part of this process we filed very detailed submissions objecting to the planned application, bearing in mind that throughout that phase our own views are being neglected and disregarded as receptors in relation to issues that are going to affect the quality of lives of all the individuals who are moored, in terms of the demolition building phases which amount to several years. That said, our objections to this proposal have been expressed already and we will not dwell too much on that other than to make a couple of key observations in relation to some matters that have already been mentioned.

One of them is local regeneration and whilst we do not object to the idea of Tottenham regenerating in due course, what we say to ourselves is that if Tottenham Hale must change, surely the preferred outcome would be for it to change to a new neighbourhood and community that positively affects the local area. In our submission, we say that the proposed development looks, feels and stands like a cash town. It benefits developers and it benefits the current landlords but we are unable to identify a single tangible benefit to the local area and the population.

Take housing. Haringey and Tottenham specifically have an understandable need for new homes; there is no doubt about that. However, we note that this target has been met through other developments. Therefore, surely there should be an opportunity to create a development here which is a community asset, not just another dormitory for commuting.

If you look at the nearby areas, Blackhorse Road, Walthamstow, you will see increased developments in studios, you will see workshops and all the facilities that are generating skills, generating employment and promoting sustained employment. We think that this kind of use is also necessary, not just housing.

We think that refreshing this brownfield site overall would provide a very bright outlook for that location in particular and provide much needed local employment. We believe it would also potentially promote entrepreneurship as well, something which is sadly lacking in that area.

As to building heights, we agree with the sentiments that have been expressed previously and we are adamant, as individuals who moor in the area, that the height of the proposed structures is completely out of character with the area. We think that the range of heights of the buildings are inappropriate across the piece and provide a negative consumer impact and also, to our minds, contradict an existing Tottenham AAP policy in relation to the fact that building heights should transition down to this thriving area.

To close, our concerns about the development are that they ultimately fail to make a positive contribution to Tottenham and they fail to improve the area in terms of quality and visually. We also feel that the development does not relate positively to the local environment and the neighbourhood structures and we also feel that certain concerns about the heights of the structures, the right to light, the effect of neighbours on neighbours and on the impact of wildlife is not being sufficiently looked at. In terms of our view on this project, we think it is time to press the reset button on it and you should reject this proposal.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Del Brenner from Regents Network.

**Del Brenner (Regents Network):** Yes. My name is Del Brenner from Regents Network and a member of the London Waterways Commission. This Hale Wharf overdevelopment, this unwelcome planning application was very roundly dismissed at the planning meeting in November at Haringey and I welcome another opportunity to express my low opinion of this maligned development.

I do not think there is objection to waterway land and wharf being redeveloped. It is just the exploitation and the reckless manner in which this one is being carried out as well as great concern about the canal management who have promoted this monstrous overdeveloping on our waterside. One of the main problems of this development, in my view, is the destructive and negative effect on the many waterways that surround it, including the Lea Navigation, the main one, which is designated by an Act of Parliament as a commercial waterway which is, with recognition, one of the seven great transport waterways in the country. In fact, in this case, the maintenance, care and use of the River Lea necessarily goes back to Acts of Parliament in the time of Henry V, believe it or not, and 1425 is the oldest Act of Parliament I have uncovered so far.

However, to get back to today. It is a wonderful stretch of waterway. It is an amazing asset and it has been important to London all that time. It has only been a couple of decades in the Lea Navigation centuries of service to London's transport and economy that this waterway has been allowed to be sighed on and run down. I can recall busy traffic on this section of the Lea and passing through Bow Locks; it was very busy then, which is not that long ago. Canal transport is within living memory.

Mayor, this stretch of waterway, we must look forward and not into the past. It is still in working order, to operate and function positively and actively for the next few centuries.

A point of information briefly; a canal freight objective is being set up on the Grand Union Canal in plant flora, so it is all coming back to life.

Please note that London waterways are of strategic importance to London. That is what we say, that is policy, that is stated in the London Plan. It goes on to say, quote:

*“The starting point for consideration of development alongside the waterways must be the water.”*

It is the London Plan policy 7.24. It continues, quote:

*“The water is the unique aspect and consideration must initially be given to how it can be used, maintained and improved.”*

The starting point is the water and I do not think the development of a gross, uncompromising, ghastly edifice with ugly, aggressive, protruding balconies will suit or

improve the waterway and the location in any way at all. The starting point is the water and a property development does not have priority over the open space and, if the shoe fits, the wonderful landscaping around the area. This is one of London's treasures.

In that connection, by the way, can I remind you that London's waterways are categorised as public, open space and Green Belt? That is London Plan policy 2.8 of table 72. In other words, the waterways have the same consideration and protection as a park.

The question, Mayor, that you need to ask is would you agree to this development beside a park; Alexander Park up in North London, for instance, or Hyde Park perhaps? With the obvious answer, of course. Hale Wharf is the last place for a gross, inner city, mountainous building development. It does provide homes, of a sort, and employment but surely not at the expense of a degraded environment for Londoners in the long-term and for the future generations.

I would just to finish that it is the long-term future of Londoners, of London's open spaces and waterways that we must consider; none of this. Thank you.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** (Several inaudible words) time of the last few objectors because I was keen - like, I am sure, the Planning Committee - to hear all the objections before I made my decision. I am afraid the applicants will only get five minutes. Over to you.

**Michael Orr (Development Director, Muse Developments):** Mayor, Deputy, officers, members of the public; I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present the Hale Wharf scheme to you today. I am Michael Orr, representing the Hale Wharf application on behalf of Muse Developments and the Canals and Rivers Trust.

Muse and the Canals and Rivers Trust have an award winning, strategic national partnership with Isis Watersides within the Canals and Rivers Trust. This is a special partnership and it looks to bring long-term benefits to sensitive sites including in relation to canals and waterways.

Hale Wharf will be the 16th this partnership has brought forward with successful completions in Leeds, Manchester and the recently completed Brentford Lock West in London. Hale Wharf is a project that will transform the tower, included, and underutilised urban plan for this site with excellent public transport links into an attractive, new, mixed use waterside community opening up the site and waterways to the public. We have worked with the Council and the GLA for over 15 years. The product of this work is a scheme delivering 500 new homes in a Housing Zone area, new public spaces, new connections and new retail and restaurant space. We are aware of the challenges this particular site faces, specifically on height. We recognise the challenge of delivering further buildings on this site.

Through working with the Council and their design panel, we have completed the scheme designs that the height of the building is based on as we move away from the busy environment of Ferry Lane into the quieter environment to the North.

On affordable housing, we have worked with the GLA to increase the percentage of affordable homes on the site to 35% representing up to 177 new affordable homes. Adding that to the scheme, the housing number of larger family homes.

Whilst Hale Wharf has presented challenges, I think you will see the benefits that our scheme will make to the area and has potential to leave a positive, long-term contribution to the wider Tottenham Hale area. Thank you for your time. I will pass you to Chris Bearman from our architects, Allies and Morrison.

**Chris Bearman (Allies and Morrison Architects):** Thank you, Michael. Good morning, everyone. I would just like to draw your attention to three key aspects of the design being presented to you today. Firstly, height, scale and mass. It is important to consider the redevelopment of this site in the context of the wider master plan for Tottenham Hale. A master plan, which in the future, will deliver a newer, denser and more vibrant residential community for this key area of North London, one that will bring positive change, one that will be very different than that of today.

The master plan is expected to bring forward a number of taller buildings including those at Hale Village and at Hale Wharf where boats are considered an important and integral part of this emerging new local context. The site at Hale Wharf has a very particular urban like quality being located between two water courses of the River Lea. As set out in the Officer's Report, the height, scale and mass of the proposed buildings respond to these unique site constraints and sensitivities and, in particular, to the open expansive character of the adjacent land and reservoirs to the North and East.

Taller, more urban buildings have been carefully located at the southern end of the site to respond both to the particular characteristics of their more immediate surroundings and the taller buildings and higher density areas along Ferry Lane and Monument Way, providing new, distinctive high-quality styled land for Tottenham Hale as a whole.

The proposed design in massing was supported by the Council to design a new panel with significant changes and refinements being made in response to comments received from the panel, officers and via the wider consultation process.

Secondly, design and quality. The proposed buildings are designed to have a reserved yet distinctive appearance; traditional stock brick, gables and varied roof lines are key features. Their architectural language has evolved from our understanding of the sites waterside location and acknowledges its former use as an historic wharf.

Thirdly, landscape and community. The landscape will provide a high-quality environment for residents and visitors whilst responding to the schemes natural surroundings. Buildings have been raised and located to ensure careful maintenance and consideration of the sensitive, ecological borders of the site. The new entrance space of the southern end of the scheme will provide opportunities to create public events and promote activity in the waterways. With the land at the north end of site, which is in or adjacent to Green Belt and ecological corridors,

will include grassed areas with trees and wildfires, all of which will create new, enriched areas of fire diversity. New landscapes will fully compliment and enhance the existing.

The social part of the scheme will provide quieter areas for residents with parking spaces being accommodated separately alongside the central street in courtyards between buildings. The scheme also incorporates a series of bridges designed by the Council's regeneration team. Connectivity is at the heart of this project and these bridges will ensure direct and high quality links from Tottenham Hale across our site towards Camden in the east and the open landscape beyond. Thank you for your time.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thank you very much. I have some questions if that is okay. Lynn, can I just start with you? Thank you very much for what you said. I understand that Natural England looked into the proposals and did not object in terms of the impacts on wildlife, and you have lived there a long time. Are there any particular effects that you are concerned about in relation to the impact?

**Lynn Tank:** My objection is that with Natural England, what they have looked at is, "Will there be any major disaster to wildlife?" What I am looking at is: let us enhance it rather than just walk the dog to the (Inaudible). Does that make sense?

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** I understand.

**Lynn Tank:** There is a lot of wildlife round there. The fox, for example. In residential development, they will be considered a pest. There is a lot of wildlife that would potentially not be protected and, therefore, they would be considered pests and they would be gotten rid of and it would not be an issue to people. But it is an issue, if that makes sense.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Gordon, do you have anything in relation to the impact on wildlife? I am happy for you to join, if you want to.

**Gordon Ifill (Stonebridge Boaters Association):** The Stonebridge Boaters did quite a lot of work in terms of analysing the data that was coming through on wildlife and the various impacts. Luckily, we have a number of individuals who live on the mooring who are their own experts in this subject and are able to contribute quite a lot in a rather detailed way which you may or may not have read when you looked at the various objections. There were concerns raised there about the relative impacts on wildlife and I do not think those issues were sufficiently addressed in the application.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK, thank you very much. Can I ask you three, the experts of the waterways -- I note your concerns around the impact of the development on the waterfront. I understand that, but do you think there are any upsides to the development? I am thinking in particular about the bridges and the public realm around the waterfront.

**Lynn Tank:** The ethos of the bridges, I fully support. Having things connected, absolutely. But potentially to have the bridge connect a huge tower block into The Paddock from the river side, there should not be that barrier between The Paddock and the river site. Going across

from Hale Village, for example, on to Hale Wharf, that should be the stop-off before you get to The Paddock to enjoy that area, rather than just going past an oversized building because I think a lot of people, they will not. You might put bridges up. You can put bridges up but you cannot force people to walk across them. They have to have things that they want to see there.

What we have at the minute is the Hale Village where you have got student accommodation there, which I think is great. It brings in a lot of culture to the area but those students, they never walk the direction of the river. The river is nice. We do need something, we need something to happen, but we need something that will attract the people who currently live here to come and walk and enjoy. People now that do, they walk to the Tube station. They go from Hale Village to the Tube station. They want something where people will want to walk across those bridges, they will want to come and enjoy, they will want to come and support the local businesses and generally wildlife in terms of animals and vegetation. The big thing at the moment, bigger than ever in my lifetime. I am 43 next month and I have never known such a big demand for home-grown food, et cetera. That is a big patch of land. There could be something on there. Education for the kids.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Thank you. Anna [Povey], maybe you guys want to come in as residents of the recent development around Hale Village. Can you see any benefits of the waterfront, public realm being opened up or the various bridges?

**Archie Maddan (The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village):** Yes. I think those of us who have lived there since the Hale Bridge came onstream, and I have been there about three and a bit years -- it is a unique space, Mr Mayor. It is a beautiful stretch of river. It is a navigational river as you have heard. It is not even a canal; it is much bigger. The bridge is more than welcome. It was one of things that we are quite excited about. There is an opportunity now with the wetland centre being properly opened up. Throughout the whole quarter of London, even the entire city, it is a city-wide resource. For us, it is the most special place and we have come to love it in the short time we have been there and I know there are those that have been there a lot longer. A lot more Londoners will appreciate it. The bridges will open it up and if there was a sensitive development of the wharf it would act as a gateway, as has just been explained, to welcome people in.

The problem with this development is it is frankly just a very large dormitory development. That phrase has been used by one of my colleagues there. I think that is the problem, which actually will tend to push people away. It was the question really of the general attractiveness of the scheme and the way that it welcomes people into a not flat area as a resource for all Londoners.

It is a fabulous place to live. It is a real secret corner of London, which is there to be better known and better enjoyed and just, at times, becoming better known and better enjoyed by everybody as we are really starting to unlock these corners of London that we had forgotten about. Suddenly, we are going to get a development that, I am afraid, is not really appropriate and will not assist the area. Whatever the architects say, it does not sensitively respond to the area. It does not add to the area whereas - this has been explained - a sensitive development



would unlock the area. You could have a canal site, riverside site type environment; cafeterias, cafes, that sort of offer.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Anna.

**Anne Povey (The Pavilions Residents, Hale Village):** May I just say, please, I agree completely that development is appropriate, a sensitive development. I just want to pick up that I had heard the waterway characterised in one way that was not used and this would enable it to be used. It is actually the towpath. I do not know what it was like when you visited but our neighbours, we walk there, we run there, we cycle there. We actually already use the waterway and developing it further so that there is a wider towpath and more access is very welcome. It is just, as you have heard for lots of reasons, some of this development is appropriate.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Sure. Councillor.

**Natan Doron (Councillor for Haringey):** Thank you. I just want play something back that was discussed at the committee in relation to this. It clearly is a unique site and the committee felt that whatever comes forward here, there is an opportunity to work with stakeholders like Groundwork UK, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), the London Wildlife Trust and the Woodland Trust, so that with any development here you could do something pretty unique and pretty special in terms of improving wildlife and nature, also opening it up to ...

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** I want to put a couple of questions to the applicants, if that is OK. Firstly, what difference will those who moor their boats on the wharf see should the development happen in relation to the new improvements or otherwise?

**Michael Orr (Development Director, Muse Developments):** Currently, the main mooring adjacent to the wharf are for three business barges. Currently, one of those business barges is let to a small business and we will be working with the operator of that business to make sure that he is comfortable with his business through the construction phase. What we want to do is to upgrade and regenerate that pontoon. Therefore, we can bring the other two business barges into use. These are quite significant and quite grand boats which have largely sat dormant alongside Hale Wharf for a number of years now. We are keen to regenerate that pontoon and we also look to provide a loading berth alongside the pontoon which was something that we agreed with the Environment Agency to include the Green Borders office there.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Can you just talk about your plans for The Paddock in relation to any contributions you are going to make in relation to that?

**Michael Orr (Development Director, Muse Developments):** We have worked with the regeneration team at Haringey for their Green Group Strategy that looks to create a series of green links into places across Tottenham Hale. Obviously, our side is a key component on that and we have worked with their officers for the design across the bridge from Hale Village

over to Hale Wharf and then the bridge from the Wharf over to The Paddock. Haringey have commissioned and designed a revised landscaping plan for The Paddock itself and our scheme will contribute £500,000 towards the works to regenerate The Paddock. I think most of the people I have spoken to in the area felt it has been left slightly run down and is not particularly well used by local people in the area, as it stands.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK. One of the big concerns for the residents is the issue of daylight and overshadowing. What is your response to points that have been made about that?

**Sean Bashforth (Project Manager, Quod Consultancy):** We have already heard from officers in terms of how the daylight and overshadowing. You saw the diagrams. Because of the orientation of the site, it faces north and it overshadows itself to an extent, to clear from east to west in the afternoon. We undertook a daylight/sunlight assessment. That has been reviewed by both Haringey and found acceptable and three of your own officers as well.

We heard earlier about others, the kind of housing themselves, internally, and BRE (Several inaudible words) as well. That is guidelines and it is based on suburban housing standards and that is why we say, "Does it meet it? Doesn't it meet it?" We all came to the same conclusion that they are acceptable for this location in London.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK. A question for the councillor in relation to land use. Comments were made by all the objectors in relation to - I am paraphrasing, so forgive me if I am not being accurate - appreciating the development around the Hale Village. There is a big concern around here. I have understood, in relation to the site we are looking at, it is within the Upper Lea Valley upstream material. The site we are looking at is within the Housing Zone area as well and also is within the AAP as well.

**Emma Williamson (Assistant Director of Planning Objectors):** Yes. The site is in the Housing Zone in the Opportunity Area next to the Tube station. It is the part we have designated for grading for mixed use development.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** Right, and the recommendation from the officers to the Planning Committee was to give permission.

**Emma Williamson (Assistant Director of Planning Objectors):** That is correct.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK. I have one final question. I am a bit confused in relation to waterboard freight transport. I am not sure, Del, if that is one for you. Is the site used for waterboard freight transport at the moment?

**Del Brenner (Regents Network):** Regretfully, at the moment, really the point on the Lea but, as I mentioned, we are developing the freight in West London and we have a pilot operation going to survey and sort out the potential of expanding the freight to the River Lea. We use (Inaudible) because there are 2,000 businesses there but when we come to use the River Lea, the potential is very much larger. There is an enormous amount of potential on the

River Lea. We are very much involved. We are using quite a lot of experts, particularly in Universal Cargo Logistics (UCL). We are getting a lot of help from them to develop the freight, freight barges and all the way that freight can be handled in the 21st century.

It will not be diesel freight. We will not be touching barges. Electric-operated and with its own loading and unloading equipment on it like a lorry has. We do not need wharves any more, not now we have trains and warehouses. The opportunity on the Lea is quite considerable.

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** I understand. Thank you, everybody, for coming along. I am going to need at least 15 minutes to think about this. You can stretch your legs and give me 15 minutes at least. I gave you all this time but thank you for, even then, being quite succinct. I appreciate you bringing all the various points you have. I appreciate the comments you have made. I will retire and let you know once I have come back. Thank you.

(Adjournment)

**Sadiq Khan (Mayor of London):** OK, thank you. I would like to begin by thanking everyone who has attended today, Haringey residents, objectors, the applicant and the Council, for the contributions they have made to the debate, ensuring that before I make my decision I am as informed as I can be about the issue surrounding this planning application.

I called in these schemes to subject them to further scrutiny. I have worked to deliver the genuinely affordable, good-quality homes Londoners urgently needed. I am determined to ensure that we explore all options for development across the capital. This includes increasing density in the areas which can support it and are well connected to London's transport network.

Hale Wharf is already well connected to public transport and will become even better connected with improved rail service already underway and through the construction of Crossrail 2.

In my recent SPG, I said I would like there to be a more certain route through the planning process for developers who offer at least 35% affordable housing. This is part of my wider effort to move towards a long-term, strategic target of 50% affordable homes across all new developments in the capital. This site is within an Opportunity Area and is also within one of my Housing Zones and both local and London policy promote the delivery of homes for Londoners in these locations.

Tottenham Hale, including Hale Wharf, is identified in local and strategic policy as suitable for tall buildings. Having worked with the applicant on the Hale Wharf scheme, we have increased the level of affordable housing from 9%, to first 30% and then to 35%. That is 177 genuinely affordable homes.

In answer to an issue raised by the Chair of the Planning Committee in relation to the review mechanisms for affordable housing, there are a few mechanisms to uplift affordable housing

at three stages throughout the process. The first two would mean any additional housing would be onsite. The third review happens at the end of the process and, by necessity, any additional affordable housing required of the developer cannot be onsite and would be offsite.

We have also ensured the project would not encroach on our precious Green Belt as was the case in earlier designs. I have made improvements to the quality of that Green Belt by having it rezoned to natural landscaping. Of course, it is absolutely right that, as part of my drive towards good growth, as I set out in *A City for All Londoners*, that I ensure that existing communities are respected and that careful consideration is given to impacts on their lives and livelihoods.

I have visited the proposed site. I have listened to the case put for the developer and also to the concerns of residents and those who use and cherish the Green Belt in Hale Wharf. I have carefully considered all the evidence available to me including the impact of overshadowing and on the openness of the Green Belt. The proposals are not considered to cause harm to the Green Belt, nor cause adverse impact on the natural environment. Natural England have raised no objections to these plans. The proposals will enhance the Green Belt within the applicator's site by replacing (Inaudible) with landscaped, open space.

The high-density development will deliver much needed, genuinely affordable, good quality homes that Londoners need in an area of the capital that cannot sustain further development without an adverse impact on the community that surrounds it.

The proposals will contribute to the approvals to open space with the bridges and fun activity and first contributions to The Paddock. For these reasons, I agree with my planning officers' recommendation and grant planning permission for this development. Thank you all very much.