

**OUR TOTTENHAM NETWORK
PLANNING POLICY WORKING GROUP**

**Addendum to the two response documents submitted to the London Borough of Haringey
on 7th March 2014 for the**

**Consultation on the *Tottenham Area Action Plans
Regulation 18 Consultation Document*
&
Consultation on *Haringey's Site Allocation DPD
Regulation 18 Consultation Document***

Contact:

Organisation: <http://ourtottenham.org.uk/>

Coordinators for the Planning Policy Working Group:

- **Claire Colomb** - ccolomb30@gmail.com
- **Dave Morris** – dmorris@onetel.com

The *Our Tottenham* network brings together 40 key local community groups, projects and campaigns standing up for the interests of people in Tottenham, especially around planning and regeneration issues (http://ourtottenham.org.uk/?page_id=31). We work together to fight for our neighbourhoods, our community facilities and the needs of our communities throughout Tottenham. **On 7th March 2014 the *Our Tottenham Planning Policy Working Group* submitted two responses to the consultation on the *Tottenham Area Action Plans Regulation 18 Consultation Document* and the *Haringey's Site Allocation DPD Regulation 18 Consultation Document*, based on the principles embedded in the *Community Charter for Tottenham* agreed by the *Our Tottenham* network on 6 April 2013 (available here: <http://ourtottenham.wordpress.com/community-charter/>). This was followed up by a Community Planning for Tottenham conference in February 2014.**

It was agreed with Steve Kelly and Matthew Randall from Haringey Council that a number of supporting documents and appendices which support the statements made in our responses to the two above mentioned consultation documents could be submitted to the Council by 25th March 2014. These appendices and supporting documents are enclosed below.

The ***Our Tottenham network*** currently includes: Bull Lane Playing Fields Campaign / Weir Hall Action Group, Chestnuts Community Centre, Clyde Area Residents Association, Day-Mer, Defend Haringey Health Services, Find Your Voice, Friends of Lordship Rec, Growing-In-Haringey network, Haringey Alliance for Public Services, Haringey Defend Council Housing, Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, Haringey Friends of Parks Forum, Haringey Green Party, Haringey Housing Action Group, Haringey Left Unity, Haringey Living Streets, Haringey Needs St Ann's Hospital, Haringey Private Tenants Action Group, Haringey Solidarity Group, Haringey Trades Union Council, Living Under One Sun, Lord Morrison Hall / Afro International, N.London Community House, Peoples World Carnival Band, Selby Centre, The Banc, Tottenham and Wood Green Friends of the Earth, Tottenham Chances, Tottenham Civic Society, Tottenham Community Choir, Tottenham Community Sports Centre, Tottenham Concerned Residents Committee, Tottenham Rights, Tower Gardens Residents Group, Tynemouth Area Residents Association, University and College Union at CONEL, Urban Tattoo, Wards Corner Community Coalition, 1000 Mothers' March Organising Group, 20's Plenty for Haringey.

List of appendices and supporting documents

**(to be read in conjunction with the two response documents submitted by the
Our Tottenham Planning Policy Working Group
on 7th March 2014)**

Item No.	Topic	Cross-reference to relevant section(s) of the response document on the Tottenham AAPs	Cross-reference to relevant section(s) of the response document on the Tottenham Site Allocation DPD
A. Our Tottenham			
1	Our Tottenham Community Charter - as agreed at the founding conference (April 2013)	p. 1	p. 1
2	Report [summary] Our Tottenham Community Planning conference (Feb 2014)	p. 1	p. 1
B. Consultation and engagement			
3	Some examples of community empowerment and community planning around Tottenham – Our Tottenham (Feb 2014)	Q14 Q27	
4	Tottenham Stadium Regeneration Controversy Continues – Campaigners call for improvements not demolitions (July 2013)	Q2 Q3 Q5 Q6 Q7	
5	Local traders condemn ‘sham’ Council consultation for North Tottenham High Road West. Backed by a 4,000-strong local petition, they call for a new scenario for the area (Nov 2013)	Q6	
6	North Tottenham High Road West Controversy Deepens – Large scale opposition expressed to Council evictions and demolition, despite misleading and controversial consultation and report (Nov 2013)	Q6	
C. Housing			
7	Our Tottenham Housing Working Group: Comments (March 2014)	Q3 Q5 Q18	
8	No Gentrification for Tottenham! The threat to people on low incomes and ethnic minorities from Haringey Council’s ‘Plan for Tottenham’ (2013)	Q3 Q5 Q18	
9	The social cleansing of Council housing estates in London - Loretta Lees / SNAG. (2014)	Q3 Q5 Q18	
10	Demolition vs Refurbishment (extract from Carpenters Community Plan) (2013)	Q3 Q5 Q18	
11	The Affordable Housing Con - London Tenants Federation pamphlet (2013) http://www.londontenants.org/publications/other/theaffordablehousingconf.pdf	Q3 Q5 Q18	
D. Sites			
12	S3: Vale Road/Tewkesbury Road		S3, p. 96-99
13	THR9: Gourley Place & Wickes Site		THR9, p. 83-85
14	TH8 – South Tottenham Employment Area		TH8, p. 33-35
15	TH7 – Hale Wharf		TH7, p. 30-32

A. OUR TOTTENHAM

Appendix 1.

OUR TOTTENHAM - A COMMUNITY CHARTER

Planning & Regeneration by and for the Community

As agreed and launched by the Our Tottenham conference on Saturday April 6th 2013

OUR voices, OUR communities, OUR neighbourhoods

Tottenham is a great place with a rich social and architectural history, made up of vibrant, diverse and talented communities. We want to ensure this continues!

The Council are promoting their 'Plan for Tottenham', backed by property developers, big business, and the Mayor of London. The Council is gifting public money and assets to the profit-driven developers, and have so far largely refused to listen to the views of residents. The plans include a range of measures, some of which will seriously impact on our lives and our communities. The plans promote corporate-led and large scale urban development; increased rents and unaffordable housing; and the loss of some independent local shops, homes, community facilities and small businesses.

Coupled with the Government's planning policies and attacks on vital public services and people's welfare, the major effect of all this will be to over-develop Tottenham, to threaten its positive community-scale character in many areas, to promote profiteering at the community's expense, and the forced displacement of thousands of local people who can no longer find or keep any affordable place to live.

This is unacceptable. It doesn't have to be like this. Together we are very powerful.

We pay tribute to all those thousands of Tottenham residents and community groups who have campaigned and worked so hard to improve their local areas and facilities.

We pledge to fight for OUR common interests, OUR neighbourhoods, OUR community facilities and for the needs of OUR communities throughout Tottenham.

We call on the people of Tottenham to oppose all inappropriate planning and developments and campaign to defend facilities and proposals which are led by local residents, for our benefit, and which improve neighbourhoods for our communities - not just for the benefit of big business.

We will show support for and help initiate new resident and community-led development plans that support the interests of local people. We support the Our Tottenham community planning and regeneration action network set up to spread co-operation and solidarity throughout Tottenham's neighbourhoods.

Together with local people we will take action to....

DEFEND COMMUNITY FACILITIES: protect and expand the 'social infrastructure' our communities value and rely on, including community centres, local pubs, corner shops, playgrounds & parks, GP surgeries, post offices etc

STAND UP FOR DECENT AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING FOR ALL: ensure that new developments provide the secure, affordable housing that people need, and that 'gentrification' doesn't force thousands of local residents out of our borough

SUPPORT SMALL BUSINESSES: support our local, independent, family shops and enterprises

PROMOTE QUALITY DESIGN AND RESPECT FOR HERITAGE: protect Tottenham's listed buildings, conservation areas and general positive architectural characteristics, and ensure any new development is of good quality

IMPROVE THE STREET ENVIRONMENT: ensure safer, friendlier, traffic-calmed, 'living' streets with less clutter and more greenery

SUPPORT YOUTH VOICES, SERVICES AND FACILITIES: encourage and support our local youth speaking out for the services, centres and facilities they need

EMPOWER OUR COMMUNITIES: ensure real respect, engagement and empowerment for our communities and community groups so that they are driving the decision-making

DEVELOP LOCAL COMMUNITY PLANS: develop our own ideas and visions for our local sites & neighbourhoods

The Our Tottenham Charter was drafted by a series of open meetings of Tottenham community groups

from January to April 2013.

The Charter's Action Points were developed, discussed, amended and adopted, along with the Charter as a whole, by the Our Tottenham open conference on 6th April 2013, attended by 110 people from over 30 local community organisations. They were collectively formulated by those attending workshops at the conference, and those that have been adopted are the ones ratified by the conference as a whole (through an overwhelming show of hands in support).

Appendix 2.

Statement agreed by Our Tottenham Organising Group, February 5th 2014

LOCAL PEOPLE CALL FOR COMMUNITY PLANS FOR LOCAL SITES, FACILITIES, AND AREAS - AND FOR TOTTENHAM AS A WHOLE **Our Tottenham Community Planning Conference A Huge Success**

On Saturday 1st February the Our Tottenham Community Planning Conference was attended by over 100 members and reps of 42 local community groups & organisations, residents associations, traders groups, education institutions and London wide networks, and a number of other individual local residents.

The conference, organised by local residents, brought this diverse range of groups together to discuss the creation of community plans in Tottenham and to share skills and knowledge.

The conference started with keynote speeches from inspiring community campaigns in Kings Cross and Newham. Many success stories from around Tottenham were then also shared. These included: our hosts Tottenham Chances who have created a vibrant arts venue; the community-led restoration of Lordship Recreation Ground; the Selby Centre and their former school building now used by 100 user groups; the successful lobbying to restore many of the High Rd's heritage features; the management by sports enthusiasts of Tottenham Sports Centre and the Frederick Knight Ground and their 30 year campaign to retain the green space at Bull Lane Playing Fields; the continuing struggle to implement a community-led plan at Wards Corner; and news from other community facilities managed by local people.

Breakout sessions discussed issues facing local groups including the on-going consultation on Haringey Council's Area Action Plans for Tottenham, how to develop local Community Plans, using planning policies and powers in the Localism Act to benefit the community, getting access to regeneration funding, empowering local people, and developing relationships with the Council. Some guidance and action points from each of the workshops were noted. [See over]

The conference climaxed with discussion about creating a Community Plan for Tottenham as a whole, and this process has now begun. [See over]. A number of open working groups were also set up to take action following the conference, including a community plans group, a planning policy group, a local economy group, and a housing group.

"The sheer number of people and groups who attended is yet another sign that people in Tottenham are tired of the Council's top-down approach to regeneration. The Council's Plan for Tottenham does not generally represent what local people need or want. The creation of community plans mean the Council must change their approach. There are so many sites under threat in Tottenham that are or could be vital resources for local people. The Council & other bodies should be working with the wide range of successful, experienced, knowledgeable, & passionate local groups so that the wishes of the community can be fulfilled." - Our Tottenham Spokesperson



Members and reps from the following groups attended the conference:

Haringey Federation of Residents Associations, Friends of Lordship Rec, Wards Corner Community Coalition, Haringey Solidarity Group, Haringey Housing Action Group, Clyde Area Residents Association, Tottenham Civic Society, Conservation Area Advisory Committee, Haringey Private Tenants Action Group, Friends of Tottenham Green, Haringey Left Unity, Friends of Lord Morrison Hall, Haringey Warehouse Tenants Association, The Eye Practice, Tottenham Traders Partnership, Haringey Needs St Ann's Hospital, Selby Centre, Tynemouth Area Residents Association, Living Under One Sun, Haringey Independent Cinema, Chestnuts Community Centre, Fountayne Arts, Moselle Project, Sustainable Haringey, Dresden Leisure Graduate School, Antwerp Arms Association, Ayep Saturday School, Bull Lane Playing Area, Haringey Needs St Ann's Hospital, Friends of Down Lane Park, Bruce Grove Residents Network, Twisted Stocking Theatre Company, Iranian Women's Association, Carpenters Estate, Tottenham & Wood Green Friends of the Earth, Creative

Key guidance and action points from the workshops

Developing community visions and turning them into Plans

- Map out existing community assets to help in the development of community planning
- Create physical and virtual space to collect together information about everything that local community / campaign groups are doing in Tottenham, in order to make such information widely accessible
- Present plans in a financially and socially viable way

Accessing and pressing for the funding/resources needed to implement Plans

- Our Tottenham members are encouraged to map, register and where possible run community assets
- We should consider forming appropriate planning and development bodies (eg Neighbourhood Forums and Trusts etc)
- To research and consider the range of potential resources and how to access them

Relations with Council and other official and commercial bodies to achieve Plans

- Keep building up the Our Tottenham network to increase legitimacy, co-operation and cohesion, so that groups in Tottenham are strong and working together
- Develop our research and evidence base, sharing knowledge, experience and information about the area and what is important to us in Tottenham
- Be prepared to negotiate in various ways and times with the authorities generally and around specific schemes - and be aware of how the authorities work so that we can participate in official discussions and planning

Understanding, using and negotiating legal/planning processes

- As individuals, groups and where possible as a network we should formally respond to relevant council consultations, especially the Tottenham Area Action Plans and the Sites Allocations.
- We need to insist that consultation processes are accessible, transparent and genuine
- We must publicly hold councillors to account for their policy decisions
- We need to have multiple lines of engagement over planning issues, and must continue to develop our own community vision and policies, alongside our critique of existing official proposals, plans and policies.

Mobilising public support and exercising our power to achieve Plans

- When developing Plans we need to engage young people and all sections of our local communities
- Find a common simple message to unite and rally people around
- Be well organised through developing action plans, and local community and solidarity networks.

The agreed next steps

1. We pledge to support Community Planning throughout Tottenham. We will encourage local people to develop their own plans for the improvements to local sites, facilities and neighbourhoods, and for Tottenham as a whole.
2. We insist that all those with wealth, resources or decision-making power affecting any or all of our neighbourhoods work in genuine partnership with those who live or work here, support our community organisations, and help implement local community plans and community-led regeneration.

3. We will continue to encourage and support local people to challenge any and all inappropriate or inadequate development proposals which do not address the real needs of our communities, or which displace local people. Our Tottenham pledges to continue to support all groups that are developing their own plans or defending community assets that are under threat. Our Tottenham will respond to official Council consultations regarding Tottenham.
4. We will set up a Community Planning Working Group promoting and supporting community planning, local planning workshops and residents' own consultations. The group will also co-ordinate the efforts to develop a Community Plan for Tottenham. The Community Planning group will be guided by the Community Charter, and by the agreed action points coming out of the conference workshops.
5. We will support the development of other Our Tottenham Working Groups, eg on the Local Economy, Housing, Planning Policy, Community Facilities, Youth, Community Planning, Communications etc,...
6. We agree there should be an Our Tottenham Recall Conference in summer/autumn 2014 to strengthen the work and increase the size of the network and its Working Groups, evaluate the Community Charter, and to discuss how best to mobilise our communities to speak out for their interests.

B. CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT

Appendix 3.

SOME EXAMPLES OF COMMUNITY EMPOWERMENT AND COMMUNITY PLANNING AROUND TOTTENHAM

The Our Tottenham network is encouraging local people to develop their own plans for places, facilities, sites, and neighbourhoods around Tottenham. Below are some examples of local community-led regeneration and community plans. Let's recognise, celebrate, promote and replicate local people's achievements – it shows the tremendous talents and potential we all have!

Some inspirational local examples we can draw on

Broadwater Farm / Lordship Recreation Ground *Broadwater Farm* Following a police/youth riot in 1985 the residents of the estate stepped up their efforts to improve the poorly-designed estate which had few facilities. The community-led regeneration of the estate attracted tens of millions of ££s of resources and has been a huge success. Improvements included concierges for all blocks, play areas, landscaping, workshops for rent, health centre, community centre, new school campus, bus route and more....

Lordship Recreation Ground Tottenham's largest and previously most-neglected public park, Lordship Rec, is adjacent to the BWF estate and has recently had a £5m makeover mainly due to the long-term commitment and hard work of the park users' group, the Friends of Lordship Rec. The whole regeneration process was community-led, in partnership with the Council's Parks Dept. The new facilities and features are now run in partnership with the various park user groups. *Indeed, there are many Friends Groups working to improve local parks around Tottenham.*



These 2 examples show what can be done where community vision and determination is backed by the resources needed and the political will.

Wards Corner This area around the former department store on the corner of the High Road and Seven Sisters Rd has been deliberately neglected by the council and landlords for years. In 2003 the council brought in and supported the developer Grainger with public funds. Their plan is to evict the vibrant indoor, mainly latin-american, market and the family-run shops in the area, demolish and rebuild with 100%

private flats above a development of high street chain stores replacing the existing market. The group organised 3 massive public meetings and a 500-strong 'hands around the site' protest. They also successfully challenged the developers in court (setting a historic precedent) as they had failed to consider equalities issues in the original plan. The developers then resubmitted a new plan which was approved by the council. However the campaign coalition - including residents and traders, backed by local Residents Associations - have developed their own Community Plan. This would retain the historic building, renew the whole area, ensure the wishes of traders and residents and offer a chance to show how distinctive and different Tottenham is. In November 2013 it was formally submitted for planning permission.

Bull Lane Playing Fields The campaign to save these playing fields in North Tottenham has been going on since 1985, backed by the local sports enthusiasts managing the Tottenham Sports Centre and the Frederick Knight Sports Ground. The council said the fields are surplus to requirements despite the lack of adequate green space and sports facilities in the north of the borough. The campaign group has done a lot over the last 25 years to raise the issue and campaign to save the fields as a local sports venue including getting plenty of media coverage, lobbying, and raising £1 million Lottery money to help buy the land. But the council wouldn't sell it to the group as the land would be worth a lot of profit to property developers - but is worth more than money to local residents! The group recently heard that the council have at last abandoned threats to build housing on the land. The campaign continues.

Tottenham marshes ***Stonebridge Lock*** In 2012 British Waterways wanted to close down the Waterside Centre - on which public money had been spent, and which is used by a number of community groups. A coalition of groups including Friends of Tottenham Marshes and Living Under One Sun successfully applied for a temporary lease to co-manage the centre, and to develop a community plan for the site.

Living Under One Sun They promote community leadership and general health and well-being throughout the community. They have created a vibrant collective community allotment on part of the Tottenham Hale allotment site [see photo]. This involves many members of the community in food growing, and in spreading education about food and healthy eating. They have linked up with other community groups involved with Tottenham marshes in order to protect the marshes and its community facilities from unwanted development and to promote positive, sustainable development.



St Ann's Hospital User groups and campaigners have lobbied and campaigned for a number of years, with some success, to protect and improve health facilities and services based in Haringey's only hospital site. The site has been allowed to get run down through NHS cuts and underfunding, and threats to sell off half to two-thirds of the site for housing development. A new group, Haringey Needs St Ann's Hospital, is now calling for an Urgent Care Centre to be based there, an additional Child Development Centre, and for the mental health facilities and other public services to be improved.

Community-run community centres ***Chestnuts Community Arts Centre:*** The well-used community-run Centre off St Ann's Road has been in hands of the community for 24 years and the group are determined to continue, despite the lease running out in 2013 and not yet being renewed by the Council. They have expanded their management committee and usage, and are involved in negotiations with the Council.



Lord Morrison Hall: Community Centre in Scales Road, Central Tottenham since the 1970's - run by Afro International. The council has not yet renewed the 20 year lease that ended in 2013,

and has so far rejected the Centre's application to renew it. The centre held a meeting to oppose the repossession attended by over 150 people, reflecting the amount of support for such community spaces. The group are taking legal advice regarding various outstanding issues between them and the Council..

Welbourne Centre: After a long campaign, including a 250-strong march, and a costly legal battle, the well-used community centre run by the local african-caribbean community for 20 years, was repossessed by the council at the end of 2012. There were plans to occupy but the council boarded the place up before anything could happen. Welbourne prepared a business plan to keep it open but this was rejected by the council, who failed to listen to the community group.

North London Community House: This thriving venue, where we held our founding conference, is not under threat. It's a social centre set up and run by Turkish and Kurdish activists as a community space for social/political organising. 20 years ago the activists purchased the empty former postal sorting office and converted/refurbished it themselves.

Tottenham Chances A former British Legion club building on the High Rd faced closure and sell off, but some members held fast and turned it into a thriving independent arts centre. They now have plans to greatly expand the activities & facilities, and interact positively with the local area.



Selby Centre Set up in 1992 in a former school building, they are a multi-purpose community and social enterprise centre led by the community and third sector organisations - a rich mix primarily from BME, refugee and other historically excluded communities in Tottenham, Haringey, North London and beyond. The site is 150,000 square feet, with offices, meeting rooms, training facilities, sports and events halls and a large car park. They are seeking an extended lease from the Council.

Appendix 4.

Our Tottenham statement, July 2013

TOTTENHAM STADIUM REGENERATION CONTROVERSY GROWS - CAMPAIGNERS CALL FOR IMPROVEMENTS NOT DEMOLITIONS

- At a joint meeting with the Tottenham Hotspur Executive Director, Our Tottenham network community reps condemned the 'negative' affects of the new Stadium-led development in the surrounding area , and called for the wealthy Club to put £100m into positive improvements for local communities 'like Arsenal had done for its new stadium'
- Our Tottenham reps to report back to July 6th 'Our Tottenham' Street Assembly outside Wards Corner
- Our Tottenham reps to address full Council meeting on 15th July



On Thursday 4th July 2013 at the Tottenham Hotspur Stadium, representatives of the Football Club and the Our Tottenham network* met to discuss the regeneration of Tottenham, and in particular some of the controversial effects of the 'Spurs-led regeneration' of North Tottenham. Donna-Maria Cullen (The Club's Executive Director), and Adam Davison (The Club's Head of Community Relations) met with Tottenham residents' delegation from the Our Tottenham network - Frank Murray (Tottenham Concerned Residents Committee), Lia-Clara Gomes (White Hart Lane shopkeepers group), Jacob Secker (Haringey Defend Council Housing), Mark MacKnight (Friends of Lord Morrison Hall), and Dave Morris (Haringey Federation of Residents Associations).

Tottenham Hotspur (THFC) had requested the meeting with the community campaigners 'to discuss the campaign and whether there might be any areas of common ground. We certainly would welcome the opportunity to meet as we recognise the extremely important roles both organisations have to play in the renewal of Tottenham.' [Adam Davison email to OT, 4.6.2013].

The campaigners put forward 7 written demands. These included:

- **that Spurs contribute £100m as s106 planning gain** 'matching Arsenal's funding into the local community during its own stadium development (in 2006)'. It was noted that THFC's official contribution had originally been set at £16.436m, but THFC had managed to get this low figure reduced to a paltry £0.477m**. It was also pointed out that Tottenham last year had the 13th highest revenues of any football club in the world***.The £100m should be paid and earmarked to go towards improvements to local community facilities, homes and small businesses, and without any rent rises.
- **that there be no demolitions or people made homeless.** For example in the North Tottenham High Road West / Love Lane area an unnecessary 'Stadium Approach' road is planned to be constructed through a Council housing estate, with many nearby shops and some community facilities also facing demolition****. It was noted that the current so-called consultation about these Council proposals scandalously omits any option to reject the threat of

demolitions, ensuring that many will be made homeless if the controversial plans are not halted.

- **that no public money be used to subsidise any stadium-related development** [The Council and GLA have earmarked £41m towards regeneration-related development around Tottenham, £8.5m of it related to the 'Stadium Approach road' area *****];
- **that any new homes built on the Spurs development site itself should be at least 50% social housing.** It was noted that 50% affordable housing was set as a planning obligation, but then scrapped after THFC lobbying.
- **The Club were also invited to 'side with the people of Tottenham' and sign up to the Our Tottenham Community Charter** [<http://ourtottenham.wordpress.com>]

In response Donna-Maria Cullen said she supported many of the Community Charter points, but resisted the calls for the Club to contribute in the ways proposed by the campaigners. She agreed to respond to all the 7 demands in writing following the meeting. Meanwhile, she denied the Club was wealthy and challenged some of the figures quoted for Arsenal [but was handed a copy of the source material]; said that the Council was responsible for the controversial Love Lane area demolition proposals and many other developments in the area and that campaigners 'should lobby the Council' *****.

There followed an intense discussion on the above issues especially the extent of Spurs' responsibility as a key partner and catalyst for some of the controversial regeneration ideas for Northumberland Park, and indeed for Tottenham as a whole. There was also debate about gentrification forcing local people out of the borough*****, and the pros and cons of developer-led and community-led regeneration.

Donna-Maria Cullen agreed to respond in writing to the 7 Our Tottenham network demands. The OT delegates agreed to report back to their planned Street Assembly on Saturday.*****

" We are calling on the club to speak out against the threat of demolitions of nearby homes and shops, and to promise to fund the improvements people actually need. Spurs always say they want to go one better than Arsenal, so we expect them to put more money into the area than Arsenal did since they built their new stadium."

- Frank Murray, for the Our Tottenham network

Notes:

* The Our Tottenham network was formed earlier this year in response to the Council's 'Plan for Tottenham' and the growing threats of '*large-scale development, increased rents and unaffordable housing, the loss of some independent local shops and closure of some community facilities*'. The network is backed by a wide range of local community organisations [see list below]. At a conference in April these organisations adopted and launched a Community Charter calling on the people of Tottenham '*to oppose all inappropriate planning and developments, and to campaign to defend facilities and proposals which improve neighbourhoods for our communities*'. The network also calls on people to: '*Defend community facilities and services; Stand up for decent & affordable housing for all; Support small businesses; Promote quality design and respect for heritage; Improve the street environment and green spaces; Support youth voices, services and facilities; Empower our communities; Develop our own local community plans*'

** Spurs stadium s106 contributions official figures, contrasted with the Arsenal stadium:
<http://ourtottenham.wordpress.com/documents-info>

*** Report by Deloitte, 2013: 'Captains of Industry, Football Money League' - p28

**** See Haringey Council's current High Road West consultation document.

***** Report for Cabinet, 7 February 2012, Item 12. 'Funding and Investment Package for the Tottenham Regeneration Program. p3.

[http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/Published/C00000118/M00005356/\\$\\$ADocPackPublic.pdf](http://www.minutes.haringey.gov.uk/Published/C00000118/M00005356/$$ADocPackPublic.pdf)

***** Our Tottenham lobby/delegation at the full Council meeting - Monday 15th July, 6.30pm @ Civic Centre, High Rd, N22

***** No Gentrification for Tottenham - published by Haringey Defend Council Housing, 2013:

<http://ourtottenham.wordpress.com/documents-info>

***** IT'S OUR TOTTENHAM! STREET ASSEMBLY - Saturday 6th July, 12 noon @ Seven Sisters tube. Outside Wards Corner Market, Tottenham High Road, N15

Appendix 5.

Statement from the Our Tottenham Organising Group - 28.11.2013

Local traders condemn ‘sham’ Council consultation for North Tottenham High Road West. Backed by a 4,000-strong local petition, they call for a new scenario for the area

On Thursday 28th November a delegation of traders from North Tottenham High Road West addressed the Council's cabinet meeting. They presented their 4,000-strong petition in which local people rejected the demolition of the area. The traders condemned the consultation over the future of the area as a 'sham' and said they had been lied to by the Council. They also condemned the report of the consultation that had excluded or sidelined most of the objections. They called on the Council to *'freeze this planning process and sit down to design a new Scenario, one that includes this Business Community and allows it to move forward and grow within the regeneration process, not be excluded from it.'* Their powerful presentation is included below in full.

It should be noted that many Councillors are at last beginning to criticise the Council's plans. At the meeting, Cllr Meehan referred to a recent Guardian expose which showed that THFC had a property company recently re-



registered 'offshore' in the Bahamas - he called on the Council to condemn Tottenham Hotspur FC for buying up shops and businesses under threat, describing this as *'making a killing'* and a *'fire sale'*. Cllr Bevan asked the traders' rep to tell the Cabinet how a THFC official had allegedly tried to buy up local shops a year ago, telling owners they could otherwise lose everything - the official apparently showed traders some unpublished Council redevelopment plans for the area long before they had even been made public

let alone consulted over. Cllr Stanton said the process of demolition and redevelopment was recognised throughout London as *'social cleansing'*. Cllr Winskill, the Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee which met on the previous Tuesday, said then that *'we are talking about a massive socio-economic transformation of the area'* and asked *'who is the redevelopment of Tottenham for?'*. At that same meeting Cllr Bull, the former head of the Scrutiny Cttee, said *'I still have a niggling concern that we rolled over far too quickly on the section 106 on Spurs'* [in which the Council allowed THFC to abandon its agreed obligations to build affordable housing

and to put 16m into the local community]. *'It just seems like everything is Spurs, Spurs, Spurs, Spurs, Spurs at the expense of everything else.'*

In reply the Council leader, Clare Kober, agreed that any *'making a killing'* tactics by THFC's property arm would be unacceptable. Regarding criticisms over gentrification and *'social cleansing'* she recognised that there was *'an affordable housing crisis'*, which was a *'crucial'* challenge *'for ordinary working people'*. The plans would be looked at again to take into account all that had been said and a new *'masterplan'* for the area would be drawn up and consulted on in the summer of 2014.

THE TRADERS' PRESENTATION

" This business community has been part of the fabric of Tottenham in most cases for over 20 years and in some cases for more than fifty. Are we to be thrown out to make way for a Football fans Walkway?

This petition with over 4000 signatures shows overwhelmingly that local people are against this.

These figures should have been added into the recent High Road West Consultation, here today for approval. The result would have been a resounding NO to your present plans. However this was not allowed to happen. When we presented it to Alan Strickland in June he neglected to tell us the petition had to be formally presented and so the figures were never included.

There has been no engagement with local business about the development of this Regeneration plan. We have been lied to and lied to by our own elected representatives.

The key decisions for this master plan were made long before the consultation. Key factors were decided at the beginning of 2012. That's when our small businesses were sacrificed in order that one very big business could become even richer.

The demolition of our shops and businesses became a non-negotiable in every master plan scenario. Where is the Democracy in that? That is why we began this petition to give the community a chance to show how they felt about it. An option to comment, which was not given to them in the consultation forms

Have we have come through recession and through riots to have our businesses blighted like this? Are successful businesses that we have worked and developed over many years to be snatched away and given to developers for their profit?

The consultation is a sham. It is not an independent study. Figures are inaccurate and manipulated to achieve the preferred Scenario.

The plans were misleading: marking new buildings for community use when they will in fact be retail outlets which incorporated community facilities.

The 68%, which has been widely quoted as a figure that shows overwhelming support for the demolition plans, is not justified. As a percentage of the total households on the estate it is just 40%. In the wider community of 4000 homes and businesses it is just 3% in agreement. That's using the figures quoted in the report and of course



70 of the business replies were never included in the figures but were placed in the appendix to the consultation report.

Regeneration is not about providing a football venue or boosting land values to justify an investment. The council should not be acting like a Corporation.

Regeneration needs to create hope for the existing community by building a better neighbourhood.

Regeneration is not about moving the existing community OUT so more up-market people can move in.

In 2011, after the riots, the council ran an I Love Tottenham campaign. Its tag line was Support your Local Traders. It needs to stand by that promise today.

- Recognise the value of the established community and its contribution over many years.*
- Recognise and accept the wishes of this community as presented now in this Petition.*
- Freeze this planning process and sit down to design a new Scenario, one that includes this Business Community and allows it to move forward and grow within the regeneration process, not be excluded from it. "*

Appendix 6.

Statement from the Our Tottenham Organising Group - 28.11.2013

NORTH TOTTENHAM HIGH ROAD WEST CONTROVERSY DEEPENS

LARGE SCALE OPPOSITION EXPRESSED TO COUNCIL EVICTIONS AND DEMOLITION, DESPITE MISLEADING AND CONTROVERSIAL CONSULTATION AND REPORT

- Traders condemn the threat of evictions and demolition, and lobby Council Cabinet (28th Nov)
 - Thousands of local people sign petition against demolitions
- Council tenants demand guarantees of better replacement Council homes in the area, if any demolition goes ahead
- Campaigners demand the Council ensure anyone evicted is rehoused in secure, genuinely affordable, local homes and fully compensated
- Campaigners re-state their calls for THFC to pay £100m for improvements to existing homes, shops and community facilities

On the 8th October the Council circulated an initial draft Report of the 'consultation' they carried out in May/June 2013 in the threatened area of Love Lane estate and its neighbouring shops and businesses in North Tottenham High Road (opposite the Spurs ground). The draft report was revealed to uproar at a meeting of local traders on October 8th, who condemned the report as biased. They are planning a deputation to the Cabinet meeting on 28th November to present 4,000+ signatures [figure provided to us] on their petition against demolitions. In fact the consultation responses show deep concern and mass opposition to evictions and demolitions [see Summary, below], despite the Council's totally biased and inadequate consultation tactics [see 'Biased consultation condemned, below] and the report's consultants' attempts to spin the results favourably for the planned objective - a 'Stadium Approach' road through the area to benefit Tottenham Hotspur Football Club (THFC) and their new 430m stadium project.



A spokesperson for the Our Tottenham Organising Group said: *The Report results reveal true scale of opposition. Despite all the bias and spin, the Report results demonstrate considerable opposition to the proposals. In particular, even where demolition is apparently supported, this is clearly because the Council tenants expect re-housing for local residents in secure, genuinely affordable, new homes at the site. As fellow residents we send our solidarity to the local residents and traders, and call on the Council to work with them in a genuine partnership.*

Biased 'consultation' condemned Campaigners from Our Tottenham and Haringey Defend Council Housing, and

local traders, have condemned the consultation context and tactics. These are some of the background issues:

- The Council's 'Plan for Tottenham' issued in 2012 showed a 'Stadium Approach' road proposed to go through the Love Lane estate
- Residents attending Haringey Defend Council Housing meetings on the estate last spring (around 50 took part to express their concerns over the threat of demolition) reported that the Decent Homes works to replace kitchens and bathrooms in the 1960s-built estate have not been done in most of the blocks, as if decisions about its future had already been made 'from on high'.
- A key condition of allowing Tottenham Hotspur to expand its ground had been that it would have to put 16m into the surrounding area. For example this could have been used to provide improvements (eg concierges) for the Love Lane estate. The Council's Planning Committee allowed THFC to drop this obligation after the club pleaded poverty. The Council had then agreed it would instead contribute 5m of public funds towards the shortfall by selling off land on the Love Lane estate. In response, Our Tottenham campaigners re-stated their calls for THFC to pay 100m for improvements to existing homes, shops and community facilities - a demand put to THFC directors during negotiations with them in July 2013.
- Original thoughts that any consultation would give people the option of saving the current estate and shops was abandoned and the 3 so called 'consultation' options ended up being 'part demolition', 'half demolition' or 'full demolition'.
- However, even these biased options were not clearly put on the consultation form, so people could not add 'none of the above' or put a line through the 3 options. Instead the only part of the consultation form that referred to the 3 'options' was a general comments box at the end which asked for comments about '*the three options outlined in the High Road West Creating a Plan for Change' document*' ...[ie people would have to hunt out, read and digest a detailed 20pp document whilst filling in the Questionnaire] '*...as well as any other general comments you have*'.
- None of the questions on the form referred to 'demolition' or 'evictions', but instead to 'redevelopment' and 'regeneration', and gave the clear impression that local residents and shops would all benefit from improved housing and facilities.
- A Tottenham Councillor who criticised the consultation documents has since been removed from the ruling Labour Group

Summary of Report The report dated August 2013 has finally been officially published as part of the documents for the Cabinet meeting on 28th November. However, the flawed consultation is increasingly seen as little more than a pro-council propaganda exercise - eg:

1. The key question was never asked, ie whether people were for or against demolitions!
2. The 3 Council options, of partial, half or total demolition of the Love Lane estate and surrounding shops, were also never explicitly put so respondents were prevented from opposing all 3 or just adding none of them.
3. The words demolition or evictions were never used.
4. All the questions painted a rosy picture of improvements and redevelopment to benefit all the members of the existing community.
5. The Council have made promises of re-housing on site for the Council tenants affected. We noted that experience of similar developments around London has shown that this rarely happens as the community gets broken up and the % of unaffordable replacements gets increased. But what would not have been clear to all is that private tenants would be made homeless and leaseholders bought out and unable to afford to stay in the area.
6. Thousands of local people have signed a local traders petition against demolitions. This was mentioned but not taken into consideration.
7. 524 consultation forms were returned, 207 from residents of the estate.
8. 62 forms filled in by local customers at a threatened shop explicitly opposed all demolitions. These 62 were sidelined in the report as a petition.
9. Unsurprisingly, in the light of some of the forms language/propaganda, and the Councils misleading promotion of the redevelopment plans, and some of the Councils promises made, some of the respondents welcomed promised improvements. For example 76 residents of the estate agreed that all properties on the estate *should be included in the redevelopment plans*. This has been used as the key statistic to demonstrate 'widespread' support for mass demolition.

But many of these also expressed strong concerns about the effect on the community and also demanded that any replacement homes be Council housing and no public land be sold off. On page 37 the report says: *'Love Lane Council tenants want to maintain their security of tenure and their existing rent levels.'*

10. There was mass opposition from local shops and businesses

Please note that the report is very confusing document and the results have been presented and spun in the best possible light for the Councils clear drive to demolish and redevelop the whole area.

C. HOUSING

Appendix 7.

Our Tottenham Housing Working Group

Comments, March 2014

We support Haringey Council's statement in the Haringey Local Plan & the Annual Monitoring Report for council's planning policies that '**provision and access to high quality and affordable housing**' is a key priority for our borough. [Haringey Local Plan 3.2 SP2 Housing p. 61 & Annual Monitoring Report p41]

This is further emphasised by the Soundings Future recent consultation which highlights residents' responses in support of this key priority as shown below.

This key priority can only start to be met within the Tottenham Area Action Plans and Site Allocations by:

- ensuring the council and developers at least meet, and preferably far exceed, agreed council targets for affordable housing (50% of all new housing developments), particularly genuinely affordable housing: social housing (70% of all affordable housing in developments).
- All existing social housing continues to receive high quality Decent Homes Standard renewal plus other estate improvements for long term sustained development of these community assets.
- that any new PRS housing is affordable to people on the London Living Wage.
- introduction of rent control to ensure existing private rented sector housing does not increase out of the reach of ordinary residents even more than at present, to ensure existing population is not forced out of their homes and communities.

The above recommendations are also reflected in the Soundings Future consultation report by residents and community groups across Tottenham:

- Tackle immediate issues in social housing by undertaking a **enhanced programme of maintenance**, security and management. [p7]
- Contribute to the growth of a high quality and **affordable** private rental sector by developing a landlord licensing scheme, regular monitoring and enforcement of standards, and **rent targets**. [p8]
- **Increase the number of homes for social rent** by driving an affordable house building programme, and **protecting current social housing stock**. [p8]
- There is concern that **existing community will be priced out of the area** if private house prices rise. [p34]
- The **need for reasonably-priced housing** as people are concerned that Tottenham is becoming too expensive for many people wishing to stay in the area [p42]
- The council should set **rent caps** for the private rented sector [p68]
- Supporting the existing community: The issue was raised many times that regeneration would result in displacement of the existing population as they are **priced out of the area**. The ideal neighbourhood in Tottenham's future would have **decent, affordable homes for all of the current residents**, so that they benefit from this 'once in a lifetime' regeneration. [p68]
- Alternative housing models: **more socially rented properties** should be built so people are not at the mercy of private landlords. [p68]

Concerns continue to rise over the failures to achieve the official modest targets, as can be demonstrated by the statistics from the **Haringey Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Review 2011-2012**. The Council

and developers failure to reach Council targets with regards to affordable housing in new developments is set out in the annual monitoring report and extracted here. We have great concerns that existing targets are not being met – if the above key priority for the council is to be met, the minimum targets the council has given itself must be met, and exceeded for the even basics to be realised.

5.17 Only 43% of new build housing was designated affordable housing, not meeting the Council target of 50% affordable housing in all new developments.

5.18 Within the affordable housing target, the council’s agreed social rented housing target is 70% but the year 2011-2012 only managed 42.4% social housing within affordable housing developments.

5.23 Unit size within new developments has been allowed to focus on smaller units: 1 and 2 bed homes. Haringey is very low on larger, family sized units but the council and developers have still failed to meet the target where they have reached only 21% rather than the 55% they expect in order to achieve their aims. (see 5.7)

5.25 The Council target for decreasing the numbers of people in temporary accommodation is a maximum of 3,000, but they only managed to reduce this to 3035 over 2011-2012.

5.30 Empty homes are said to be being brought back into use which we support. However, there are homes on the Wards Corner Site which have been left empty for over one and two years which as far as I am aware are perfectly sound and could be helping to meet the need for housing residents immediately. All empty homes need to be brought back into use.

Tottenham Strategic Regeneration Framework March 2014

Lacks the detail which both the Local Plan offers and also the Soundings Consultation offers, and should therefore be amended accordingly to meet the needs of the both local residents who were consulted, but also so that it meets the needs of the Council framework policy.

We note that under the London Plan proposed new borough housing targets – Haringey has been allocated the greatest increase of all London boroughs. And yet most of the development is being pushed in the most densely populated parts of Haringey. We believe these figures are unsustainable, unrealistic and unfair.

2011-2012	2015 – 2025	Increase	% increase
820	1502	662	83%

Appendix 8.

NO GENTRIFICATION FOR TOTTENHAM! THE THREAT TO PEOPLE ON LOW INCOMES AND ETHNIC MINORITIES FROM HARINGEY COUNCIL'S 'PLAN FOR TOTTENHAM'

INTRODUCTION

On 31st July 2012, Haringey Council announced a regeneration plan, the *Plan for Tottenham*, which it claims will create thousands of new homes and jobs in the wake of the riots of August 2011 (1). The small print of this plan reveals that it is actually a plan which will push up house prices and rents, reduce the amount of council housing in the area, force out small shops and drive out large numbers of the poor and members of ethnic minorities to make way for a new higher-income population. This is gentrification - people with lower incomes being forced out of an area to make way for the people with higher incomes and the middle class. Hardly any effort is being made to increase the amount of genuinely affordable, rented social housing to re-house people displaced from private housing by new quality standards and higher rents.

..... continues (cut for reasons of space).....

Please read the full report/analysis at: http://ourtottenham.org.uk/?page_id=16

Appendix 9.

By Loretta Lees - Just Space, The London Tenants' Federation and SNAG

THE SoCIAL CLEANSING oF CoUNCIL ESTATES IN LoNDON

We are clear that the regeneration of council estates in London is nothing more than a state-led gentrification strategy disguised by a liberal policy rhetoric of mixed communities. Together as academics and activists [1] we have researched four London council estates, all at different stages of renewal: the Heygate Estate (finally empty as the last of the leaseholders, who were asserting their right to proper compensation through a public inquiry around their CPOs, was forcibly evicted by high court bailiffs at the instruction of Southwark Council'), [2] the Aylesbury Estate (part of which has been redeveloped, the rest of which is being decanted or is still in limbo), the Pepys Estate (where a council tower block, Aragon Tower, was redeveloped by Berkeley Homes into the Z Apartments), [3] and the Carpenters Estate (whose residents vigorously and effectively opposed the London Borough of Newham and UCLs plans for a UCL-led development, and whom we have been helping to develop an alternative neighbourhood plan). [4]

Mixed Communities Policy was launched by the previous New Labour government to tackle social exclusion in deprived areas such as council estates. New Labour believed that they could reduce social exclusion and promote social mobility for the poor by mixing them with the middle classes the idea being that the social and economic capital of the middle classes would trickle down to the poor through social mixing. The goal of this revanchist form of social engineering was a new moral order of respectable and well-behaved (middle class) residents. Despite a change of government and no new national discussion on mixed communities policy, local councils in London still cling to it as the selling point for their regeneration schemes (as seen in the current Earls Court regeneration plan).

But there is significant evidence of the poor performance of mixed communities policy with respect to its claims to aid the social and economic mobility of the poor. Geographers have called it a faith-based displacement activity. The evidence to date [5] indicates that mixed communities policy improves the life circumstances of neither those poorer residents who are able to remain in the neighbourhood, nor of those who are moved out. Indeed, there seems to be quite persuasive evidence [6] that specialised neighbourhoods have labour market advantages, even for the poor; indeed particularly for the less skilled who rely on personal contacts to a greater extent to find jobs.

The term the new urban renewal has been used [7] to describe the American HOPE VI programme of poverty deconcentration, in which public housing projects in US inner cities have been demolished (much as London council estates are being demolished in the name of mixed communities policy) to make way for mixed income housing in ways very similar to post-war urban renewal programmes in the US. Despite a new emphasis in 21st century London on partnership working, community involvement, and sustainability, the results are the same: the destruction of local communities and the large-scale displacement of low-income communities (see the SNAG maps showing the displacement of council tenants and leaseholders from the Heygate Estate).

The process for all four regeneration schemes we have looked at has been very similar:

First, local authorities made out that the estates were failing in some way, socially or economically; they were sink estates, they were structurally unsound, etc. These were often misrepresentations and falsehoods.

Second, the local authorities systematically closed down options and subsequently created a false choice for the estates residents between living on estates that needed upgrading and repair (which they were very unlikely to get) or newly built neighbourhoods in which they were unlikely to be able to afford the rents let alone get a mortgage, and even if they did they would not be living with their existing community.

Third, residents support for these regeneration programmes was more often than not misrepresented or misused.

Fourth, the delays and uneven information flows meant that residents often struggled to fight, many lived and still live in limbo, unsure about the future of their estate, many suffered and continue to suffer from depression and exhaustion.

Fifth, the affordable housing supposedly being made available to the ex-council tenants is a con much of the housing deemed affordable by the government is out of the reach of households earning below the median level of income in London (around 30,000 p.a. in 2012)! [8]

The fact is that a variety of unjust practices have been, and are being, enacted on these council estates.

In this project we have been gathering the data (evidence of resident and business displacement and unjust practices) and the tools (examples of alternatives) necessary to try to halt further demolitions and social cleansings, and to develop community-led alternatives for sustaining existing communities on council estates in London. We are in the process of producing an anti-gentrification toolkit that will provide tenants, leaseholders and housing activists across London with the information that they need to recognise council estate destruction as a form of gentrification, and also with suggestions for practical ways to fight it.

If we truly want London to be a socially mixed city we must stop the social cleansing of its council estates now! It is already getting too late!

Southwark Notes Archives Group

1 This research is funded by a 2012 Antipode Activist Scholar Award, PI: Loretta Lees, CoIs: London Tenants Federation, Richard Lee/Just Space and Mara Ferreri/SNAG, Challenging the New Urban

Renewal: gathering the tools necessary to halt the social cleansing of council estates and developing community-led alternatives for sustaining existing communities.

2 35 Percent: Campaigning for a More Affordable Elephant. Heygate Leaseholders Forced to Leave Their Homes,

<http://35percent.org/blog/2013/07/20/heygate-leaseholders-forced-to-sell-their-homes-cpo-approved>

3 See Davidson and Lees (2010)

4 CARP and the UCL students campaign did influence UCLs decision to back out, but there were also economic factors regarding the price of the land, etc, and more generally the failure to reach a commercial agreement (read the interview with the former UCL Provost Malcolm Grant in <http://cheesegratermagazine.org/investigations/2013/5/13/interview-with-the-provost.html>).

5 See Bridge, Butler and Lees (2012); and specifically on London, Arbaci and Rae (2013).

6 See Cheshire (2009).

7 See Hyra (2008).

8 See <http://www.londontenants.org/publications/other/theaffordablehousingconf.pdf>

Appendix 10.

EXTRACT FROM THE CARPENTERS ESTATE COMMUNITY PLAN

Housing: Demolition v refurbishment

There is compelling evidence that estate or tower block refurbishment, in all but the most extreme cases is both cheaper and less damaging to the local environment than demolition and new build (*Anne Power, 2008, "Does demolition or refurbishment of old and inefficient homes help to increase our environmental, social and economic viability?"*).

Power identifies a list of issues and assumptions that are not addressed in arguments in favour of demolition.

- Embodied carbon in homes that are being destroyed and in replacement homes is not 'counted' in proposals in favour of demolition.
- Demolition and renovation waste make up about one-third of all landfill.
- The infrastructure required for new building and its significant energy costs and emissions impact are not discussed.
- Demolition breaks up the essential social infrastructure and social capital in neighbourhoods, which take decades to build up again. Facilities and meeting places are costly to reinstate once they have been lost, and young people can become very disorientated as demolition is planned and carried out. Government research about social capital identifies a strong relationship between local social networks and individual wellbeing and resilience. There is a need for research that looks at the social and financial costs of breaking up local social networks, in particular the impact on young families, children and the elderly.
- Demolition plans have knock-on effects on schools, shops, health provision, banks and other local services, most of which leave an area before it is demolished and do not return till long after rebuilding, if at all. This causes hardship to the residents and, if they are elderly, can have very negative health impacts
- Rebuilding timescales are slowed by the need to renew infrastructure after demolition. The whole process can take up to 20 years. All in all, it is rare for a demolition plan to deliver replacement housing in less than 10 years, even with strong government backing and funding, as the Housing Market Renewal area demolitions are showing. It often takes far longer.

All these factors make demolition costly, disruptive, damaging to wider areas and therefore unpopular. The local environmental impacts of demolition are obvious: unsightly boarding up, accumulated rubbish, increased dumping, overgrown gardens, decayed streets and reduced maintenance. The wider environmental impacts of demolition are even more serious: loss of valuable and increasingly scarce materials; impact on landfill sites; transport of materials to and from demolition sites; particulate pollution in the process of demolition and transportation of rubble; and loss of housing, creating the need for new housing with its high embodied energy. Only the most extreme physical conditions justify such high social, economic and

environmental costs.

Here are 3 specific examples with the costs of the refurbishment provided:

Edward Wood Estate, Hammersmith and Fulham. The refurbishment works included adding wind turbines, cladding and solar panels to three tower blocks. In addition, there was refurbishment of the communal areas, construction of 12 penthouses for sale (on top of the tower blocks), new lighting and refurbishment of main electrical systems, double glazing to windows in stairwells, installation of gas central heating to bedsits and conversion of ground floor spaces to provide seven offices for voluntary organisations. The total cost was 16.3 million. However, the funding for the works came from a variety of sources – including sale of the penthouses, money from the Greater London Authority and section 106 planning gain monies. The total cost to the Housing Revenue Account (which leaseholders would have been required to contribute to) was £3.5m. Each block had 176 homes, so the total cost to each leaseholder would seem to be £6,666. There is an expected 72% reduction in fuel bills for residents as a result of the environmental improvements.

Colne and Mersea Houses, Barking and Dagenham. These are two 17 storey 1960's blocks with 204 flats. The works carried out comprised installation of photovoltaic roof panels generating 55kWp of electricity, triple glazed windows; some with integrated blinds, external cladding, insulated roofs, flood mitigation works, lift replacements, improved door entry systems and CCTV, upgraded common areas, single IRS satellite TV system, new heating and heat distribution system, Smart meters for each home, kitchen and bathroom upgrades and low water appliances.

The low carbon work carried out plus decent homes work cost a total of £10.6 million. £3.6 million came from the GLA. The cost proportionate cost to each leaseholder would have been around £34,000. There is an estimated reduction in residents' fuel bills of £400 per year.

Ethelred Estate, Lambeth Three tower blocks were part of a 'sustainable refurbishment' project – to achieve an 80% reduction in carbon emissions. The blocks were built in the 1970's – comprising 297 flats. The works included new kitchens and bathrooms, thermal installation, window renewal, roof renewal, communal heating improvements, a photovoltaic façade / solar panels, redecoration of communal areas, lift replacement and landscaping works. The total cost was £15.7 million, with £9m coming from the LDA and Concerto Project. The cost to leaseholders would have been around £22,500

The costs of these projects vary and are also dependent on how much additional money can draw in to reduce the cost to the Housing Revenue Account and thus the proportionate cost to leaseholders. Newham would have the potential to use section 106 monies – including from the Olympic Park and also monies raised from the use of the Carpenters Estate tower blocks for advertising.

Appendix 11.

The Affordable Housing Con

London Tenants Federation

The Mayor recognises the pressing need for more homes in London in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford. [London Plan 2011]

This report, produced and published by the London Tenants Federation aims to expose the many layers of what London Tenants Federation members call the 'Affordable Housing Con' and the sleight of hand used by politicians and policy-makers in promising to deliver homes that Londoners can genuinely afford. It considers the reasons for and the results of the 'con'.

FORWARD

Social scientists take considerable care in defining their concepts in order to make them more precise. By contrast, the term 'affordable housing' is used in such a wide variety of ways by those people in positions of power in relation to housing provision, such as politicians, property developers and planners, that it means just what they want it to mean – just like Humpty Dumpty. Hope for any kind of terminological precision will recede even further as the Coalition Government's notion of an 'Affordable Rent' product becomes established. Common sense usage of the word 'affordable' links it to people's capacity to pay for a particular good or service, a notion that is largely absent from the usage of 'affordable housing' in policy circles.

The London Tenants Federation's report *The Affordable Housing Con* provides a welcome guide through the manifold ways that the much-abused term 'affordable housing' hides more than it reveals. The report is essential reading for all those who want to grasp what the failures of current housing policy in London are, and also what genuinely affordable housing might mean for the hundreds of thousands of ill-housed Londoners for whom affordable housing, or rather lack of, means something all too real.

Dr. Paul Watt

Senior Lecturer in Urban Studies, Department of Geography, Environment and Development Studies, Birkbeck, University of London

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS

- The Government's definition of affordable housing refers to specific types of homes, rather than housing that is actually affordable. In fact the Government's formal definition, contained (at present) in its Planning Policy Statement 3, specifically says that 'affordable homes' and 'affordability' are not the same thing. PPS3 defines social-rented, intermediate and affordable rent homes as 'affordable housing'.
- Much of the housing defined by Government as affordable, isn't affordable for households that have below median income level in London. The 'equivalised' (taking into account the requirements of different household sizes) median income level is £31,379 for inner London and £30,507 for outer London.

Research carried out by Shelter when producing its publication on intermediate housing – ‘The Forgotten Households’, found that the average household income of those accessing part-rent part-buy homes in London is over £33,000 and for those accessing shared equity products (where part of the cost of a home is funded by a shared equity loan repayable on the sale of the property) is over £40,000. Even when it comes to social-rented housing, it is generally accepted that around two-thirds of tenants are unable to meet the cost of their rent without claiming housing benefit. In London, social rents are equivalent to 37% of the average social tenants’ household income compared with 31% outside London.

The new affordable rent tenure at between 60% and 80% market rents in London will require household incomes of £33,375 - £44,500 without claiming housing benefit. The introduction of universal credit caps, in 2013, is likely to result in much of this type of housing being inaccessible even to London households that are able to claim benefits.

- Although housing targets are set, seemingly, to meet evidenced existing and future need depending on what households can afford, social-rented targets are set at far lower levels than evidence shows are required, while targets for intermediate and market homes are set at higher levels than evidence shows are required

- In 2004 the Greater London Authority’s commissioned study of need found that 35,350 new homes needed to be built in London each year to meet existing and new need over a period of 10 years. 59% of those homes (20,790) needed to be social-rented, 7% (2,475) intermediate and 34% (12,019) market homes. From 2007, the London Plan set an annual target of 30,500 new and additional homes comprising a significantly lower 35% (10,675) social-rented target, but higher 15% (4,575) intermediate and 50% (15,250) market homes targets. By 2008 a new GLA study of need provided evidence of an increased level of need for social-rented homes, requiring that 24,500 such homes be built each year to address existing and future need over a 10 year period. The London Plan 2011 sets a target equivalent to only 7,927 social-rented homes a year.

- Even inadequate targets for social-rented homes have not been met, while higher than required targets for market and intermediate homes been more than met. Only 47% of the London Plan target for social-rented homes was met in 2007-10. In six London boroughs less than 20% of the target was met. Delivery was poorest in the East and North London planning sub-regions, where only 13% and 16% of the already inadequate social-rented housing target was met.

- Evidence of need for social-rented homes in London is consistently unmet. From 2007-10 only 15,083 social-rented homes were delivered – meeting only 21% of the evidenced need identified in the GLA 2008 study. 14,806 intermediate homes were delivered, for which there was little or no evidence of need and 50,272 market homes were delivered, some 165% of the assessed need.

- The London Mayor’s office collects two sets of data relating to delivery of social-rented homes. One takes into account how many new homes are replacements for others taken out of supply, while the other relates simply to the number of new social-rented homes delivered in any one year. The Mayor’s office uses the latter in dealing with the media

- In 2008-10 the number of social-rented homes delivered (using the second set of data) was 13,570, but 3750 (27%) of these were replacement homes.

- Both the current and previous London Mayors have defined their vision for London as being to gain or retain ‘world city’ status via growth, particularly of high-end finance, business, education and research. Their individual versions of the London Plan have set out policies that in spatial terms have facilitated the handing over of prime land in fashionable central and inner London to an international elite, to construct homes and create jobs to meet their needs. At the same time both Mayors have suggested that on the back of or as a by-product of doing this there will be trickle-down benefit to address London’s increasing levels of deprivation and polarisation of its communities.

Given that consistently there has been a lack of evidence demonstrating that deprivation and polarisation of communities in London are reducing, it would seem that both Ken Livingstone and Boris Johnson have operated on the basis of appearing to address this issue while knowingly not doing so, with the 'affordable housing con' being a key component of this.

•

Ken Livingstone's well-known and much publicised 50% affordable housing target certainly sounded good, but from the start he was aware that the target was not being met, that more intermediate homes were being produced than evidence required and that the need for social-rented homes was increasing.

....continues....

Full document: <http://www.londontenants.org/publications/other/theaffordablehousingconf.pdf>

D. SITES

Appendix 12.

S3: Vale Road/Tewkesbury Road

[Analysis by UCL students]

Observations:

It is true that the area appears to have a mixed use. There are artist live/work spaces by Eade Road (where it meets Seven Sisters Road) and they appear very well maintained and neat. This part of the site appears well laid out and there is a decent amount of floor space – adopting a real estate planners mind you can see why they may want to try and build property here, however, I do feel that this would be to the detriment to the open feel of that area.

As you move down along Eade Road there are big industrial warehouses containing building material and these warehouses are fully operational and neatly laid out. Further down Eade Road where it starts to meet Vale Road there is construction work going on where the National Grid are doing work trying to build tunnels for electrical cables.

Along Vale Road there is a long stretch of clothing manufacturers, all of which appear to be fully operational and in trade. On the left hand side of the road, just a few of the buildings seem to be of worse physical quality than the buildings on the right side of this road (which are of a high physical quality). As you turn right into the sight at the bottom of Vale Road you meet purely residential spaces (Tiverton Estate) – apart from a church (which is definitely in use every Friday, Saturday and Sunday). Again these residential properties appear to be occupied and well maintained. There is no space here to build any extra residential accommodation.

Overbury Road is an “artists’ village” according to a large mural on one building. The mostly two-storey buildings seem to be live/work spaces and in fairly good condition.

There appeared to be a community sort of feel here and an acceptance of these places as live/work spaces, e.g. through the prevalence of residential bins outside these spaces.

Along Tewkesbury Road there are Automobile workshops along one side of the road and living spaces along the other side of the road, these living spaces appear to be slightly less well-maintained.

Along Seven Sisters Road we liked the look and design of the buildings as we were walking up. I am not sure what development along this part of the site would actually achieve as on the ground floor all the buildings are in use and the homes above appear to be occupied and of a good design as well.

The Site Allocations document states that any development is “dependant on decisions on the future of current industrial uses,” which makes it seem that the future of this area is very unclear. It seems that current employment sites (the document lists four main ones) could be “regularized,” “redeveloped,” etc., but there seems to be no guarantee they would be retained. The document certainly makes clear the potential for residential developments, and says that the site should contribute to the Council’s “50% affordable housing” target, but again there is no guarantee this would happen or that new housing would be genuinely affordable.

S3 Vale Road/Tewkesbury Road - photos



Off of Eade Road - we believe live-work spaces in building to right



off of Eade Road



off of Eade Road



Eade Road grid work



Vale Road



Manufacturer on Vale Road



Off of Vale Road



Vale Road



Florentia clothing village – Vale Road



Artists' Village Overbury Road



Creative expression



Tewkesbury Road



Tewkesbury Road



Back of homes

Appendix 13.

THR9: Gourley Place & Wickes Site

[Analysis by UCL students]

The site is a rather small triangle consisting of mostly industrial units, the largest of which is the Wickes trade/retail unit. Along Seven Sisters road there are a number of businesses selling furniture or other textiles. Some of these buildings are 2-3 storeys but it is unclear how upper floors are being used. There are a number of warehouses and autoshops which are in use, along with a few residential spaces behind Seven Sisters road.

Only a couple of the buildings seem dilapidated and the use is unknown.

Around the perimeter of the site is extremely lively with a number of restaurants and businesses, many pedestrians and transport including the rail lines which intersect at one corner of the site.

A number of casual workers seeking employment hang out around the Wickes unit and across the street on Seven Sisters Road.

The Site Allocations document states that development of the site “should not remove employment uses from the site, but the nature of this employment could change...” and mentions including “office space, professional services, research and higher value workshop space.” Considering it also mentions casual workers as a “blight” on the local area, it could be presumed that developments aim to remove these workers and convert employment from industrial use to more professional services. Yet these workers also need access to job opportunities.

There is also the aim to build more residential space, which might include 3-4 new streets running off the main road frontage. Presumably this would entail the removal of the warehouses and industrial units. There is no mention of what kind of housing will be built and whether it will be genuinely affordable.

The Site Allocations document claims there is “considerable evidence that a much better use of this site could be made”; it does not detail what this evidence actually comprises.

THR9 Gourley Place/Wickes Site - photos



Commerce across the street from Wickes site



Seven Sisters road



Gourley Place



Gourley Place



Wickes

Appendix 14.

TH8 – South Tottenham Employment Area

[Analysis by UCL students]

We divided the site into several units. None of the buildings were abandoned, it seemed that almost every one of them are used and the site is viable.

1. A building in good condition with a wide parking lot
2. Car wash
3. Manufacturing building in good condition
4. Housing
5. Industrial area
6. Car repairing building in bad condition
7. Industrial unit, no access to the public
8. Industrial buildings in terrible condition
9. Industrial unit, narrow street



10-11-12. Industrial buildings, mainly car repairs/car washes



13. Railway area and a park behind it.

+ 14. Containers with unknown usage, they are not indicated on the map.

Appendix 15.

TH7 – Hale Wharf

[Analysis by UCL students]

This area is much smaller. There is one newly built/refurbished building at the entrance, which is used as a restaurant. Besides that, mostly storage buildings in active use dominate the area. The striking contrast can be seen on the picture below.

