

PD6657/SM  
email: [simon.marks@montagu-evans.co.uk](mailto:simon.marks@montagu-evans.co.uk)

4 March 2016

Haringey Planning Policy  
River Park House  
225 High Road  
N22 8HQ

CHARTERED SURVEYORS  
5 Bolton Street  
London  
London W1J 8BA  
Tel: 020 7493 4002  
Fax: 020 7312 7548  
[www.montagu-evans.co.uk](http://www.montagu-evans.co.uk)

Dear Sirs

**HARINGEY LOCAL PLAN – PRE SUBMISSION CONSULTATION  
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT DPD AND TOTTENHAM AREA ACTION PLAN –JANUARY 2016**

**Introduction**

We write on behalf of our clients Hale Village Properties, who are the freehold owners of the Hale Village Tower site, identified as allocation TH6 within the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP) (January 2016). The following representations are submitted in respect of the Development Management DPD and Tottenham Area Action Plan.

As per our previous representations to the Tottenham AAP we wish to outline our general support for a plan which identifies the regeneration opportunities within Tottenham and this will provide certainty for both land owners and developers and will assist the Council in realising its revised housing targets. Furthermore, we are pleased to see that the Hale Village Tower has been identified as a key site in terms of achieving these objectives.

In our opinion both the Development Management DPD and Tottenham AAP are generally sound. However, there are some elements of both policy documents which as currently drafted would in our opinion render both documents unsound.

Our observations regarding the soundness of both policy documents are set out in further detail below.

**Development Management DPD**

Policy DM6 – Tall Buildings

In our opinion the principle of a tall buildings policy is sound as this will ensure that the plan is both justified and effective. The identification of areas (at figure 2.2) within the Borough suitable for tall buildings is also supported as this will ensure that the plan is positively prepared and justified. The Council's preparation of an Urban Characterisation Study constitutes a robust and up to date evidence base and justifies the tall building locations defined at figure 2.2.

However, Policy DM6 is very detailed and in our opinion as currently drafted this part of the DPD is unsound as it is not justified or effective. In particular, Part D(a) of the policy, which concerns the canyon effect of proximate tall buildings, is in our opinion not justified and could compromise the effectiveness of the Plan. The term canyon effect is vague and its application subjective. The remainder of Policy DM6, combined with other design related policies provide sufficient criteria against which to assess the effects, suitability, appropriateness of tall buildings.

In order to make the Plan sound we recommend that Policy DM6 Part D(a) is deleted in its entirety.

#### Policy DM13 – Affordable Housing

In our opinion Part D of Policy DM13 is unsound as it is not justified nor consistent with national policy. Part D as currently worded proposes a fix to the valuation methodology and approach to determining land value. In our opinion it is not the purpose of planning policy/or the planning system to be prescriptive concerning particular methods of valuation.

The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) at Paragraph 14, Reference ID 10-014-20140306 states:

*‘Central to the consideration of viability is the assessment of land or site value. The most appropriate way to assess land or site value will vary but there are common principles which should be reflected.*

*In all cases, estimated land or site value should:*

- *reflect emerging policy requirements and planning obligations and, where applicable, any Community Infrastructure Levy charge;*
- *provide a competitive return to willing developers and land owners (including equity resulting from those building their own homes); and*
- *be informed by comparable, market-based evidence wherever possible. Where transacted bids are significantly above the market norm, they should not be used as part of this exercise.’*

In our opinion Part D of Policy DM13 would preclude the ability to apply alternative means of determining site value and as such is not consistent with national policy. The NPPG very clearly sets out that the most appropriate way assess site or land value will vary. Furthermore, the Council have not provided any evidence which would justify the precise drafting of this part of the policy.

In order to render the Plan sound we recommend that Part D of Policy DM13 is deleted entirely.

#### **Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP)**

##### Allocation TH8: Hale Village

Our previous representations concerning allocation TH8 do not appear to have been considered by the Council. In our opinion the allocation as currently drafted, fails to maximise the opportunities available to the Council in respect of the Site. The allocation as currently drafted only suggests support for an 18 storey

building and makes no comment as to whether the principle of a building above 18 storeys could be acceptable.

Taking into consideration the strategic planning policy context for this area which due to:

- a) the recently adopted Further Alterations to the London Plan (2015) requires LB Haringey to deliver a minimum of 1,502 per annum over the Plan period, which equates to an additional 682 dwellings per annum compared with the London Plan (2011); and
- b) recent confirmation of the Tottenham Housing Zone, whereby 2,000 new homes are required to be delivered around Tottenham Hale Station

the purpose of the AAP must be to ensure that development sites within Tottenham are fully optimised. In our opinion the allocation is currently unsound as it has not been positively prepared and is not justified.

We therefore recommend that the following amendments are made to the draft allocation in our to render the AAP sound.

#### TH6: Development Guidelines

It our opinion bullet point 1 of the Development Guidelines section is negatively worded, as the policy suggests that a building of over 18 storeys will require justification and no commentary is provided in terms of potential support of a building above this height.

It is our position that this part of the policy is unsound as it has not been positively prepared. Paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires Plans to be positively prepared to meet objectively assessed development requirements.

In order to optimise the development potential of this brownfield Site, a principle which runs throughout planning policy at all tiers, the policy should be positively prepared and justified. The Council's own evidence base, in the form of the Urban Characterisation Study, at page 108 states that the Hale Village Tower could reach 20 – 25 storeys. In light of this context we consider that this part of the policy should be amended to ensure the Plan has been positively prepared. The amendment suggest below is, in our opinion, justified in light of the Council's supporting evidence base.

Therefore, in order to make this part of the policy sound we recommend that the first bullet point is reworded as follows:

*“Proposals for a tall building over 18 storeys should be explored in line with the Urban Characterisation Study which suggests a building of between 20 – 25 storeys could be appropriate. Any proposal for a tall building within or above these parameters will need to be of exceptional architectural quality in accordance with the DM DPD tall building policy.”*

Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact Simon Marks of this office.

Yours sincerely

*Montagu Evans*

**MONTAGU EVANS LLP**

cc. Chris Shellard – Lee Valley Estates