

5

CONSULTATION



**TOTTENHAM
HOTSPUR™**

5.1 Consultations

In developing the previous design proposals during the course of 2009-2012, extensive consultations were conducted with both the general public and fans as part of the planning process, and also with the following bodies and companies:

- Haringey Council Planning
- Greater London Authority (GLA)
- English Heritage/London Advisory Committee
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE – now Design Council)
- Haringey Council Building Control and Safety Licencing Authority *
- Metropolitan Police Wood Green *
- Metropolitan Police Security and Counter Terrorism Consultant Team (MPSCT)
- London Fire Brigade (LFB) *
- St John Ambulance *
- Football Licencing Authority (FLA)
- Football Writers Association (FWA)
- National Association of Disabled Supporters (now Level Playing Field)
- International Stadium Group (ISG)
- The Right Solution Ltd
- Philips Lighting Major Projects Team

(The bodies marked * combine with THFC's own in-house stadium management and safety team to form the licencing project safety advisory group or SAG team).

Fresh consultations have been undertaken with all of these stakeholders, as part of the new planning submission, with the obvious exception of CASE - which no longer exists. Haringey council has set up a Quality Review Panel, which effectively replaces the design review work that CASE had historically undertaken, and a design review with them has formed part of the current consultation process.

5.2 Consultation - Building Control

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS WITH HARINGEY BUILDING CONTROL AND SAFETY TEAM (2009-11)

This section sets out key discussions between KSS and Haringey Building Control (HBC) during the course of 2009- 11 which helped to inform the original design proposals for the consented scheme. The list is not exhaustive, as additional discussions between Buro Happold and Haringey on structures and services were also undertaken, as well as further conversations related to the request from THFC to future proof the stadium to a net 61,000 capacity. Populous has looked to work with the main principles that have been previously agreed with the HBC team, but these conversations will need to develop as the technical design is progressed.

General Spectator Seating

30 general admission seats in a row is acceptable (exceeds 28 seat Green Guide 5th Edition recommendation), providing the maximum travel distance is within limits and vomitory widths are sufficient. 475mm general admission seat width is acceptable (less than 500mm Green Guide 5th Edition recommendation) providing more comfortable new generation seats are provided with wider seat bases and backs, and closing actions which give a wider “clearway”.

General Spectator Toilet Provision

The overall provision will be based on FSADC ‘Toilets in Stadia’:1993 rather than BS6465-1:2006 and 90% male /25% female split where practically possible. (Existing split is 87% male / 13% female).

- Male Standard - 1 WC/600, 1 urinal/70 and 1 wash hand basin/300
 - Female Standard - 1 WC/35 and 1 wash hand basin/70
- Wheelchair User Overall Provision

252 wheelchair user viewing positions are currently proposed for the stadium, in line with Green Guide / FLA ‘Accessible Stadia’ recommendations. The general admission and hospitality split will be proportionate to the respective

capacities. The principle of family seating in wheelchair user tribunes with higher perching seats is established. HBC agreed a 1% provision for overall stadium is not necessary, nor appropriate for a privately funded stadium. A future proofing strategy for additional wheelchair positions will be reviewed during the detail design phase, which would be at the expense of general spectator seating.

Wheelchair User Seating Sightlines

A key issue is when general spectators stand up in front of wheelchair user seating tribunes. The proposal is to give wheelchair users C115 min sightline using lowered wheelchair user eye point (-15mm) and raised general spectator height (+15mm) in relation to Accessible Stadia design guidance. It is agreed that NADS’ (now Level Playing Fields) request for ‘guaranteed unobstructed sightlines’ was practically unachievable and unreasonable.

Away Fans Segregation Principles

The principles of the varying away fans splits is agreed, including acceptance that the 15% option for FA Cup will require away fans on both the lower and upper tier in the NE corner. The general principle of 2m wide stewarded zones with moveable barriers with sockets is agreed. The resolution of upper tier steps in stewarded zone is still to be agreed and evacuation of away fans in the NE quadrant still to be demonstrated.

Basis of External Steps and Internal Staircase Design

External steps and internal stairs will be based on latest BS5395-1:2010 rather than Green Guide 5th Edition: 2008. 300mm min tread widths and 170mm max riser heights are agreed to public area stairs throughout. 20 risers in a flight are acceptable, but Populous will try to limit to these to 16 where practically possible.

Podium Heads of Stairs Protection and Planters

The current design of the podium looks to remove the need for heads of stairs barriers by either incorporating a 90 de-

gree turn at the top of the stairs, or by limiting the width of each flight of stairs to below 3m. If a number of stairs are required at a particular entrance point to the podium, then there will be a separation of at least 3m between flights. Podium planters will also be carefully designed to work with the recommendations of the Green Guide.

Hospitality Toilet Provision

Hospitality suite and box toilet provision will be based on BS6465-1:2006 Table 10 - Restaurants & Places with Seating for Eating & Drinking, with 85% male / 50% female split for main suites, and 85% male / 25% female split for boxes. Club Bar provision will be based on BS6465-1:2006 Table 11 - Licensed Pubs, Bars, Nightclubs and Discotheques, with 85% male / 50% female split.

Club Bar provision will be based on BS6465-1:2006 Table 11 - Licensed Pubs, Bars, Nightclubs and Discotheques, with 85% male / 25% female split. The principle of reduced female provision based on unlikely simultaneous usage of all suites and corner bars on non-match days is agreed.

Emergency Evacuation / Means of Escape Strategy

A presentation of the KSS/Buro Happold FEDRA combined strategy was made on 29 July 2010 and the following principles were agreed. Further briefings relating to the updated design will need to be scheduled, to enable these principles to be revised, as appropriate.

The evacuation times and flow rates for level areas and stairs will be based on Green Guide 5th Edition: 2008 agreed, and a phased / managed evacuation strategy is acceptable. Fire fighting access principles and hydrant strategy are established (BH are reviewing these). An East stand fire fighting command position will be required, though LFB are to confirm.

The away fans segregation barriers to general admission concourses will remain in place during normal egress and emergency evacuation. The open staircases to the Upper Concourse on Level 4 will allow a slightly quicker evacua-

tion and are agreed as each perimeter core has a separate enclosed fire fighting stair.

5.3 The Consultation Strategy

THFC had already engaged heavily with the local community, Club supporters and key groups and individuals that resulted in overwhelming support for the original scheme in 2011. With the scheme revisions and added benefits that this new design would bring, the need to undertake further consultation work was recognised and the THFC invested heavily in carrying out this programme.

The objectives of the Club's latest public consultation were clear:

- To build on the support and excitement that Tottenham is staying in Tottenham.
- Genuinely engage local people and a wide range of stakeholders, from residents in neighbouring streets to schools and businesses, to the local authority.
- To provide opportunities for local people and fans to view and comment on the plans as they developed.
- To explain the proposals and how they would regenerate the area.
- To widely circulate all comments received so that they can be properly considered and so that the scheme can respond appropriately.
- To understand and address where possible all of the issues / concerns / objections before the application is made.
- To work closely with Haringey Council to ensure key officers were aware of our planned consultation activities and could influence them.
- To explain the need for these design improvements and developments.

A consultation strategy was therefore developed to meet these objectives. This was centred on the production of a new community newsletter, called 'The Hotspur', which was sent out to key stakeholders upon launch and distributed widely to local residents and businesses. This newsletter set out everything the THFC has already delivered as well as details of the new scheme, to provide a positive context for the new plans to be considered.

EXTENSIVE PROMOTION OF THE CONSULTATION

From the very outset the THFC has placed engagement with the local community, not just football fans, as a key priority. Each phase of consultation has therefore undergone extensive promotion to ensure that as many members of the local community, as well as the supporters of THFC are given the opportunity to comment on proposals. The consultation around this revised application was no different.

The following range of promotional activities took place:

- The community newsletter The Hotspur was door-dropped to over 26,000 local residents in the area with details of how to feedback comments
- Letters announcing the start of consultation and the revised scheme details were sent to over 220 political and community stakeholders including key statutory consultees.
- A follow-up letter was also sent to all stakeholders with a copy of The Hotspur
- A news story was posted on the THFC homepage, directing visitors to the Future Plans micro-site.
- A press notice announcing the revised scheme details and consultation information was issued to local, regional and national papers.
- On launch day for the consultation, a digital copy of The Hotspur was made available for download on the THFC website, www.tottenhamhotspur.com.

REACHING ALL SECTORS OF THE COMMUNITY – DATABASE AND LETTER WRITING

The Club has been in Tottenham for 126 years and as a result, has relationships and access to a considerable network of local groups and community leaders, particularly through the work of Adam Davison as Head of Community Relations.

In advance of issuing letters to alert community members to the revised application, a full database of stakeholders was created that included council members, officers, other London political figures, local community groups, statutory

groups, residents associations as well as local schools and churches.

All these individuals and groups were given the opportunity to discuss the proposals in more detail and many more were offered meetings with the project team to review the new scheme.

Each of the Haringey Councillors was also included on the database to ensure they received a copy of all letters and the community newsletter.

MEETINGS AND PRESENTATIONS

The project team has ensured that local groups are fully appraised of the evolving proposals, and in particular the heritage and transport elements of the scheme. A crucial part of the pre-application consultation process has been meeting with a wide range of key organisations with a relevance to the planning application.

These have included numerous bodies involved with transport, heritage, sustainability and other technical matters

A full list of these meetings and when they took place is listed below: Any missing meetings to be added in here

The feedback from these meetings can be seen in Section 5.6.

Date	Meeting
25 June	Presentation to Historic England LAC
29 June	Presentation to Cabinet lead for Planning (Cllr Demirci) and the chair (Cllr Peray Ahmet) and Vice Chair (Cllr Vincent Carroll) of the Planning Committee. LBH officers in attendance.
2 July	Presentation to Neale Coleman, Mayoral Advisor on Tottenham
3 July	Presentation to David Lammy MP for Tottenham
6 July	Presentation to Cllr Alan Strickland, Cabinet member for Housing and Regeneration, LBH
6 July	Briefing to Sir Eddie Lister, Deputy Mayor Policy & Planning, GLA; Fiona Fletcher Smith Chair of the Planning Committee, GLA; Neale Coleman and Stuart Murray, Assistant Director Planning, GLA
6 July	Briefing to Rob Leak, CEO, LB Enfield
6 July	Meeting with LBH Officers to discuss the consultation
7 July	Presentation to Tottenham ward councillors, Cllr Sheila Peacock, Cllr John Bevan and Cllrs Kaushika Amin and wider Tottenham Councillors. LBH officers in attendance
13 July	Presentation to the Tottenham Hotspur' Supporters Trust
15 July	Presentation to the LBH Quality Review Panel
15 July	Presentation at the Development Management Forum
22 July	Matthew Bradby, Chair Tottenham Civic Society
23 July	Presentation to LBH Planning Committee
29 July	Presentation to the Mayor of London

5.4 Consultation Materials

A raft of consultation materials was produced to support the planning application that all held the purpose of informing as many people as possible of THFC’s intention, whilst providing details of how they can leave feedback. Details of these materials are set out below.

COMMUNITY NEWSLETTER – THE HOTSPUR

The consultation material provided by THFC centred around a community newsletter that aimed to provide information about the revised scheme, provide an opportunity for people to leave feedback, and give details of the work already undertaken on the site to improve the area.

Over 26,000 copies of this 20-page magazine were produced and distributed, by-hand, to neighbouring residents in the four most immediate wards around the site – Northumberland Park, White Hart Lane, Bruce Grove and Tottenham Hale. This approach was agreed with by LBH officers prior to distribution.

A further 223 copies were also sent out to all stakeholders on THFC’s consultation database of community and resident groups, local businesses and landowners and political contacts, to ensure as many people were aware of the proposals as possible.

This content of the newsletter was as follows:

- Pages 2-3: Welcome message from Daniel Levy, Chairman Tottenham Hotspur
- Pages 4-5: Northumberland Development Project: New scheme image -Take a look at our exciting revised plans for the site
- Pages 7-8: Northumberland Development Project: Revised Design - Read about what is included as part of this development
- Page 9: Northumberland Development Project, Jobs and economic impact - The increased benefits our revised scheme will deliver
- Page 10: Have your say - We want your views on our proposals. Details of how to get in contact

- Page 11-12: Tottenham University Technical College - A world class new College, now fully open and supported by the Club
- Page 13: Brook House development - 222 new affordable homes and a new primary school, delivered by the Club together with Newlon Housing Trust
- Page 14: Restoration of Percy House - Our plans to bring this Grade II listed building back to use as the new home for the Tottenham Hotspur Foundation
- Page 15-16: Tottenham Hotspur Foundation - What our community charitable organisation has been up to
- Page 17-18: Current works - Aerial images of the early development works
- Page 19: Site update - Next phases of our construction programme
- Back Cover: THFC training opportunities - Learn how you can access new training and employment opportunities

DEDICATED SCHEME MICRO-SITE – WWW.TOTTENHAM-HOTSPUR.COM/NEW-SCHEME

A dedicated micro-site was added to the official Tottenham Hotspur website that included details and images of the revised NDP proposals. This site provides a vast amount of information to help present the stadium designs and surrounding masterplan details, as well as encouraging visitors to leave their feedback on the proposals.

- 4.7 A news story was also posted on the Club’s home page and Latest News page to direct visitors to the micro-site to further promote the consultation.
- 4.8 A digital version of The Hotspur was also made available to download.
- 4.9 The NDP micro-site contains the following web pages of information:
 - a) Project Update
 - The Impetus for Change
 - What’s New
 - Crowd Movement

- Passionate About Tottenham
- Lilywhite House
- Project Timeline
- b) New Stadium
 - World Class Design
 - The Fan Experience
 - NFL
- c) Scheme Details
 - The Tottenham Experience
 - Sky-Walk
 - Extreme Sports
 - Hotel
 - New Homes and Employment Space
 - Medical Centre
 - Public Space
 - Environmentally Sustainable
- d) Well-Connected
- e) Key Benefits
 - Jobs and Economic Impact
 - Heritage Benefits
 - Local Opportunities
- f) Feedback

TAILORED LETTERS

4.11 To announce the launch of consultation and the details of the revised NDP scheme, a letter was sent on behalf of THFC to over 220 stakeholders. This letter was designed to inform them of the intention to submit a revised application, and to invite them to visit the NDP micro-site to find out more about the proposals and leave their feedback.

4.12 The groups of stakeholders that were sent this letter was agreed with LBH Officers and included:

- All London Borough of Haringey councillors

- LBH Officers
- LBH press/media team
- Key members of the London Borough Enfield Council (CEO, Leader, Cabinet members and local ward members adjacent to the site)
- Local Enfield and Haringey MPs
- London Assembly Member for Enfield and Haringey
- Key members of the GLA (including members of the Planning Committee, Regeneration Committee and head Officers)
- Tottenham Hotspur Foundation community contacts
- Local community groups and resident associations
- Local landowners and major business groups
- Key heritage groups

Following the announcement date of the revised scheme on 8 July, all contacts on THFC’s database were also sent a follow-up letter which enclosed a copy of The Hotspur newsletter for their review.

MEDIA ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE NEW PLANS

The revised scheme was officially announced on 8 July to the national, regional, local, broadcast and trade media, with a press notice, as well as a number of supportive computer generated images.

4.15 The news secured a huge amount of coverage in a wide range of media across all mediums that, whilst mainly focused on the stadium design, raised interest in the plans, and led more people to find out information on the wider development proposals.

4.16 It is the intention of THFC to issue another press announcement upon submission of the revised application and to inform members of the public of the start of Haringey’s own statutory consultation period.

5.5 Consultation Responses

This full consultation and engagement programme successfully led to a number of responses to the revised scheme and built on the interest raised from the original scheme. Details of the consultation responses can be found below.

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS

- Each comment received via the online feedback form, Future Plans email account or the Freephone consultation line was typed up and put into a spreadsheet.
- These were all then analysed according to their content.
- Some people made multiple comments covering a range of subjects in a single response.
- This meant a total of 184 responses were received, however many more comments were submitted.
- In total, 263 comments were logged.
- Of these, 163 were positive about the proposals, 23 were negative and 77 were neutral.
- 27 of the 184 total responses came to the Future Plans email account
- 155 were sent in via the online feedback form
- Two phone messages were left on the dedicated consultation line – both asking neutral questions about the proposals.
- Of all comments received, only seven were made in relation to the loss of the listed buildings on site, and just two negative comments regarding the heights of the stadium and masterplan
- In total, of the 184 responses received, 90 were in outright support of the revised NDP plans (49%).
- 163 comments out of 263 were positive about the proposals (62%).
- Only three responses were submitted in outright opposition to the proposals.

The table in the following column sets out all comments received through the different feedback mechanisms, and notes how many were positive, negative, and how many were neutral.

Comments received via:	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Objecting to the proposals	Outright support for the proposals
Future Plans Email	7	9	26	1	3
Micro - site feedback	156	14	49	2	87
Freephone Line	0	0	2	0	0
Total	163	23	77	3	90

This shows that the vast majority of comments left were in support of the revised NDP proposals and were positive about the proposals. The high number of neutral comments is mainly due to a number of emails that were received simply asking questions about the proposals without leaving any views positive or negative.

It should be noted that seven of the nine negative comments submitted to the Future Plans email account were left by just one local resident.

Overall, the highest number of negative comments submitted was in relation to traffic and parking concerns (16).

Whilst a key focus throughout the design phase of the revised scheme was on the heritage and locally listed buildings on the site, there have only been seven negative comments received relating to this aspect of the design.

However two of these comments stated they understand the need for their removal as they have experienced the issues of walking on the road/bus lanes when visiting the ground.

Similarly, only two comments made reference to the heights of the development, suggesting that respondents do not see it as a key issue for the development.

Only three outright objections were made to the plans, one due to the inclusion of NFL designs in the stadium scheme, one due to the loss of heritage as part of the proposals, and the third for a number of reasons listed in section 5.6.1 below.

It is clear that through the extensive consultation activity undertaken by THFC when the original designs were made

public in 2008, followed by the thorough public engagement for the revised scheme, there is an overwhelming support for the development to be taken forward and in the case of a few comments, the desire for it to happen as soon as possible.

It should also be said that the vast majority of comments seem to have been sent in by supporters of the Club who are local to the area, with a specific focus on the stadium design rather than the wider masterplan. This would suggest that there is general overall support for the development as a whole with only a few comments objecting to elements of the proposal having been received.

FUTURE PLANS EMAIL ACCOUNT

27 emails were submitted to the consultation email account. The vast majority of those were classified as ‘neutral comments’, usually asking a direct question about the proposal without stating any positive/negative views.

All emails were received were issued with a suitable response to their question, or a reply email thanking them for their comments.

Seven emails wrote positive comments for the proposals.

Only one email stated their outright opposition to the revised scheme. In fact seven of the total nine negative comments were submitted by just one local resident. One other email welcomed the new stadium but raised objections to some aspects of the proposals.

The remainder of the emails received were neutral, leaving general comments or questions.

Positive comments submitted:

- Believe THFC is doing many positive things and improving the area in many aspects
- Pleased to see THFC investing so much money into the area
- Pleased about the new plans for Tottenham
- Welcome the plans for a new stadium
- Think the designs for the new stadium are ‘brilliant’
- Can’t wait for work to begin.

Key Issues/Questions raised:

- Asked where THFC would be playing their games in the upcoming seasons.
- Requesting whether existing seats / memorabilia at White Hart Lane would be sold to fans.
- Requesting a copy of The Hotspur community newsletter.
- Concerned about extra traffic from to Devonshire Hill Lane.
- Requesting further details around disability access into the new stadium
- Suggestions for the stadium design, such as a Tottenham motivational sign in the player’s tunnel
- Suggestions that TfL build a Victoria Line station at Northumberland Park

5.6.1 There have only been two emails raising objections to the proposals, although one welcomed the new stadium for the area. The reasons for these objections from two local residents were:

- The increase in capacity to net 61,000 - and the disruptive effect this would have
- The introduction of a hard surface for NFL which would allow for much more frequent events throughout the year, to the detriment of residents
- A lack of social housing
- A concern that new flats are advertised as investment properties

- Doesn't believe another new hotel is needed for the area.
- Objection that the scheme no longer includes a Health Club as in the consented scheme
 - Objection to the removal of 3 locally listed buildings.
 - Disapproval of the height of the new stadium
 - Objection to the heights of the buildings to the south of the scheme

MICRO-SITE FEEDBACK

A total of 155 responses have been received via the micro-site feedback form. The vast majority of these are in support of the revised NDP proposals.

156 out of the total 219 comments on the micro-site were positive.

87 responses gave their outright support for the scheme and only two of the responses received raised an outright objection to the development.

Traffic was the highest single issue raised with a total of 14 comments raising concerns about the impact it could have.

Positive comments submitted:

- Fantastic and inspirational design
- This development is long over-due
- Applauds the development improvements
- Improvements are wide and creative for an area that needs a boost
- Wanting the Club to stay in the local area
- Delighted that the scheme includes affordable housing
- Inclusion of 'destination' activities outside of match days is welcome
- The Tottenham Experience is a great idea to help develop the area
- Excited to see the ambition shown by the Club

Key Issues/Questions raised:

- Concerns around transport and access to and from the area
- A suggestion that the public space may be too small
- Objections to the removal of the listed buildings
- Suggestions around stadium design (i.e. a retractable roof, seating colours, safe standing, naming rights, number of disabled seats)
- Questions about how the retractable pitch will work
- Concerns over an increase in ticket pricing for fans
- A request for an inclusion of public toilets into the designs
- Understands the reasoning for removal of heritage buildings
- Believe the tower blocks at the south end are too high
- Dislikes the architecture of the stadium roof design

PHONE MESSAGES

Only two phone messages were left to the dedicated Free-phone line. Both leaving neutral comments and asking questions about the proposals, mainly focussing around an increase in traffic to the area. Comments included:

- Concerned about the extra traffic to Devonshire Hill Lane
- A request for speed bumps and cameras to slow traffic on this road.
- Worries around an increase in air pollution due to increased traffic.
- Requesting information on job opportunities as part of the new development for all ages, not just for the younger generations.

A huge number of meetings, presentations and discussions have been held as part of the pre-application process and

Meeting Date	Consultee	Key Points Discussed
25 June	Presentation to Historic England LAC	
29 June	Presentation to the Cabinet lead for Planning (Cllr Demirci) and the Chair (Cllr Peray Ahmet) and Vice Chair (Cllr Vincent Carroll) of the Planning Committee. LBH officers in attendance	
2 July	Presentation to Neale Coleman, Mayoral Advisor on Tottenham	• Delivered by Donna Cullen (THFC Executive Director) and Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning). • Included a rehearsal of the proposed scheme and identification of the key planning issues.
3 July	Presentation to David Lammy MP for Tottenham	• Delivered by Donna Cullen (THFC Executive Director) and Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning). • Included a rehearsal of the proposed scheme and identification of the key planning issues.
6 July	Presentation to Cllr Alan Strickland, Cabinet member for Housing and Regeneration, LBH	
6 July	Briefing to Sir Eddie Lister, Deputy Mayor Policy & Planning, GLA; Fiona Fletcher Smith Chair of the Planning Committee, GLA; Neale Coleman and Stuart Murray, Assistant Director Planning, GLA	
6 July	Briefing to Rob Leak, CEO, LB Enfield	• Courtesy telephone call by Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning) to forewarn of proposed scheme press launch on 8 July.
6 July	Meeting with LBH Officers to discuss the consultation	
7 July	Presentation to Tottenham ward councillors, Cllr Sheila Peacock, Cllr John Bevan and Cllrs Kaushika Amin and wider Tottenham Councillors. LBH officers in attendance	• Led by Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning) and Adam Davison (THFC Head of Community Relations) with support from scheme architects. • Included a rehearsal of the proposed scheme and identification of the key planning issues. • Need for community benefits to be clearly articulated in lay terms raised. • Issue of match-day impacts (litter, anti-social behaviour etc.) on local residents raised and Club invited to try and improve conditions.
13 July	Presentation to the Tottenham Hotspur' Supporters Trust	• Delivered by Donna Cullen (THFC Executive Director), Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning) and Adam Davison (THFC Head of Community Relations). • Included a rehearsal of the proposed scheme with particular emphasis on spectator experience and disability access. • Non-application issues also discussed.
15 July	Presentation to the LBH Quality Review Panel	• Led by Richard Serra (THFC Head of Planning) and lead designers from Populous, Allies & Morrison and Donald Insall Associates. • Included a full rehearsal of the proposed scheme and design philosophy. • Notes of the Panel subsequently reported to Planning Sub Committee for information on 23 July.

15 July	Presentation at the Development Management Forum (around 40 people in attendance)	• Several attendees called for an end to demolitions of existing buildings and to redesign the scheme to better fit in to the area • It was asked what was considered to be 'affordable housing' • Concerns that people cannot get in or out of their road due to road closures when a major event is on • Pleased about the inclusion of community facilities • Questions around how tall the buildings would be • Concerned that too much cycle provision is provided which is not used • Questions whether the underground depot at Northumberland Park can be turned back into a working Tube on the Victoria line
22 July	Matthew Bradby, Chair Tottenham Civic Society	• Bradby understood the loss of buildings and the safety case we have put across. • Was interested in exploring how much of the dispensary frontage we could keep beyond just the wording. • Also asked whether we could potentially facilitate a visit to the buildings prior to their demolition as some cynicism exists about what is actually still in there.
23 July	Presentation to LBH Planning Committee	• The issue of affordable housing targets was raised. • There was an emphasis on the need for new GP / health facilities in the area • It was raised that given the increase in capacity there'll be a need for more buses and car parking to serve the stadium • Concerns around increased litter, lack of public toilets, disabled car parking spaces being misused on match days – all of which are difficult for Council to manage due to budget cuts • One member would be very supportive of 'green balconies' and building for life standards being secured in the residential buildings • One member queried whether the team has considered moving the locally listed buildings • One member queried the provision of car parking for the residential and the stadium
29 July	Presentation to the Mayor of London Also in attendance: • Eddie Lister, Deputy Mayor for Policy & Planning • Fiona Fletcher-Smith, GLA Exec Director • Stewart Murray, Head of Planning, GLA • Patricia Charleton, case officer and various other GLA and TfL officers • Emma Williamson, Head of Development Management, LBH	• The Mayor was extremely enthusiastic and supportive of the scheme. • He was very encouraged by what had already been built and progress with the groundworks. • He was particularly enthusiastic about the retractable pitch and the added versatility it would bring to the stadium. • He liked the concept of the Extreme Sports Hub. • He noted the loss of the three heritage assets, understood the crowd safety arguments and made no negative comments about their loss. • He liked the residential towers and raised no questions about affordable housing.

5.6 Response to Consultation

The design team has been involved in a wide range of consultation events and stakeholder engagement during the pre-application phase of the planning process. These presentations and consultations have led to some significant design development, which has been incorporated into the final proposals being submitted for planning approval.

5.6.1 STADIUM

The stadium design has generally been well-received by all parties during the consultation. The context created by the consented scheme has been considered in any response to the new proposals and the main response has been that it is an improvement on the architecture and design of the consented scheme.

The design of the perforated metal panel screen is clearly a key element of the architectural design and the refinement of the panel sizes, levels of perforation and opening of some panels to assist with natural ventilation of the plant rooms at high level has been felt to give a clear articulation to the form.

The lifting of the screen to reveal the major entrances to the stadium was also felt to be a strong response to the public realm and in particular the design of the south stand atrium, looking out over the public square, is felt to create a wonderful new space for the home fans to occupy during match days.

Some comments were raised about the design of the west entrance and the expressed truss was removed from the design and a new structural design approach taken to the escalator box, to simplify the detail of this element.

5.6.2 TOTTENHAM EXPERIENCE

The design of the Tottenham Experience has evolved significantly during the consultation process. The initial design envisaged the removal of all 4 heritage buildings, including Warmington House, in order to deal with the crowd safety issues and create a new gateway to the site. The 3-storey glass pavilion was proposed to extend the influence of the stadium to the junction of Park Lane and the High Road. Initial discussions with Historic England, the GLA and LBH

expressed concern over the loss of the heritage buildings and in particular the loss of the statutorily listed Warmington House. While they acknowledged the case that was being made for their removal, their recommendation was that we should make sure that all options have been investigated and that the removal of Warmington House was a particular concern.

As the options analysis had demonstrated that the retention of the 3 locally listed buildings were the primary contributor to the crowd safety issue of spectators being forced into the bus lane during arrival for a match, the design was changed to incorporate Warmington House, but remove the 3 locally listed buildings. The design also changed in appearance to incorporate Warmington House into a new terrace and utilise a mixture of glazing to the shopfronts – lined through with the height of stucco on the listed building – and cast iron panels to the upper levels, to work with the materiality of the listed building.

Further discussions with the Quality Review Panel and the Planners and Conservation Officer at LBH led to a further refinement of the design, with the rhythm of the Georgian façade used to set up the modules for solid cladding and openings to the new wings either side of the listed building. Care and attention was spent on the design of the glazed elements encapsulating Warmington House and new elements punctuated the roof form to articulate with the chimney stacks on the listed building. Further details of the final design can be found in section 8 of this report.

5.6.2 HOTEL

The discussions around the Hotel focused around the detail of the plinth as it reaches street level and how this interacts with the Tottenham Experience. The façade details have been developed to maintain the composition of solid cladding with vertical slots to complement the detailing of the Tottenham Experience as it wraps around the shared entrance stair to the podium. The detailing of the glazed entrance to the hotel has also been developed to work with the main entrance to the Tottenham Experience, while care has been taken in the final detailing of the double-façade to the hotel rooms to ensure that there is no overheating and

that it is consistent with the energy strategy.

5.6.3 EXTREME SPORTS

Some concern was raised at the initial bulk of the Extreme Sports building and so this has been taken on board and the overall width of the building reduced, to increase the breathing space between the hotel, Extreme Sports building and residential towers. A lot of design coordination has gone into the development of the plinth, so that the Extreme Sports building and residential towers have a unified treatment as they meet Park Lane and the public square on the south podium. The structural grid from the towers passes down into the plinth and this rhythm then extends towards the Extreme Sports building. The large truss supporting the projecting tower has also been developed so that it sits behind the colonnade of the residential tower, reveals itself along the podium elevation of the Extreme Sports building and then tucks into the entrance of the climbing tower.

5.6.4 RESIDENTIAL

The conversation around the residential development has centred on the way in which the development meets the ground and also the profile of how the buildings reach the sky, in order that the overall scale and mass of the design fits into the wider urban context. Key viewpoints have been studied and the individual towers have been chamfered at the top and the bottom to improve their silhouette and proportions. A lot of care and attention has gone into the design of the entrances onto Park Lane, Worcester Avenue and the south podium, in order that the plinth can be used to animate and activate the public realm.

5.6.5 COMMUNITY HEALTH

The Community Health building anchors the scheme at the interface with the residential properties of Worcester Avenue. Work has been done to refine the cut-backs in the building profile, so that it does not create too much overshadowing of the neighbouring properties, as well as creating an increase in scale from the domestic properties to the stadium. The building shape has been refined to slope up to the area of rooftop plant and the louvred cladding has been extended to wrap up and over this plant, to minimise the visual impact on Lilywhite House.

5.6.6 PUBLIC REALM

Discussions were held with officers at LBH to get a better understanding as to how the paving materials and external lighting would be designed to work in with the existing context of the surrounding area. Further discussions were held around the design of the public square, to ensure that it fits in with the wider masterplanning strategy for the area and to include landscaping design that will attract people to utilise the space during non-match days. A key component of the public realm is the provision of an outdoor play area in the new public square, which will be utilised by the Tottenham Foundation as part of their outreach work, and this has been refined to work in with their requirements.

BEFORE



AFTER



