

Objection to planning application HGY/2026/2421

Application: HGY/2026/2421 — Former Ashley House site, Ashley Road, London N17 9LZ

Applicant: Re:shape T Ltd

From: Liam McCarthy, A121 West Apartments, 2 Ashley Road, Tottenham Hale, London N17 9RZ

Date: Sep 22, 2026

I am the owner-occupier of Flat A121, West Apartments, 2 Ashley Road, on the twelfth floor with a west-facing aspect directly across Ashley Road from the application site.

I object to this application in its current form. I set out at section 18 the terms on which I would withdraw that objection, and I ask that section to be read alongside the rest. My position is not that this site should stay empty, nor that a tall building is wrong in this part of Tottenham Hale. It is that the scheme as submitted places a use no allocation supports on an allocated employment site, reduces the employment floorspace the allocation exists to protect, inverts the height strategy on which tall buildings here were justified, rests on a consultation exercise that drew three completed feedback forms, and has not been assessed at the elevations where its effects on existing homes will actually be felt.

I request that the application be determined by the Planning Sub-Committee rather than under delegated powers, given its scale, its Environmental Impact Assessment status and the level of local interest. I wish to register to speak, and would be grateful to be notified of the committee date.

I ask that my telephone number and email address be redacted before publication.

Summary of what I ask the Council to do

1. Require the applicant to justify large-scale purpose-built shared living as the dominant use on a site allocated for employment-led mixed use, against London Plan Policy H16 in full.
2. Publish the viability assessment and have it independently reviewed at the applicant's expense.
3. State in the officer's report the consented maximum heights for this plot under HGY/2016/4165, and explain what has changed in policy terms to justify a departure of this scale.
4. Record in the officer's report the actual number of people who engaged at pre-application stage and the number who responded.
5. Confirm whether any Quality Review Panel review took place after 17 June 2026, and if not, require one before determination.

6. Confirm which baseline the Environmental Statement uses, and require reporting against the existing cleared site.
7. Satisfy itself that the Environmental Statement assesses this tower and the Cannon Factory tower cumulatively, and issue a Regulation 25 request for further information if it does not.
8. Confirm whether 2 Ashley Road appears in the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing receptor list, at which floors, and whether west-facing windows were screened out.
9. Secure the obligations listed at section 18 if permission is granted.

Where I refer below to the pre-application material, I mean the officer's report to Planning Sub-Committee of 27 July 2026 (PPA/2026/0004), the draft minutes of that meeting, and the appendices published with it: the Quality Review Panel reports of 22 April 2026 and 17 June 2026, and the applicant's Stakeholder Feedback Report of 30 June 2026. I also refer to the officer's report on outline permission HGY/2016/4165. All are published on the Council's own website and are listed at the end of this representation.

1. The principle of large-scale purpose-built shared living on this site is not established by the development plan

The site is covered by Site Allocations TH5 (Station Square North) and TH6 (Ashley Road South Employment Area) in the Tottenham Area Action Plan 2017. TH5 allocates the site for ground floor town centre uses with a mix of residential and employment above. TH6 allocates it for employment-led mixed-use development, with residential permitted to cross-subsidise improvements to the employment stock. Neither allocation provides for large-scale purpose-built shared living.

The scheme proposes 522 shared living studios alongside 87 conventional homes. On any reading the shared living element is the dominant residential use and is not an ancillary component of a mixed-tenure development. The Council's own officers made this point at pre-application stage, recording that the quantum of co-living would not be an ancillary component of the overall residential development and would need to be justified in a formal submission.

The emerging Haringey New Local Plan sets out the direction of travel. Draft Policy H8 provides that large-scale purpose-built shared living must not compromise the supply of land for conventional self-contained homes, and would be supported only where a site allocation provides for such uses as an ancillary component of a larger mixed tenure development, with proposals otherwise resisted. I accept that limited weight attaches to an emerging plan and I do not suggest otherwise. The emerging policy is consistent with the adopted allocations rather than a departure from them, and the direction of travel is a material consideration.

I ask the Council to assess the application against London Plan Policy H16 in full, including criteria 4 to 8 and the Large-scale Purpose-built Shared Living London Plan Guidance, and to require the applicant to demonstrate why a use that no allocation identifies for this site should be permitted at this scale.

2. Loss of employment floorspace contrary to Policy DM38

The northern third of the site lies within a Local Employment Area: Regeneration Area. Policy DM38 of the Development Management DPD 2017 requires employment-led development and requires the quantum of employment floorspace to be maximised. Site Allocation TH6 prioritises employment floorspace to replace the factory and employment uses historically on the site, and provides that residential development is acceptable for the purpose of making viable the re-provision of employment floorspace.

The extant permissions secured materially more non-residential floorspace than is now proposed. Outline permission HGY/2016/4165 required a minimum of 600 sqm (GIA) of commercial and community floorspace on the Ashley House site; HGY/2019/0108 included a further 151 sqm.

The proposed figure has fallen during the pre-application process. At the earlier pre-application stage the proposal was 234 sqm commercial and 125 sqm community, a total of 359 sqm. By the time the scheme reached the Quality Review Panel on 17 June 2026 it was 245 sqm of commercial space and 58 sqm of community space, a total of 303 sqm. That is around 448 sqm less than was previously secured. I ask the Council to state in the officer's report the figure in the submitted Planning Statement, and to set it against the 751 sqm secured by the extant permissions, so that the comparison appears on the face of the decision rather than only in the applicant's documents.

The Quality Review Panel recorded in April 2026 that the overall quantity of employment space had been reduced and that care was needed as a result.

The justification given to Members is the point I ask the Council to examine most closely. The applicant told the Planning Sub-Committee on 27 July 2026 that Tottenham was not considered an optimum location for large-scale office or industrial employment uses. That is an argument against the site allocation itself, not an argument for a departure from it. The allocation was adopted in 2017 with knowledge of the local market. If the applicant's position is that TH6 and DM38 are no longer deliverable, that case has to be made on evidence and tested through the plan-making process, not asserted at a briefing and accepted at determination.

The applicant also indicated at the same meeting that affordable workspace could be provided at peppercorn rent, but qualified this as subject to viability. A qualified offer is not a policy-compliant provision.

I ask that the viability assessment be published in full and independently reviewed at the applicant's expense, and that the Council require a fixed quantum of genuinely affordable workspace secured by planning obligation rather than left to viability.

3. The Statement of Community Involvement cannot bear the weight placed on it

The applicant's own Stakeholder Feedback Report of 30 June 2026 records that the public consultation exhibition of 17 June 2026 was attended by 13 people. Three of those attendees completed a feedback form. There were three further online submissions. The report's conclusion that respondents were broadly supportive therefore rests on three completed forms.

Two of the three respondents gave the postcode N17 9RZ, which is 2 Ashley Road, the building immediately opposite the site. All three said they live in the area. One of the three said the external design was unattractive and asked for more thought to be given to it.

The applicant told Members on 27 July 2026 that engagement had extended beyond that event, through coffee mornings and local working group meetings. No attendance figures or feedback records for those sessions appear in the published material.

By way of comparison, the applicant for the extant permission on this same site held two public exhibitions attended by 53 and 20 people, publicised by 4,600 invitations, for a scheme of 265 homes. The present scheme is more than twice the size and drew a fraction of the attendance.

Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD requires development proposals to address feedback from local consultation. For a scheme of 522 studios, 87 homes and a 23-storey tower, three feedback forms is not a foundation on which that criterion can be said to be met.

I ask that the Council scrutinise the Statement of Community Involvement submitted with the application against the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement, and record in the officer's report the actual number of people who engaged at pre-application stage and the number who responded. I make no complaint about the Council's own statutory notification, which I received.

4. The Quality Review Panel's support was conditional

The Haringey Quality Review Panel reviewed the proposals twice, on 22 April 2026 and 17 June 2026. Both reports are published appendices to the 27 July 2026 committee report.

In April the panel broadly supported the proposed height, massing and placement of the buildings, but expressly subject to environmental testing and further design development. It

asked for a microclimate assessment covering daylight and sunlight, overshadowing and wind, and said those studies should inform the landscape strategy. It asked for more detail on how the sustainability targets would be achieved and how overheating would be addressed. It said it expected the layout and building footprints to change based on further assessment of how residents and the public would use the routes and amenity spaces. It described the affordable housing block as underdeveloped in its then form.

In June the panel recorded that, following a new requirement for increased on-site parking, the central space was struggling to accommodate the demands placed on it, and that more time and thought was needed so that people could use the space and move through it safely. It identified potential conflict between reversing vehicles and people walking or cycling through the space, and children playing. It said further work was needed to resolve servicing, refuse and fire access. It asked again for studies on how the facades and building design respond to overheating and daylight.

The June panel closed by saying it would like to see the scheme again, and suggested an intermediate review format. The April panel had separately recommended that each of the two sites be the subject of a separate full review.

I ask the Council to confirm on the record whether any further design review took place between 17 June 2026 and the submission of this application. If none did, I ask that one be required before determination. The panel's support was given conditionally, and if the conditions have not been discharged it should not be reported to Members as unqualified endorsement.

5. Housing mix, single-person accommodation and the exclusion of children

Paragraph 5.152 of the Tottenham Area Action Plan envisages Tottenham Hale providing a range of housing with a mix of tenures and unit sizes. The units prioritised close to the station were one and two bedroom homes capable of multiple occupancy, not single-occupancy studios. Site Allocation TH6 itself records that the proximity of Harris Academy and Down Lane Park makes this area particularly suitable for larger units along those edges.

The applicant told Members on 27 July 2026 that approximately 90 per cent of the co-living accommodation would be single occupancy, with around 10 per cent dual occupancy or accessible. It stated that the accommodation is intended solely for single adult occupation and would not house anyone under the age of 18, and that a resident who became a parent would technically be in breach of the tenancy, with the operator working to find alternative accommodation. It gave the average length of stay in its existing schemes as around 19 months and the average resident age as 33.

Two consequences follow.

First, adding 522 units of accommodation from which children are contractually excluded, to a neighbourhood that has already absorbed a very large number of one and two bedroom flats, and alongside the Purpose Built Student Accommodation proposed on the Cannon Factory site opposite, will materially skew the demographic balance of Ashley Road. I ask the Council to assess whether the proposal delivers a mixed and inclusive neighbourhood as required by London Plan Policies D6, H10 and H16, and whether there is evidenced local need for this quantum of single-person accommodation. The needs assessment relied on should be published.

Second, the Quality Review Panel recommended in April that the applicant consider the long-term adaptability of the shared living and student blocks by providing some larger units capable of accommodating couples or families, suggesting these could sit in the shoulder blocks. The submitted scheme does not appear to do this. I ask why the recommendation was not taken up.

The applicant also told Members that both the co-living and student buildings are designed to allow future adaptation to conventional C3 residential use, and that the flat slab concrete structure would facilitate conversion. If that is right, the adaptability should be secured, and the Council should consider a section 106 mechanism requiring conversion to conventional housing if the shared living use ceases or fails to let, rather than permitting a change to some other sui generis use.

6. Affordable housing

The delivery of 87 homes for social rent, including 22 larger family homes and ten four-bedroom maisonettes with their own front doors and gardens, is a genuine public benefit. I do not object to it. I welcome it, and I would not wish anything in this representation to delay it.

Three matters need resolving.

The 87 homes are said to represent 35 per cent affordable housing measured by floorspace. Policy SP2 of the Local Plan: Strategic Policies targets 40 per cent by habitable room. The Council should be satisfied that the measurement basis is the correct one and that the tenure split is policy-compliant. I note that the extant outline permission on this same site secured 50 per cent affordable housing by habitable room.

The applicant confirmed to Members on 27 July 2026 that no Registered Provider had been formally appointed, and that discussions with Haringey Homes remained at an early stage. Delivery is therefore unsecured.

I ask that a late-stage viability review mechanism be secured under section 106 so that any improvement in viability is captured, that the affordable homes be secured for delivery in the first phase rather than deferred to a later phase, and that the Registered Provider position be resolved before permission is issued.

7. Effect on existing homes at 2 Ashley Road: sunlight, glare and outlook

My flat is on the XXXX floor with a west-facing aspect. The proposed part 7, part 23 storey shared living block sits directly across Ashley Road, with the tall element at the western end of the site abutting Down Lane Park.

Sunlight. My habitable room windows face west and depend entirely on afternoon and evening sunlight. The tower lies close to due west of my flat. BRE Guidance BR 209 requires assessment only of windows facing within 90 degrees of due south, and west-facing windows sit precisely on that threshold. I am concerned that the assessment may have screened out west-facing windows on that basis.

This concern is sharpened by what the applicant told Members. It explained that the tall building had been positioned adjacent to Down Lane Park in order to improve daylight and sunlight for the neighbouring Rosa Luxemburg residential properties. West Apartments at 2 Ashley Road was not mentioned. The applicant also accepted that some overshadowing would occur, particularly to neighbouring communal gardens.

I ask the Council to confirm whether 2 Ashley Road appears in the receptor list of the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing chapter of the Environmental Statement, at which floors, and whether west-facing windows were excluded from assessment by application of the 90 degree rule. If they were, I ask that the effect on west-facing habitable rooms be assessed on its merits, including transient overshadowing and sun-path analysis around the spring and autumn equinoxes, when the sun sets close to due west and directly into the proposed tower.

Daylight. I accept that at my own level the vertical sky component and no-sky line results are unlikely to breach BRE targets. I raise daylight on behalf of residents on the lower floors of West Apartments, for whom the seven-storey element at close range across Ashley Road is a different proposition, and I ask that their windows be individually assessed.

Solar glare and reflection. The tower's proposed materials include glass reinforced concrete and perforated metal panels. Reflected solar glare toward residential receptors at height is a foreseeable effect that is routinely omitted from assessment. I ask whether it has been assessed for receptors at 2 Ashley Road, and at what floors.

Outlook and enclosure. I recognise that loss of a view is not a material planning consideration and I do not advance one. My point is the different one that a 23 storey building will occupy the principal outlook of homes at mid-height directly opposite, and that the Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment appears likely to have tested public realm viewpoints at ground level only. I ask whether any Residential Visual Amenity Assessment has been undertaken, and whether any assessed viewpoint represents the elevation of existing homes facing the tower at similar height.

Privacy. I ask that the separation distance between the proposed studios and communal terraces and the west elevation of 2 Ashley Road be confirmed, and that mutual overlooking at floors broadly level with my own be assessed.

Light spill and plant noise. A 23 storey residential building lit through the night, together with rooftop and ground floor plant, will affect existing homes opposite. I ask that external lighting be assessed and controlled by condition, and that plant noise be assessed against the appropriate standard with a condition limiting rated noise level to below background.

8. Cumulative effects and the splitting of the two applications

The applicant controls both the Ashley House site and the Cannon Factory site opposite, and both were consented together under HGY/2016/4165. They are now being brought forward as two separate planning applications.

The Cannon Factory proposal, as presented to the Planning Sub-Committee on 27 July 2026, comprises a part 8, part 10 storey hotel of around 150 rooms and a part 10, part 25 storey building of around 500 Purpose Built Student Accommodation units. It is not speculative. It has been before the Sub-Committee at pre-application stage and was presented at the Planning Forum of 10 September 2026 alongside this scheme. Taken together, the two proposals place 23 storeys on a plot consented for seven and 25 storeys on a plot consented for 16.

Under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, the Environmental Statement must assess the cumulative effects of the development with other existing and approved development, and with development reasonably foreseeable at the time of assessment. London Plan Policy D9 likewise requires the cumulative visual, functional and environmental impacts of tall buildings to be considered.

Two further points bear on this. Officers told Members on 27 July 2026 that the early Quality Review Panel had considered the overall masterplan for both sites, that the subsequent panel had focused on the Ashley House site alone, and that further design review of the Cannon Factory site would follow as proposals progressed. The northern site has therefore had one early-stage review. The April panel itself asked for the two sites to be reviewed separately and in detail.

I ask that the Council satisfy itself that the Environmental Statement assesses both towers together, in townscape, daylight and sunlight, wind, transport, air quality and population terms. If it does not, the Council should require further information under Regulation 25 before determining. Determining the first application in isolation would commit the Council to a cumulative outcome it has not assessed.

9. Environmental Statement: baseline and adequacy

Environmental Statements for sites with extant consents frequently assess effects against the consented scheme rather than the existing physical situation.

The Quality Review Panel's April 2026 report records the position plainly: permissions were granted to a different applicant in 2018 and 2020 and were implemented to the extent that the existing two-storey commercial buildings were demolished and the sites cleared, but construction did not start. The site has stood vacant since August 2023. The change experienced by existing residents is the change from the site as it now stands.

I ask the Council to confirm which baseline has been used and, if the consented scheme is used, to ensure the Environmental Statement also reports effects against the existing situation. The 23 storey tower has no equivalent in the extant permissions, which capped this plot at seven storeys and 34.95m AOD, as set out in section 10 below. Assessing a 23 storey building against a consented seven storey building and then reporting the difference as modest change would not be a fair account of what existing residents will experience.

10. Height: the proposal inverts the consented step-down strategy

The site lies within an area identified as appropriate for tall buildings and I do not argue that height is objectionable here in principle. My objection is to the distribution of height, which departs from the approach on which tall buildings in this location were justified.

Outline permission HGY/2016/4165 fixed maximum height parameters for each plot. On the Ashley House plot the consent provided for a four-storey pavilion (Building 2) and a mixed use building of up to seven storeys (Building 2A), capped at 34.95m AOD on the approved Building Heights parameter plan, 35.95m with flue. The tall element of the consented masterplan, at 16 storeys, was located on the Cannon Factory plot at the north-eastern corner facing Watermead Way, where the officer's report justified it as marking the approach to the emerging District Centre and as stepping down from the buildings of around 20 storeys planned within the centre itself. The Tottenham Hale District Centre Framework identified Ashley Road South as suitable for medium rise buildings.

The consented pattern across Tottenham Hale therefore steps down from the station towards Down Lane Park and the low-rise residential hinterland beyond it. The officer's report for HGY/2016/4165 expressly identified that transitional role for the park, describing it as dividing

the smaller scale industrial areas near the centre from the low rise residential streets forming the hinterland.

This application reverses that. It proposes 23 storeys on the plot consented for seven, at the point furthest from the District Centre and directly against the park, while the applicant's related proposal places 25 storeys on the plot consented for 16. The applicant's own case to Members was that the tower completes the cluster and forms a landmark at its edge. A cluster that rises towards its edge, away from the transport interchange it exists to mark, is not the cluster the adopted framework describes.

I ask the Council to state in the officer's report the consented maximum heights for this plot under HGY/2016/4165, to explain what has changed in policy terms to justify a departure of this scale, and to assess the proposal against London Plan Policy D9 Part C on that basis, including visual, functional, environmental and cumulative impacts.

I also ask that the effect on the setting of the Tottenham High Road Historic Corridor Conservation Area be assessed and, where harm is identified, weighed under the statutory duty in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework. The effect on Berol House as a non-designated heritage asset should also be assessed. The site falls within a Tier 2 Archaeological Priority Area and I would expect an appropriate archaeological condition.

11. Density

The extant outline permission was assessed at a maximum of 265 units per hectare, which the officer's report acknowledged was already slightly above the London Plan indicative range for urban sites at this Public Transport Accessibility Level, and which was accepted on the strength of the scheme's design quality.

The present scheme proposes 609 residential units on the Ashley House plot alone. I ask the Council to set out the density of the submitted scheme on a comparable basis, to explain how it is optimised rather than over-developed, and to have regard to the Quality Review Panel's finding in June that the central space is already struggling to accommodate the demands placed on it.

12. Quality of the proposed accommodation

This is a material consideration irrespective of my own interest.

At pre-application stage officers noted that the shared living block would contain single-aspect north-facing units and that the main east-west corridor is long with little access to daylight. The Quality Review Panel referred in June to the number of single-aspect units inherent in the co-living typology. The applicant's answer to Members was that residents have access to large

dual-aspect communal spaces and that the units should not be compared directly with conventional single-aspect flats. That is a submission, not an assessment.

I ask that the Council assess compliance with London Plan Policies D6 and H16 and the Housing Design Standards London Plan Guidance, and that it scrutinise the overheating assessment for a dense, largely single-aspect building. Both Quality Review Panels asked for further work on overheating and neither recorded that it had been resolved. I note that overheating modelling for the extant permission on this site concluded that a majority of bedrooms and a third of living rooms could potentially overheat, and that officers required mitigation by design rather than by blinds. The same standard should apply here.

The applicant stated that around 90 per cent of units would be single occupancy and around 10 per cent dual occupancy or accessible. The occupancy split, the management arrangements and the 24-hour staffing commitment should be secured by condition and obligation, so that what was described to Members is what is delivered and maintained.

13. Children's play space and Down Lane Park

Officers recorded at pre-application stage that play space provision did not appear to meet the spatial requirements of London Plan Policy S4 and local policy, and that proximity to Down Lane Park was being relied upon. The June Quality Review Panel found the play provision too segregated and recommended it be integrated into the public realm.

Down Lane Park is a public park under existing pressure from the significant new population already delivered along Ashley Road. Members themselves raised this at the 27 July meeting, noting that the park is already heavily used and would need additional maintenance, staffing and investment, and asked that the impact be considered in determining planning obligations. I endorse that.

Off-site provision should not substitute for on-site provision required by policy. If any shortfall is accepted it should be compensated by a substantial financial contribution to Down Lane Park, indexed and secured for maintenance as well as capital works.

14. Transport, parking and highway safety

I do not object to a car-lite approach in a location with a Public Transport Accessibility Level of 5 to 6a. I raise the following.

- Ashley Road north of Burdock Road is a school street serving Harris Academy. Construction and servicing traffic must be routed and timed so as not to conflict with it.
- The site sits within The Hale Controlled Parking Zone, which operates with extended hours on Tottenham Hotspur match days. Several hundred additional residents with no on-site parking will place pressure on the CPZ. Occupiers should be excluded from

eligibility for residents' parking permits by section 106 obligation, and a car club and Traffic Management Order contributions secured, as was done under the extant permission.

- Officers noted at pre-application stage that the applicant was seeking cycle parking provision for the shared living block below the London Plan Guidance standard. I object to any shortfall and ask that full policy-compliant provision be required under London Plan Policy T5. The April Quality Review Panel separately recommended that cycle storage be brought inside the buildings rather than housed in external sheds.
- The June panel identified a risk of conflict between reversing vehicles and pedestrians, cyclists and children in the central space, and said further work was needed on servicing, refuse and fire access. I ask that swept path analysis be published and that servicing, refuse and blue badge movements be shown to enter, turn and leave the site safely without reversing onto Ashley Road or across the pedestrian route to the park.
- The April panel noted that the shared living use is likely to generate a high volume of deliveries. Delivery vehicle and cycle provision should be shown in the layout and managed by a secured Delivery and Servicing Plan.

15. Flood risk, wind, greening and sustainability

- The site is in Flood Zone 2 and in an area susceptible to groundwater flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment should demonstrate that surface water flooding is mitigated and that the sequential approach has been properly applied.
- Wind microclimate at the base of a 23 storey tower requires wind tunnel testing, not desk-based assessment, particularly at the entrances to the new east-west Green Link and at the Down Lane Park frontage. The April panel asked for microclimate assessment covering wind alongside daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. Conditions should secure any mitigation identified. A tower more than three times the consented height on this plot cannot rely on wind conclusions drawn for the consented scheme.
- Urban Greening Factor of 0.4 and Biodiversity Net Gain of at least 10 per cent should be secured, along with protection of the mature trees in Down Lane Park adjacent to the site and assessment of effects on the Down Lane Recreation Ground local Site of Importance for Nature Conservation. The April panel warned that the narrow buffer spaces around the buildings are likely to restrict tree growth. I ask that the planting schedule be tested against the space actually available, so that what is drawn can be grown and maintained.
- The effect on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation from air quality and recreational pressure requires assessment, as officers noted.
- Energy, whole life carbon, circular economy and overheating assessments should be scrutinised, and any carbon offset payment secured. The June panel welcomed alignment with the UK Net Zero Carbon Building Standard and asked that the submission demonstrate how the design meets those targets. I ask whether it does.

16. Construction phase

This is a phased development immediately opposite occupied homes, and construction will run for several years. The construction period is the effect residents will feel most acutely and for longest.

I ask for a Construction Environmental Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan secured by condition before commencement, covering hours of working, dust suppression and monitoring, vibration limits and monitoring, piling method, HGV routing away from the school street, wheel washing, and a named contact for residents. Given the duration and proximity, I ask for a condition requiring quarterly liaison with residents of 2 Ashley Road throughout the construction period.

17. Planning obligations

The extant permissions secured £1,255,000 towards open space improvements at Down Lane Park, plus Community Infrastructure Levy liability of approximately £600,000. The new scheme should not deliver less.

The applicant told Members that CIL would be paid in accordance with the charging schedules and that anything beyond statutory requirements, including enhancements to the tree belt adjacent to Down Lane Park, would be secured through section 106. Where open space contributions are now captured through CIL, the Council should secure a supplementary contribution to Down Lane Park if the CIL sum falls below what was previously secured on a proportionate basis.

I would also ask that the local labour and training obligations secured under the extant permission, including the targeted approach to on-site employment during construction and the end user skills contribution, be carried forward at no less than their previous level.

18. The terms on which I would support this scheme

I would not wish this representation to be read as opposition to development on this site. The site has stood cleared and vacant since August 2023 and its condition helps nobody. The 87 social rent homes are needed. If the matters below are resolved, whether by amendment before determination or by condition and obligation at grant, I would withdraw my objection and say so in writing to the Council.

On the use and the employment floorspace

1. Non-residential floorspace restored to at least the 751 sqm secured by the extant permissions, or the shortfall justified by a published and independently reviewed viability assessment.
2. A fixed quantum of affordable workspace secured by obligation at a defined rent for a defined term, not left as an offer subject to viability.
3. The community space is secured at a community rent, with a management partner identified before permission is issued rather than left to a future agreement.

On height and density

4. The height reconsidered against the consented parameters for this plot, or the departure justified on published evidence that addresses why the step-down strategy no longer applies.
5. The density of the submitted scheme stated on a basis comparable to the extant permission, and assessed against London Plan Policy D3.

On the accommodation

6. A proportion of larger units capable of housing couples, as the Quality Review Panel recommended in April, rather than a block from which children are contractually excluded in its entirety.
7. The stated occupancy split, 24-hour staffing and management arrangements secured by condition and obligation.
8. The stated adaptability to conventional C3 housing is secured, with a section 106 mechanism for conversion if the shared living use ceases or fails to let.
9. A local priority period for Haringey and ward residents on first letting, as the applicant indicated could be secured.
10. Overheating mitigated by design rather than by blinds, as officers required on the extant permission.

On the effects on existing homes

11. Daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, solar glare and wind assessed for receptors at 2 Ashley Road at the floors where the effects arise, including west-facing windows, with the results published before determination.
12. A Residential Visual Amenity Assessment from the elevation of existing homes facing the tower, not from ground-level public viewpoints alone.
13. Lighting and plant noise controlled by condition, with rated plant noise limited to below background.

On construction and the park

14. Construction Environmental Management Plan, Construction Logistics Plan and quarterly resident liaison secured by condition.
15. A substantial indexed contribution to Down Lane Park covering maintenance as well as capital works, reflecting both this scheme and the Cannon Factory scheme.
16. Wind tunnel testing, with any mitigation secured by condition.

On process

17. A further Quality Review Panel review, as the June panel requested, before determination.
18. Cumulative assessment of this scheme with the Cannon Factory scheme, or a Regulation 25 request if the Environmental Statement does not provide it.

Most of this does not require the tower to be abandoned. It requires the scheme to deliver what the allocation, the policies, the extant consent and the Council's own design panel have asked of it.

Conclusion

There are real benefits in this scheme and I recognise them, principally the 87 homes for social rent.

My objection is that the dominant use is one no site allocation supports, at a quantum that is not ancillary; that employment floorspace on an allocated employment site is being reduced on the strength of an argument against the allocation itself; that a plot consented for seven storeys is proposed for 23, reversing the step-down strategy on which tall buildings in this location were justified; that the consultation relied on to demonstrate local support drew three completed feedback forms; that the Quality Review Panel's support was conditional on environmental testing and further design work that does not appear to have been completed; and that the environmental effects on existing neighbouring homes, including my own, have not on the material available been assessed at the elevations where they will actually be felt.

If those matters are addressed on the terms at section 18, I will withdraw this objection.

I would be grateful to be notified of the Planning Sub-Committee date and I wish to register to speak.

Liam McCarthy

A121, West Apartments, 2 Ashley Road, London N17 9RZ

Sep 22, 2026

Documents referred to

Published by the London Borough of Haringey with the Planning Sub-Committee agenda of 27 July 2026:

- Pre-application report PPA/2026/0004: minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158625
- Quality Review Panel report, 22 April 2026:
minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158626
- Quality Review Panel report, 17 June 2026:
minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158627
- Plans and images of the proposal: minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158628
- Applicant's Stakeholder Feedback Report, 30 June 2026:
minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158629
- Draft minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee, 27 July 2026:
minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s158994

Also referred to:

- Officer's report on outline permission HGY/2016/4165, Cannon Factory and Ashley House, Planning Sub-Committee 18 July 2017:
minutes.haringey.gov.uk/documents/s95026