

Felicity Foley,  
Principal Committee  
Co-ordinator

020 8489 2919

felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

08 March 2018

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Monday, 12th March, 2018

I attach a copy of the following reports for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

**9. (2017/3584) LAND AT BERNARD WORKS, BERNARD ROAD,  
HERBERT ROAD AND NORMAN ROAD (PAGES 1 - 18)**

Appendix 5 & 6

Yours sincerely

Felicity Foley, Principal Committee Co-ordinator  
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

## **APPENDIX 5 -MEETING NOTE**

### **Development Management Forum**

A Development Management Forum for a development proposal was held on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017 for the site:

*Land at Bernard Works, Bernard Road, Herbert Road and Norman Road, Bernard Road Tottenham London N15 4NX*

Development Proposal:

*Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part 1,3,4,5,6,7 storey mixed use development comprising 25 Commercial Units (B1), music rehearsal space (Sui Generis), a café (A3), Commercial Pavilion (Sui Generis) (2446.9sqm), and 99 Residential Units (C3) including 12 apartments tethered to the commercial space, plus site access, landscaping, plant and other associated development.*

This note is a summary of the meeting.

### **Summary of Issues**

The key planning concerns highlighted at the meeting by residents were: the principle of the development, density and design, heights of new buildings, privacy/overlooking to adjoining occupiers, the loss of trees and green space, daylight/sunlight issues, increased pressure on local services, parking, and consultation issues.

More specifically, the issues and questions raised by local residents were as follows:

### **Principle of Development**

- The site is already in use as industrial land and should not be released.
- What are local people being offered in exchange for accepting this development?
- Regeneration is generally positive, but this specific scheme will result in the decline of the area.
- Why should the developer be allowed to profit from this development?

### **Design, Density and Building Height**

- The massing of the new build blocks is visually unappealing.
- The height of the blocks is excessive. The mansion-style block fronting Ashby Road is too tall.
- The density of the scheme is excessive.
- All of the proposed buildings are too tall.
- There are too many other tall buildings being granted planning permission in the local area, including Apex House.
- What is the Quality Review Panel?

- The Quality Review Panel has been inconsistent in its treatment of this scheme.
- A scheme comprising 2-storey Victorian houses should be presented instead.

### Local Services

- The scheme will put pressure on local services (including local schools, transport, health care, waste collection and other infrastructure)

### Green Space

- The proposal will result in the loss of a local green space.
- The trees on the green space are mature and should be retained.
- Local residents were promised that the existing green space would be retained
- The green space should be retained and not built on – can it be retained?
- The loss of the greenspace will lead to crime in the local area.

### Parking and Traffic

- The on street parking proposed is insufficient.
- The current road layout is defined by differing types of commercial and residential traffic and it would be inappropriate to consolidate the road layout.
- The traffic measures installed would not prevent rat running through the area.
- The proposal will lead to overspill parking outside CPZ areas.
- The commercial parking serving in the interior courtyard will be noisy and disturb local residents.
- Why should local residents have to put up with increased traffic and noise? The area has been the same for many years.
- Two way roads will result in more traffic.
- The increase in pedestrian connectivity will result in increased crime in the local area.
- Development will result in increased air pollution and noise from car traffic.
- When will transportation reports be available after the planning application is submitted?
- Concerns regarding volume and duration of construction traffic.

### Amenity to Adjoining Occupiers

- The daylight/sunlight impacts to adjoining properties are unacceptable.
- The overshadow impacts are unacceptable.
- The development is a violation of human rights of occupiers.
- The new residential units will be multi-occupied as rental units as they will be unaffordable. This will impact local amenity.

### Consultation

- There was a lack of consultation on the scheme.
- There was a lack of consultation on the site allocation on the Tottenham Area Action Plan and the site allocation TH12 (and the site requirement to rationalise the road layout).
- Has the application already been decided by the Council?
- What is the Tottenham Area Action Plan?  
What are the guidelines that set how the TH12 site allocation was brought forward?
- Local residents have been unable to contact Council Officers about the scheme.
- Residents were on the electoral roll but did not receive consultation letters about the Tottenham AAP.
- Applicant's consultants should not have canvassed local residents prior to the deposit of the application.
- Will the DM Forum be presented to committee?
- The Planning Case Officer is unaware of the location of the local school.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Appendix 6 QRP Notes**

**CONFIDENTIAL**



FRAME PROJECTS

**Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Bernard Works

Tuesday 5 September 2017

River Park House, 225 High Road, London, N22 8HQ

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Andrew Matthews

**Attendees**

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Rebecca Ferguson	Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Peter O'Brien	London Borough of Haringey
Maurice Richards	London Borough of Haringey
Michelle Bradshaw	London Borough of Haringey
James Farrar	London Borough of Haringey
Nairita Chakraborty	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

**Confidentiality**

This is a pre-application review, and therefore confidential. As a public organisation Haringey Council is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

2

**1. Project name and site address**

Bernard Works, Bernard Road, Herbert Road and Norman Road, N15 4NX

**2. Presenting team**

Nick Charalambous	Empyrean Development
Anja Silverton	Empyrean Development
David Storring	Duggan Morris Architects
Hugh Queenan	Duggan Morris Architects
Niamh Treacy	Duggan Morris Architects
Nick Hartwright	Mill Co.
Jose Rosa	MRG
Jo Hanslip	Urbanissta
Katheryn Waldron	Urbanissta

**3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting**

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of highly experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice, and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

**4. Planning authority's views**

The site at Bernard Works Herbert Road consists of 0.7 hectares of industrial units, an internal access road and a small area of poor quality, open space to the north. The surrounding area to the south and west is industrial, however to the north and east there are two storey terraced houses. The site is within a local employment area, and the Tottenham Hale Growth Area. Part of the site (excluding the open space) is subject to a site allocation in the draft Tottenham AAP: TH12 Hebert Road, for 'potential redevelopment of the sites for commercial-led mixed-use development with residential'.

The AAP notes that this area has a number of buildings that produce unsuitable neighbours for the residential uses, parallel access roads which do not provide an appropriate street layout, and several disused and derelict buildings in need of redevelopment. By introducing new employment floorspace and homes into the area, this site can make a positive contribution to meeting the borough's housing and employment needs.

The proposal has been reduced in scale since the previous QRP, and the design and articulation of the proposals have also advanced. Whilst officers are broadly happy with the current proposals, they note some remaining concerns about the scale of the development fronting onto Ashby Road, in addition to the single aspect residential accommodation.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

3

**5. Quality Review Panel's views***Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the amended proposals for the Bernard Works site, and offers their support for the scheme, subject to its concerns about the privacy of single aspect ground floor flats being addressed. The panel would also encourage further refinement of the architecture, to add depth, richness and variation to the scheme. They feel that the overall concept promises high quality development, and would be a very positive addition to the local area. They also highlight that the success of such a scheme depends upon the implementation of a comprehensive management strategy for the open spaces and the café. Further details of the panel's comments are provided below.

*Massing and development density*

- The panel welcomes the reduction in scale that has been achieved within the scheme, which will significantly improve the quality of the accommodation and open spaces.
- It understands concerns regarding the scale of the proposals fronting onto Ashby Road; but feels that as the width of the street is increasing, four storeys would be acceptable in this location.

*Scheme layout*

- Single aspect flats at ground level can be problematic in terms of privacy and security, as bedrooms and living rooms will front onto public areas. The panel remains to be convinced that a one metre strip of planting will provide an adequate privacy buffer for such flats.
- One solution could explore the possibility of raising the floor level of the ground floor accommodation by 600mm, to lift the height of the window sill towards eye level, mitigating any views into the accommodation from outside.
- If the ground floor level were raised, careful consideration of inclusive design would be necessary to ensure that the scheme is compliant with Part M of the Building Regulations.
- The panel notes that even if the privacy issues are resolved, deep plan dwellings with rear access corridors and kitchens without adequate daylight are not ideal.
- In this regard, they would strongly encourage the design team to consider incorporating maisonettes at ground level, with individual front doors opening onto the public realm. This would enable bedrooms to be located at a higher level, avoiding privacy conflicts at ground level.



## CONFIDENTIAL

4

- In addition, it would also support a more domestic frontage onto Ashby Road (that of two-storey maisonettes with individual front doors, with two storeys of flats above); which could help to promote a sense of community within the street.
- Avoiding a rear corridor access to the ground floor units (as currently shown) through the provision of individual front doors would also enable efficiencies within the floor plan. This should enable a greater number of units to be retained with a maisonette configuration than suggested by the design team.
- The panel notes that the standardised bay width may need to change in order to accommodate maisonettes with front access.

*Architectural expression and place-making*

- The panel welcomes the emerging architectural expression, but feels there is scope for further refinement and articulation to create visual depth and richness.
- The panel notes that whilst the development creates markedly different types of streets and spaces (new homes opposite 1930s houses, an urban commercial courtyard and a green open space), it relies on a single type of façade throughout.
- The panel would like to see more variation and articulation of the different parts of the development.
- In particular, the elevational treatment fronting onto Ashby Road would benefit from additional detail in order to break it down to a more domestic scale, as the distance between existing and proposed facades is only 17m.
- The inclusion of individual front doors fronting onto Ashby Road, in addition to some lighter visual elements would help to 'lift' the façade and create greater coherence within the street itself.
- The panel feels strongly that the success of the scheme depends upon the implementation of a comprehensive management strategy for the open spaces and the café, to ensure that the quality of the development is maintained over time.

*Next Steps*

- The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers.



**CONFIDENTIAL**



FRAME PROJECTS

**London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Bernard Works

Wednesday 5 July 2017

River Park House, 225 High Road, London, N22 8HQ

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Selina Mason

**Attendees**

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Rebecca Ferguson	Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Nairita Chakraborty	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

**Confidentiality**

This is a pre-application review, and therefore confidential. As a public organisation Haringey Council is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

2

**1. Project name and site address**

Bernard Works, Bernard Road, London N15 4NX

**2. Presenting team**

Denny Adam	Adam Roberts
Hugh Queenan	Duggan Morris Architects
Niamh Treacy	Duggan Morris Architects
Anna Martin	Duggan Morris Architects
Adrian Cole	Steer Davies Gleave
Jennifer Mui	MRG Studio
Jo Hanslip	Urbanista Planning

**3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting**

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of highly experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice, and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

**4. Planning authority's views**

The site at Bernard Works Herbert Road consists of 0.7 hectares of industrial units, an internal access road and a small area of poor quality open space to the north. The surrounding area to the south and west is industrial, however to the north and east there are two storey terrace, residential properties. There is an unusual arrangement along the east of the site where Herbert Road runs parallel to Ashby Road, separated by a two-metre high brick wall.

The site is within a Local employment area: Rangemoor / Herbert Roads and the Tottenham Hale Growth Area. Part of the site (excluding the open space) is subject to a site allocation in the draft Tottenham AAP: TH12 Hebert Road. For 'potential redevelopment of the sites for commercial-led mixed-use development with residential'. The AAP notes that this area has a number of buildings that produce unsuitable neighbours for the residential uses, parallel access roads which do not provide an appropriate street layout, and several disused and derelict buildings in need of redevelopment. By introducing new employment floorspace and homes into the area, this site can make a positive contribution to meeting the Borough's housing and employment needs.

Officers note that the development is intended to support the 'maker' economy; affordable workspace and tethered affordable housing to rent will be provided, with blended rent levels to ensure appropriate subsidies are delivered.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

3

**5. Quality Review Panel's views***Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the aspirations of the scheme; delivery of both affordable workspace and residential accommodation on site, in tandem with enabling live/work options (through managed, subsidised leases) will help to support and develop a local 'maker' economy. Whilst the broad principles of the development seem appropriate, the panel recommends the scale should be reduced in some areas. For example, to the south and centre of the site, taller buildings will overshadow the working courtyard, and balconies overlooking this. They would also encourage the design team to refine and develop the design of the public realm, and the interface of the edge of the buildings and spaces adjacent. They note that the development fronting onto Herbert Road works well; however, there remains scope for improvement in the configuration and layout of some of the other parts of the development, to avoid single aspect residential units and improve the quality of the accommodation. Further detail on the panel's views is provided below.

*Massing and development density*

- The panel notes that whilst the development aspires to be employment-led, it will also create a high-density residential scheme. At the current density, a much more generous provision of open space would typically be expected.
- The panel thinks in some areas the scale of the proposals should be reconsidered. Analysis of micro-climate is needed to inform decisions on scale and massing, to ensure the streets and spaces are pleasant in terms of wind conditions, sunlight and daylight.
- They note that the building heights and densities achieved on this section of the wider masterplan will set a baseline for the remaining development plots adjacent.
- In particular, the panel is concerned that the taller elements to the centre and south of the site will significantly overshadow the working courtyard area, in addition to the residential units and balconies that overlook it.

*Place-making, character and quality*

- The panel would encourage further thought about how the architecture and landscape design of Bernard Works combine to create a high quality place to live and work.
- For example, the edge condition to the park at the south of the site is very complex, comprising a café, a number of entry positions, and the 8-storey wall of the tallest building on site.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

4

- There may also be potential to extend the open space to the south, when the adjacent toy factory site is redeveloped. It would be helpful for the current development proposals to illustrate how this could be achieved.

*Scheme layout, architectural expression and sustainable design*

- The part of the development that will front onto Herbert Road seems to work well; and the scale of the development onto Ashby Road is successful.
- The panel would encourage further thought about the layout of the residential accommodation to avoid single aspect ground floor flats; creating maisonettes on the lower levels could be one way to achieve this.
- Scope also remains to improve the quality of the internal circulation to maximise levels of natural light.
- There is much to admire in the evolving architecture, and the panel would welcome an opportunity to comment on this in more detail at a future review.
- The panel would also like to know more about the strategic approach to energy efficiency and environmental sustainability for the scheme as a whole.

*Next Steps*

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals before a planning application is submitted, particularly in terms of: microclimate, refinements to the massing, landscape design and architectural expression.

CONFIDENTIAL



**London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Bernard Works

Wednesday 8 March 2017

River Park House, 225 High Road, London, N22 8HQ

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
Stephen Davy  
Andrew Matthews  
Hugo Nowell  
Chris Twinn

**Attendees**

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Nairita Chakraborty	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Adrian Harvey	Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Stuart Minty	London Borough of Haringey

**Confidentiality**

This is a pre-application review, and therefore confidential. As a public organisation Haringey Council is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.



## CONFIDENTIAL

### 1. Project name and site address

Bernard Works, Bernard Road, London N15 4NX

### 2. Presenting team

Nick Charalambous	Empyrean Development Ltd
Denny Adam	Adam Roberts Ltd
David Storrington	Duggan Morris Architects
Niamh Treacy	Duggan Morris Architects
Hugh Queenan	Duggan Morris Architects
Doug Meadway	Duggan Morris Architects
Simon Edwards	Steer Davies Gleave

### 3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of highly experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice, and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

### 4. Planning authority's views

The application is for a mixed-use, employment-led development – part of a wider masterplan for the area - that responds to the demands of a changing local labour market, which requires a different kind of employment space. The proposed development comprises a range of creative enterprise units, to be managed by MillCo, alongside a significant number of residential units; affordable commercial rents will be guaranteed for 50 years. The proposed development aims to improve circulation and increase the permeability of the site, as well as make better use of the limited green space currently provided. The site is allocated for employment-led development with the Tottenham Area Action Plan, but while the wider context has been considered in terms of use, the masterplan for land beyond the current site has no formal status in planning.

Haringey Council owns much of the site and its immediate surroundings, including the road, green space and one of the buildings currently in the application site. The AAP notes that this area has a number of buildings that are seen as unsuitable neighbours for nearby homes. Parallel access roads do not provide an appropriate street layout, and several disused and derelict buildings are in need of redevelopment. The introduction of new employment floor space and homes into the area on this site would potentially make a positive contribution to meeting the Borough's housing and employment needs.



## CONFIDENTIAL

### 5. Quality Review Panel's views

#### *Summary*

The panel congratulates the team on the work done so far on the development of proposals for the Bernard Works site. This is based on a detailed site analysis that is very helpful in setting the scheme within its wider context and drawing up a masterplan for later phases. The mix of employment and residential uses is welcomed, as well as the overall approach to the design. In the context of offering its support to the design strategy, the panel raised some issues to be considered at the next stage of design. It would also encourage Haringey Council to consider how a development strategy for the wider area could be taken forward, and given weight through the planning process.

#### *Massing and development density*

- The panel broadly supports the scale and massing of the proposed development.
- However, eight storeys is considered to be at the limit of what is acceptable in the western part of the site, and careful consideration will need to be given to the impact of this scale on the character and microclimate of the shared yard to the east.
- The proposals represent a significant change in aspect for the residents of Ashby Road, but the proposed scale of the new terrace facing Ashby Road is broadly acceptable, given its setback from the road and the generous landscaping treatment that is proposed for this frontage..
- Although the development is described as being employment-led, only a quarter of the floor space is proposed as employment space
- The panel feels that the transport impact of this mix of uses needs to be carefully assessed at the masterplan level, as this development will set a precedent for the remainder of the allocated site.
- Furthermore, given the significant increase in residential development, the panel feel that the amount of green space on the site should be increased, not merely maintained, and that more thought needs to be given to the form and use of the proposed public space.

#### *Place-making, character and quality*

- There are currently some mature trees on the site that could be retained to good effect, and the panel feels that a rigorous tree survey would assist the application in making the best use of what currently exists as well as guiding additional planting.



## CONFIDENTIAL

### *Relationship to surroundings: access and integration*

- The panel has some concerns about the short term relationship between the proposals for the application site and the existing commercial buildings in the wider masterplan area.
- In particular, there are concerns that the commercial traffic routes envisaged for the wider site will not be in place after the first phase/application site is completed, and that this will create access problems until neighbouring sites are redeveloped.

### *Scheme layout*

- The panel feel strongly that the informal masterplan is a very useful contribution and should be given some formal weight by Haringey Council.
- This will enable a thorough investigation of the wider impact of the intensification of use represented by the proposed development, not least in terms of traffic and footfall moving through the neighbouring streets from Seven Sisters.
- The panel feel that, currently, the hierarchy of entrances, especially in terms of distinguishing between residential and commercial uses, is not clear and requires further thought.
- The impact of the development on car parking will be a substantial concern to existing residents. Even if the intention is to produce a car free development, this needs to be properly considered and addressed.

### *Architectural expression*

- The panel welcome the extensive development of potential roof forms and doorways, for example, by drawing on the prevailing forms within the area. They look forward to that approach continuing as the scheme develops.

### *Inclusive and sustainable design*

- The panel encourage the applicant to investigate the likely micro-climate impacts of the proposed development, particularly if the buildings reach 8 storeys, where wind and shadow become significant factors.
- The panel feel that while this may be a good place to work, it is less clear that it will be a good place to live. For example, given the increase in the number of residents of the immediate area, it is unlikely that sufficient amenity space is being created, let alone that anything is being given back to the existing community, who will feel that they are absorbing costs in terms of disruption and congestion



**CONFIDENTIAL**

*Next Steps*

- The panel welcome the approach set out in these early plans and look forward to seeing the scheme again as it develops.