

# Addendum

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 14<sup>th</sup> September 2021

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Item No.8

<b>Reference No:</b> HGY/2021/2075	<b>Ward:</b> Bounds Green
<b>Address:</b>	
<p><b>Proposal:</b> Redevelopment of the site comprising the demolition of existing garages and the erection of a nine-storey building to accommodate 23 residential units for council rent (Class C3). Associated cycle and refuse/recycling storage facilities, accessible car-parking spaces, and landscaping and public realm improvements including a children's play space. Relocation of existing refuse/recycling facility.</p>	
<b>Applicant:</b> London borough of Haringey	
<b>Ownership:</b> Council	

### **CONDITION AND HEADS OF TERMS**

**Para 2.4:** ADD additional condition: No.29 (Piling Method Statement)

**Para 2.8: (Payment Head of Terms):**

**AMEND Initial carbon offset contribution & Deferred carbon offset contribution from "£14,170' to '£11,913"**

### **REPORT AMENDMENTS**

**Para 6.132 (Sustainability, Energy and Climate Change):**

**REPLACE:** £25,764 + 10% with: £23,826 including 10% and £14,170 with: £11,913

### **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

**Para 6.2: ADD 'Fire Safety' to list of planning issues, and text to section below;**

#### **Fire safety**

- 6.1.1 Fire safety is generally assessed at Building Regulations stage along with other technical building requirements relating to structure, ventilation, and electrics, for example. However, Policy D12 London Plan 2021 also makes clear that all

development proposals must achieve the highest standards of fire safety. It requires all major proposals to be supported by a Fire Statement.

- 6.1.2 A comprehensive fire statement produced by a suitably qualified third-party assessor (as required by the policy) has been submitted with the application. It consists of a high-level review of fire safety requirements for the proposed development based on relevant British Standards. It addresses means of warning and escape, internal and external fire spread and how these are addressed (e.g. automatic fire suppression systems, internal linings of walls and ceilings, fire doors, cavity barriers), and access and facilities for the fire and rescue service. It also outlines addresses fire safety maintenance and management issues.
- 6.1.3 The London Fire Brigade and Haringey Building Control were consulted on this application. Both have confirmed that they are satisfied with the proposed development details at this stage.
- 6.1.4 The development would be required to meet the Building Regulations in force at the time of its construction by way of approval from a relevant Building Control Body. As part of the Building Control plan checking process a consultation with the London Fire Brigade would be carried out. On completion of work, the relevant Building Control Body would issue a Completion Certificate to confirm that the works comply with the requirement of the Building Regulations.
- 6.1.5 Considering the above, the proposed fire safety details are acceptable and satisfy the requirements of planning policy.

**CONSULTEE UPDATES (Para 4.10):**

**Internal Consultees:**

**No.1 (LBH Transportation Group)**

**REPLACE:** *“No objection subject to conditions further details of waste/recycling and servicing arrangements. Awaiting further information from applicant and review before revised comments.”*

**with**

*“No objection subject to conditions – Having regard to further details submitted and evaluation, proposals acceptable, including in terms of servicing/access/deliveries and vehicle movements, including those serving the new bin store to the block of flats opposite.”*

No.4 (LBH Cleansing)

**REPLACE:** *“No objection in principle but raised queries with further information expected to be submitted to address them”*

with

*“No objection – Having regard to further details submitted and evaluation, proposals acceptable, including in terms of waste bin servicing/access and replacement purpose-built bin store to serve the block of flats opposite”*

**External Consultees:**

No.11 London Fire Brigade

**REPLACE:** “No comment” with: “No objection – “information [which] shows satisfactory fire fighting access and facilities”

Thames Water

**REPLACE:** “No comment” with: “No objection subject to condition for piling method statement and informative”

**Section 5. Local Representations - Update**

Further third party responses received since publish of main report (x3 objections, issues raised already summarised in report)

---

## **APPENDIX 1 Planning Conditions and Informatives**

**ADD** the following additional conditions

### **29. Piling Method Statement**

No piling shall take place until a piling method statement detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.”

Reason: To protect nearby underground sewerage utility infrastructure in accordance with Policy DM28 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

### **Condition 2 (In accordance with approved plans)**

#### **REPLACE:**

“MLM Group' Summer Overheating Assessment in Dwellings - CIBSE TM59 Compliance for Partridge Way, Haringey, REV.01 dated 14/12/2020”

with

“*MLM Group' Summer Overheating Assessment in Dwellings - CIBSE TM59 Compliance for Partridge Way, Haringey, REV.03 dated 03/09/2021*”

**DELETE:** [duplicate] “*MLM Group' Energy Statement REV.03 dated 23/06/2021*”

#### **REPLACE:**

“*MLM Group' Energy Statement REV.03 dated 23/06/2021*”

with

“*SWECO' Energy Statement, ref: 66201764-MLM-ZZ-XX-RP-SU-0001, Rev.4*”

### **Condition 6 Energy Strategy:**

**REPLACE:** “*...Energy Statement (dated 23 June 2021) prepared by MLM, delivering a minimum 64% improvement ...*”

With

*“...Energy Statement (dated 6 September 2021) prepared by Sweco, delivering a minimum 67% improvement...”*

**DELETE:** *“(c) Within six months of first occupation, evidence shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority that the development has been registered on the GLA’s Be Seen energy monitoring platform.”*

**Condition 6 Details of hard and soft landscaping**

**Insert-** after written specifications “and maintenance plan”

**REPLACE:** *“...The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter...”*

With

*“...The landscaping scheme, once implemented, is to be retained thereafter and maintained in perpetuity for the lifetime of the development...”*

## APPENDIX 3 Consultation Responses – Internal and External Consultees

### AT ‘Carbon Management’;

**First section: ADD:** “Revised comments received on 07/09/21 & 09/09/21 confirmed no objection or further queries, subject to details outlined in revised comments. Confirmed the new carbon offset contribution would be £23,826 (including the 10% management fee).”

### **ADD latest revised Carbon Management comments (in light of additional & revised supporting information) received 07/09/2021 as follows;**

“The applicant submitted an updated Energy Statement prepared by Sweco (dated 6 September 2021, Revision 5) to respond to the questions and comments noted above on 11/8. A summary of the changes is noted below.

#### **Be Lean**

The average Fabric Energy Efficiency improvement is 21%.

The average space heating requirement is 17.05 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year, which almost meets the Passive House standard of 15 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year, which is supported. The individual apartments range in space heating demand from 9.22 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year to 31.26 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>year.

#### **Carbon Offset Contribution**

A revised offset contribution has been calculated below based on the updated report.

	<b>Residential</b>	
<i>(SAP10 emission factors)</i>	<b>tCO<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Baseline emissions</b>	22.7	
<b>Be Lean savings</b>	3	13%
<b>Be Clean savings</b>	0	0%
<b>Be Green savings</b>	12.1	54%
<b>Cumulative savings</b>	15.1	67%
<b>Carbon shortfall to offset (tCO<sub>2</sub>)</b>	7.6	
<b>Carbon offset contribution</b>	£95 x 30 years x 8.3 tCO <sub>2</sub> /year = £21,660	
<b>10% management fee</b>	£2,166	
<b>Total carbon offset contribution</b>	£23,826	

#### **Updated Planning Conditions**



As a planning obligation will not be appropriate to ensure the scheme complies with London Plan Policy SI2 under Be Seen, the following planning condition is recommended:

Be Seen Energy Monitoring

Within 4 weeks of the grant of Planning Permission to submit to the GLA verified estimates of the 'be seen' energy performance indicators through the GLA's dedicated portal.

On or prior to Practical Completion to ensure that Automatic Meter Reading Devices are installed and in operation at the Development in accordance with the Approved Metering Strategy and not to Occupy or permit the Occupation of the Development until the Automatic Meter Reading Devices have been installed and are in operation.

On Practical Completion to submit updated and verified energy performance estimates to the GLA through its dedicated portal and not to Occupy or permit the Occupation of the Development until those estimates have been submitted.

In respect of each Residential Unit on expiry of the defects liability period and on each anniversary of this date thereafter for a period of 5 years to submit to the GLA via its dedicated portal the energy performance data.

Energy Strategy [Revised]

The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the Energy Statement (dated 6 September 2021) prepared by Sweco, delivering a minimum 67% improvement on carbon emissions over 2013 Building Regulations Part L, with SAP10 emission factors, high fabric efficiencies (min. 13% reduction), air source heat pumps (ASHPs) and minimum 8.4 kWp solar photovoltaic (PV) energy generation.

(a) Prior to above ground construction, details of the proposed ventilation and heating systems and solar PV shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This must include:

- Location, specification and efficiency of the proposed ASHPs (Coefficient of Performance, Seasonal Coefficient of Performance, and the Seasonal Performance Factor), with plans showing the ASHP pipework and noise and visual mitigation measures;
- Specification and efficiency of the proposed Mechanical Ventilation and Heat Recovery (MVHR), with plans showing the rigid MVHR ducting and location of the unit;
- Details of the PV including: a roof plan; the number, angle, orientation, type, and efficiency level of the PVs; how overheating of the panels will be minimised; their peak output (kWp) and the final carbon reduction at the Be Green stage of the energy hierarchy;
- A metering strategy.

The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved prior to first operation and shall be maintained and retained for the lifetime of the development. The solar PV array shall be installed with monitoring equipment prior to completion and shall be maintained and cleaned at least annually thereafter.

(b) Within six months of first occupation, evidence that the solar PV and ASHPs installation have been installed correctly shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, including photographs of the solar array, a six-month energy generation statement, and a Microgeneration Certification Scheme certificate.

(c) Within one year of first occupation, evidence shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate how the development has performed against the approved Energy Strategy and to demonstrate how occupants have been taken through training on how to use their homes and the technology correctly and in the most energy efficient way and that issues have been dealt with. This should include energy use data for the first year and a brief statement of occupant involvement to evidence this training and engagement.

Reason: To ensure the development reduces its impact on climate change by reducing carbon emissions on site in compliance with the Energy Hierarchy, and in line with London Plan (2021) Policy SI2, and Local Plan Policy SP4 and DM22.”

**At ‘Thames Water’ ADD:**

“Waste Comments

We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Groundwater discharges typically result from construction site dewatering, deep excavations, basement infiltration, borehole installation, testing and site remediation. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. Should the Local Planning Authority be minded to approve the planning application, Thames Water would like the following informative attached to the planning permission: “A Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water will be required for discharging groundwater into a public sewer. Any discharge made without a permit is deemed illegal and may result in prosecution under the provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991. We would expect the developer to demonstrate what measures he will undertake to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. Permit enquiries should be directed to Thames Water’s Risk Management Team by telephoning 020 3577 9483 or by emailing [trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:trade.effluent@thameswater.co.uk) . Application forms should be completed on line via [www.thameswater.co.uk](http://www.thameswater.co.uk). Please refer to the Wholesale; Business customers; Groundwater discharges section.

The proposed development is located within 15 metres of a strategic sewer. Thames Water requests the following condition to be added to any planning permission. “No piling shall take place until a PILING METHOD STATEMENT (detailing the depth and

type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with Thames Water. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.”

Reason: The proposed works will be in close proximity to underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Piling has the potential to significantly impact / cause failure of local underground sewerage utility infrastructure. Please read our guide ‘working near our assets’ to ensure your workings will be in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you’re considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-yourdevelopment/>

Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: [developer.services@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk) Phone: 0800 009 3921 (Monday to Friday, 8am to 5pm) Write to: Thames Water Developer Services, Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB

There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. If you're planning significant work near our sewers, it's important that you minimize the risk of damage. We'll need to check that your development doesn't limit repair or maintenance activities, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-nearor-diverting-our-pipes>.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to WASTE WATER NETWORK and SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application, based on the information provided. With regard to SURFACE WATER drainage, Thames Water would advise that if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water we would have no objection. Management of surface water from new developments should follow Policy SI 13 Sustainable drainage of the London Plan 2021.

Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. Should you require further information please refer to our website.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Apply-and-pay-for-services/Wastewaterservices>.

#### Water Comments

On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application. Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a

minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

The proposed development is located within 15m of our underground water assets and as such we would like the following informative attached to any approval granted. The proposed development is located within 15m of Thames Waters underground assets, as such the development could cause the assets to fail if appropriate measures are not taken. Please read our guide 'working near our assets' to ensure your workings are in line with the necessary processes you need to follow if you're considering working above or near our pipes or other structures.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planningyour-development/Working-near-or-diverting-our-pipes>. Should you require further information please contact Thames Water. Email: [developer.services@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:developer.services@thameswater.co.uk)

There are water mains crossing or close to your development. Thames Water do NOT permit the building over or construction within 3m of water mains. If you're planning significant works near our mains (within 3m) we'll need to check that your development doesn't reduce capacity, limit repair or maintenance activities during and after construction, or inhibit the services we provide in any other way. The applicant is advised to read our guide working near or diverting our pipes.

<https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Developing-a-large-site/Planning-your-development/Working-nearor-diverting-our-pipes>"

Planning Sub Committee 14<sup>th</sup> September 2021

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No.10

<b>Reference No:</b> PRE/2020/0138	<b>Ward:</b> Highgate
<b>Address:</b> Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, N6	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of all the existing buildings on the site and redevelopment to provide a new nursing and convalescence home of 70 beds with support facilities, a wellbeing and physiotherapy centre and associated works.	
<b>Applicant:</b> Highgate Care Limited	
<b>Ownership:</b> Highgate Care Limited	

Quality Review Panel Comments attached for committee attention

This page is intentionally left blank

**CONFIDENTIAL**



FRAME PROJECTS

**Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home**

Wednesday 25 August 2021

Video conference

**Panel**

David Ubaka (chair)

Louise Goodison

**Attendees**

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Katerina Koukouthaki	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Laurence Ackrill	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Zainab Malik	Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	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.

**1. Project name and site address**

Mary Feilding Guild Care Home, 103-107 North Hill, Highgate, London N6 4DP

**2. Presenting team.**

Nick Johnson	DWA Architects Limited
Jordan Alcock	DWA Architects Limited
Mitesh Dhanak	Highgate Care Limited
Neeraj Dixit	ND Planning Limited
Nick Collins	KM Heritage
Rebecca Morgan	Guarda Landscape
Nimco Ali	Hodkinson Consultancy Limited

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

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of 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 briefing**

The site was formerly owned (and operated as a care home) by the Mary Feilding Guild. It was recently acquired by Highgate Care Limited. The site sits within the Highgate Conservation Area and does not contain any listed buildings or structures. On its North Hill frontage, the site is flanked on one side by a Grade II Listed Georgian terrace while on its View Road frontage it is adjoined by a Locally Listed villa at 3 View Road. The current care home complex includes a red brick building on the site's View Road frontage, the core of which is an Edwardian House with some Arts and Crafts features. This has been linked through a series of extensions and newer buildings to a four storey 1960s / 1970s block on the North Hill frontage. The original Edwardian building is considered a positive contributor to the Conservation Area.

The proposal is for the complete demolition of the existing 42-bed care home (Use Classes Order C2) and the redevelopment of the site to provide a new 70-bed care home with support facilities, a well-being and physiotherapy centre and associated works. Officers strongly support the retention of a care home facility on the site, which would confer some public benefit. Officers would welcome the panel's views on the design quality of the scheme, including the scale and massing of the proposed building and the impact this may have on the character and appearance of the conservation area, the setting of adjoining listed buildings and on the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.





## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for the former Mary Feilding Guild Care Home as they continue to evolve. The panel is pleased that the applicant's intention is to retain the use of this important site for residential care accommodation. It thanks the project team for the helpful presentation, and feels that the work done in response to the previous review has been very positive. It commends the tenacity of the project team, working with planning officers and consulting with the community.

The panel supports many of the strategic moves made during design development; however it feels that the massing and detail of the roofscape could be further improved, along with the architectural expression of the scheme. It would also encourage further consideration of the scheme layout, to improve the quality of the communal accommodation and circulation areas, while enhancing the relationship between key shared spaces and adjacent garden areas. As design work continues, sections taken through the building and the surrounding context will be important to ensure high quality accommodation.

The retention and re-purposing of the North Hill block should be considered, alongside a wider strategy for the re-use on site of any appropriate demolition material. Full consideration of embodied energy, alongside a 'fabric first' approach to sustainable design, should inform the continuing evolution of the proposals at a detailed level. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing and roofscape*

- The panel accepts the massing and development density of the proposals, but would encourage the project team to refine the massing of the roofscape to further reduce the visual bulk of the building.
- For example, the roof line of the two wings either side of the central block, fronting onto View Road, could be lowered by reducing the roof pitch, or by using a flat roof or mansard roof. This would make the side wings visually subordinant and would start to break up the bulk of this important façade, while also reflecting the approach to massing within existing adjacent buildings on View Road. Introducing a different tone of brickwork in these side wings could also help to distinguish them from the central block.
- In addition, the ridge-line of the pitched roofs across the scheme could potentially be lowered. Sections through the building would help to identify where higher pitches are needed to accommodate adequate head-room. A careful balance will be required to ensure that - within external views - the roofscape appears generous enough, while also reducing the visual bulk of the top of the building.



- The depth of the roof also presents some challenges with regard to the nature of the hip elements, which seem oversized. The panel would encourage a simpler approach to the pitched roofs within the scheme, using strong gable ends rather than large hips. For example, an opportunity exists to bring the ridge line of the linking building from the North Hill block and terminate it at the garden with a gable end facing west into the garden.
- The panel welcomes the adjustments to the building footprint, which has been pulled away from adjacent buildings to allow for a more generous gap than currently exists.
- The panel notes that the demolition and redevelopment of the North Hill building only achieves the same mass and footprint as the existing building. It would strongly encourage the project team to fully explore retaining, refurbishing / re-cladding and re-purposing the existing building, which the panel considers to be architecturally elegant and which does not seek to compete with the adjacent Georgian terrace.

#### *Landscape design*

- While the panel regrets the reduction of the garden space, it feels this is acceptable as the building footprint has also been pulled away from the boundary in some locations, providing a more generous distance to adjacent buildings.
- The panel welcomes the concept of the healing garden, with its aspiration to nurture the physical and mental well-being of residents. Careful consideration of the path, the orientation of the garden and the ramp access will be required to ensure that a strong visual and physical relationship is created between the internal accommodation and the garden.

#### *Scheme layout and quality of accommodation*

- The panel would like to see further refinements to the scheme layout, to create a better relationship (both visually and physically) between internal communal areas and the garden spaces externally. The terrace areas in the 'elbow' of the scheme also need further work.
- The panel is concerned by the intention to locate the restaurant in the basement. Instead, it would like to see it at ground floor level, ideally in the west-facing section of building overlooking the garden (where there are currently a number of individual rooms shown). The kitchen could remain at basement level.
- Some of the other uses currently located within the basement would also be much better suited to being located at ground level, including staff rooms and communal facilities like the shop, library, barbers and hair and beauty salon.



These uses could potentially help to activate the frontage of the North Hill block.

- The panel feels that the proportion of circulation space within the North Hill block is unbalanced and would like to see improvements to the efficiency of the floor plans.
- It would also support further refinement of the design of the circulation spaces and communal areas, to include increasing the generosity of - and daylight access to - corridors, circulation cores and stairwells.
- Sections taken through the accommodation will be critically important to understanding how the sloping roofs and dormers will affect the quality of accommodation within the roof spaces.
- Greater clarity would be welcomed on the arrangements for refuse storage and how this will work in practice for the different parts of the development.

#### *Architectural expression*

- The panel would support further refinements to the View Road elevations, including simplified recesses and a greater distinction in the side wings of the main building through use of different brickwork, as mentioned above.
- It would also encourage further consideration of the northern (flank) façade of the scheme. It thinks that a green wall would not be appropriate in this location, and notes that flank walls can be used to express things; examples can be seen within the arts and crafts buildings nearby.
- The panel feels in particular that it would be beneficial to get daylight into the stairwell that is bounded by the flank wall, and would encourage exploration of options, including fritted glass.
- Opportunities exist to introduce visual references or motifs within the architectural expression that relate to Mary Feilding, to give a sense of narrative and historical perspective to the scheme.
- While the panel feels that retention of the North Hill block should be explored as a first response to this part of the site, it would encourage a calmer and simpler approach to the architectural expression of the proposed North Hill block; it thinks that the stepping of the proposed building line is too complicated, and does not relate to the adjacent Georgian terrace. The panel also notes that the exterior looks like an office building, rather than reflecting the uses that are accommodated within.



*Low carbon design and environmental sustainability*

- As at the previous review, the panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability within the scheme.
- It highlights that following its Climate Emergency Declaration in 2019, Haringey Council adopted the Climate Change Action Plan in March 2021, which identifies a route map to enable the borough to become Net Zero Carbon by 2041. All new development coming forward should have regard for these requirements to avoid the need for retrofitting later. Proposals should demonstrate how they comply with these requirements.
- The panel notes that consideration of the embodied energy within existing buildings is an important starting point in sustainability terms. It would like to see detailed analysis of a development approach that seeks to retain – as a minimum – the North Hill block, plus other parts of the existing building where appropriate. This should include exploration of the existing floor plan layout, along with options to retain, adapt and extend it. Options for re-using demolition materials should also be fully explored.
- Consideration of operational energy requirements should start with a ‘fabric first’ approach – optimising the performance and design of the building envelope, components, and materials to achieve sustainable and energy-efficient design; renewable energy sources, natural light, and cross ventilation will also form part of this work. Further details on the approach to u-values would be welcomed.
- A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as the scheme continues to evolve.
- As design work continues at a greater level of detail, the panel would encourage officers to challenge and interrogate the scheme further regarding the agenda for the climate emergency.

*Next steps*

- The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers. It would be happy to review the proposals at a further chair’s review if required.
- The panel also offers a focused chair’s review on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability.



**Appendix: Haringey Development Management DPD****Policy DM1: Delivering high quality design****Haringey Development Charter**

- A All new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will support design-led development proposals which meet the following criteria:
- a Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
  - b Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
  - c Confidently address feedback from local consultation;
  - d Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
  - e Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

**Design Standards**

## Character of development

- B Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:
- a Building heights;
  - b Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;
  - c Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;
  - d Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;
  - e Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;
  - f Active, lively frontages to the public realm; and
  - g Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.



This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 14<sup>th</sup> September 2021

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE      Item No.11

<b>Reference No:</b> PRE/2021/0011	<b>Ward:</b> Tottenham Hale
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Proposal:</b> Proposals seek to deliver 30 new homes in five buildings fronting Lansdowne Road at Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court.	
<b>Applicant:</b> London borough of Haringey	
<b>Ownership:</b> Council	

Quality Review Panel Comments attached for committee attention

**CONFIDENTIAL**

FRAME PROJECTS

**Haringey Quality Review Panel****Report of Formal Review Meeting: Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court**

Wednesday 25 August 2021

Zoom video conference

**Panel**

David Ubaka (chair)

Marie Burns

Tim Pitman

Craig Robertson

Wen Quek

**Attendees**

Kevin Tohill

London Borough of Haringey

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Zainab Malik

Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

Elisabetta Tonazzi

London Borough of Haringey

Ian Pinamonti-Hyde

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.

**Declaration of interest**

Tim Pitman (panel member and Director of Pitman Tozer Architects) has advised that Pitman Tozer Architects has collaborated with BPTW in the past, and a number of Pitman Tozer Architects' staff have previously been seconded to BPTW. This is not considered a material conflict of interest and therefore does not affect Tim's participation in the review.

Report of Formal Review Meeting

25 August 2021

HQR113\_Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court



**1. Project name and site address**

Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court, Lansdowne Road, N17

**2. Presenting team**

David Doherty	Haringey Council
Rashida Hussain	Haringey Council
Martin Cowie	Haringey Council
Geertje Kreuziger	Haringey Council
Andrea Hilton	BPTW
Melisa Villar	BPTW
Dominic Kilbey	BPTW
Mike Luszczak	ME Landscape Studio
Andrew Sturt	Silcock Dawson & Partners Ltd

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

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of 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 briefing**

The application site relates to Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court, which are two estates facing Lansdowne Road, in North London. The plot of land is currently in use in part as a car park and part non-designated open space. The existing brick buildings on site are three storeys, constructed in the 1970s, with associated garages and storage areas.

The proposal is to provide high-quality new council housing on under-utilised land currently occupied by parking, pram sheds and garages, the loss of which will have to be fully justified as part of the planning application. The existing street frontage for these developments is considered very poor and inward looking. There is one access point for both pedestrians and vehicles.

It will be important for the proposal to deliver a high-quality design, that respects the setting of the surrounding buildings and the locality. Officers would welcome the panel's views on the proposed massing and scale of the buildings, the design quality of the development and its contribution to the street scene.



## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity for early review of the proposals for Arundel Court and Baldewyne Court.

The panel feels that a good start has been made: the massing seems appropriate for the context, and the approach to development – that of inserting simple blocks into the frontage of each site – could be very successful, if the issues of scheme layout and the relationship with the existing buildings adjacent are resolved. Local authority schemes should be exemplars, to set the standard for private schemes within the borough. In this regard, the panel would encourage further refinement of the scheme layout, the architectural expression and the landscape design to enhance the quality, liveability and longevity of the proposals.

As part of this work, it will be important to establish key environmental analysis data, and use this to inform the evolving design, especially in terms of the different elevations. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing*

- The massing of the current proposals – at three storeys - seems sensible. However, the panel notes that if the viability of the scheme was an issue, or if re-distribution of some of the accommodation is required, then massing of up to three-plus-one storeys would be possible, providing that the visual emphasis of the primary three storeys was dominant.

### *Public realm, landscape design and parking*

- The panel likes the garden courts created by the densification of the original sites. It would encourage the project team to identify and facilitate more space for passive recreation across both sites for informal play and socialising.
- The panel questions whether the allocated width/depth of the planted buffer zones is adequate to establish and sustain the proposed density of planting - if the planting fails then this could result in a very harsh exterior realm. The panel also questions the degree to which fencing will be required. It would therefore welcome further detail on these important boundaries and buffer zones.
- Careful consideration of the arrangements and detail of new street trees will also be required; the panel notes that achieving longevity with street trees is always challenging.
- The panel would like clarification of who will be able to access the new landscape features and growing boxes, along with how this will be managed.



- It notes that play provision for teenagers is not provided within the site, and would like to know more about the analysis of safe walking routes to the local offsite provision. It questions whether extra infrastructure will be needed, to make these routes safer or improve the provision for teenagers at local parks.
- The parking proposals are acceptable, given the proximity of multiple bus routes. It would however encourage the project team to allow infrastructure for electric car charging, and to explore options for a car club on site.

#### *Scheme layout*

- The panel welcomes the development approach that seeks to transform two garden courts through framing them with simple buildings. Providing a positive frontage to Lansdowne Road will also contribute greatly to an enhanced streetscape. While five additional blocks seem an appropriate aspiration, it thinks that further work is required to ensure that the new accommodation is of a high quality, both internally – in terms of liveability – and externally.
- The scheme layout is most successful when the central circulation core of a new block is aligned with the gable end of the existing building adjacent to it, as in the Baldewyne Court site. This helps to reduce issues of poor outlook, overlooking and overshadowing, as each dwelling either side of the central circulation core can gain access to daylight and views from beyond the adjacent block.
- In the Arundel Court site, however, misalignments of the cores with the gables result in poorer quality accommodation with inadequate outlook and access to daylight and sunlight: some bedrooms are only 2.5m away from the blank gable walls adjacent, which the panel finds unacceptable. Canted bays will not be sufficient to overcome these issues and the panel would strongly encourage the project team to revisit the scheme layout here to reconfigure the blocks so that the circulation cores align to the existing buildings.
- Alternative arrangements for access and parking may need to be considered to allow the proposed blocks to move into a better alignment. Accommodation on the Arundel Court site will also have issues with overshadowing, which will also need to be considered and mitigated as far as possible.
- As design work continues, it would be helpful for the project team to consider the liveability of the proposals – the human experience of living there on a day-to-day basis - to ensure that the aspiration of a joyous, sociable and comfortable place is fully realised.

#### *Architectural expression*

- While the panel welcomes the simplicity of the proposed additional blocks, it feels that the scheme would benefit from more articulation and detail, to enliven the architectural expression and make the proposals more joyful. In



particular, more attention needs to be given to the gable ends of the scheme, as these are very prominent elevations.

- The panel welcomes the detail of the wider contextual analysis but feels that this analysis should inform the evolving architectural expression of the proposals to a greater extent, rooting the proposals more firmly in the local area. For example, some local examples of Victorian dwellings have qualities within the front elevations, with certain roof pitches, panels, bays and pairing of elements giving a strong vertical accent, and some of the 1960s-1970s blocks in the area have responded to this verticality.
- Entrances could provide opportunities for delight, to enhance the ground plane, and this could be achieved through the introduction of lighter brickwork to denote entrance areas.
- The panel would welcome further consideration of the fenestration. It understands why smaller windows have been specified but would encourage greater generosity where possible. For example, the inclusion of shorter, wider windows would improve daylight levels, ventilation, and aid cleaning, while also providing more interest and delight.
- Combining bay windows together to form vertical bays across the first and second floor would help to improve the continuity of the building envelope, reducing thermal bridging.

*Inclusive and environmentally sustainable design*

- The panel notes that the blocks are designed without lifts. While lifts are necessary for wheelchair accessible flats, they also support long-term occupation by tenants, including those at different life stages, including young families with pushchairs. The panel therefore urges the design team to consider introducing lifts to the scheme; deck access circulation may be beneficial in this regard as it can save on space through reducing lobby areas.
- If it is not possible to incorporate lifts, then other measures should be adopted, including wider stairs and lower stair risers (150mm).
- In terms of energy use and the low-rise typology, the development has the potential to be a very low lifecycle carbon scheme. However, the panel notes that environmental sustainability has not informed the design process thus far, and this may limit the success of the scheme.
- In particular, environmental analysis data (for example daylight, sunlight and overshadowing studies) should inform the architectural response of the different elevations, especially those orientated north or south. Currently the north and south elevations of the scheme are very similar, but it is likely that



the north elevation will require a larger area of fenestration to meet internal daylight requirements.

- The panel questions why shading measures have been adopted for some windows but not others within the same elevations. It also notes that brise soleil located on west elevations have limited value, as the angle of sunlight is lower.

*Next steps*

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals.
- It also offers a focused chair's review specifically on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability.



**Appendix: Haringey Development Management DPD****Policy DM1: Delivering high quality design****Haringey Development Charter**

- A All new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council will support design-led development proposals which meet the following criteria:
- a Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
  - b Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
  - c Confidently address feedback from local consultation;
  - d Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
  - e Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

**Design Standards**

## Character of development

- B Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:
- a Building heights;
  - b Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;
  - c Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;
  - d Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;
  - e Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;
  - f Active, lively frontages to the public realm; and
  - g Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

