

# Addendum

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 04 October 2021

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No.8

<b>Reference No:</b> PPA/2021/0011	Ward: Tottenham Green
<b>Address:</b> Brunel Walk, Turner Avenue Estate N15 5HQ	
<b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of the existing 36 temporary accommodation homes on site and redevelopment of Brunel Walk and some of the space between the Council buildings of Turner Avenue to create 44 additional new homes for Council rent.	

## 8. QRP Note

- 8.1 The proposal was presented to Haringey's Quality review Panel on September 2021. The Panels comments from the meeting are summarised as follows:

*The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue. The site is very challenging, reflecting very piecemeal development, with two estates, a railway line and terraced housing. The panel welcomes the approach that seeks to undertake a 'repair' of some of the issues and sees the project as a major opportunity to improve the quality of the immediate area. The panel feels that the project team has made a good start, and it welcome the work that has gone into the process so far. It applauds the consultation that has informed the design development to date, and would support continued engagement, especially with residents of Seaford. It considers that the scale and layout are promising in broad terms, but it would encourage a further evaluation and iteration o some of the scale relationships to adjacent buildings, the articulation of the massing, and privacy, amenity and aspect issues. As design work continues, further consideration should be given to the permeability of the development and the nature of the new amenity spaces, and to the configuration of Building D and the linear mews. Scope also remains for refinement of the scheme's architectural expression.*

- 8.2 The Panel's comments are repeated in full below

**CONFIDENTIAL**



**Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Formal Review Meeting: Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue**

Wednesday 15 September 2021

Zoom video conference

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Marie Burns

Leo Hammond

Tim Pitman

Wen Quek

**Attendees**

Valerie Okeiyi

London Borough of Haringey

Kevin Tohill

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Miranda Stuart

Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

John McRory

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.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

2

**1. Project name and site address**

Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue Estate, London, N15 5HQ

**2. Presenting team**

Bruno Bridge	London Borough of Haringey
Ishen Stewart-Dowding	London Borough of Haringey
Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Geertje Kreuziger	London Borough of Haringey
Colin Merifield	KC+A Architects
Kiran Curtis	KC+A Architects
Maria Boyer	KC+A Architects
Emma Currens	Madlins LLP
Abi Grant	OOBE Landscape Architects

**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 is in the east of the borough; the Turner Avenue Estate is on the south side of West Green Road, and the Brunel Walk Estate lies immediately to the south of that. Access to Brunel Walk is from Kirkton Road to its east, at the junction of Braemar Road and Lomond Close. To the west of Turner Avenue runs Elmar Road. The existing 1970s buildings occupying Brunel Walk are one to two-and-a-half storeys in height, and currently house 36 temporary accommodation one-bedroom units, which will be demolished. Turner Avenue contains four three- and four storey 1950s blocks, which will be retained. There is no existing connection between the two estates, which are separated by fences and concrete walls. The alleyway access to Brunel Walk has little or no natural surveillance. The site has a public transport accessibility level rating of 4. Seven Sisters underground and rail station is within easy walking distance (eight minutes' walk of the site). There are bus services on West Green Road to the north. The site lies close to the Clyde Circus Conservation Area to the north, which includes the Locally Listed Fountain Hotel, whose garden backs onto the wooded amenity space at the eastern end of Turner Avenue. The site is designated as SS3 'Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue' in the Tottenham Area Action Plan 2017, where there is a potential master-planned housing estate renewal opportunity to improve the quality and utility of the housing stock on the site.

The current proposal is for the redevelopment of Brunel Walk and some of the space between the buildings of Turner Avenue. The proposed development would include

Report of Formal Review Meeting  
15 September 2021  
HQR115\_ Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue



**CONFIDENTIAL**

3

38 flats (seven one-bedroom, 14 two-bedroom, 17 three-bedroom), four three-bedroom maisonettes, and two four-bedroom houses across four buildings, with associated amenity space, cycle and refuse / recycling stores and a reconfiguration and enhancement of the existing parking area, public realm, play space and landscaping of the Turner Avenue Estate. Officers seek the panel's views on the design and massing of the proposals, in addition to the relationship between the proposed and existing buildings on site and nearby, in terms of privacy, overlooking and noise disturbance.

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

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for Brunel Walk and Turner Avenue. The site is very challenging, reflecting very piecemeal development, with two estates, a railway line and terraced housing. The panel welcomes the approach that seeks to undertake a 'repair' of some of the issues and sees the project as a major opportunity to improve the quality of the immediate area. The panel feels that the project team has made a good start, and it welcomes the work that has gone into the process so far. It applauds the consultation that has informed the design development to date, and would support continued engagement, especially with residents of Seaford Road. It considers that the scale and layout are promising in broad terms, but it would encourage a further evaluation and iteration of some of the scale relationships to adjacent buildings, the articulation of the massing, and privacy, amenity and aspect issues. As design work continues, further consideration should be given to the permeability of the development and the nature of the new amenity spaces, and to the configuration of Building D and the linear mews. Scope also remains for refinement of the scheme's architectural expression. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing, development density and development approach*

- It is clear that the proposals are the result of a design rationale that seeks to respond in a sensitive way to the scale of the existing context. While the scale and massing of the proposals seem broadly acceptable, the panel has some concerns about the scale relationships with neighbouring buildings. It would encourage a further evaluation and iteration of design, to consider these scale relationships at greater depth, which should also include overshadowing and daylight / sunlight impacts.
- The articulation and moderation of massing in terms of the Heat Loss Form Factor – the efficiency of the surface area of the thermal envelope in terms of the floor area – should also be considered, to ensure a careful balance is achieved between urban design principles and sustainable and energy efficient design.



**CONFIDENTIAL**

4

- At a detailed level, the panel questions the inclusion of louvres at the upper storeys of the southern elevation of the new blocks. It thinks that if the problem is actually one of scale, then the removal of the top storey at the rear elevation of the buildings (from four storeys to three storeys) may be a more appropriate solution.
- As there is 18m between the rear of the new development and the rear of the adjacent terraces on Seaford Road, the louvres could be removed to allow the new development more access to the southerly aspect.
- The panel thinks that if the current form / layout of the scheme is retained then there is a need for greater engagement with the Seaford Road residents.

*Place-making, public realm and landscape design*

- A design response to antisocial behaviour and crime – exacerbated by the nature of the alleyway through the site – needs to inform the scheme as it evolves. Options for reducing the permeability of the scheme – by reducing or removing the through routes – should be considered.
- This would also allow further opportunities to allocate each green space to a separate block as a secure communal amenity space, as the panel feels that the proposed open areas separating the new blocks may be vulnerable to antisocial behaviour, as they are currently shown.
- Additional community consultation to explore the options for reducing permeability and enhancing security would be beneficial.
- The panel would like more information about the proposed management arrangements for the landscaped areas.

*Scheme layout, access and integration*

- The panel welcomes the positive relationship that Buildings B and C have with the landscape and feels that Building D successfully brings active frontage to the entrance of the development.
- It would encourage the project team to step back from the design work and spend some time reviewing how successfully the current footprint relates to adjacent housing, in terms of privacy and outlook: there may be an opportunity to revisit some aspects of the layout to improve the overall quality of the scheme.
- Further analysis of the relationships between the front and backs of the buildings – both existing and proposed – would be helpful. The new development should seek to rationalise the configuration, with back gardens against back gardens and building frontages addressing other building



**CONFIDENTIAL**

5

frontages. While this is successful in some parts of the new development, it is less so in others.

- The external balconies on Buildings B and C are located very close to the existing blocks and the panel is concerned that these balconies may allow direct views at quite close range into what may be bedrooms within existing blocks. It would be very helpful to establish the floor plans of the existing blocks so that privacy and amenity conflicts like these can be avoided.
- Building A at the west of the site is configured differently to the other blocks; the panel notes that it is very close to both a gable wall and a boundary wall. As design work continues, careful consideration of the aspect, outlook and landscape of Building A would be welcome.
- The panel also has concerns about the nature of the outlook of the linear mews houses adjacent to Building D. Alternative typologies for these dwellings could be considered, such as providing terraces and roof gardens within the overall footprint, to allow the building line of the main frontage to move away from the gable end of the existing terrace of houses to the north. Examples of this typology include housing by Alison Brooks Architects.
- A further option to explore could be the reconfiguration of Building D and the linear mews to orientate to the east and west, rather than to the north and south.

*Architectural expression*

- The panel welcomes the contextual analysis that has begun to inform the evolving architectural expression of the proposals. It feels that further development of the elevational treatment of the buildings is required, to enhance the level of interest, particularly within the important northern elevations of Buildings B and C.
- It would also encourage the project team to revisit how the main entrance sits within the elevation of Building B. The current arrangement, with the front door located in the left-hand bay, appears unresolved.
- The articulation of the entrances across the new development, which are recessed and lined with a darker brick, is in contrast with the much more positive relationship to the street of the bin stores, which are brought forward from the main plane of the elevations. Further work to delineate and celebrate the entrances would be welcomed, perhaps drawing on the example of the entrances within Peabody Housing Association mansion blocks, where the entrances are in a bay that pushes forward and are under the tallest section of roof.





**CONFIDENTIAL**

6

- The current proposals for Building D (sitting at the junction of Braemar Road, Kirkton Road and Lomond Close) seem a little generic in comparison to the late Victorian / Edwardian residential architecture adjacent, and its built form would benefit from further consideration.
- The prevailing materiality of the adjacent streets is typically warm red brick and contrasting brick and stucco. Building D could reflect the richness of the materiality on the adjacent streets to a greater extent, in terms of tones and contrast.
- The panel understands that the windows have been designed 'from the outside' as a part of the elevational composition. It would encourage further consideration of the windows from inside, in terms of how they contribute to the liveability of the accommodation. Inclusion of wider, shorter windows would improve levels of daylight within the dwellings, alongside enhanced privacy, and easier cleaning, while reducing overheating.

*Inclusive and sustainable design*

- The panel would encourage the project team to consider the provision of lifts within blocks to ensure that the development is inclusive and suitable for residents at different life stages and with different mobility needs. If it is not possible to provide lifts at the outset then stairs should be carefully designed, with generous width and manageable risers; scope for possible future adaptation should also be considered.
- The panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability within the scheme. 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 targets.

*Next steps*

- As design work continues, the panel highlights a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers. It would be happy to consider the scheme at a further Chair's Review, if required.
- It also offers a focused chair's review specifically on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability.



This page is intentionally left blank