



**Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Chair's Review Meeting: 22 - 42 High Road**

Wednesday 9 May 2018

River Park House, 225 High Road, London, N22

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Phyllida Mills

**Attendees**

Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Wendy Robinson	London Borough of Haringey
Samuel Uff	London Borough of Haringey
Bruna Varante	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects

**Apologies / report copied to**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Rebecca Ferguson	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. Site address

22 - 42 High Road, Wood Green, N22

## 2. Presenting team

Dan Burr	Sheppard Robson Architects
Jenna Fife	Sheppard Robson Architects
Caroline Keane	Gerald Eve LLP

## 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 location of the site is on Wood Green High Road, a Metropolitan Town Centre designated in the London Plan, close to Turnpike Lane Station. The site falls within Wood Green Town Centre, and within a Primary Shopping Area with a Primary Frontage in the Local Plan Proposals map.

The applicant has engaged in further pre-application discussions with Haringey Council and is near to submission for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site to create a residential led mixed-use scheme consisting of a part 5, part 7 and part 8 storey building comprising 2,500m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floorspace, 209 residential units, and a 136-bed hotel. There are expected to be two phases of development, but a single planning application. Officers generally support the scheme and it is considered likely to meet principle policy requirements for the comprehensive redevelopment of this site.



## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel is generally supportive of the scheme, and feels that the feedback from the previous review has been very well addressed. It particularly welcomes the changes to internal planning, both at ground floor level and above, and the evolving architectural expression. At a more detailed level, the panel highlights some aspects of the architectural expression that offer scope for further refinement, in order for the scheme to meet its full potential as a high-quality development.

Subject to the comments outlined within this report, the panel offers its support for the scheme. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing, configuration and scheme layout*

- Further to the previous feedback of the panel, it now feels that the massing as shown in the current proposals is acceptable. In particular, greater variety and articulation within the different elements and rooflines of the scheme has visually broken down the massing of the scheme as it fronts onto Bury Road. Long views approaching the site from Whymark Road are now much more convincing.
- The panel also welcomes the changes to internal planning within the scheme. These changes will significantly enhance the liveability of the scheme for the residents. Provision of 41% affordable housing within the scheme is also welcomed.
- It recognises the improvements that have been made to the circulation spaces, and notes that whilst some of the internal corridors remain longer than would be ideal, on balance it feels that this is an acceptable level of compromise, as the levels of daylight have been increased within the corridors through the inclusion of extra fenestration at the ends of the corridors.
- The panel agrees with the design team that it will be very important for the courtyard space to remain open, to avoid the creation of a gated development.

### *Place-making and landscape design*

- The panel supports the naming of the central courtyard as 'Duckett's Yard' to help enhance a unique sense of place, and welcomes the aspiration to embed this as a visual theme within the signage and landscape of the space.
- The 'portal' or entrance way could be considered as part of the public art of the courtyard, and it could help to reinforce the visual theme of 'Duckett's Yard'.



- The interface between the private market housing and the play space for the affordable housing should be very carefully considered so as to avoid undermining social cohesion between the different resident groups.

#### *Architectural expression*

- At a detailed level, the architectural expression of the High Road frontage is generally working well. However, the panel wonders whether an adjustment to the relative visual proportions of the ground and first floors would present a more resolved articulation for this important façade, in addition to reinforcing a more 'civic' presence for the retail accommodation at ground level.
- Consideration of the position and size of the lowest white band within the elevation and its relation to the darker fascia adjacent could help in this regard.
- Whilst understanding the architectural aspiration underpinning the materiality of the façade fronting onto the High Road, the panel questions whether the combination of architectural metalwork and bush hammered concrete offers the most appropriate solution, as there are potentially negative associations with this palette of materials.
- The panel would encourage the design team to consider the inclusion of planters and benches (as exemplified by the Golden Lane estate), which could soften the living environment for the residents whilst enhancing levels of privacy.
- The refinements to the rear elevation of the development at Bury Road are welcomed by the panel. Varying the rhythm of the fenestration of the lower levels of accommodation creates a more dynamic and domestically-scaled architecture, whilst the set-back at the uppermost level looks convincing, and will be visually perceived as a roof due its materiality.
- The panel identifies scope for further improvement in the architecture of the hotel, with particular reference to how the building both addresses and turns the corner at the junction of Bury Road and Whymark Road. Current proposals present a solid brick wall at the corner of the building.
- The panel notes that the ground floor rooms abut the back edge of the pavement, and it questions whether this accommodation is adequately protected in terms of privacy and amenity, or whether it may be appropriate to consider how these aspects might be improved.
- The panel finds the external design of the hotel, whilst inoffensive, rather dull and uninspired, and wonders whether a more exuberant and lively building would be more appropriate here.



### *Next Steps*

The panel offer their support for the proposals, subject to the comments above. It is confident that the project team will be able to address the points raised in the review, in consultation with Haringey officers.

### **Appendix: Haringey Quality Charter**

#### **Policy DM1: Delivering High Quality Design**

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 - 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.

*Haringey Development Management DPD (2017)*

