



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review of 867-879 High Road

Wednesday 13 March 2019

River Park House, 225 High Rd, Wood Green, London N22 8HQ

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
David Ubaka
Joanna Sutherland
Phil Armitage
Wen Quek

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
James Hughes	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Lucy Morrow	London Borough of Haringey
Christine Wood	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Adela Paparisto	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Fred Raphael	London Borough of Haringey
Matthew Maple	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.

1. Project name and site address

867 – 879 High Road, Tottenham, London N17 8EY

2. Presenting team

Richard Serra	Tottenham Hotspur Football Club
Sean Bashforth	Quod
Rebecca Burnhams	Quod
Adrian Ball	F3 Architects LLP
Eike Sindlinger	Arup
Guy Denton	Reform

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's views

The application site is 1.2ha and primarily contains a large format retail unit (trading as a B&M Store) and surface car park. The site also includes a Grade II listed building (867 and 869 High Road) within the eastern site boundary, together with a row of five small retail units towards the south of the site. It lies within a wider strategically allocated parcel of land (NT5 - High Road West), pursuant to the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP). A masterplan (adopted in 2014) is in place for the area (the High Road West Masterplan Framework). The NT5 site allocation for the wider area calls for a masterplanned comprehensive development, creating a new residential neighbourhood and a new leisure destination. It also envisages a new high quality public square and an expanded local shopping centre, as well as an uplift in the amount and quality of open space and improved community infrastructure. Site requirements indicate that the applicant's development should accord with the principles set out in the most up to date council approved masterplan.

Only matters of site access and heritage matters are proposed to be set out in the outline planning application, with other matters being reserved. Planning officers are concerned that the current proposal may foreclose progression of a more comprehensive site wide development in the strategically allocated area, and may prejudice comprehensive infrastructure provision. Planning officers seek the panel's view of the applicant's proposals at both a strategic level and at a detailed level in terms of the indicative buildings, circulation and access, open space proposals, parking, and the relationship to existing context. They would also welcome comments on the scope and approach of a design code for the scheme.



6. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to comment on the scheme at the pre-application stage. At a strategic level, the panel broadly supports the proposals which seem generally in line with the adopted 2014 masterplan. The level of detail available did not allow for a comprehensive review of the proposed buildings and spaces; the panel would like to see the scheme again, to enable a more thorough review of the indicative proposals, parameter plans and design codes.

As an initial response, the panel identifies scope for refinement of the design and layout of Blocks B/A, G and D. It would also like to see a greater level of detail on these aspects of the development, in addition to the relationship of the scheme to Mallory House, adjacent to the site at the north. Further consideration of the secondary spaces within the site would also be welcomed, to include the courtyard spaces and shared playspace.

The panel expresses concern about how quality will be secured through an outline application for this part of the wider masterplan area. It would like to see the scheme again, when more detail is available. Parameter plans and design codes will need to be very carefully considered in order to control the key elements that will establish the scheme's quality. In addition, the panel thinks that the detailed component of the hybrid planning application should extend to cover Block D as well as Block G.

Further details of the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- At a strategic level, the panel broadly supports the massing of the proposals, which seem generally in line with the adopted 2014 masterplan.
- The panel is broadly happy with the scale of the proposed tower but feels that more work is needed to refine its design in the context of local and long-distance views. The tower would be the tallest in the group of towers in the immediate vicinity and the panel wonders how the group will be perceived, both at close quarters and from further afield.
- In general terms, while broadly supporting the proposals, the panel feels that there is insufficient detail to be able to adequately assess the quality of the proposals.
- It would like to see the indicative proposals worked up in greater detail in order to resolve some of the issues noted below. The parameter plans and design codes will need to carefully set down critical requirements. In addition, the panel would also like to see the detailed element of the hybrid planning application extended to cover Block D because of its prominent position fronting the open space and its close proximity to Mallory House to the rear..



Place-making, public realm and landscape design

- The panel welcomes the detailed approach to the design of the landscape and thinks that the key aspects of the public realm proposals should be secured in detail through the planning process (at the reserved matters stage).
- It would encourage further consideration of how a 'sense of arrival' (into the site at the High Road, and at the new park) might be fostered through the design of the public realm.
- The increase in connectivity eastwards, through and beyond the site, is supported.
- The panel considers that the potential future pedestrian crossing westwards over the railway is clearly a desirable objective. If this is identified by the local planning authority as a policy objective, the scheme should demonstrate that it would not prejudice its implementation..
- The boundaries between what is public space and what is private space need more consideration, especially with regard to the central courtyard spaces created within the scheme. Additional work to refine the detailed design of these spaces and the ground floor edges of the buildings that enclose them would be welcomed.
- While the heritage court (Pickford Yard Gardens, bounded by Block G) has a good sense of enclosure, the panel considers that the tower court (Embankment Gardens) needs a more defined edge to the west, to avoid the space 'leaking' out.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of the location of car parking; it would like to see the parking in front of Block D (facing onto the park) relocated to the side streets, to enhance the setting and visual qualities of the park.
- The panel considers that the proposed location of a shared playspace at the north-eastern corner of the site will present significant design challenges.
- As it is intended to be a secure playspace for the adjacent school during the day, it will need high fencing which will significantly alter the nature of this important corner onto the High Road. The high fencing will make the space look private; the panel wonders how this will work out-of-hours when the space becomes a public facility.
- The detailed design of the boundary treatments will also need to be carefully considered, in order to strike a balance between not wanting passive surveillance when the school is using the space with the need for passive surveillance when the local community is using it.



- The management of the space will also need to be carefully considered in terms of how it is lit at night, and how anti-social behaviour is avoided.

Scheme layout, and architectural expression

- The panel was not able to consider all the indicative proposed buildings within the scheme due to limited time and available information. It would welcome the opportunity to review the proposals when more details are available.
- The design of the open spaces (and the blocks that bound them) should be carefully considered in order to minimise privacy and nuisance issues for residents of ground floor properties.
- The panel would also like to see more information on Block G; it currently remains to be convinced by the proposals for this importantly located building, which will provide a setting for the Grade II listed 867 and 869 High Road.
- It would encourage further consideration of the layout and typology of Block G, in order to enhance the quality of accommodation, and the nature of the spaces immediately adjacent to the building.
- Concern remains that a significant proportion of the ground floor frontage of Block G is cycle and bin storage, which does not contribute to the activity, character and quality of the public realm. The panel would also encourage the design team to avoid upper-level corridors on main frontages where possible.
- Options to consider include the provision of two cores within Block G (which would enable the division of the bin/cycle stores), town houses at ground floor, plus the potential for multi-generational homes.
- The panel recommends that the proposals for Block G and its immediate setting form part of the 'detail' component of the hybrid planning application.
- Block D is also in a primary position, terminating a key view from the new park. It should not be a generic 'background' building but should have an architectural expression that is visually special, to acknowledge its importance in the local context.
- The northern elevation of Block D will also require careful consideration, due to its proximity to the rear of the existing Mallory House. The panel would like to see a cross section of the buildings (and space between) and would also like to understand the nature of the windows that will look directly onto the balconies opposite.
- Due to Block D's importance within the overall masterplan (and close proximity to Mallory House), it feels that the design of the building should also be included within the detailed part of the hybrid planning application.



- While the height of the tower (Block B) is potentially acceptable, the panel thinks that scope for improvement remains in relation to the orientation, three-dimensional form, roofline and expression of the block. Sculpting the massing and profile of the tower could mitigate the impact of the tower in long distance views.
- The expression and materiality of the tower does not need to reference the existing tower to the north; the panel would encourage an architectural approach that brings character, depth and detail to the elevations. Brick façades may work well in this regard.
- The easternmost corner of the tower accommodates plant and a cycle store at ground level, resulting in a relatively blank façade terminating the view from the High Road, and marking the entrance to the tower itself.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of this key area; options to explore could include altering the layout and configuration of the tower and Block A (adjacent), to more effectively 'turn the corner' within the streetscape.
- The panel also considers that the bin stores would be more appropriately accommodated away from the front elevation of the building.
- It considers that a large tower needs a substantial – and highly visible – entrance, and would encourage the design team to significantly increase the generosity of the arrival area and lobby, and consider the design in terms of the practicalities of mail boxes, deliveries, concierge facilities etc. A double-height lobby area can work well within a tower building.

Sustainable design

- The panel would like to know more about the impact of the proposals on the local microclimate. Daylight/sunlight studies and wind analysis will be important and should inform the continuing design process as well as measure the impact of the final proposals.
- In order to minimise overshadowing of the park by the tower at the west of the site, the panel would encourage consideration of shaping the corners of the block to increase the levels of direct sunlight.
- A 'zero carbon' target for the development is potentially very challenging; principles for passive design should inform development of the design at an early stage. Key considerations will be daylighting, heating and cooling.
- The panel would encourage the design team to explore issues that will become increasingly important as the climate changes. The need to switch from gas-fired boilers to electric boilers may become a requirement in the future.



Next steps

The Quality Review Panel would welcome the opportunity to consider the proposals at a further review, when more detailed information is available, particularly on the issues identified in its comments.

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.

