

## Appendix 6: Previous application Quality Review Panel Report

**CONFIDENTIAL**



### **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: 26 - 28 Brownlow Road

Wednesday 15 November 2017

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

### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Phyllida Mills

### **Attendees**

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Tobias Finlayson	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
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.

Report of Haringey Quality Review Panel  
15 November 2017  
HQR60\_CR\_26-28 Brownlow Road

**1. Site address**

26 – 28 Brownlow Road, London, N11 2DE

**2. Presenting team**

Simon Gerrard	Abbeytown Ltd
Richard Maltese	Richard Maltese Architects Ltd
Simon Grainger	Grainger Planning Associates Ltd
Gareth Jones	Peter Stewart Consultancy

**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 planning permission (HGY/2016/3130) was granted in October 2016 for the erection of two no. three bed detached dwellings with parking, cycle and refuse storage and formation of an access.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with purpose-built blocks of flats, conversions and single-family dwellings. The site has an excellent (6a) PTAL rating.

The site itself is not located within any conservation areas, does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building and is not subject to any other planning designations. It currently has two deep plots located on the eastern side of Brownlow Road. Two houses currently occupy the site, which would be demolished as part of the scheme.



## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel feels that the combined sites at 26-28 Brownlow Road offer great potential for redevelopment due to their proximity to Bounds Green Underground Station. Whilst it welcomes the plans to replace the two low-density houses on the combined site with a higher density residential scheme, the panel considers that some further refinements to the proposal will be required in order to ensure that the development fulfils its obvious potential.

The panel broadly supports the scale and configuration of the development; however, it feels that scope remains to improve the entrance and circulation of the main block of accommodation, the quality and accessibility of the communal garden, and the arrangements for servicing and cycle storage. The panel would also encourage further consideration of the ground floor plan in the south-eastern corner of the main block, and some refinement of the fenestration and architectural expression. Further details of the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing and development density*

- The panel broadly supports the scale and configuration of the development, and notes that the development of the mews houses at the rear of the site have been granted approval under a previous planning application.

### *Place-making, character and landscape design*

- The panel would encourage further consideration of the configuration of (and access into) the communal garden. Currently the bin and cycle storage is located at the midpoint of the communal garden, and effectively breaks the external space in two.
- The panel would encourage the design team to relocate the bin and cycle storage within the main block of accommodation, to enable the creation of a high quality communal garden that is accessible to all of the residents on site.
- The proposed hard landscaping and vehicular access should be carefully considered; the use of a shared surface material for vehicular access and parking could also help to enhance the quality of the garden area.
- A mature beech tree is located in the middle of the site; this should be retained if possible, and the anticipated site decontamination should be carried out in such a way as to avoid damage to this important tree.



*Scheme layout*

- The panel question whether the two front entrances into the main block allow for sufficiently generous arrival space. Currently the two entrance lobbies are very constrained, whilst a lot of space is devoted to long corridors linking the two cores.
- A single entrance could allow for a more efficient re-configuration of the ground floor circulation, freeing up space for a generous hallway, with space for residents' mailboxes and deliveries.
- The panel welcomes the provision of two lifts, which will mitigate against potential access issues caused by maintenance or breakdown of one of the lifts.
- Exploration of a re-configured entrance area should also seek to make the stairs as convenient and accessible as possible. Residents on the first floor would most likely prefer to use the stairs, and it would be positive in terms of health to encourage the use of the stairs by residents.
- The panel also suggests a re-think of the south-eastern corner of the main block at ground floor level, where bedroom windows are tight up against the access road to the rear houses.
- One solution would be to remove the residential unit in this location, and use this space to relocate the bin and cycle storage areas from the garden. This would allow convenient access from the internal circulation.
- The panel notes that the building line of the main block has been pushed slightly further forward, and that as a result the defensible space in front of the block has been reduced. Careful consideration of this interface is required in order to ensure that the privacy and amenity of the ground floor units on the primary frontage is not compromised.
- The development of townhouses at the rear of the site has already been granted permission in principle, so is beyond the scope of the review. However, the design team may wish to explore adjusting the internal floor plans of these units, which could significantly improve the quality of the accommodation.
- For instance, the living room would benefit from being located at the rear of the property, which would take advantage of the higher ceilings under the sloping roof, in addition to access to the garden.



*Architectural expression*

- The panel feels that the architectural expression of the development could be very elegant, subject to some refinement. It will be important to specify a high quality brick, and to carefully consider construction detailing.
- The panel suggests that the symmetry of the facades could be relaxed to allow the internal configuration to be reflected in the external elevations.
- Moving away from the constraints of symmetry would enable more appropriate fenestration for the individual rooms. In this regard, the panel notes that in current proposals, some bedrooms have full-height glazing and balcony doors, whilst other rooms have relatively small areas of glazing. Further thought about bedroom windows could achieve a better balance of privacy and light.
- The panel considers that the extensively glazed stairs on the front façade could create unwelcome light spill at night, and the large area of west facing glass may also result in overheating.

*Inclusive and sustainable design*

- The panel welcomes the aspiration for the scheme to be cycle friendly, with good levels of cycle storage and a reduction in car parking.
- However, in the current scheme, the cycle storage is not located conveniently for residents in the main building; the expectation for a premium development in this location would be for a highly accessible and convenient cycle store.
- The panel would encourage the design team to explore a more integrated approach to cycle storage. This might include relocating the cycle storage into the main block of accommodation (as noted above), and creating a 'wet lobby' within the main entrance/core that can accommodate the passage of cycles through to the cycle store.
- The panel considers that it is not good practice to put cycles in the same space as bin storage, and would encourage provision of separate areas.

*Next Steps*

- The panel highlights a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.

**Appendix: Haringey Quality Charter****Policy DM1 Delivering High Quality Design**

All development is required to be of a high standard of design and compatible with, and contributing to, the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council expects proposals to be design-led, and will support proposals for new development that:

- a) make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
- b) relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
- c) confidently address feedback from local consultation;
- d) demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
- e) is inclusive and incorporates sustainable design and construction principles.

*Haringey Consultation Draft Development Management Policies DPD (2015)*

