

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.

