



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: High Road West Developments

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Video conference

Panel

David Ubaka (chair)

Esther Everett

Tim Pitman

Andy Puncher

Paddy Pugh

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

Elisabetta Tonazzi

London Borough of Haringey

Katerina Koukouthaki

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Graham Harrington

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Kiki Ageridou

Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Phillip Elliot

London Borough of Haringey

Dean Hermitage

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

Two interrelated sites / applications within the High Road West Local Plan allocation, comprising:

- The Goods Yard, 36 and 44-52 White Hart Lane and The Depot, 867-869 High Road, Tottenham;
- The Printworks, 819-829 High Road, Tottenham.

2. Presenting team

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| Richard Serra | Tottenham Hotspur Football Club |
| Ian Laurence | F3 Architects |
| Sean Bashforth | Quod |
| Richard Coleman | Citydesigner |
| Ignus Froneman | Cogent Heritage |
| David Livesey | Re-form Landscape Architecture |

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 proposals relate to three interrelated sites, owned by Tottenham Hotspur Football Club, on the west side of the High Road: the Depot (formerly known as Sainsbury / B&Q, 867-869 High Road), the Goods Yard site (36 and 44-52 White Hart Lane) and the Printworks site (formerly known as the Banqueting Suite, 819-829 High Road). Parts of all three sites are within the North Tottenham Conservation Area and include – or are adjacent to – a number of heritage assets. All are within a Growth Area and Site Allocation NT5 (High Road West), as identified in the Tottenham Area Action Plan. Policy SP1 requires that development in Growth Areas maximises site opportunities, provides appropriate links to, and benefits for, surrounding areas and communities, provides the necessary infrastructure, and is in accordance with the full range of the Council's planning policies and objectives. Site Allocation NT5 calls for a masterplanned, comprehensive development that creates a new residential neighbourhood and leisure destination for London. It sets out a number of relevant requirements and development guidelines.

The most up-to-date masterplan is the High Road West Masterplan Framework, published September 2014. This highlights opportunities for improvement and change in the NT5 area and identifies where housing, open space and play areas, as well as community, leisure, education and health facilities and shops, could be provided.

Tottenham Hotspur Football Club intends to submit two separate 'full' planning



applications: one for the Depot and Goods Yard combined and one for the Printworks. Previous planning permissions for the sites include: 330 residential units, a shop/café (A1/A3) and area of public open space for the Depot site (September 2020); 316 residential units, employment (B1 use), retail (A1 use), leisure (A3 and D2 uses) and community (D1 use) uses for the Good Yard site (June 2019); and historic permissions for the Printworks site.

Officers seek the panel's consideration of the proposed density and consequent 'liveability' issues, the acceptability of the three proposed towers (including the reduction from 39 to 32-storeys for the middle tower), the proposed tower architecture, and the relationship with existing High Road and White Hart Lane buildings. Comments are also sought on the access and heights strategy for the proposed Printworks scheme, and the proposed loss of the locally listed 829 High Road to create a wider Brunswick Square, as part the proposed Printworks scheme.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposals for High Road West, and thanks the project team for a very comprehensive and clear presentation. It highlights that the masterplan is a significant development project and will potentially deliver a very large number of homes; in this regard, it will be important for the panel to consider the individual buildings and spaces within the masterplan, including the relationship to the conservation area and heritage assets at a much greater level of detail at future review meetings.

The panel is very pleased to see how well the project team has responded to comments made in the previous review in December 2020. The scale and massing of the two sites is improved; the panel welcomes the removal of the fourth tower, and the reduction in height of the remaining three towers. While the central tower remains higher than the 29-storey threshold, the panel feels that this could be acceptable, subject to further design refinements. The overall organisation of the site and the network of routes seems to be successful, and the initial proposals for Goods Yard Walk show promise. Further work to improve the legibility of the east-west route and to create a stronger visual link to the pedestrian and cycle route westwards beyond the railway would be welcomed.

As design work continues, the panel would encourage further consideration of the architectural form, language, and materiality of the towers and the lower buildings across both sites, in addition to improvements in the configuration and layout of the individual buildings to maximise the quality and liveability of the accommodation. Consideration of low / zero carbon design and environmental sustainability principles should also underpin and inform key decisions about orientation, layout, three-dimensional form, elevational treatments and materiality; the panel feels that these aspects should be reinforced as the proposals evolve.



Scope for improvement also remains within the landscape and public realm proposals, which should seek to create special, distinctive, and characterful places while helping to establish and support a sense of community. Further consideration of public and private realms and the interface between the two would be supported.

As the panel considers that the proposals are likely to harm the setting and views of the conservation area, a broader programme of enhancements to the conservation area should be established and agreed, in consultation with officers.

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

Scope of the review

- Due to the quantity of information presented within the limited time of a single review, discussion was focused mainly at a strategic level. It was not possible for the panel to look at the different parts of both sites in detail; it would welcome the opportunity to consider the material further, as design work continues.

Massing and development density

- The panel welcomes the removal of one of the four towers from the previous scheme, which enables a more balanced distribution of massing within the site.
- The reduction in height of the remaining towers is also supported, from 18/27/36/39 storeys (as presented to the panel in December 2020) to 27/32/29 storeys (running south to north). While the panel considers that a more appropriate threshold for the tower heights would be 29 storeys, as established in the existing consent for 867-879 High Road, it thinks that the revised tower heights within the proposals presented at review could be acceptable, subject to amendments and refinements to the detailed design, three-dimensional form, language and setting (at ground level) of the towers, outlined below.
- The northern tower with adjoining 'shoulder' buildings (the Depot) is the least successful of the towers; it lacks the elegance of proportion of the others as its footprint is wider. The junctions with the adjoining buildings also feel awkward, as they appear to 'collide' with the tower. Further consideration of the footprint and configuration of the tower and shoulder blocks would be supported.
- The Depot building forms one of the edges of the northernmost section of Peacock Park, and of the Northern Square. The building footprint has extended southwards towards the adjacent site, and now sits very close to the boundary. This relies on the neighbouring development not to build up to the boundary to avoid significant negative impacts upon the public realm. The panel would encourage further consideration of this problematic shoulder



building, in terms of three-dimensional massing and footprint, in addition to scenario planning if the scheme to the south fails to come forward, to ensure that the development will function well as a 'stand-alone' scheme.

- The building heights of the lower blocks across the two sites seem to be reasonable; however, the panel notes that it would like the opportunity to consider the proposals in further detail in terms of three-dimensional form and detailed design of the individual blocks, as this was not possible due to time constraints within the review.

Masterplan, public realm and landscape design

- At a strategic level, the panel feels that the overall organisation of the site and the street network is generally working well. The north-south route is well-considered, providing an attractive landscaped route through the site, and the location of the three towers close to the railway – and away from the High Road - seems sensible. The east-west route requires further consideration, as it lacks clarity and does not provide a clear and visible link through to the pedestrian link westwards across the railway.
- The design of the public realm will be extremely important; each open space will require its own design process, to ensure that each site becomes a distinctive, characterful, and high-quality place.
- This will be particularly relevant to the design of Brunswick Square. If the width of the space is increased by removing part of the building adjacent and setting back the building line, then this provides opportunities for a special landscape design approach in this important space that provides a key link between the High Road and the site. Consideration of the potential uses of this space would be welcomed, as this would help to define and enliven this important piece of public realm.
- The panel welcomes the creation of Goods Yard Walk at the western fringe of the site, adjacent to the railway, and feels that the terraced landscaping that steps down from the buildings into the space will be very successful.
- It understands why Goods Yard Walk has been identified as private amenity space for the residents immediately adjacent, but regrets that it is not possible to open it up – in part or in whole – to the public.

Conservation area and heritage assets

- A key question concerns the extent of the impact of the towers on the setting and views of the conservation area. Some of the images presented at review show that they will be visible – which will lend a different scale and character to the area, in contrast to that of the conservation area itself. The panel has concerns that there is potential for the towers to overwhelm the setting of buildings on the High Road. It concludes that there is likely to be some harm



to the conservation area, and in this regard, there should be a discussion about the benefits and enhancements that could offset this anticipated harm.

- There is clear national guidance that the applicant is required to demonstrate proposed enhancements that will serve to offset anticipated harm, and the panel notes that it is not yet clear what the scope of these enhancements will be. It understands that repairs to 823-829 High Road are proposed as enhancements; however, in a scheme of this size and importance the panel would expect a broader programme of further enhancements to the conservation area in mitigation of the harm caused by proposed development.

Architectural expression and building configuration

- The panel feels that some of the precedent images presented at review are lacking in richness, and don't represent the best examples. Alternative precedents could better inform the scheme's visual approach and architectural expression.
- It would encourage the design team to adopt a more coherent approach to the design of the three towers, so that they are perceived as a group. It welcomes the inclusion of glazed bricks within the elevations, but feels that the colour palette and visual language across the three towers could be closer in tone and substance, to increase the similarity while adopting subtle variations. It highlights that the Barbican towers are very successful as a group, which successfully strike a balance between similarity and subtle difference.
- Further consideration of the visual language, architectural form, materiality, and tone of the central white 'core' of accommodation within each tower would also be supported, to reduce the visual conflict with the main body of each tower. The panel understands the desire to reduce the scale of the upper floors of accommodation; however, it feels that the white 'pop-up' central core presents too much contrast with the form and texture of the richly articulated and coloured façades of the towers below.
- Due to time constraints within the review meeting, the panel has outstanding questions and comments. It was unable to consider the architectural expression, form, configuration, and layout of the lower buildings across both sites, and it feels that these should be subject to further detailed review meetings.
- It would like to know more about the rationale behind the different architectural forms and themes across both sites, and how these relate to the local context and character. It is not clear how the visual language has developed, and where the rationale for pitched roofs, flat roofs or ribbons originates.
- More information about the configuration and layout of the different buildings would also be welcomed. The panel wonders whether the lower blocks all have corridors, and questions whether there might be opportunities to



incorporate deck access, which could enable dual aspect, high-quality living environments.

- The three-dimensional form and architectural language of the shoulder buildings of the Depot would benefit from further consideration, to mitigate the awkward visual junction with the tower block and to achieve a less aggressive, calmer expression.
- The panel would encourage the design team to rigorously test the proposals for each individual building to ensure that the accommodation is of high-quality and 'liveable', in terms of what it might be like to live and work there. This should include consideration of individual dwellings, communal areas, circulation spaces and wayfinding. Good access to daylight and sunlight (in dwellings and circulation spaces) will be very important in this regard.

Low / zero carbon design and environmental sustainability

- The panel would like to know more about the strategic and detailed approach to low / zero 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, and proposals should demonstrate how they comply with these targets.
- 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. Utilising renewable energy sources, natural light, cross ventilation, and nature should form part of this work. A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as a scheme evolves.
- The panel feels that the current proposals do not seem to respond to environmental conditions. It would like to see these considerations – including orientation, layout, wind profiling, window sizes, u-values of the external envelope, and solar gain - informing the detailed design of the scheme, at both an urban scale and in regard to the design of individual buildings and dwellings.
- It would also encourage greater rigour within the evolving floorplans, designing from the 'inside out' as well as the 'outside in'. There appear to be limited numbers of dual aspect apartments, and the number of single aspect accommodation should be minimised. The development should aspire to being an exemplar in terms of quality of accommodation, as well as low / zero carbon design.



- At a detailed level, the configuration of fenestration is also very important; vertically orientated windows are less efficient than horizontally orientated windows, especially in terms of daylight penetration into rooms.

Next steps

- The panel highlights a number of action points for consideration by the design team. It would welcome further opportunities to review the proposals in detail, as design work continues.
- It expresses concern about the quantity of material being covered in a single review. It highlights that multiple reviews will be needed, to allow time for adequate consideration of the tower buildings, the lower buildings, the squares, open spaces, the design of the public realm, and the relationship to the conservation area and heritage assets. It would like to look at each building in detail.
- It also offers a focused chair's review specifically on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability, if required.



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.

