

## Appendix 5 – QRP Reports

### Panel Review 1

**CONFIDENTIAL**



FRAME PROJECTS

#### **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Cranwood House

Wednesday 5 February 2020

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

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Esther Everett

Phyllida Mills

Craig Robertson

Lindsey Whitelaw

#### **Attendees**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliot	London Borough of Haringey
Ian Pinamonti-Hyde	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Kyriaki Ageridou	Frame Projects

#### **Apologies / report copied to**

John McRory	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**

Cranwood House, Cranwood Woodside, Highgate, London N10 3JH

**2. Presenting team**

Peter Exton	London Borough of Haringey
Sadhbh Ní Hógáin	London Borough of Haringey
Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Jo McCafferty	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Chris Lomas	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Andrew McKay	Levitt Bernstein Associates 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 application site lies within Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (SA51 – Cranwood Care Home) which provide for redevelopment comprising new residential development and improved connections linking Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk. The site is 0.43 hectares and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of two with a forecasted rating of three for 2021. It contains a vacant care home to the north of the site and a row of low-rise (predominantly) Council-owned housing to the south. Highgate Wood, a designated Historic Park, Strategic Local Open Land and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (Borough Grade II) adjoins the site's southern boundary. The southern boundary of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area is located on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue immediately to its north. St James Church of England Primary School and its playground adjoins the western boundary, with Muswell Hill Road and the Parkland Walk subway link abutting the site's eastern boundary.

The Council has embarked on an ambitious Council Housing Delivery Programme and this site could help to deliver a sizable proportion of the 1,000 homes that the Council has committed to building by 2022. Planning officers sought the panel's consideration of the proposed block / building heights, massing and the design quality of the scheme; its relationship to the surrounding area and heritage assets; the public realm proposals and linkages between Highgate Wood, the Parkland Walk and the north / northeast of the site; and the legibility of the scheme on approach to the site and within it.

The scheme presented to the panel is for the whole site; however, the site is likely to come forward in phases and the consequent planning application will be for part of the site and the remainder will be presented as a masterplan for the whole site, in line with the site allocation, in the Design and Access Statement.

## **5. Quality Review Panel's views**

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for Cranwood House at an early stage. It recognises the level of thought shown in the design process so far but considers that the brief for the development is over-ambitious. The site sits on a key corner opposite the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and adjacent to Highgate Woods, so achieving an appropriate scale, massing and texture for the development must be given the highest priority if Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD is to be met (see Appendix below).

As the scheme continues to evolve, the panel considers that the massing of the buildings fronting onto Muswell Hill Road and Woodside Avenue should be reduced significantly in order to respond better to the neighbouring context. It would also encourage a rethink of the role and nature of the central space within the site, and of the location of the pedestrian route that will link the Parkland Walk to Highgate Wood.

The architectural expression of the scheme, which is currently generic and anonymous, must draw on the special character of Muswell Hill, which implies a varied roofscape, contrasting materials and rich detailing. The panel commends the aspiration to design the buildings to Passivhaus standards and feels that the scheme could be an exemplar in this regard. Further information on the panel's view is provided below.

### *Massing and development density*

- The site sits at a prominent junction between the Muswell Hill Conservation Area to the north and Highgate Woods to the south. Its immediate context is defined by richly-detailed three storey Edwardian townhouses to the north and east, and a more plain four storey parade of shops to the south. In the panel's view, an important constraint is the need to protect the glimpsed view of Highgate Woods on the horizon when approaching the site from the north down Muswell Hill Road.
- Given this context, the panel considers that the scale and massing of the scheme proposed is wholly inappropriate. The height of two largest Buildings A and B will probably need to be reduced by at least two storeys, and the reduced massing will need to be carefully articulated to protect views of Highgate Woods. The scale of the more modest Buildings C and D adjacent to the school is considered to be broadly acceptable.

- The design team is therefore encouraged to explore other options for the massing of the development, and the Borough, as the client, is encouraged to scale back its ambition for the site to enable an appropriately-scaled development to come forward.
- Some panel members suggested that it might be possible to increase storey heights towards the rear (western) edge of the site, adjacent to the woods and the school, which would provide residents with views to the woodland and across the roofs to the east and south. While it was suggested that taller development adjacent to schools can be successful – and is not an unusual situation in London – careful modelling to reduce overshadowing of the central space would be required.

*Place-making, public realm and landscape design*

- The panel understands that the intention is to create a green link across the site that joins the Parkland Walk (from Alexandra Palace) to Highgate Wood.
- It feels that the current brief for the central space within the development is extremely challenging. As a public route, this space would become very compromised in terms of security and amenity space, as the area would be dominated by public pedestrian routes, parking spaces and entrances.
- The panel considers that providing an additional entrance into Highgate Woods directly from the central space is neither necessary nor desirable and would potentially have negative implications for security and management of the development. It would encourage the design team to liaise at an early opportunity with the City of London (which manages and funds Highgate Wood), as it may not even be a realistic or achievable aspiration for the development.
- It would also support a rethink of the role of the space, which would see it shift from a physical link to an ecological link and become a more private amenity space for the residents of the development rather than a route through to the woods beyond. There will potentially be many families living in the development, so optimising the amenity value of the central space for children will be very important.
- The panel feels that the concept of 'rewilding' the central space is interesting, and would encourage the design team to explore further how this might transform into a landscape that reflects 'soft woodland edge', to provide a green area where residents could enjoy the sun – in contrast to the woods which are very shady.
- It would be helpful to better understand the changes in level across the site in section, as this could inform a more responsive interface between the buildings and the landscape.

- Scope exists to move the parking away from the centre of the space so that the focus is on creating an attractive amenity for residents; in this regard, a centrally located structure for residents to use for social purposes could be an option. The inclusion of a potting shed was supported by the panel.
- The panel understands the aspiration to link the Parkland Walk through the centre of the site but raises a number of concerns. Approaching the site along the Parkland Walk requires entering the underpass (under Muswell Hill Road), with a blind corner at the end adjacent to Building A; this potentially poses security, safety and management issues. The Parkland Walk runs alongside Building A, which will create privacy and security issues for residents where living rooms or bedrooms face onto this route.
- The panel would encourage the design team to clarify priorities for the Parkland Walk, as this might inform a different approach to its integration within or around the development, and links into Highgate Wood.

#### *Scheme layout, access and integration*

- The panel feels that a further iteration of the scheme layout will be necessary, as the role and location of the pedestrian routes and open spaces evolve further.
- The panel welcomes the level of thought that has gone into the design of the individual blocks but feels that scope for improvement of the configuration of the units and the circulation areas remains. In particular, the layout of Building A (onto Woodside Avenue) would be improved by avoiding deck access fronting onto the street, as deck access on a main road frontage is not typical of this area and could create nuisance to local neighbours from lighting at night.

#### *Architectural expression*

- The panel would support further exploration of the local architectural context. It would welcome an approach to architectural expression that reflects the local distinctiveness of Muswell Hill, rather than the bland and generic elevational treatment shown in the current proposal.
- For instance, visual cues from local mansion blocks could be used to create a fluid language for the development – contemporary but complementing the local vernacular.
- The panel points out that enriching the exterior of the scheme in its detail, tone and contrasts can be achieved within a reasonable budget. It is confident that the design team can meet this challenge and achieve something distinctive for this important site.

*Design for inclusion, sustainability and healthy neighbourhoods*

- The panel commends the ambition to design the development to Passivhaus standards and feels that the Cranwood House development has the potential to be an exemplar scheme for the wider industry.

*Next steps*

The Quality Review Panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals and adds that panel continuity at the next review will be extremely important. It highlights a number of points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.

**Appendix: Haringey Development Management DPD**

**Policy DM1: Delivering high quality design**

<b><u>Haringey Development Charter</u></b>	
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.
<b><u>Design Standards</u></b>	
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.

## Panel Review 2

**CONFIDENTIAL**



### **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Cranwood House

Wednesday 26 August 2020

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
Esther Everett  
Craig Robertson  
Tim Pitman  
Lindsey Whitelaw

#### **Attendees**

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliot	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Shamiso Oneka	London Borough of Haringey
Kyriaki Ageridou	Frame Projects
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects

#### **Apologies / report copied to**

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Ian Pinamonti-Hyde	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Sadhbh Ní Hógáin	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**

Cranwood House, Cranwood Woodside, Highgate, London N10 3JH

**2. Presenting team**

Peter Exton	London Borough of Haringey
Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Jo McCafferty	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Matt Flannery	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Andrew McKay	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Marcus Ball	Levitt Bernstein Associates 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 application site lies within Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (SA51 – Cranwood Care Home) which provide for redevelopment comprising new residential development and improved connections linking Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk. The site is 0.43 hectares and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of two with a forecasted rating of three for 2021. It contains a vacant care home to the north of the site and a row of low-rise (predominantly) Council-owned housing to the south. Highgate Wood, a designated Historic Park, Strategic Local Open Land and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (Borough Grade II) adjoins the site's southern boundary. The southern boundary of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area is located on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue immediately to its north. St James Church of England Primary School and its playground adjoins the western boundary, with Muswell Hill Road and the Parkland Walk subway link abutting the site's eastern boundary.

The Council has embarked on an ambitious Council Housing Delivery Programme and this site could help to deliver a sizable proportion of the 1,000 homes that the Council has committed to building by 2022. Planning officers sought the panel's consideration of the revised block / building heights, massing and the design quality of the scheme; its relationship to the surrounding area and heritage assets; the public realm proposals and linkages between Highgate Wood, the Parkland Walk and the north / northeast of the site; and the legibility of the scheme on approach to the site and within it.



The scheme presented to the panel excludes the row of terraced homes that abut the wood. The current proposal seeks to retain these homes and only redevelop the land where the former care home is currently located. The proposals still show the potential future redevelopment of the row of homes within the southern part of the allocation as this is required by policy; however, this is only shown for indicative purposes.

## **5. Quality Review Panel's views**

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the evolving proposals for Cranwood House. It recognises the level of thought shown in the design process so far, and considers that the design team have done a very good job of addressing the concerns that were raised by the panel at the previous review. The panel feels that the proposals are coming together really well.

The site is located on a key corner opposite the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and adjacent to Highgate Wood. The panel supports the aspiration for the development, in addition to the reduced scale of the amended proposals. It welcomes the removal of the proposed additional pedestrian access into Highgate Wood, and supports the approach to make the courtyard function primarily as an amenity space for the residents.

The panel is generally supportive of all the broad principles of the scheme, in terms of the scale, massing, architectural expression, public realm and landscape design. However, it feels that scope remains for refinement of some of the details, especially in terms of the landscape design, the architectural expression and roofscape, and the detailed configuration of some of the units. The panel commends the aspiration to design the buildings to Passivhaus standards and feels that the scheme could be an exemplar in this regard.

The panel understands that Building A has been designed in greater detail than Buildings B and C, for which there is limited information at this stage. It notes that the review focuses primarily on the design of Building A. The panel would like to see further details of Buildings B and C at a further review, when these are available. Further information on the panel's view is provided below.

### *Massing and development density*

- The site sits at a prominent junction between the Muswell Hill Conservation Area to the north and Highgate Wood to the south. Its immediate context is defined by richly-detailed three storey Edwardian townhouses to the north and east, and a more plain four storey parade of shops to the south.
- The panel feels that the reduction in scale as outlined in the current proposals works well. The loss of two storeys in Building A onto Muswell Hill Road

results in the appearance of a five storey building, with an additional storey at the lower level in the courtyard to bring it to six storeys in total. The panel feels that this is appropriate for the site's location.

- The scale of Building B works well, as it mediates between the scale of the block onto Muswell Hill Road and the scale of the school adjacent. The scale of Building C could potentially be increased by a storey, which could help to set a new scale - and also typology - for any future redevelopment of the terraces adjacent.
- While accepting that the partial view of Highgate Wood behind the development is not formally recognised or protected, the panel feels that having a glimpsed visual link in some way to the trees beyond is important, when approaching the site from the north down Muswell Hill Road. Retaining a glimpsed view between the separate buildings within the site might be a successful way of preserving a visual link.

*Place-making, public realm and landscape design*

- The panel welcomes the removal of the proposed additional pedestrian access into Highgate Wood from within the site, and supports the approach to make the courtyard function primarily as an amenity space for the residents.
- It would like to see more detail about the design and landscape proposals for the central courtyard space – and it would encourage the design team to be more explicit about the intended uses and activities that will occur within the different parts of the space.
- There will potentially be many families living in the development, so optimising the amenity value of the central space for children will be very important. In this regard, the panel would encourage the design team to establish a more integrated and responsive play strategy that also looks beyond the site to the different types of existing play provision in the area.
- Consideration of how a child would use the space is important, alongside identifying potential opportunity for doorstep play. While Highgate Wood is close at hand, this is not always an appropriate place for all ages to play, so good amenity play on site is required. The panel notes that the opportunity exists to create interesting natural play on the woodland edge bank.
- The panel understands the design team's aspiration to increase footfall, activity and natural surveillance at the junction of the underpass and the site, through the inclusion of steps up to pavement level on Muswell Hill Road, but notes that this will also reduce the level of greenery and tree cover at this important edge of the site. Further consideration of how to incorporate or retain further trees and greenery would be supported.

- Careful consideration of how to design the landscape and public realm to enhance the privacy of the accommodation in Building A that faces onto the pedestrian route and stairs would also be welcomed.

#### *Scheme layout*

- The panel supports the work that has been undertaken to adjust and refine the broader configuration and more detailed layout of the proposals, and feels that generally it has been very successful.
- While at the previous review the panel expressed some concerns about the inclusion of deck access to some of the blocks within the development, it now feels very reassured by the evolving detail and design of the circulation, and thinks that the deck access could work well, subject to some further refinement.
- The panel notes that the decks provide access to limited numbers of units per floor, and they also include bays and seating areas, which are potentially very positive. However, at a detailed level it would encourage some further consideration of the design of the deck area, especially in terms of achieving a good level of privacy outside bedroom windows that face onto the deck.
- In addition, careful design and integration of the deck lighting within the soffit should minimise nuisance at night-time.
- Further consideration of the floor plans of the individual dwellings would also be supported, to ensure that there is enough generosity, especially within kitchen / dining / living areas, access to balcony areas, and storage space. Some of the current plans seem a little constrained in this regard, especially within the maisonettes onto Woodside Avenue. It would ideally like to see a width of more than three metres for the dining / kitchen areas.
- The panel welcomes the inclusion of a generous bicycle store, and would encourage the design team to consider additional security measures for accessing the bike store. One option to explore could include locating a ramped bicycle store access from the rear of the building, in the courtyard.

#### *Architectural expression*

- The panel welcomes the thorough site and context analysis, but would also encourage the design team to explore contemporary precedents of the mansion block typology for additional inspiration.
- The architectural expression of the current scheme looks very promising; however the panel feels that there is scope for some further refinements.

- It welcomes the approach to the articulation of the two types of bays, and the potential – in some parts of the development - to 'read' each individual dwelling externally through different visual cues.
- The panel would also encourage the design team to increase the ground floor storey heights to 2.6m (floor to ceiling), to avoid the lowest levels appearing visually 'squashed'.
- It highlights that within the local context, bay windows do not always extend to the top storey, and that this approach would be very interesting to explore within the scheme. It would allow the removal of the roof of the 'bay' device within the deck access, which could be open to the sky, which would also reduce the visual perception of the building's bulk.
- At a detailed level, it also notes that some of windows at top floor level have high sills; and it would encourage the design team to incorporate lower sills, which would enable much better views.
- The panel welcomes the generous entrance into Building A that provides a good view to the parkland walk; however, as it is largely glazed it has a very 'commercial' feel. It would encourage the design team to include craftsmanship elements at the entrance, to provide texture and interest at a more human scale. Pottery elements would work well, and would provide a link back to the site's heritage.
- At roof level, the panel notes that inset dormers are not characteristic of the area, and it wonders whether further work could explore the possibility of a greater level of exuberance and interest within the form or detail of the roof. Currently, the panel feels that the roofscape lacks interest and articulation.
- The opportunity exists to defray additional expenditure on roofscape articulation through a simpler roofline on Woodside Avenue, removing the top balconies.
- The panel would like to see more information about Buildings B and C; and notes that the flank walls to Buildings B and C are potentially prominent.

*Design for inclusion, sustainability and healthy neighbourhoods*

- As at the previous review, the panel commends the ambition to design the development to Passivhaus standards and feels that the Cranwood House development has the potential to be an exemplar scheme for the wider industry.

*Next steps*

The Quality Review Panel highlights a number of points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers. It would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals - either as a full panel review or as a chair's review - especially additional information for blocks B and C, the smaller flatted block and the new terrace proposals. Panel continuity at the next review will be extremely important.

**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.

## Panel Review 3

**CONFIDENTIAL**



### **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Cranwood House

Wednesday 02 December 2020

Video Conference

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Phyllida Mills

#### **Attendees**

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Shamiso Oneka	London Borough of Haringey
Katerina Koukouthaki	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliot	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Hanako Littlewood	Frame Projects

#### **Apologies / report copied to**

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Ian Pinamonti-Hyde	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	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**

Cranwood House, Cranwood Woodside, Highgate, London N10 3JH

**2. Presenting team**

Sadhbh Ní Hógáin	London Borough of Haringey
Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Jo McCafferty	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Matt Flannery	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Andrew McKay	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Marcus Spaul	Levitt Bernstein Associates 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 application site lies within Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (SA51 – Cranwood Care Home) which provides for redevelopment comprising new residential development and improved connections linking Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk. The site is 0.43 hectares and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of two with a forecasted rating of three for 2021. It contains a vacant care home to the north of the site and a row of low-rise (predominantly) Council-owned housing to the south. The scheme presented to the panel excludes the row of terraced homes that abut the wood. Highgate Wood, a designated Historic Park, Strategic Local Open Land and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (Borough Grade II) adjoins the site's southern boundary. The southern boundary of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area is located on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue immediately to its north. St James Church of England Primary School and its playground adjoins the western boundary, with Muswell Hill Road and the Parkland Walk subway link abutting the site's eastern boundary.

Officers would welcome the panel's views on the overall design quality of the scheme and especially the detailed design of Buildings B and C, and the deck area to Building A. In addition, comments on the amenity value of the central space and the wider play strategy, and the development's relationship to the surrounding area and heritage assets, would be valuable.

**5. Quality Review Panel's views***Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the scheme for Cranwood House as it continues to evolve. It feels that the proposals are coming together well, and it commends the attention to detail that is articulated within the drawings. The panel is supportive of the approach to scale, massing, architectural expression, public realm and landscape design. The proposals strike a successful balance between respecting the scale of the local context while optimising the development potential of the site for much-needed housing. Proposed public realm improvements to the pedestrian route running adjacent to the site along Muswell Hill Road, linking the Parkland Walk (North) to Highgate Wood, will represent a significant benefit to the local community. The panel also applauds the aspiration to design the buildings to Passivhaus standards and feels that the scheme could be an exemplar in this regard.

As design work continues, scope remains for refinement of some aspects at a detailed level: the architectural detail at eaves/parapet level of Buildings A, B and C; the three-dimensional design of the gallery/deck spaces, including lighting design; and the design of the public realm and the interface with private areas. Opportunities to further adopt and reinforce links to local heritage within the detailed design of materials and elements would also be welcomed.

The panel offers warm support for the scheme, subject to resolution of the detailed points outlined below.

*Massing and development density*

- While the height of the development's frontage onto Muswell Hill Road is greater than the prevailing height in the locality, the development sits below pavement level, in the former railway cutting, which reduces the visual impact on the street. The proposals strike a successful balance between respecting the scale of the local context while optimising the development potential of the site.
- The panel welcomes the increase of an additional storey to the two new townhouses (Building C), bringing them to three storeys in height.

*Place-making, public realm and landscape design*

- The panel commends the detailed landscape designs, although it feels that further attention could be given to the thresholds between private and public space. The way in which these are 'graded' through the design of the landscape - from planters on the edge of plots, to gardens and the courtyard - will help to make a high-quality, liveable environment.



- The panel notes that the landscape within and around the site will need to be well maintained and managed. Careful consideration and management of parking provision will also be required. Including electric vehicle charging points within the parking spaces may be prudent.
- The creation of a high quality pedestrian route along the edge of the site at Muswell Hill Road will represent a real benefit to the local community. This also offers an opportunity to rationalise - and minimise - existing street clutter, such as the utility boxes located near the main entrance.
- Provision of a new wall/parapet on Muswell Hill Road, together with high quality planting, will enhance the streetscape and will offer further opportunities to reinforce links to the heritage of the site. This could include signage or motifs that celebrate the Parkland Walk, or the route of the former railway.

#### *Scheme layout and architectural expression*

- The scheme layout and architectural expression of the current proposals are promising, although scope for refinement at a detailed level remains.
- Further refinement of the gallery/deck areas would help to create well-designed areas that have good levels of natural daylight and allow views through into the courtyard. Adjusting the depth of these gallery spaces (particularly at the junction of the two wings of Building A), through varying or cutting back the overhang of the deck above, would increase the quality and liveability of these areas, and avoid them feeling 'institutional'. Reducing the depth of the deck above the main entrance could also allow for a greater perceived view through to the courtyard, for those entering or passing by.
- As part of this work, breaking the roofline at the junction of the two wings of Building A - through reducing or removing the roof element of the uppermost gallery - would achieve greater visual separation of the two blocks, while 'opening up' the gallery space to the sky.
- The lighting design of the deck and gallery areas should also be very carefully considered, to avoid nuisance to neighbours. A view of the proposals at night-time – particularly along Woodside Avenue - should be submitted as part of the application, to illustrate the lighting design strategy.
- The panel welcomes the use of different textures and enriched details that reference the local area within the architectural expression. Further opportunities for incorporating visual clues to the site's heritage would be supported. This could include the choice of materials, the use of motifs, text or signage, and the design of gates and balconies.

- Further refinement of the precast concrete band at the top of the balconies and bays would be supported, to ensure that it does not obscure the brick details at eaves level when seen from below. It will be a visually prominent feature of the building and finding ways to soften or articulate its appearance of this element would be beneficial.
- The parapet detail on the two new town-houses (Building C) is currently very simple, and the panel feels that this would benefit from further articulation or detail to help reinforce the visual links between the townhouses and Buildings A and B.
- Overall, the attention to detail within the scheme is highly commendable; it is important that the emphasis on high-quality materials and details is retained throughout the technical design and construction process. The panel would support officers achieving this through planning conditions.

*Design for inclusion, sustainability and healthy neighbourhoods*

- As at the previous review, the panel commends the ambition to design the development to Passivhaus standards and feels that the Cranwood House development has the potential to be an exemplar scheme for the wider industry.
- It understands that achieving these standards has informed the choice of materials, especially at roof level where the use of contemporary materials and detailing will enable substantial levels of insulation within the mansard roof.

*Next steps*

The Quality Review Panel highlights a number of detailed design points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers. However, it would also be happy to undertake a final review of the scheme following submission of the planning application, 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.

## **Appendix 6 – Development Management Forum minutes**

### Summary of Discussion Topics

- Further consultation required
- Density is excessive
- Height is excessive
- Design is inappropriate
- Internal layouts require further work
- More details on trees required
- Negative impact on Parkland Walk
- Greater mixing of tenures
- Protect Highgate Wood
- Consider impact on bats
- Management of communal areas
- Overlooking towards adjacent school
- Ensure archaeology is fully assessed
- Lack of parking on site
- Hydrological surveys required
- School place availability
- Management of construction works

## **Appendix 7 – Pre-Application Committee minutes**

### Summary of Discussion as Recorded in the Printed Minutes

Robbie McNaugher, Planning, provided an overview of the proposal for the demolition of former Cranwood residential care home; and erection of 2 buildings, 1 of 4 storeys and 1 of 8 storeys, to deliver 42 homes. 36 homes (86%) would be affordable Council homes let at council social rent levels. The drawings also identified indicative proposals for a potential further development to the south of the site which satisfied the requirement to masterplan the entire site set out in the site allocation (SA51).

Clerks note: The Chair resolved to suspend standing orders to allow the meeting to continue until 10.15pm.

Councillor Ogiehor addressed the Committee. She supported the need for Council, but felt disappointed that there had been no engagement with Ward Councillors throughout the planning process. Cllr Ogiehor agreed with the QRP assessment that the design did not attempt to complement the street scape.

Councillor Hare addressed the Committee. He requested that a development management forum be set up to allow other partners and organisations to be consulted on the scheme. The local area was an important wildlife area, and the application would require a full ecological impact assessment.

The Chair requested that officers provide information to local Ward Members who were not Members of the Planning Committee.

Members commented that there was not much detail in the pre-app to be able to give much feedback