



**Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Formal Review: High Road West**

30 January 2019

The Grange, 32-34 White Hart Lane, London N17 8DP

**Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)  
Esther Kurland  
Paddy Pugh  
Tim Pitman  
Marie Burns

**Attendees**

Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Lucy Morrow	London Borough of Haringey
Chris Smith	London Borough of Haringey
Tania Skelli	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	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
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Fred Raphael	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**

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

**2. Presenting team**

Matthew Maple	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Fagg	Lendlease
Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Allie Piehn	Studio Egret West

**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 High Road West site, approximately 11 ha, is located in the Northumberland Park ward in North Tottenham, between the Great Anglia railway line and the High Road and adjacent to Tottenham Hotspur Football Club. Policy SP1: Managing Growth identifies High Road West within the North Tottenham Growth Area. It requires development in Growth Areas to deliver new housing and business accommodation, maximise site opportunities, provide necessary infrastructure, links and benefits for local communities and surrounding areas. The application site is allocated in the Tottenham Area Action Plan (TAAP) as NT5: High Road West, which highlights the need for a comprehensive new residential neighbourhood and a new leisure destination for London. The TAAP was in part shaped by the High Road West Masterplan Framework prepared by Arup and approved in 2014. This document represents the most recent Council masterplan for the site, to be considered with the TAAC in setting the context for regeneration.

The Council's development partner, Lendlease, is preparing a masterplan to form the basis of a hybrid planning application: a detailed first phase for redevelopment of Whitehall Mews with the remainder in outline. A first review was held on 27 June 2018 which sought to highlight the key policy requirements and design principles and how these were informing evolution of the masterplan. A ballot is now required by the GLA for estate regeneration. Consequently, the panel's consideration of the evolving masterplan is sought: this includes a review of the principles; the development's approach to context, routes and connections; the approach to height and urban structure; the suitability of the masterplan for the ballot; and advice for next steps of the project.



## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the evolving masterplan, and considers that it is significantly improved. It recognises that there is an ambitious brief for the redevelopment, and that viability issues may present some difficult challenges as the scheme progresses.

The panel feels that many of the strategic design moves have been successful: shifting the massing westwards towards the railway, away from Peacock Park and Moselle Square; clarifying the residential nature of Peacock Park; and refining the layout of Moselle Square to create a more successful – and legible - route between the station and the stadium.

However, the panel still has significant concerns about the height and impact of the tallest tower fronting Moselle Square, and it is yet to be convinced about the liveability of the high-density residential blocks proposed throughout the development. The planning of these blocks appears to be based on single aspect flats with a central corridor. Greater detail on the design of these blocks will be necessary to establish whether the numbers of homes indicated can actually be delivered to an acceptable standard. The panel would also like to see the detail, layout and context of Moselle Square evolve further, in order to deliver a high-quality civic space.

Overall the panel believes that with some further reductions in scale and density, and with further refinements to their design, the evolving proposals hold much promise for the creation of high-quality residential neighbourhoods, community facilities, employment and town centre uses, and the panel looks forward to seeing it develop further. Further details are provided below.

### *Scope of the review*

The panel understands that this review is intended to consider the overall masterplan at a strategic level, rather than the detail of the component parts. As a ballot is now required for GLA-funded estate redevelopment, the scope of the review will reflect the level of information required for the ballot.

This includes:

- design principles of the proposed estate regeneration
- estimated overall number of new homes
- future tenure mix
- proposed associated social infrastructure

It is anticipated that additional reviews will be scheduled following the ballot, in order for the panel to consider the evolving details of the proposals.



*Moselle Square and the southern section of the masterplan*

- As noted at the previous review, Moselle Square presents a very difficult design challenge. It has to operate effectively on match days both as a gathering place for very large crowds and as part of the busy through-route between the stadium and station. But for most of the time it will act as a local neighbourhood centre that needs to feel safe, active and well overlooked both in the daytime and at night.
- The panel feels that the revised configuration of Moselle Square is now much improved; the adjustments to building lines that frame the space will help to open up destination views through to the stadium and the station. It understands that there is a strong aspiration to strike a successful balance between achieving containment for the space, whilst also allowing substantial pedestrian flows on event/match days.
- However, the panel considers that there is potential for the square to open up to the High Road to an even greater extent in order to increase the opportunities for passive surveillance from the High Road, which could increase the safety – and perception of safety – of Moselle Square at night time.
- At a detailed level, it would also encourage the design team to ensure that the layout and landscape scheme for Moselle Square (including the nature, scale and configuration of the buildings around it) is driven - and underpinned - by a deep understanding of the potential microclimate that will be created in the different zones of the space.
- The potential movement flows and eddies, and areas of activity within the space will also inform the hard and soft landscape strategies.
- The panel would also welcome further clarification on the nature of the roads identified as passing through (or touching) the different zones of Moselle Square, especially in terms of how access is controlled or limited. Exploration of how these routes could be made part of the public space would be welcomed.
- Concern remains over the impact of the taller buildings to the south of the masterplan – towers are potentially unfriendly structures within an urban townscape due to overshadowing and wind turbulence issues.
- Moving the primary towers away from the public space will mitigate some of the negative microclimate issues within the square, and will also give the square a more comfortable ‘human’ scale, whilst avoiding tall buildings visually looming over the central area.



- The panel would also encourage further consideration of how the taller buildings could be designed, located, configured and modelled (in three dimensions) so as to minimise negative impacts on the public realm. How these tall structures meet the ground is also a critical aspect in ensuring high quality public realm. These issues are also relevant in the north of the masterplan.
- Of the cluster of tall buildings at the south of the site, the smaller two seem to be broadly of an acceptable scale (20 and 23 storeys). However, the panel is unable to support the scale of the third tower (35 storeys). This tower would benefit from a significant further reduction to its scale, as well as moving it back from Moselle Square so that it does not overshadow and over-dominate this important public space.

*Peacock Park and the northern section of the masterplan*

- The panel welcomes the approach taken to the northern section of the masterplan, and feels that the design team has done a good job of accommodating the challenging brief for this part of the site.
- It would welcome further clarity about the legibility of the site, especially in terms of the design response to the key views in and out of the different spaces, and the detail of important elevations. The panel would encourage the design team to establish what parts of the urban fabric are most legible and meaningful, and to integrate this with the land use and massing strategies. This issue is also relevant within the south of the masterplan.
- The panel supports the move to locate the community theatre building at Moselle Square, rather than at Peacock Park – which is more of a green residential amenity space.
- Shifting the bulk of the massing westwards towards the railway – and away from the residential amenity space at Peacock Park – is a positive move. Locating the 29 storey Peacock Park tower close to the railway line at the west of the site, and generally stepping down the massing of the buildings towards the High Road will help to reduce overshadowing and negative microclimate effects on Peacock Park, and will also reduce the visual impact on the conservation area.
- The panel would encourage the design team to explore adjusting vehicular access arrangements around Peacock Park, to potentially remove one of the roads bounding the green space, whilst retaining the other vehicular routes which will provide passive surveillance.
- The panel would like to know more about the arrangements for visitor parking within the residential district.



- The open space of the park itself needs to have a good balance between space for activities, in addition to space for passive enjoyment. Consideration of the 'footprint' in plan terms of the different activities envisaged for the park will help; territorial space around these footprints should provide a buffer zone between different usages.
- The existing group of plane trees at the northern end of the masterplan area are very important in townscape terms, and the panel would encourage the design team to adjust the layout of this section of the masterplan in order to retain all of them. It notes that this may require the removal of a smaller block on the corner.

#### *Residential quality and liveability*

- The panel considers that residential development at very high densities (as proposed across the High Road West masterplan) needs to be thoroughly interrogated at a very early stage in order to establish the quality of buildings and public realm that is achievable. Otherwise the risk remains that as the detailed design progresses, the massing and configuration may not be able to deliver an acceptable quality of accommodation.
- The panel feels that the configuration and plan-form of the proposed towers and mid-rise sections of the development should be explored at a greater detail at this early stage. At the moment they seem to rely heavily on single aspect flats with a central corridor, which is likely to be unacceptable across the whole development. It will not be possible to establish the overall capacity of the site until it can be clearly demonstrated that the proposed high-density blocks can deliver an acceptable quality of living accommodation, with good sunlight and daylight, in addition to generous amenity spaces, circulation areas, entrances and storage arrangements.
- Externally, the aim should be to create attractive and comfortable public realm with good levels of sunlight and daylight, and minimal turbulence.

#### *The yards*

- As mentioned at the previous review, the proposed mixed-use yards could be an exciting interface between the High Road and the residential neighbourhood to the west.
- It will be important, however, to be clear about what type of commercial activities are likely to succeed in this location, and how these will be curated and managed.



- The relationship of workspaces to residential accommodation will have to be carefully considered. The panel considers that the proposals for the yard are a potentially lovely idea, but need to be tested to make sure that they can actually be delivered.
- The panel suggests that it may not be necessary to allow for an additional north-south pedestrian route through the yards that line the eastern side of Peacock Park. It would encourage some further exploration of this section of the masterplan.
- It may be a better approach to focus pedestrian/cycle movement on the route adjacent to Peacock Park (or on the High Road), with access to each individual yard space as a spur off the main route.

#### *High Road*

- The High Road is one of the most important pieces of existing public realm in the immediate vicinity. It is undergoing significant change with the redevelopment of the stadium.
- The panel welcomes the aspiration at the heart of the proposals to retain and repair the High Road.

#### *Next steps*

- With some further reductions in scale and density, the panel believes that the evolving proposals hold much promise for the creation of high-quality residential neighbourhoods, community facilities, employment and town centre uses.
- The panel would welcome an opportunity to consider the evolving masterplan and its component parts in greater detail, as the scheme progresses.



**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.

