



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: High Road West

Wednesday 28 April 2021

Video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Dieter Kleiner
Joanna Sutherland
Paddy Pugh
Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliot	London Borough of Haringey
Graham Harrington	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Kiki Ageridou	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Stéphane Pietrzak	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Tim Starley-Grainger	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

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

2. Presenting team

Matthew Maple	London Borough of Haringey
Greg Greasley	Lendlease
Nick Bromell	Lendlease
Selena Mason	Lendlease
Avni Mehta	Lendlease
Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Alix Roberts	Studio Egret West
Nick James	Studio Egret West
Chris Goddard	DP9
Katharine Woods	DP9
Chris Hartley	DP9

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 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. North Tottenham is a diverse neighbourhood with many different characteristics, land uses, urban structures, typologies, and a rich heritage. Parts of the site also fall within the North Tottenham Conservation Area which includes several Statutory and Locally Listed Buildings. 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 Tottenham Area Action Plan was in part shaped by the High Road West Masterplan Framework prepared by Arup and approved by the Council's Cabinet in 2014. This document represents the latest Council 'masterplan' for the site and should be considered with the Tottenham



Area Action Plan in setting the context for regeneration in this location. The Council's development partner, Lendlease, is preparing a masterplan to form the basis of a hybrid planning application. Previous reviews were held in 2018 and 2019; since the scheme was last reviewed, the applicant team have secured grant funding from the Greater London Authority which makes the delivery of policy compliant levels of affordable housing more viable. The ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority funded estate regeneration process will take place in June 2021.

The panel's consideration of the evolving masterplan is sought. This includes a review of the vision, objectives, and masterplan principles; the development's approach to context, routes, and connections; the potential impact on heritage assets; the approach to height, massing, and urban structure; and advice on the next steps for the project.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to re-visit the draft proposals and strategic approach for High Road West at an early stage. It considers that the project is clearly very challenging, with some significant constraints and factors, including the need to decant residents from the existing housing estate, crowd management on match days, the relationship to the station, the concentration of different activities and the impact on the Tottenham High Road Conservation Area. In this regard, High Road West represents one of the most complex current regeneration schemes in London.

The panel thinks that the review provided a very useful overview of the proposals, with exploration of the conceptual arrangements, for example block footprints, movement flows and character areas. While some of the strategic changes are positive and are moving the scheme in the right direction – especially the evolving design of Moselle Square and the new library and learning centre – the panel is not yet convinced by the proposals as a whole. The scale and density of the scheme remains highly ambitious and a lot more work is needed at a detailed level to test an appropriate development density and massing for the site from the point of view of residential quality and liveability. These tests should include: greater scrutiny of the detailed configuration and layout of individual blocks; the detail of servicing and circulation at ground floor level; the microclimate within the public realm and open spaces; daylight and general amenity of the accommodation internally; and impact on the Tottenham High Road Conservation and on the residential neighbourhood to the west of the railway. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- The panel has concerns about a scheme of this scale and density in this location; the proposed scale and density of the master plan is similar to that



being built at more central locations such as Tottenham Hale, Stratford, and King's Cross, yet the public transport accessibility here is much poorer.

- It is important to ensure that the scheme is not being driven solely by the quantum of housing, without regard to the quality and liveability of the places created.
- There are a significant number of quite complex blocks within the masterplan; the panel is not convinced that this quantum can fit comfortably within the location and thinks that the development density may need to reduce to enable high quality residential environments, public realm, and open spaces.
- It would like to see testing of the blocks at a detailed level, to ensure that there is a high level of residential liveability, in terms of the configuration of the accommodation, floor plans, circulation, bin and cycle storage, orientation and daylight / sunlight levels. In addition, examination of the microclimate within the public realm and in key spaces will be critical.
- It will also be important to break the overall masterplan into smaller parcels of land and to consider these in detail, which should include sections through the site (and into adjacent areas), alongside the detailed tests outlined above.
- This will be especially important regarding the relationship to existing houses to the west of the railway. Moving the taller buildings within the masterplan towards the railway (and away from the High Road) is a sensible approach. However, the panel notes that this could result in a 'wall' of development alongside the railway, when viewed from the neighbouring streets to the west. It will be important to explore this relationship through site sections and view studies, and to mitigate negative impacts through design where possible.
- The panel would also like to know more about the mix of unit sizes, type, and tenure, and about the nature of the community that will be established at High Road West. It also questions whether a development comprised predominantly of apartments is appropriate.

Residential quality and liveability

- A key question (at a high development density) is how the ground floor is managed. This includes circulation, natural surveillance, servicing, bin stores, cycle stores and the nature of the building's frontage onto key parts of the public realm. These aspects all present huge challenges at higher densities; exploration of how these issues may be resolved will be crucial even at outline stage.
- It notes that the inclusion of a podium can potentially provide opportunities to successfully integrate many of these requirements and can also facilitate the provision of a central courtyard at first floor level.



- The panel highlights that configuring residential accommodation as double-loaded corridors of single aspect units does not typically result in high-quality, liveable development, especially at higher densities. Greater generosity within layouts and circulation spaces, alongside responsive and intelligent configuration of units can help to deliver dual aspect, high quality places to live, that will respond well to the microclimate.
- Block L1 in the northern half of the masterplan looks like a perimeter block with double-loaded corridors. The panel questions what the internal courtyard would be like and notes that at 6-8 storeys, a courtyard of these proportions may be acceptable, but at 10 to 26 storeys it would significantly compromise the quality of the accommodation orientated into the courtyard, especially at the lower floors.
- It also highlights blocks D1 and F1 as having very constrained ground floor footprints that would be unlikely to accommodate all of the functions necessary at entry level.
- Residential accommodation at ground floor level of tall buildings can present significant challenges in terms of privacy and amenity. The panel wonders whether inclusion of alternative uses at ground floor may be more appropriate, for example cultural or creative uses.

Placemaking and public realm

- The panel welcomes the scenario testing as part of the design development of Moselle Square. The adjustments to the design of the square are positive, including shifting roads, activating corners, and increasing the scale of the route. Locating the library at the entry to the square and reducing the scale of the building through the inclusion of landscaped terraces will help to provide visual links between the square and the High Road and should provide a level of activity and surveillance at quieter times. The library is potentially a very exciting project and could become an important visual route-marker.
- Inclusion of a drainable water feature is welcomed; it will allow for the movement of crowds on match days, and enhance the square at other times. However, the panel questions whether low-level planters (as shown in one of the sketches) will be robust enough to withstand the volume of pedestrians on match days; it would encourage further input from a specialist in managing crowd flows into stadiums.
- Love Lane is a key route within the masterplan. More information about its proposed nature and character – and how it will be distinctive from other parts of the masterplan and local area – would be welcomed.



- The panel questions how the masterplan can meet the London Plan requirements for open space and recreation areas, given that the development density has increased by approximately 75% since the 2014 masterplan. The nearest existing open space is a graveyard, which would not meet the requirements for children's play.
- It would also like to know more about the detailed proposals for Peacock Park. The panel considers that the aspirations for the green space may be optimistic in the light of possible constraining issues, for example access and servicing around the edges of the space. It notes that the park will have residential accommodation along one of the edges, while another edge comprises light industry / retail yards. Consideration of how this might inform the design and uses within the park would be welcomed.
- Exploration of the microclimate within Peacock Park would be supported. The panel is concerned that tall buildings adjacent to it would result in overshadowing, and create wind tunnel effects. Questions such as these need to be addressed as the scheme evolves.
- The panel understands that the intention is to design in flexibility of use for the yards but would support exploration of the opportunities for both the buildings and spaces. More detailed information on the yards would be welcomed, including proposals for servicing.
- It will be important for the design team to try to retain as many of the category A and B trees as possible. It notes that there are a lot of mature trees on the existing housing estate; it would be helpful to understand at a detailed level which trees will be retained, and which will have to be removed. T39 is a very attractive tree and it could be retained within the proposed square.
- The movement hierarchy of pedestrians and vehicles will inform the design and function of the public realm. It is important to see how servicing arrangements will also integrate with the proposed movement hierarchy.
- The panel questions the decision to include no parking within the masterplan, given that there is likely to be up to 10,000 residents living within the area. Consideration of the impact this might have on the local area on match days and non-match days will help to inform decisions about parking.
- While it would not be appropriate to provide large amounts of parking, it will be important to provide some parking, especially for the affordable housing. The panel would also like to know what provision is being made for disabled persons parking.



Heritage assets and relationship to Conservation Area

- The panel feels that the development should actively aim to enhance the adjacent Conservation Area.
- It understands that the proposal to locate the new library and learning centre adjacent to the High Road will benefit the design of Moselle Square. However, the site is an existing terrace of buildings identified as positive contributors to the Conservation Area, in addition to a listed building. If these are lost because of the development, discussion is needed concerning the compensating benefits that could be offered within the site and elsewhere in the conservation area.

Community involvement

- Community consultation will be crucial in the development of this project, and the panel looks forward to hearing about the response from the forthcoming consultation programme at the next review.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome the opportunity to consider the evolving proposals in a series of further reviews prior to submission of the planning application.
- It would be useful to split the masterplan into two halves (southern and northern) and consider how each half works at a more detailed level, including block by block notional floor plans, play spaces, microclimate, edges, the relationship to the public realm and to the adjacent conservation area, the High Road, and the residential neighbourhoods to the west of the railway. As part of this process, it will be important to test the blocks in terms of servicing, bin and cycle storage and parking circulation.
- In-depth reviews of Peacock Park and the proposed library and learning centre would also be welcomed.
- An opportunity to revisit the overall masterplan, in addition to consideration of the parameter plans and design codes, would be very useful.
- It will be important to retain panel continuity for all future reviews where possible.



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.

