



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: High Road West

Wednesday 2 March 2022

The Grange, 32–34a White Hart Lane, London N17

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Tim Pitman

Attendees

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Matthew Maple	London Borough of Haringey
Oskar Gregersen	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Kate Trant	Frame Projects
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects

Apologies / copied to

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Elizabeth Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Stéphane Pietrzak	London Borough of Haringey

1. Project name and site address

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

2. Presenting team

Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Alix Roberts	Studio Egret West
Greg Greasley	Lendlease
Michelle Letton	Lendlease
Prue Hay	Lendlease
Tom Horne	DP9

3. Planning Authority briefing

The scheme for the High Road West site was last reviewed by the Quality Review Panel on 17 September 2021. Officers have met the applicants a number of times since the last review, and issues discussed include parameter plans, development specification, block-by-block maximum heights and block deviation, final refinements to the detailed design element, illustrative scheme options, heritage assessment and views.

The ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority (GLA) funded estate regeneration process resulted in a vote of approval for a scheme of this form and quantum of development. The proposals have also been reviewed by GLA officers who welcomed all aspects of the proposals including form, layout, density, height and affordable housing provision.

The previous concerns of the panel are noted, and the applicant has sought to address these concerns where possible. They have submitted work that indicates how the scheme is comparable to similar developments in the capital in terms of open space provision and which shows how comfortable distances between plots, with generous public space benefiting from good sunlight and daylight, would be achievable.

The applicant has also sought to show how plots have been appropriately tested to ensure blocks avoid overlooking and promote privacy and views over animated open spaces. This work also seeks to show how the number of dual aspect homes could be maximised and how the parameters and control documents would allow for improvements in these and other aspects.

The current proposals have not sought to address the broader concerns around density. The development density is comparable to other London developments with similar characteristics. Officers consider it to be appropriate given the aspirations of the site allocation to create a new leisure destination and local centre, good transport links, and location at the centre of a key growth area.

Officers believe that a liveable scheme with high quality residential environments, public realm, and open spaces is possible within this development density if well



designed. Therefore, the council would welcome commentary that focusses on the tools that will be used to shape future reserved matters applications (RMAs).

This includes the development specification, design code and parameter plans. The council seeks the panel's guidance on whether these documents will provide the necessary confidence that the outcomes proposed will be delivered. There will be further opportunities with each RMA for the panel to shape and finesse designs as they come forward, allowing further scrutiny of the liveability of particular phases and individual buildings.

The applicant team has submitted a hybrid application, part outline, part full, consisting of:

- illustrative scheme for 2,615, maximum parameters up to 2,929 homes
- target of 40 percent affordable housing, with minimum of 35 percent (including 500 Council-owned homes to be let at target rents)
- buildings up to 29 storeys
- new public park (approximately 5,300sqm) and civic square (approximately 3,500sqm)
- a library and learning centre
- new shops, civic, leisure and business space
- energy centre (DEN)
- detailed scheme (full) for new buildings of 5–6 storeys comprising 60 homes for social rent (to west of tracks on Whitehall Street).

The panel's consideration is sought on the applicant's response to concerns raised in previous review meeting:

- whether the control documents such as the development specification, design code and parameter plans provide the necessary confidence that the outcomes proposed will be delivered
- advice on proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—south and north of White Hart Lane
- advice on public realm, movement, and landscape.



4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel appreciates that this is a very important scheme for the area and for the borough. While the panel supports many aspects of the proposal, in particular the detailed proposals for Plot A west of the Overground line and the general layout and public realm proposed in the outline application, it still has concerns about the proposed density of the development – from 1400 homes in the adopted AAP to the current figure of 2,900 – and the impact that this is having on several aspects of the overall scheme. It is thus unable wholeheartedly to support the application in its current form.

The panel is broadly supportive of the proposed development north of White Hart Lane, where it feels that the scale, layout and emerging architecture and landscape designs seem appropriate. The panel's primary concern on this part of the scheme is the viability of the delivery of the key public space, Peacock Park, given uncertainties about acquisition of this land and its proposed delivery as one of the final phases of development. It also feels that there are still issues around service access to this area, and its impact on the public space.

The key concern regarding the area of the development on the south side of White Hart Lane relate to the exact location, the heights and massing of the tall buildings, particularly on Plots B and F, as well as the relative heights of the tall buildings down this western side of the scheme.

The panel has not yet had the opportunity to look in detail at the design code but feels that the architecture emerging in the illustrative plan is encouraging.

Further details on the panel's views are provided below, and comments made at previous reviews that remain relevant are repeated for clarity.

Planning process

- The panel understands the rationale for flexibility within parameter plans but highlights a number of areas where it would encourage a greater level of 'fix'.
- The current illustrative scheme accompanying the outline application has many positive qualities—but there is a risk of these being diluted if there is too much flexibility in the parameter plans and design code.
- For example, the panel feels that combining Plots B and C in defining maximum floor space is problematic. The constraints of Plot B may lead to greater floor space being placed in Plot C, impacting on the conservation area.
- The exact position of taller elements on Plots B, D and F will be a significant factor in their impact on the townscape. The parameter plans should carefully define shoulder height elements on key street frontages such as White Hart Lane, Whitehall Street and Brereton Road where these would play an important role in creating a human scale and mitigating wind impact.



- Similarly, the three-storey link blocks to the south of Plot C are crucial to let sunlight into the courtyards—but as proposed the parameter plans would allow these to be taller.
- The panel asks planning officers and the applicant to consider areas where greater certainty about the scale and massing of the development is needed to safeguard quality of life, and the scheme’s relationship with the conservation area.
- The delivery of Peacock Park will be crucial to the success of the scheme as a whole. At the previous review, the panel asked the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life. However, the application confirms this will not be delivered until phase 6 out of 8, and then only if a compulsory purchase order (CPO) process is successful.
- The panel would support the planning authority in the use of mechanisms such as Section 106 agreements and Grampian Conditions to provide certainty about the delivery of open space for each phase of development, including Peacock Park.
- Similarly, the planning process should ensure affordable housing is not allocated to the blocks that receive low daylight and sunlight levels.

South of White Hart Lane

- The panel is broadly supportive of the layout plan of development south of White Hart Lane but continues to have concerns about its scale and massing.
- It understands that, in addition to Moselle Square, this area of the masterplan is close enough to Bruce Castle Park to meet open space and play space requirements.
- The panel does not object in principle to the ‘marker building’ on Plot D opposite White Hart Lane station, signalling the route through Moselle Square to the stadium. However, the presentation acknowledged that this will have a negative impact on the environmental quality of Moselle Walk, requiring wind mitigation.
- The appropriateness of Plot D as a location for the tallest building is enhanced by its configuration, with a courtyard opening onto Whitehall Street allowing light into this space.
- The panel encourages the idea of an architectural competition for the site’s marker building. It also supports the idea of an architectural competition for the library building.
- The panel feels the role of the marker building on Plot D would be strengthened if the tall buildings on Plots B and F were significantly reduced in height.



- In particular, the panel highlights the overpowering relationship of the 27-storey tower on Plot B in relation to its internal courtyard. The quality of the courtyard and daylighting of some of the homes at lower levels will be poor.
- The panel is also concerned about the impact of the 25-storey tower in Plot F because of the harm that it will cause to the setting of the Grade II-listed Grange and to the Conservation Area. Although its impact could to some extent be mitigated by an amendment to the parameter plans that would require, say, a 10-storey ‘shoulder’ building fronting White Hart Lane, the impact would still be significant.
- The panel would be open to considering a modest increase in the height of the ‘marker building’ in Plot D if it helped to offset a reduction in the height of the proposed towers in Plot B and Plot F.
- The panel is broadly convinced by the form of Plot C—subject to the comment recommending that the floor area schedule separates Plot C and Plot B.
- The panel admires the proposals for Moselle Square, particularly the way that it has been considered both for match days and for general use throughout the week, and its role as part of the development’s play space provision.
- The panel also remains concerned about the wind mitigation across the scheme, particularly the area south of White Hart Lane, and urges further detailed consideration of this aspect of the proposal.

North of White Hart Lane

- The panel is broadly supportive of the area of the development north of White Hart Lane, the scale, layout and emerging architecture and landscape designs.
- It notes that the tall buildings shown in the illustrative scheme to the west of the site reflect an extant planning approval, and this was therefore not discussed at the review.
- The panel’s concern remains the delivery of Peacock Park, which is dependent on the acquisition of Peacock Industrial Estate. At the previous review, the panel asked the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life. However, the application confirms this will not be delivered until phase 6 out of 8, and then only if a compulsory purchase order (CPO) process is successful.
- Open space provision is therefore the main risk for the northern area of the masterplan, which is further from Bruce Castle Park than the southern area.



- The high density of development, including a high proportion of affordable housing, creates requirements for play space that are challenging to accommodate. This makes the delivery and quality of open space a critical requirement, as noted above under planning process.
- The panel feels that there is a possibility that the service access required, particularly on Parkside West, will reduce the quantity of green space provided, and suggests further consideration of measures to address this.
- The panel recognises that there is limited vehicle access to Parkside East—where access will be needed to service the buildings with no rear access—and recommends further examination of this aspect.
- As detailed designs progress, it will be important to ensure that circulation and servicing is compatible with the proposed amenity and play space of Peacock Park.
- At reserved matters stage, the panel encourages further work to increase the proportion of dual aspect units, as recommended at previous reviews.

Next steps

While the Quality Review Panel admires many aspects of this development proposal it is unable to support the application wholeheartedly in its current form on grounds of overdevelopment, excessive heights of the tall buildings in Plots B and F and the lack of certainty about the provision of essential greenspace on Peacock Park.

The panel recognises that the planning authority will need to consider its advice in the context of wider planning policies and is available to support the continuing design process.



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.

