

Appendix 6 – Quality Review Panel Reports



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review: St Ann's Hospital

Wednesday 6 April 2022

Karakusevic Carson Architects, 37 Cremer St, London E2 8HD

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Andy Puncher

Attendees

Richard Truscott London Borough of Haringey

Chris Smith London Borough of Haringey

Kate Trant Frame Projects

Joe Brennan Frame Projects

Apologies / copied to

Philip Elliot London Borough of Haringey

Suzanne Kimman London Borough of Haringey

Rob Krzyszowski London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher London Borough of Haringey

John McRory London Borough of Haringey

Elizabetta Tonazzi London Borough of Haringey

Deborah Denner Frame Projects

Report of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Wednesday 6 April 2022

HQRP110_ St Ann's Hospital

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

St Ann's Hospital, St Ann's Road, London N15 3TH

2. Presenting team

Maurizio Biadene	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Rachel Parker	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Graeme Sutherland	Adams and Sutherland Landscape Architects
Rob Reeds	Lambert Smith Hampton
Jess Watts	Catalyst

3. Planning authority briefing

St Ann's Hospital is a Victorian-era former fever hospital located on the southern side of St Ann's Road and bordered on its remaining sides by Hermitage Road (east), the residential properties of Warwick Gardens (west) and the Gospel Oak to Barking London Overground train line (south). To the north of the site across St Ann's Road is Chestnuts Park.

The hospital land is designated as Site Allocation SA28 which identifies the site for residential development, consolidated medical activities and town centre uses. The site currently has a maximum public transport accessibility level of two.

The northern part of the site is located within the St Ann's conservation area. The Mayfield House building within the conservation area is locally listed. Other heritage assets are located within a short walk of the site including the grade II* listed St Ann's Church.

The hospital site is designated as an area of change and a critical drainage area. The south of the site includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and an ecological corridor and is also covered by a woodland tree preservation order.

The scheme presented at this meeting covers approximately two-thirds of the hospital site with the remaining land to the east being retained for medical purposes. The hospital site received hybrid planning permission in 2015 (ref. HGY/2014/1691) for approximately 450 residential units and commercial uses. This permission has not been implemented and has now expired.

The emerging proposals are for a highly landscaped development of 995 residential dwellings in buildings of between three and nine storeys in height, commercial and community uses, retention of existing historic buildings, new public realm and green space, new routes into and through the site, and car and cycle parking. The development would be delivered in multiple phases through a hybrid planning application and subsequent reserved matters applications and would be supported by a site-wide masterplan.

CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel warmly welcomes the response to its comments at the previous reviews and supports the improvements made to the scheme, commenting that the treatment of the retained wall is particularly successful.

The panel is pleased to see the quality of the proposals, which will act as the baseline for the development of the rest of the site. It stresses the importance of ensuring that the use of high-quality materials as presented is secured through the planning process in order that any subsequent value engineering does not impact negatively on the scheme.

The revisions made to block D3 are contributing positively to the building's architectural quality. The articulation of the corners is working well, and the visual relationship between D3 and D2 has been well-developed. The panel also supports the scale and detailed design of the low-rise housing on the St Ann's Road frontage.

The panel offers some comments on the detailing of the three types of entrance through the retained wall—the pedestrian and vehicular entrances, and the window openings.

These comments are expanded below.

Architecture

- Phase 1A will be the first element of the scheme for the St Ann's Hospital site to be delivered. It is therefore important that it sets the standard for the whole development, with high quality detailing and materials.
- Since the previous review, the design team has tested the design of the tallest building (D3). The panel is reassured by this work and feels that the building will have a successful relationship with the courtyard and the Peace Garden.
- The panel supports the development of the verticality of this block, with the creation of a slenderer appearance, by opening up the corner balconies, and removing the roofs of the balconies at the upper-most floors.
- The lighter, more sculptural approach to the top of the building is successful in reducing its heaviness.
- The attention paid to brickwork detailing is also welcomed, for example, where D3's elevation has a clear base, middle and top, referencing the tones of existing brickwork on the site.
- Equally, the panel enjoys the relationship between the east-facing elevations of C3 and D3 over the Peace Garden, which has been achieved through visual reinforcement of the link through the brick tones, the tops of the buildings and the architectural treatment of the top, middle and base of the elevations of both buildings.



CONFIDENTIAL

Low-rise housing

- The panel feels that the scale and detailed design of the low-rise housing on the St Ann's Road frontage relates well to the retained wall and the conservation area.

The retained wall

- The panel admires the further development of the retained wall, which it feels is a very successful part of the proposal, accommodating pedestrian and vehicular entrances, and window openings.
- The panel stresses the importance of the construction detailing where new openings are created in the retained wall. Submission of detailed drawings to describe these would be valuable as part of the planning application.
- The panel questions whether the pedestrian entrances may appear weak when compared to the robustness of the existing buttresses, pointing to the success of the concrete capping of the piers at the vehicle entrances, and suggests further exploration of this aspect.
- The panel has concerns about how the red precast concrete porticos that project above the pedestrian entrances will fare over time. These may not age as gracefully as brick, and the panel suggests consideration of alternative materials.

Landscape

- The panel comments that the Spotted Thorn sits well in the space between the newly orientated D3 building, the courtyard and the Peace Garden.
- It will be essential that the Spotted Thorn is well protected during the construction phase.
- Long-term management and maintenance of the courtyard areas will be essential to their success. Details of how this will be achieved should be included in the planning submission.

Next steps

The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers.



CONFIDENTIAL

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.



CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: St Ann's Hospital

Wednesday 8 December 2021

Karakusevic Carson Architects, Studio 501, 37 Cremer St, London E2 8HD

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Martha Alker

Phyllida Mills

Andy Puncher

Craig Robertson

Attendees

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Chris Smith

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Adela Paparisto

Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

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

St Ann's Hospital, St Ann's Road, London N15 3TH

2. Presenting team

Paul Karakusevic	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Rachael Barker	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Maurizio Biadene	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Ed Blackett	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Robert Reeds	Lambert Smith Hampton
Chris Struthers	Catalyst Housing Limited
David Wakeford	Catalyst Housing Limited
Jess Watts	Catalyst Housing Limited
Ross Williams	Hill Group
Graeme Sutherland	Adams and Sutherland
Lucy Victor	Bioregional
Ed Josey	Markides Limited
Amber Fahey	xco2
Louise Fitzgerald	The Environment Partnership

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

St Ann's Hospital is a Victorian-era former fever hospital, bordered on the southern side by St Ann's Road, and by Hermitage Road (east), Warwick Gardens (west) and the Gospel Oak to Barking London Overground train line (south). To the north of the site, across St Ann's Road, is Chestnuts Park. The hospital land is designated as Site Allocation SA28, which identifies the site for residential development, consolidated medical activities and town centre uses. The application site covers approximately two-thirds of the hospital site, with the remaining land to the east being retained for medical purposes. A previous consent was given in 2015 (planning reference HGY/2014/1691) for approximately 450 residential units and commercial uses. This permission has not been implemented and has now expired.

The site currently has a maximum PTAL of 2. The northern part of the site is located within the St Ann's Conservation Area; while the site does not contain any listed buildings, Mayfield House in the northern part of the site is locally-listed and there are other non-designated buildings of historic interest on the site. The Grade II* Listed St Ann's Church is within a short walk of the site. The site is designated as an Area of Change and a Critical Drainage Area. The south of the site includes a Site of



Importance for Nature Conservation and Ecological Corridor and is also covered by woodland Tree Preservation Orders.

The emerging proposals are for a highly-landscaped residential development of around 975 dwellings in buildings of between three and nine storeys. A new pedestrian and cycle link would connect the south-western corner of the site to Warwick Gardens (and onto Green Lanes). A connection under the railway to the south will also be provided or safeguarded.

This is the third panel review and the design development is well-advanced. Officers seek the panel's views on the design of the housing and boundary treatment on the eastern side of the site, architectural treatments and articulation, car and cycle parking provision, heritage, non-residential strategy, energy/sustainability, drainage, ecology, servicing and phasing.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposals for development at St Ann's Hospital as they continue to evolve. It commends the thorough presentation and thinks that the proposals promise a high quality of development.

The panel supports the aspirations of the scheme and welcomes the commitment to deliver a high level of affordable housing, alongside generous open spaces and courtyards. The wider site strategy is generally moving in the right direction, and the panel is pleased by the ambition to retain a good proportion of trees within the site, and how this has informed the design process. The retained buildings have the potential to significantly contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the scheme, and the panel highlights that it will be important to get the right uses within these existing buildings.

As design work continues, the panel would encourage further exploration and testing of options for the design of building D3 (nine storeys), in addition to the landscape design of the Spotted Thorn space. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Masterplan

- The panel thinks that the diagonal path crossing the site is much improved and has greater clarity and legibility.
- On the southern boundary of the site, the central gap between the buildings seems more generous than the other gaps between the other adjacent buildings. The panel wondered whether this additional space could be given to the opening at the southwest of the site at the junction with the proposed



pedestrian link beyond the site. Greater generosity in this link could enable better visual permeability through – and beyond – the site.

- The panel notes that the distance from the buildings to the eastern boundary of the site has increased to seven metres. It considers this to be the bare minimum of what is acceptable, if the design and details of the edge treatments and boundary walls are pinned down very carefully, to protect the amenity of the residents in the new blocks in terms of noise and streetlights.
- However, it feels that nine metres to the boundary would be preferable, as this would set the standard of 18m between buildings either side of the boundary if the hospital were to undergo further redevelopment in the future.

Massing and development density

- Nine storeys could be acceptable for the tallest building (D3) if further work to improve the modelling, proportion and visual presence of the block is undertaken. This work should include exploration of the re-orientation of the building through 90 degrees to locate the narrower façade onto the Peace Garden.
- In addition, a more generous plinth, to avoid the full nine storey façade meeting the ground at the primary frontage, would provide a more human-scale to the public realm.
- A lighter, more sculptural approach to the top of the building should also be considered; options include removing the roofs from the upper-most balconies.
- While the five storey shoulder on the buildings within Plot C works well, options should be explored to visually reinforce it, perhaps through re-orientating the bulk of the seven storey section of building.

Place-making, circulation and landscape design

- The panel welcomes the generosity of open space within the proposals and thinks that these will work well. The views through the development and across the Peace Garden to the administration building will significantly contribute to the character and distinctiveness of the place.
- Ensuring that the different spaces within the site are well-articulated and human-scaled will be very important. Reinforcing the approach to primary entrances of key buildings within the landscape design will help to improve legibility.
- The panel would like to know more about some of the secondary spaces within the site, for example the smaller demarcated areas within and adjacent to the Spotted Thorn space. It will be important to clearly define these different areas, and create appropriate boundary conditions for them, to avoid the



perception of gaps in the landscape. Establishing strong relationships between the character of the interior courtyards and the spaces adjacent to them would also be welcomed.

- The gates into the courtyard spaces appear very large, and the panel feel that greater clarity is needed as to whether the courtyards are the main entrance to each block or intended to be private and secluded; the design and location of the building entrances should respond to the primary approach within the landscape.
- The planters adjacent to building perimeters will play a very important role in achieving privacy for the ground floor corner units and they need to be large enough and deep enough for planting of sufficient scale to deliver adequate screening. The requirements for screening might be different at other façade locations; it will be very important to get this right as it will make a significant contribution to the overall streetscape.
- As there is a high level of affordable housing proposed, the panel has concerns that there will be a significant number of residents who may need vehicles for work. Further thought needs to be given to where these residents will park, and how this will be managed.

Scheme layout and architectural expression

- The architectural language and materiality across the site are generally working well, and the level of care and thought within the evolving elevations is apparent. The palette of tones from buff to light red and dark red is supported. While the brick themes for building D3 (nine storeys) are successful, the opportunity exists to reinforce its architectural expression, to articulate the entrance further, and introduce more depth, detail and contrast to the elevational treatment overall, to better reflect the character of the area.
- The approach to the housing backing on to St Ann's Road is appropriate, as the gables reflect the form of gatehouses and are an attractive feature, although this is more convincing in the images rather than on the model.
- The retained brick walls backing onto St Ann's Road provide a strong edge to the development. Further design development in three dimensions could also help to articulate the rear and gable ends of the housing.
- Further clarity is required concerning the servicing requirements for the retained buildings, as there may need to be internal space allocated for plant.
- There may also need to be further consideration of any specific detailed design requirements of the different uses located within the retained buildings. For example, nurseries require a secure (and visually impermeable) boundary around external spaces, which limits the level of visual 'activity' within the frontage.

Inclusive and sustainable design

- The panel notes that, as the delivery of the different phases of the development will take six to seven years, the embodied carbon target of <950 kgCO₂e/m² is inadequate. It would encourage the project team to work towards the targets established in the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge (<625 kgCO₂e/m²), especially in the later phases of the development.
- Visiting the site illustrates the scale of the demolition work to be undertaken; the panel welcomes the aspirations for reusing elements, alongside the audits and sketches that have been undertaken so far. It would like to know more about this at a detailed level and is keen to see the ambitions for sustainable design and embodied carbon carried through the design process.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals, perhaps at a chair's review. They highlight a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- 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.

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: St Ann's Hospital_A

Wednesday 13 October 2021
Zoom video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Yemi Aladerun
Martha Alker
Georgios Askounis
David Ubaka

Attendees

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Chris Smith	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Adela Paparisto	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	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.

Revisions

A number of revisions have been introduced to clarify the panel's views on the massing of the proposals, and the section of site at the eastern boundary. All revised sections of text are prefaced by **.

Report of Formal Review Meeting
13 October 2021
HQR110_St Ann's Hospital_A

1. Project name and site address

St Ann's Hospital, St Ann's Road, London N15 3TH

2. Presenting team

Paul Karkusevic	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Rachael Barker	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Ed Blackett	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Robert Reeds	Lambert Smith Hampton
Fiona Harte	Lambert Smith Hampton
Rachel Shand	Lambert Smith Hampton
David Wakeford	Catalyst Housing Limited
Ross Williams	Hill Group
Frazer Collett	Hill Group
Graeme Sutherland	Adams and Sutherland
Lucy Victor	Bioregional
Ed Josey	Markides Limited
Tom Kordel	xco2
Amber Fahey	xco2

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

St Ann's Hospital is a Victorian-era former fever hospital located on the southern side of St Ann's Road and bordered on its remaining sides by Hermitage Road (east), the residential properties of Warwick Gardens (west) and the Gospel Oak to Barking London Overground train line (south). To the north of the site, across St Ann's Road, is Chestnuts Park. The hospital land is designated as Site Allocation SA28 which identifies the site for residential development, consolidated medical activities and town centre uses. The site currently has a maximum PTAL of 2. The northern part of the site is located within the St Ann's Conservation Area. The site does not contain any listed buildings. The Mayfield House building in the northern part of the site is locally listed and there are other non-designated buildings of historic interest on the site. There are other heritage assets within a short walk of the site including the Grade II* Listed St Ann's Church. The hospital site is designated as an Area of Change and a Critical Drainage Area. The south of the site includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ecological Corridor and is also covered by woodland Tree Preservation Orders.



The application site covers approximately two-thirds of the hospital site, with the remaining land to the east being retained for medical purposes. The same site received hybrid planning permission in 2015 (planning reference HGY/2014/1691) for approximately 450 residential units and commercial uses. This permission has not been implemented and has now expired.

The emerging proposals are for a highly landscaped development of circa 965 residential dwellings with a mix of London Affordable Rent, London Living Rent, Shared Ownership, and market sale, along with associated commercial floorspace and community uses, retention of existing historic buildings, new public realm and green space, new routes into and through the site, as well as car and cycle parking. The development would be delivered in multiple phases through a hybrid planning application and subsequent reserved matters applications and would be supported by a site-wide masterplan. Discussions have progressed well with future pre-application meetings moving towards more technical aspects of the proposals. A design freeze is expected soon. The proposed development is also likely to return to the Quality Review Panel for further review in the future.

Officers seek the panel's views on the design of the housing and boundary treatment on the eastern side of the site, architectural treatments and articulation, car and cycle parking provision, heritage, non-residential strategy, energy/sustainability, drainage, ecology, servicing and phasing.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the proposals for St Ann's Hospital as they continue to evolve. It commends the work undertaken to understand the landscape and is pleased to see how this has informed the evolving masterplan, with the creation of new, linked spaces around retained trees serving to loosen the grid-form of the previous masterplan. The panel feels that the project team is creative and experienced, and that the scheme is underpinned by laudable aims and objectives. The proposals promise a very high quality of development: the landscape is commendable, there are unique buildings within the site and there will be local distinctiveness and character. The panel feels that the opportunity exists to create a distinguished exemplar for the borough.

However, the panel has some concerns about the massing in the heart of the site, and it is not yet convinced by the scale of the proposals. **As at the previous review, the panel feels that a height of seven to eight storeys would typologically better reflect mansion blocks, and this scale would feel less aggressive than blocks of nine storeys (or greater), in terms of their relationship to the retained heritage buildings and the proposed peace garden. The panel feels that the southern four blocks within the site read as freestanding pavilions, so could be more flexible in terms of building heights as they do not form part of perimeter blocks, subject to overshadowing analysis. However, it acknowledges the balance that must be struck between competing drivers within the brief, and it accepts that allowing more space around existing trees,



alongside an improved public realm, could off-set some of the impact of the proposed scale. Further consideration of sections taken through key parts of the proposals, in addition to sensitive design of the upper levels of the tallest buildings is required.

Other issues to be addressed include proximity to the boundary to the hospital at the eastern edge of the site and the panel feels that this requires further design work as part of the outline application. Further work, to embed strategic sustainability principles and targets within the proposals, is also required. This should include optimising the design of the elevations around their orientation, specifically in relation to microclimate, shading, cooling and biodiversity requirements. Further refinement of the detailed design of the building envelopes would also be beneficial, in terms of how they shape, activate, and relate to the public realm and pedestrian routes through the site.

The panel is disappointed that it has not had chance to consider the detailed part of the hybrid application and it would like to address this at a further review, alongside the relationship between buildings and the peace garden. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Masterplan, massing and development density

- ****At the last review, the panel were keen to see a redistribution of massing from the centre of the site to the southern periphery, to avoid the creation of cavernous or inhospitable streets and courtyard spaces. **Concerns remain about the scale of the development, especially in terms of the relationship to the retained heritage buildings, and the panel would prefer to see the massing peak at seven to eight storeys, with an emphasis on a more gentle 'mansion block' typology, rather than taller buildings that tower over their surroundings.**
- ****It suggests that the visual impact of the taller buildings on site (seven storeys and greater) could be somewhat ameliorated by careful architectural treatment of the top two storeys.**
- **The panel welcomes measures that have been taken to improve the levels of daylight in the streets and spaces, including giving more space to existing trees. It would like to see sections through the key areas, to understand better how the spaces and streets would feel in practice.**
- **The panel is also concerned about the proximity of the buildings to the eastern boundary with the adjacent hospital. Residents of the maisonettes will likely feel very tight up against the boundary and the peripheral hospital route beyond it which will be lined with parked cars.**
- ****The distance to the boundary in this location should be nearer ten metres rather than five – subject to detailed testing - and the boundary should be strongly defined, potentially reusing bricks within the wall and planting semi-mature trees along its length.**

Place-making, circulation and landscape design

- The panel commends many of the strategic and detailed decisions that have been made in terms of landscape design and place-making. Using the existing trees as a way of loosening up the grid and generating additional linked public spaces has significantly enhanced the masterplan and public realm proposals. The peace garden also promises a high-quality landscaped environment.
- It warmly welcomes the approach to retain a good proportion of the trees on site, and wonders whether there is a proposal for successional planting, as fruit trees have a shorter life span.
- The central civic route through the site would benefit from some additional work to reinforce its legibility and to strengthen the route and its relationship with fronts and backs of buildings located along it.
- Consideration should be given to what users of the route will see when they pass through the different spaces. For example, the admin building is awkwardly situated, with the route passing the rear of the building. This could be addressed by providing a positive new frontage to the rear of the building, so it is essentially double-fronted, or gating/controlling part of the space. More generally, refinement and clarification of the nature of the route, the space, and the fronts and backs of buildings will be needed if it is to be successful.
- The panel would like more information about the location and nature of building entrances and the level of activity they will bring to the spaces around them. Clarification of whether residential units have communal entrances or separate entrances at ground level would also be welcomed.
- The panel would like to know more about how privacy and natural surveillance are to be balanced within the different ground floor uses within the site.
- Further refinement should be made to the gable ends of buildings, to increase the level of activation and articulation in the elevations.
- Greater clarity is needed with regard to the arrangements for pedestrian routes and cycle routes. The panel notes that problems can occur when pedestrians and cyclists come into conflict and greater segregation of routes would be welcome.
- The option to provide a second, western access to the site, to the housing estate to the north of Warwick Gardens, should be explored. This could potentially help to stitch the new development back into the wider urban grain and would also potentially split the length of proposed terraced houses at the western boundary. It would also open up access to the new amenities on site for the wider community.
- The panel would welcome greater clarity on the detailed design of the amenity space at the southern end of the site, including the delineation of the space. It



questions whether the use of the amenity space will have an impact upon the conservation quality of the SINC.

- The scale of the open space containing the spotted thorn tree needs additional testing, to ensure that it does not feel like a void.
- The panel questions whether the proposed growing space is an asset for the new residents on site, or whether it will be available to the wider community. In either case, there needs to be clarity on the proposed management of the space.
- The parking spaces on site are shown empty in the illustrations, and the panel would like to see more honest representation of the environment in use, when parking spaces are occupied. Electric charge points will also be required, and these should be accommodated within the design of the public realm.
- The panel would like to see explored the scope for using the streets for occasional markets if the parking were relocated.

Heritage buildings

- The strategy for non-residential uses within the site needs to balance flexibility – in planning terms – with a more detailed approach to the design and function of spaces, so that all parts of the public realm are activated and work well.
- The panel questions the condition of the retained buildings, and whether it would be possible to accommodate meanwhile uses within the site during the overall development process. This type of activity could test out potential uses and could start to draw in the community and establish a new culture for the locality.

Inclusive and sustainable design

- The panel welcomes the inclusion of key performance indicators (KPIs) within the sustainable design strategy. It would like to see more detail about the specific KPIs, beyond indicative measures.
- It would encourage the design team to consider biosolar roof systems, combining PV panels with green or blue roofs.
- The issue of overheating – and measures to mitigate it – should be considered as early as possible in the design process. This should include vegetation and shading, as well as façade design.
- The panel notes that darker brick absorbs more heat, contributing to overheating, and would like to see the use of lighter brick stock considered.
- The design team should consider circular economy principles in developing its proposals as part of an integrated approach to construction and reuse.

- The panel supports strategies to foster biodiversity with regeneration proposals. Swales can be an important part of this, and can reduce the requirement for irrigation, alongside rainwater harvesting.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome the opportunity to consider the proposals at a future review, particularly regarding the detailed application and the relationship between buildings and the peace garden, and sections through key parts of the proposals.
- 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.

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: St Ann's Hospital

Wednesday 7 July 2021
Video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Yemi Aladerun
Martha Alker
Phyllida Mills
Craig Robertson

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Christopher Smith	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Zainab Malik	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	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

St Ann's Hospital, St Ann's Road, London N15 3TH

2. Presenting team

Paul Karkusevic	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Rachael Barker	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Suzanne Prest	Karacusevic Carson Architects
Robert Reeds	Lambert Smith Hampton
Fiona Harte	Lambert Smith Hampton
Graeme Sutherland	Adams and Sutherland
Chris Struthers	Catalyst
Hannah Utting	Catalyst
David Wakeford	Catalyst
Ross Williams	Hill Group
Jeremy Thurlby	Hill Group
Jenny Baker	Markides Limited
Tom Kordel	XC02
Lewis Knight	Bioregional

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

St Ann's Hospital is a Victorian-era former fever hospital located on the southern side of St Ann's Road and bordered on its remaining sides by Hermitage Road (east), the residential properties of Warwick Gardens (west) and the Gospel Oak to Barking London Overground train line (south). To the north of the site across St Ann's Road is Chestnuts Park. The hospital land is designated as Site Allocation SA28 which identifies the site for residential development, consolidated medical activities and town centre uses. The site currently has a maximum PTAL of 2. The northern part of the site is located within the St Ann's Conservation Area. The site does not contain any listed buildings. The Mayfield House building in the northern part of the site is locally listed and there are other non-designated buildings of historic interest on the site. There are other heritage assets within a short walk of the site including the Grade II* Listed St Ann's Church. The hospital site is designated as an Area of Change and a Critical Drainage Area. The south of the site includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation and Ecological Corridor and is also covered by woodland Tree Preservation Orders.



The current site for review covers approximately two-thirds of the hospital site with the remaining land to the east being retained for medical purposes. The same site received hybrid planning permission in 2015 (planning reference HGY/2014/1691) for approximately 450 residential units and commercial uses. This permission has not been implemented and has now expired.

The emerging proposals are for a highly landscaped development of circa 934 residential dwellings in buildings of between three and eight storeys in height, commercial and community uses, retention of existing historic buildings, new public realm and green space, new routes into and through the site, as well as car and cycle parking. The development would be delivered in multiple phases through a hybrid planning application and subsequent reserved matters applications and would be supported by a site-wide masterplan. Discussions are at a relatively early stage with several further pre-application meetings arranged. Officers seek the panel's views on the general development principles, including the proposed land uses and layout, access routes (including potential links to the hospital site), landscaping, parking, heritage and commercial/community strategies, and affordable housing provision. In addition, consideration of the proposed development density, building heights and proportion of family homes would also be welcomed.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposals for the St Ann's Hospital site at an early stage, and feels that the presentation successfully communicates the project team's ambitions for the development. The panel supports the broad strategy for the project, and feels that the work done to date is very positive, and reflects a lot of thought. The landscape proposals, sustainability strategy, affordable housing and tenure mix are all commendable.

Further work, however, is required to refine the configuration of the southern and eastern sections of the masterplan, and this should include clearer integration and reinforcement of the key pedestrian routes into – and beyond – the site to the south, southwest and east. The panel also feels that there should be less reliance on an imposed grid structure. While the proposed development density may be acceptable – subject to testing – the panel feels that some re-distribution of massing may be required to avoid the creation of cavernous or inhospitable streets and courtyard spaces; deeper scrutiny of these areas will be required. The panel would also encourage further exploration of the development approach to the retained heritage buildings in terms of uses, interventions, legibility, language and passive surveillance. Community consultation should help to inform decisions about the relative viability of different commercial uses, in addition to the needs and priorities of the local residents. Scope also remains to improve the architectural expression of the new buildings; as design work continues the panel would like to see greater richness and articulation, resulting in the creation of some distinctive and characterful places. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Masterplan

- The panel welcomes the affordable housing-led approach to development, which will include a mix of housing types and scales. However, it notes that phasing of the masterplan is weighted towards market properties, which may mean that the Council will have to wait for a number of years before any affordable housing is released.
- A key component of the masterplan will be the new link to Green Lanes at the southwest corner of the site, which will significantly improve access to public transport. The strong grid-like layout of the current masterplan does not support this proposed southwest connection, however, and the panel feels that this diagonal route across the site should be reinforced, passing through the key spaces within the masterplan and driving the overall configuration.
- It encourages the design team to consider alternative options for the layout of the southern section of the site, and the area along the eastern boundary. While the layout at the western boundary seems well-considered, it is not necessary to mirror this section along the eastern boundary, adjacent to the hospital.
- The panel would like to see a detailed plan showing the masterplan and the surrounding areas in terms of the infrastructure and amenities within the locality. This should include social infrastructure like schools, nurseries, doctors' surgeries and supermarkets, so that an evaluation of whether the proposed amenities within the masterplan itself are sufficient.
- It would encourage further consideration on the distribution of uses within the masterplan. It questions whether there is enough activity and footfall to support three cafés on site; consideration of income levels and local priorities will also be very important. If there was a very clear pedestrian link through to the hospital, then a well-located and visible café could become a place that hospital staff and visitors would also use, which would improve the long term viability of such a use.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of how well the key routes and spaces are activated and overlooked. It notes that the level of passive surveillance – or activation of a building frontage – of a café compared to a gym are very different.

Massing and development density

- The panel feels that a maximum height of up to 7 or 8 storeys for the tallest buildings on site could be acceptable, subject to an evaluation of the impact that this would have on the adjacent streets and spaces. It has concerns that at this height, some of the streets within the heart of the site will feel canyon-

like, while the courtyard spaces will be dark and inhospitable. Comprehensive testing of the proposals will be necessary.

- If the massing needs to be re-distributed slightly within the site, there may be potential for a slight increase in the height of the development against the railway at the south of the site, subject to evaluation of daylight / sunlight and overshadowing assessments.
- The lower massing at the western boundary seems appropriate. However, the panel feels that there is potential capacity for some additional height on the eastern boundary, adjacent to the hospital.

Place-making, circulation and landscape design

- The ground floor experience of the primary routes presented appear to be attractive, but the panel would like to see greater distinctiveness for different parts of the masterplan, to create a variety of character areas.
- The panel welcomes the proposed creation of additional links, with connections towards Green Lanes, under the railway, and potentially into the hospital site to the east; the new 'windows' at child height through the main wall onto St Ann's Road provide an additional visual link here. The potential links to the hospital site would give access westwards from the hospital to the new Peace Garden on site, and the panel would encourage further exploration of how to make these east-west links more positive and legible.
- Private gardens backing on to the eastern boundary could be a workable solution to the difficult interface with the hospital. Providing a good buffer of landscape at the rear of the gardens would mitigate nuisance from street lighting and vehicular access through the night within the hospital site.
- The panel suspects that the potential link under the railway will be a complex matter. Identifying the proposed location of this new link within the masterplan and clearly integrating it as a nodal point within the primary circulation routes on site would be supported.
- Further consideration of how the proposed new access to Green Lanes at the southwest corner of the site will be integrated - both with the proposed link under the railway, and with the pedestrian circulation on site as a whole – would be welcomed. Both new connections – under the railway and to Green Lanes – should be well-overlooked and safe.
- The panel would encourage measures to prioritise pedestrian movement within the scheme, for example by introducing raised tables at junctions and reducing the carriageway width, with passing places for vehicles.

- The panel would like more information about the general arrangements for parking, including parking for delivery or other commercial vehicles. While encouraging active modes of transport is a positive aspiration, it should be recognised that within the affordable housing tenure, a large proportion of residents may need cars due to the nature of their work (for example key workers working unsociable hours).
- Parking provision within the site needs to be realistic, otherwise it could lead to conflict, and the approach to parking should be developed with the community, through consultation. Further exploration of how to accommodate parking sensitively within the masterplan would be supported; this could include some edges of the site being given over to parking.
- The panel applauds the prioritisation of the landscape within the proposals. It would encourage further work on the interfaces between the buildings and the spaces, and careful consideration of the nature of these spaces, whether they are transitional or are places that people will want to spend time in. The landscape proposals should create a sense of ownership and safety.
- The panel notes that the streets within the scheme will have to work very hard, as they accommodate trees, SUDs, and a lot of on-street parking. It welcomes the inclusion of community allotment gardens located on the pedestrian route network.
- The diagrams showing the extent of the green spaces and how they form a continuous link through the site are very attractive. However, the panel notes that, as movement and circulation diagrams are overlaid on the landscape diagram, the extent and continuity of the green space is significantly eroded. It would like to see clear proposals both for how the continuity of green space will be retained across the development, to create ecological corridors, and for how the edges of the central green space are designed, to maximise the proportion of 'parkland' between the buildings fronting onto the space.
- The panel notes that the proposed pedestrian routes through the courtyard spaces may function better as visual links, rather than physical ones, to enable optimum levels of water attenuation, as too many physical routes could create a predominantly hard landscape.

Heritage buildings

- The panel welcomes the retention of the seven heritage buildings within the scheme, and wonders whether there are other notable buildings / structures or surfaces of value – for example the cobbled street – that could be meaningfully retained to contribute to the character of the development.

- These retained buildings have been treated as 'pavilions', set individually within their context. The panel has concerns that there is no longer any clear sense of 'front' and 'back' to each of these buildings, which presents challenges in terms of architectural language, legibility, views and building approach / entrance sequence. It would encourage further exploration of how the heritage buildings could be adapted; and notes that more dramatic interventions to the existing buildings could be warranted.
- Community and commercial uses have been located in the retained buildings, which could be problematic in terms of conversion, accommodating accessible entrances, or functional requirements like fencing, containment and privacy, for example in the proposed nursery. The panel would encourage further exploration of residential uses within the retained buildings, alongside community uses in new buildings: a contemporary pavilion giving public access and accommodating a community use could be a positive addition to the central parkland.

Architectural expression

- The panel understands that the three-dimensional visualisations of the proposed buildings reflect an initial response in terms of architectural expression. As design work continues, it would like to see a greater level of articulation, detail and variety within and between each block, in order to avoid blandness within the elevations, and to help deliver distinctive, characterful spaces.
- It would like to know more about the proposed mansion blocks at the south of the site, including details about the proposed configuration of the accommodation. The footprints appear to be very deep and the panel questions whether there will be corridors with lifts or whether the blocks will be 'walk-ups'.

Inclusive and sustainable design

- The panel would encourage further scrutiny of the justification to demolish some of the existing buildings on site, where they are of a similar condition or quality to those being retained. It notes that the embodied carbon within the existing buildings should be factored into the life cycle carbon assessment of the overall development.
- The panel would encourage the project team to establish clear sustainability objectives, including unambiguous key performance indicators, to help define the performance of the development, communicate the aims for sustainable design and drive – and quantify – the design process.
- In terms of operational energy performance, the panel welcomes the aspiration for a net zero carbon development. It highlights that as 60 per cent

of the accommodation will be affordable, a key consideration will be fuel costs for future occupants.

- As the design of the green spaces continues, the panel would like to see the objective qualities of these open areas quantified.
- The panel would also like to see the inclusion of measures to encourage active modes of transport, and to ensure that the purple route through the site is walkable and cyclable, and does not become a rat-run or over-dominated by parked cars.

Next steps

- As design work continues into the next level of detail - and informed by the community engagement process – the panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals prior to submission of the planning application.
- The panel 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.

Appendix 7 – Development Management Forum comments

Summary of Discussion Topics

- Affordable housing
- Development design
- Heritage approach

Appendix 8 – Pre-Application Committee minutes

Minutes:

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for hybrid planning application for the re-development of part of the St Ann's Hospital site to provide a new residential neighbourhood of circa 995 new homes including 60% affordable housing in buildings up to nine storeys in height, 2,400sqm of non-residential uses (including refurbishment of existing buildings), landscaping and public realm improvements, 160 parking spaces and cycle parking.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- Some members enquired about the location and safety of the main vehicular entrance to the site and any mitigations. The applicant team stated that moving the entrance had been considered but would create issues with the nearby ambulance station or would result in an entrance closer to junctions or dense foliage in the conservation area. It was explained that safety audits had been undertaken and it was considered that the current proposal was the best available main access point to the site.
- In relation to the location of taller blocks and concerns of residents in Warwick Gardens, the applicant team noted that the highest building in Phase 1a would be nine storeys and would be located approximately 90 metres from Warwick Gardens. It was added that the tallest building would be located close to open space and that its building footprint had been reduced to ensure the retention of an existing tree on site. In relation to alternative locations for the building, it was stated that the proposed location was the optimum location to minimise overshadowing.
- The applicant team noted that they supported the maximisation of walking and cycling opportunities on the site. It was added that the inclusion of a south to west link was a key part of the proposal and would be a link from the main masterplan site to Warwick Gardens.
- In terms of green spaces, the applicant team noted that the St Ann's new neighbourhood site was located near Chestnuts Park but did not seek to compete with this space about would provide a different type of space with more greenery and more intricate spaces.
- It was confirmed that the applicant would be retaining the wall on site but, based on feedback from consultation, would be creating a number of new openings for site access and visibility.

- In relation to a query about the water tower, the applicant team confirmed that they had consulted extensively with the local community and a variety of uses had been considered. It was explained that this was still being determined but would not be a residential use. It was confirmed that the applicant would manage all maintenance standards on site, with the exception of any internal parts should the Council decide to take up its option to purchase.
- It was confirmed that the owner of the building would be responsible for service charges.
- In response to a query about the height and detailed design of the proposal, the applicant team believed that nine storeys would fit comfortably on the site. It was added that there was some variety between buildings and that this was often considered to be subtle. It was highlighted that the applicant team had examined the settings of all buildings and considered that the design was contextual and contemporary.

Cllr Hymas spoke as ward councillor and noted that there would be 167 car parking spaces with a maximum of 10% of these spaces for disabled people. It was commented that, under the London Plan, there was an expectation that developments would be car free and it was queried why the proposal would provide this level of parking. It was added that the homes in the development would be 60% affordable and that car ownership levels were expected to be low. It was suggested that a much lower level of parking could be provided, particularly given the nearby location of schools and local support of reduced car usage.

The applicant team commented that the development proposed 167 car parking spaces, which amounted to 0.17 of parking spaces per home. It was noted that the area had a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL). It was explained that the London Plan policy proposes 3-7% of the total number of spaces for accessible spaces, with a maximum of 10%, which meant that up to 100 accessible spaces could be provided on site. It was also noted that 17% of the units would be 3-bed and 4-bed homes and were expected to require access to a vehicle at times and there were also some requirements for vehicles that people used for work purposes. The applicant team considered that the proposal achieved a balance which would be supplemented by car clubs, a transport assessment, and a car parking management plan.

Cllr Harrison-Mullane spoke as ward councillor and enquired how the proposal would interact with the District Energy Network (DEN). It was noted that residents were supportive of including a higher number of solar panels as part of the scheme. It was also commented that some residents had expressed safety concerns about the near entrance onto Warwick Gardens. The Assistant Director of Planning, Building Standards, and Sustainability explained that the DEN was not specific to this proposal but was a wider, Council project to provide decentralised energy. It was noted that a decision on the outline business case had been made at Cabinet report in December 2021. The applicant team stated that provision would be made on site if a connection to the DEN became available but that, in the interim, air source heat pumps were proposed and would be supplemented by solar panels. It was added that the scheme planned to have a significant number of solar panels on the roof space. In relation to the pedestrian entrance, the applicant team felt that this would provide a number of wider benefits to the community around access to and through the site. It was added that the applicant was incorporating safety considerations into the design of the site and was working with the Police Secured by Design officer.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.