



FRAME PROJECTS

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: High Road West Developments

Wednesday 8 September 2021

Video conference

Panel

Hari Phillips (chair)

Paddy Pugh

Andy Puncher

David Ubaka

Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

Rob Krzyszowski

London Borough of Haringey

Robbie McNaugher

London Borough of Haringey

John McRory

London Borough of Haringey

Elisabetta Tonazzi

London Borough of Haringey

Richard Truscott

London Borough of Haringey

Graham Harrington

London Borough of Haringey

Sarah Carmona

Frame Projects

Zainab Malik

Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Phillip Elliot

London Borough of Haringey

Deborah Denner

Frame Projects

Confidentiality

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 Developments, The Goods Yard (36 and 44-52 White Hart Lane) and The Depot (819-829) High Road West, Tottenham.

2. Presenting team

Richard Serra	Tottenham Hotspur Football Club
Ian Laurence	F3 Architects
James Beynon	Quod
Xenia Georgiou	Citydesigner
Ignus Froneman	Cogent Heritage
Mark Shelton	Re-form Landscape Architecture

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 proposals relate to two sites owned by Tottenham Hotspur FC (THFC) on the west side of the High Road: the Depot (formerly known as Sainsbury/ B&Q) (Nos. 867-869 High Road) and the Goods Yard site (Nos. 36 and 44-52 White Hart Lane). Parts of the sites are within the North Tottenham Conservation Area and include – or are adjacent to – a number of heritage assets. Both are within a Growth Area and Site Allocation NT5 (High Road West), as identified in the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP). Policy SP1 requires that development in Growth Areas maximises site opportunities, provides appropriate links to, and benefits for, surrounding areas and communities, provides the necessary infrastructure, and is in accordance with the full range of the Council's planning policies and objectives. Site Allocation NT5 calls for a masterplanned, comprehensive development that creates a new residential neighbourhood and leisure destination for London. It sets out a number of relevant requirements and development guidelines.

The most up-to-date masterplan is the High Road West Masterplan Framework, published September 2014. This highlights opportunities for improvement and change in the NT5 area and identifies where housing, open space and play areas, as well as community, leisure, education and health facilities, and shops, could be provided. THFC has submitted a full planning application for the combined Goods Yard and Depot (HGY/2021/1771), comprising 867 homes and 1,878sqm of commercial space, including three residential towers (27, 32 and 29 storeys). Previous planning permissions for the sites include: 330 residential units, a shop/café (A1/A3) and area of public open space for the Depot site (September 2020); 316 residential units,



employment (B1 use), retail (A1 use), leisure (A3 and D2 uses) and community (D1 use) uses for the Good Yard site (June 2019).

Officers seek the panel's consideration of the proposed density and consequent 'liveability' issues, the architectural expression of the proposed towers, and the form, configuration, layout and architectural expression of the proposed lower buildings. Comments are also sought on the quality of proposed publicly accessible open spaces and public realm, and the proposed relationship with existing High Road and White Hart Lane buildings.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposals for High Road West, and thanks the project team for a very comprehensive and clear presentation. While the scope of the review was limited primarily to consideration of the tower buildings due to time constraints, the panel supports the strategic approach to the masterplan, and thinks that in general terms, the architectural expression of the low-rise buildings is well-considered.

The height and scale of the three towers will have a significant visual impact on the North Tottenham Conservation Area and the setting of buildings on the High Road, and the panel feels that further work is required to refine their massing, form and proportion. Further consideration should also be given to the relationship between the towers and the plinth / shoulder buildings, as well as the way in which the towers meet the ground. The panel also feels that the entry sequence, the quality and configuration of the internal accommodation, and architectural expression of the towers should be improved; importantly, the design of the facades and the configuration of the accommodation should be underpinned by their relationship to the site, in particular the environmental factors. In addition, given the impact of the towers, the panel would like to see how this impact is being offset through the public benefit to be provided by the scheme.

While it thinks that the design of the streets and spaces are very promising, the panel is concerned that the increase in residential units within the current proposals – in comparison to the consented scheme – will increase pressure on the proposed amenity space to an unacceptable level.

In light of the scope of the amendments recommended for the tower buildings, in tandem with concerns over the quantum of public open space and play space provision for the proposed development density, the panel is not able to offer support for the planning application as it stands. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.



Scope of the review

- Due to time constraints within the review, the panel were unable to consider the lower-rise buildings or the landscape proposals for the streets and open spaces at a detailed level.

Masterplan, public realm and landscape design

- At a strategic level, the panel feels that the overall organisation of the site and the street network works well in general.
- At the previous review, the panel asked the project team to look at creating distinctive spaces which could establish and support a sense of community, in addition to carefully considered public and private realms, and the interface between them. It feels reasonably comfortable that these aspirations have been achieved.
- The panel understands that the quantum of play space / public open space provided within the consented scheme does not meet the Council's requirements. While this approach was accepted in the extant planning permission for the site, it understands that the current scheme proposes an additional c.220 units above the consented scheme, which will result in an even greater shortfall and will put additional pressure on the amenity space. As these proposals will only deliver the northernmost section of Peacock Park, it questions whether this will further exacerbate the problem.

Conservation area and heritage assets

- As discussed at the previous review, the panel has concerns that there is potential for the towers to overwhelm the setting of buildings on the High Road, and concludes that there is likely to be some harm to the conservation area.
- The height, scale and impact of the three towers requires that they should be of sufficient quality and the development as a whole should deliver sufficient public benefit within the overall planning balance. The panel is not yet convinced that the quality of the towers is sufficient, and it is not yet clear what the extent of the public benefit will be. This requires further consideration by the project team and Haringey officers.

Massing and development density

- The panel understands that the three towers have remained at the same height since the previous review – 27/32/29 storeys, running from south to north. At the previous review, it identified that these tower heights could be acceptable, subject to amendments and refinements to the detailed design, three-dimensional form, language and setting (at ground level) of the towers.



- The panel notes that the three-dimensional form of the towers is unchanged from the previous review. The building footprints, width, height and proportion of the towers remain significantly larger than those of the consented scheme, which has resulted in a reduction in space between the towers.
- This will have the effect of significantly reducing the area of sky visible between the towers, increasing the amount of built form on the skyline, and being perceived as one entity when viewed from certain angles.
- The panel therefore feels that the towers need to reduce in width, to have a more elegant proportion and to increase the amount of space between the towers from the important east and west viewpoints.

Architectural expression and building configuration

- The panel would encourage further refinement of the form and proportion of the towers to avoid a visually bulky profile and to respond better to the nature of the site and local context.
- The top sections of the towers would benefit from further consideration, to add more visual interest and to lighten the 'crown' of the towers.
- The width of the towers should be reduced, to render a more elegant profile and allow greater space in between the buildings: the 'cloak' element does not successfully disguise the width of the buildings and in any case the overall form still appears bulky and inelegant when seen from the east and west.
- The panel is not convinced by the interface between the tower buildings and the lower-rise plinth or shoulder buildings that sit beneath them. Visually the towers appear to 'crash down' onto the lower buildings, or grow out of the roofs. As a result the entrances to the towers do not have the correct emphasis or hierarchy in the streetscape appropriate to their scale. The towers should meet the ground confidently, have their own entrances, and be more assertive within the groundscape. The northern and central towers both have a very awkward junction with the adjoining shoulder buildings that appear to collide with the base of the tower.
- Further consideration of the configuration of these buildings – to give greater visual integrity to all three towers as they meet the ground – would be welcomed, as would work to explore the entry sequence and the visual experience of identifying, approaching and entering each tower. The panel notes that there is little information within the presentation about how the current proposals meet the ground, and the nature and detail of the entrances.
- The panel would like to see further consideration given to the building aspect ratio and number of units per floor. It would also encourage greater rigour within the floorplans, designing from the 'inside out' as well as the 'outside in', as discussed at the previous review. In addition, the number of single aspect



accommodation should be minimised.

- The panel welcomes the calmer approach to the detailed design of the coloured facades, including the simplified panels and aligned windows. Nevertheless, the panel feels that more rigour could be applied to the design of the facades by considering the specific relationship to the site, such as aspect and views, and environmental factors such as wind and solar aspect.
- It feels that simplifying the colour palette and using different shades of the same colour tones on the three different buildings would be more successful than including blue glazed bricks on one of the towers. The panel feels that shades of terracotta could work well across the three towers.
- While the lighter central core elements serve as a visual reference to the materiality of the existing tower adjacent (Rivers Apartments), it feels that further consideration of the composition of this part of the façade is required, to give a more human scale to the architectural expression, and to avoid the appearance of an office building.

Low / zero carbon design and environmental sustainability

- The proposals do not respond sufficiently to the environmental conditions of the site. These considerations – including orientation, layout, wind profiling, window sizes, u-values of the external envelope, and solar gain – should inform the detailed design of the scheme, at both an urban scale and with regard to the design of individual buildings and dwellings.

Next steps

- The panel highlights a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- It 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.

