

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEMS

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Reference No: HGY/2023/2357	Ward: Noel Park
Address: Land at Haringey Heartlands between Hornsey Park Road Mayes Road Coburg Road Western Road and the Kings Cross / East Coast Mainline Clarendon Gas Works Olympia Trading Estate and 57-89 Western Road London N8 & N22	
Proposal: Application for approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout, scale, access, pertaining to Buildings H1, H2 and H3, forming Phase 4, including the construction of residential units (Use Class C3), commercial floorspace, basement, and new landscaped public space pursuant to planning permission HGY/2017/3117 dated 19th April 2018.	
Applicant: St William Homes LLP	
Ownership: Private	

To note: the numbering as set out in this addendum corresponds with the numbering of each section within the Officers committee report

1. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

1 further objection has been received from Parkside Malvern Residents Association (PMRA). The comments are summarised below:

- Wish to raise serious issues and concerns which should be considered
- A snapshot poll over the weekend received 100 objections and has increased since
- Request a deferral of the decision

Officer response: The application consultation took place between 12th September and 22nd October 2023 in which time no comments were received from PMRA, letters were sent to neighbour addresses and site notices were erected around the site.

Prior to that the applicant carried out their own pre-application engagement including a public consultation at the Grace Baptist Church Hall on the 8th of February 2023 where a detailed exhibition of the proposals took place. More recently in October last year the applicant held a meeting with PMRA.

Given no substantive points have been raised and adequate opportunity has been provided for PMRA to formally submit objection, there is no reason to now defer the decision on this application.

2. Additional comments have been received from the Council's independent wind microclimate consultants, Windtech, in their latest comments on the assessment by the applicants' wind microclimate consultants, Urban Microclimate, dated 15th January 2024, have requested further information from the applicants' consultants. In the event that this further information results in the Council's consultants recommending wind mitigation measures would need to be designed into the final building(s) under consideration in this application. An additional condition is included below:

Mitigation of unacceptable wind conditions

Prior to the commencement of superstructure works for the development hereby approved a revised wind assessment shall be carried out by the applicants' wind consultants, incorporating information requested by the Council's 3rd party expert Windtech consultants dated 15th January 2024, to the satisfaction of the Council's 3rd party expert. In the event that the revised report indicates the prevailing wind conditions would not provide comfort levels suitable for the intended use (as agreed by the Council) in all areas of the public realm within and around the site, then modifications to the mitigation measures/or landscaping in this scheme shall be made to provide comfortable wind levels. All details shall be submitted to and approved by the Council and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure public safety and amenity of the public realm within and around the development

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 – Summary of consultation responses - is amended to include formal Design comments, Summary of Wind response from 3rd party expert and 1 further objections

Appendix 2 – Further objection from PMRA

Appendix 3 – Summary of conditions and S106 Obligations attached to the outline permission

Appendix 1 – Summary of consultation responses - is amended to include formal Design comments, Summary of Wind response from 3rd party expert and 1 further objections

Stakeholder	Representations	Officer comments
INTERNAL		
Design Officer	<p>Formal comments provided</p> <p><u>Contents</u></p> <p>Principle of Development 3</p> <p>Outline Permission and Neighbouring Sites..... 5</p> <p>Masterplan & Streetscape..... 9</p> <p>Height, including Tall Buildings 10</p> <p>Private, Communal and Public Amenity Spaces 17</p> <p>Residential Quality, including Aspect and Privacy 19</p> <p>Daylight and Sunlight 20</p> <p>Quality Review Panel..... 23</p> <p><u>Principle of Development</u></p> <p>1. The proposed “Clarendon Square” development on the former gasworks at Haringey Heartlands is a large and complex masterplanned development that has been under preparation since 2008. An earlier scheme by different architects (Make) was approved in outline in 2012 (HGY/2009/0503). The applicants, National Grid, then entered into a joint venture with Berkeley Homes, as St William, and commissioned new architects (Panter Hudspith) to improve the masterplan and</p>	Comments noted

	<p>progress to development. The replacement hybrid planning application (HGY/2017/3117) was approved in April 2018, with full planning permission for what is being referred to now as “The Southern Quarter”, and outline permission, with an indicative scheme, parameter plans and a Design Code for the rest. One part of the development, known for now as “Block C”, has the same footprint as in the original Make approval, so its revised design has been approved as a separate reserved matters approval and minor amendment (HGY/2017/0821).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="674 544 1648 1094">2. Reserved Matters applications for detailed design of Blocks D1 & 2 (HGY/2019/0362), and Blocks D3 & 4 (HGY/2019/1775) were approved in 2021, followed by Blocks E1-3 (HGY/2020/1851) in 2022. All these, to the south of this application site, are now known together as the Eastern Quarter, and are now under construction, with the earliest approaching completion. This application (HGY/2023/2357) is for Blocks H1, 2 & 3, now known as the Northern Quarter (or a part of it, which may include further phases to the west). This site is at the northern edge of the Clarendon Square wider masterplan site (with outline/hybrid planning permission), with its northern edge bounded by Coburg Road, and eastern edge by Silsoe Road. Further sites that will form later phases of this wider masterplan, Blocks F1, G1 & G2, lie to the west of this Reserved Matters application site.<li data-bbox="674 1114 1648 1367">3. A number of Non-Material Amendments (NMAs) have also been made to the hybrid permission and previous reserved matters approvals. These generally are of very minor significance, relating to other parts of the wider masterplan, and are often unrelated to design matters. But one NMA is of particular relevance; this is HGY/2021/1392, approved June 2021, which revised the Parameter Plan PP5; the Parameter Plans control	
--	---	--

aspects of the outline parts of that hybrid plan, and PP% set maximum and minimum heights for each development plot. This NMA increased the maximum parameter height of Building H1 from 91.10m (AOD) to 110.2m (AOD), an increase of 19.1m. At that time, officers were shown 3d models of the change and the Planning Authority did not consider this amendment to be material.

4. **Architect Retention** - Although Panter Hudspith Architects were retained for the detailed design and reserved matters applications for Blocks D1-4, the applicants switched to Sheppard Robson Architects for Blocks E1-3, and have subsequently retained Sheppard Robson for this application. Approval of any change of architects is subject to a condition (Condition 15) of the original hybrid planning approval, which can be deemed to have been discharged in approval of the most recent previous Reserved Matters application, HGY/2020/1851 for Blocks E1-3 (phase 3b). It remains important, though, that Panter Hudspith architects are retained by the applicants in a supervisory role to check and provide written confirmation, available to the planning authority, that the design principles, code, spirit and integrity of their original design is retained when worked up in detail by other architects, such as in this Reserved Matters application.

Outline Permission and Neighbouring Sites

5. This application is for the first three blocks of the seven that make up what is known as “The Northern Quarter” (or Northern and Western Quarters) of the Clarendon Square development. This “quarter” will sit around and to the north of the main urban square of the development (“Clarendon Square” itself), to the north-west of “The Eastern Quarter”, comprising Blocks D1-4 and E1-3 of the overall masterplan. The main

	<p>north south street through the overall masterplan (Mary Neuner Way / Clarendon Road / “the spine road”), will run south out of the square through the middle of the rest of the overall masterplan, crossing the central “Community Park”, stretching from Hornsey Road to the east to the railway embankment to the west, at the southern edge of the Eastern Quarter. South of the park, the spine road continues, with Blocks A1-4 and B1-4, comprising the “Southern Quarter”, to either side. Block C (or C1, although no other Cs are planned) sits north of the park, west of the spine road and south of where the vehicular roadway bends west.</p> <p>6. The applicants also refer to this application as Phase 4, with the D Blocks referred to by them as Phase 3a, and the E Blocks as phase 3b. Future phases, containing planned F1, G1 and G2 in the outline consent and masterplan, have not yet been submitted for Reserved Matters approval not engaged in any pre-application discussions with the planning authority on their detailed design, these will be to the west of this reserved matters application, the square and the E Blocks, and north of C1, up to the applicants’ western and northern boundaries. There are existing low-rise commercial buildings on these blocks, similar to those on this application site. It is not yet known to the planning authority whether these plots, Blocks F1, G1 & 2, will be progressed as one phase or more than one, nor whether the applicants will refer to them as further parts of the “Northern Quarter” or another, “Western Quarter”, in whole or in part, nor is it considered relevant to consideration of this application.</p> <p>7. The main north-south spine route, running into the square from the south, will continue north of the north-western corner of the square, between the western edge of this reserved matters application site and the future phase(s). At a crossroads with</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Coburg Road, the street forming the northern boundary of this application site, it will approximately align with the continuation of Clarendon Road; this street continues into the heart of the separate major development site known as Chocolate Factory, to the north of Coburg Road and currently under construction for a high density mix of residential, workspace and town centre uses, and in future plans and site allocations, the Council hopes that it will eventually be extended beyond, into Wood Green Common. The plots immediately north of Coburg Road, known as Mallard and Kingfisher Place, are part of the approved Chocolate Factory masterplan but not part of the current development and in different ownership, however it is to be hoped their existing single and two storey industrial units are soon to be redeveloped along the same lines, specifically with town centre and employment uses on at least the ground and (to the Coburg Road frontage) 1st floor, with further commercial and/or residential above.</p> <p>8. A further low-rise industrial site, Bittern Place, occupies most of the block to the east of this application site, across Silsoe Road, with some small separate 2 storey buildings along its southern edge along Brook Road, which runs east from the south-eastern corner of this RM site, lining up with the street exiting the south-eastern corner of the square. There are no current proposals for Bittern Place, but it is a site allocation for ground and 1st floor town centre or commercial uses and residential above, with tall buildings to the nearest western edge, dropping to lower to its east, where the site backs onto existing terraced and detached 2-4 storey houses on Mayes Road to the east. There is an existing early 20th century industrial building, Chocolate Factory 2, on the north side of Coburg Road opposite Bittern which is expected to be retained, with a further allocated development site beyond that, up to the Duke of Edinburgh pub on the corner</p>	
--	--	--

of Mayes Road. South of Brook Road, the Clarendon Square site extends a short distance, with currently under construction block D4 having a retail ground floor street frontage. Next to that is the entrance to the masterplan's Ecological Walk footpath running south over the culverted Rover Moselle that forms its eastern boundary, with back gardens of houses on Horsey Park Road. Beyond that is currently the car park to the Iceland supermarket, on the corner of Brook Road and Mayes Road. Planning permission has been granted for a further major redevelopment for this site for retail, workspace and a health centre on the ground and 1st floor, with residential above up to 10 storeys.

9. Both Coburg and Brook Roads end in T-junctions with Mayes Road to the east, close to the existing Metropolitan Centre of Wood Green (an important London Plan planning designation), with the back of The Mall and Market facing Brook Road, and further site allocations and plans in the council's draft Wood Green AAP are that a major new east-west town-centre pedestrian/cycle street will branch off Wood Green High Road, between the Library and northern edge of The Mall, to link to Brook and/or Coburg Roads to provide a direct and attractive east-west pedestrian / cycle route from the heart of Heartlands (at this RM site) to the heart of Wood green Metropolitan Centre. This RM site therefore becomes the key crossing point of major north-south and east-west pedestrian and cycle friendly streets, as well as marking the western end of the intended extended Metropolitan Centre, the heart of Heartlands, and the entrance to the Penstock Tunnel path to Alexandra Park to the west, for which significant public realm improvements have been planned and are shortly to commence.

Masterplan & Streetscape

10. The buildings in this application, like those of the E Blocks, have a more urban, “town centre” character than the earlier phases and blocks of the wider Clarendon Square development, relating more to the urban square and neighbouring urban streets to the north, north-east, and west, without much relationship to the older existing terraced houses and back gardens to the south-east. This entails greater density and height, and with workspace (use class B1) and town centre retail uses on much of their ground and first floors, and with active non-residential uses (town centre, including retail, or workspace) on all of the main street frontages. In particular, it is envisaged that the urban “market square”, between the Eastern and Northern Quarter will be a major focus of town-centre-like activity.
11. Therefore, like the north side of E2 & 3, all parts of this development are designed to have ground floor town centre uses and active frontage to interact with the vibrant space all around them, although Silsoe Road, to the east, will be a less busy street and more suited to back-of house servicing than the square, Coburg Road or shorter linking sides of any of the blocks. Therefore, almost all of this proposals’ servicing including refuse and cycle storage will be from the basement, accessed from the E Blocks to the south and for refuse collection only from Silsoe Road. The proposals have a two-storey base of town centre uses, with bars/restaurants/tap rooms proposed for most prominent location in the masterplan, facing the square, retail/workspace on the rest of the ground floor and workspace/office use covering the whole of the 1st floor of all three blocks, with its receptions in the centre of the north side, facing Coburg Road. The convincing layout of the

proposed town centre and workspace use floors gives design officers strong confidence that the intended vibrant street frontages will be achieved.

Height, including Tall Buildings

12. These proposals include the tallest two buildings in the Clarendon Square overall masterplan, with Building H2-3 rising to 17 and 20 floors and H1 rising to 26 floors.
13. The principle of height such as this was agreed in the original hybrid approval and in a subsequent Non Material Amendment (NMA); HGY/2021/1392, which increased the maximum parameter height of Building H1 from 91.10m (above ordnance datum - AOD) to 110.2m AOD, where the ground level is to be 24.1m AOD. The originally approved height of 67m (91.1-24.1) could accommodate 21 storeys at a typical residential floor to floor height of 3.1m (notwithstanding that the non-residential floor could be expected, and indeed are proposed to be of considerably greater height, so not quite that many floors would be possible). The increase permitted in that NMA is to an 85.1m tall building, which could on the same basis house a maximum of 27 floors. 26 floors are proposed for the tallest part of Building H1 in this detailed Reserved Matters application.
14. Considering each relevant criterion from The London Plan (adopted 2021) tall building policy D9 and Haringey's tall building policy in SP11 of our Strategic Polices DPD (adopted 2013 (with alterations 2017) and DM6 of our Development Management DPD (adopted 2017):
 - LP D9.B: *"1) Boroughs should determine if there are locations where tall buildings may be an appropriate form of development, subject to meeting the other requirements of the Plan. This process should include*

	<p><i>engagement with neighbouring boroughs that may be affected by tall building developments in identified locations. 2) Any such locations and appropriate tall building heights should be identified on maps in Development Plans. 3) Tall buildings should only be developed in locations that are identified as suitable in Development Plans". HGY SP11: "an adopted Area Action Plan or existing adopted masterplan framework for the site and surrounding area" - The site is within the areas of both the adopted locations suitable for tall buildings (Policy DM6 in the Development Management Policies DPD, adopted 2017), and in the preferred options consultation draft Wood Green AAP (2018), and identified in the Haringey Urban Characterisation Study (2015), which all identify the northern end of the Clarendon Square site as suitable for tall buildings, without specifying precisely how high.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• HGY SP11: <i>assessment supporting tall buildings in a Characterisation Study" - The council prepared a borough-wide Urban Characterisation Study in 2016, which supported tall buildings in this wider Wood Green-Haringey Heartlands major development area and specifically, that height should rise in this specific location, as one of four high points, marking the centre of the Heartlands regeneration area, the envisaged central town square and the western end of the new east-west route from the High Road to Heartlands, connected to the onward western route via the Penstock Tunnel to Alexandra Park. The Characterisation Study recognises that the railway forms a significant barrier and buffer between the two sides, with the much more sensitive west side of the railway being a much quieter, parkland</i>	
--	--	--

	<p>dominated neighbourhood than the east, as well as the railway corridor being at its widest beside this part of Heartlands, giving a much greater distance, with the broad, wooded embankments providing further buffering between the two areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LP D9.C.1 a): <i>“development proposals should address ... visual impacts”</i> [long, mid & immediate views]; HGY DM DPD DM6.B.a: <i>“Protect and preserve existing locally important and London wide strategic views in accordance with Policy DM5”</i> – A range of local, intermediate and long distance views of these proposals have been prepared by the applicants in consultation with Haringey design and planning officers, to officer satisfaction.• LP D9.C.1 b): <i>“whether part of a group or stand-alone, tall buildings should reinforce the spatial hierarchy of the local and wider context and aid legibility and wayfinding”</i>; These proposals will be capable of being considered “Landmarks” by being wayfinders or markers within the masterplan, closing vistas of Brook Road and the two stretches of Coburg Road either side of it’s kink, marking a key crossroads on the main north-south street with Coburg Road, and marking the new square from all directions.• LP D9.C.1 b): <i>“architectural quality and materials should be of an exemplary standard to ensure that the appearance and architectural integrity of the building is maintained through its lifespan”</i>; HGY DM DPD DM6.B.a: <i>“be of a high standard of architectural quality and design, including a high quality urban realm”</i>; HGY DM DPD DM6.C.a: - High quality design especially of public realm is promised in the approved Hybrid Scheme, its	
--	---	--

	<p>accompanying Design Code and Illustrative Scheme, and is promised to be achieved in this detailed Reserved Matters phase for the reasons mentioned in other sections of this document. They should also be capable of being considered “Landmarks” by being elegant, well proportioned and visually interesting when viewed from any direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LP D9.C.1 c): <i>“proposals should take account of, and avoid harm to, the significance of London’s heritage assets and their settings...”</i> - It was agreed at the hybrid approval that no heritage assets nor their settings are affected by these proposals.• LP D9.C.1 g): <i>“buildings should not cause adverse reflected glare”</i> – these residential proposals are for masonry buildings with inset windows framed between brick and reconstituted stone projecting framing which in addition to avoiding solar heat gain, should prevent any glare problem occurring.• LP D9.C.1 h): <i>“buildings should be designed to minimise light pollution from internal and external lighting”</i> – again, given they will be in domestic use and not all window should not be a concern.• LP D9.C.2 a): <i>“the internal and external design, including construction detailing, the building’s materials and its emergency exit routes must ensure the safety of all occupants”</i> – Second staircases have been added to all cores of all blocks, with separate entrances to the street, along with other work by the applicants team, in consultation with their specialist fire consultants, to ensure the proposals are in complete accordance with	
--	--	--

	<p>the latest building regulations , fire prevention, fire spread prevention and means of escape enablement recommendations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LP D9.C.2 b): <i>“buildings should be serviced, maintained and managed in a manner that will preserve their safety and quality, and not cause disturbance or inconvenience to surrounding public realm. Servicing, maintenance and building management arrangements should be considered at the start of the design process”</i> – Servicing has been carefully thought about and designed with care, but is particularly eased by the masterplanned inclusion of a basement level under all of the northern and eastern quarter, providing all the refuse, cycle and plant storage, as well as disabled car parking. Management has also been thought about in the masterplanning of the wider development, including management and resident amenity facilities concentrated in the Eastern Quarter which will be completed before this phase.• LP D9.C.2 c): <i>“entrances, access routes, and ground floor uses should be designed and placed to allow for peak time use and to ensure there is no unacceptable overcrowding or isolation in the surrounding areas”</i> – The location of ground floor active town centre uses is primarily driven by the desire to attract more activity to the site; there is no concern with overcrowding.• LP D9.C.2 d): <i>“it must be demonstrated that the capacity of the area and its transport network is capable of accommodating the quantum of development in terms of access to facilities, services, walking and cycling networks, and public transport for people living or working in the building”</i> – The council’s specialist Transportation	
--	---	--

	<p>Planning officers have been closely involved in every stage of the design of this project, the wider masterplan, the detailed design of earlier phases and the detailed design of this phase, and have covered all of these issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LP D9.C.2 e): <i>“jobs, services, facilities and economic activity that will be provided by the development and the regeneration potential this might provide should inform the design so it maximises the benefits these could bring to the area, and maximises the role of the development as a catalyst for further change in the area”</i> – The attraction of employment and town centre activities as part of this development is an intrinsic and important part of the wider masterplan and in particular of this phase detailed design, which has been carefully designed to appeal to and be suitable for a wide range of likely employment and town centre uses. These detailed designs have been prepared in consultation with The Council’s Regeneration Officers with specialism in employment generation.• LP D9.C.2 f): <i>“buildings, including their construction, should not interfere with aviation, navigation or telecommunication, and should avoid a significant detrimental effect on solar energy generation on adjoining buildings”</i> – Although tall, these proposals are not considered tall enough to interfere with aviation, navigation or telecommunication in any way, and are close to taller potential interferences, notably the Transmission Tower of Alexandra Palace. As a predominantly masonry set of buildings, with glazing shaded from the sun to	
--	--	--

	<p>avoid solar gain, there should not be any concern with solar glare.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• LP D9.C.3 a): <i>“wind, daylight, sunlight penetration and temperature conditions around the building(s) and neighbourhood must be carefully considered and not compromise comfort and the enjoyment of open spaces, including water spaces, around the building”</i> – The applicants’ consultants have carried out extensive wind testing on computer and in laboratories, along with detailed daylight and sunlight assessment as detailed elsewhere.• LP D9.C.3 b): <i>“air movement affected by the building(s) should support the effective dispersion of pollutants, but not adversely affect street-level conditions”</i> – The site is not a heavily trafficked location, away from any immediately neighbouring busy roads or other pollution sources.• LP D9.C.3 c): <i>“noise created by air movements around the building(s), servicing machinery, or building uses, should not detract from the comfort and enjoyment of open spaces around the building”</i> – There have been no suggestions that there would be any adverse wind generated noise around these proposed buildings.• LP D9.C.4 a): <i>“the cumulative visual, functional and environmental impacts of proposed, consented and planned tall buildings in an area must be considered when assessing tall building proposals and when developing plans for an area. Mitigation measures should be identified and designed into the building as integral features from the outset to avoid retro-fitting”</i> – no	
--	---	--

	<p>cumulative issues considered relevant as these tall buildings will be relatively isolated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LP D9.D: <i>“Free to enter publicly-accessible areas should be incorporated into tall buildings where appropriate, particularly more prominent tall buildings where they should normally be located at the top of the building to afford wider views across London”</i>. – again, given they will be in domestic use, not relevant. • HGY DM DPD DM6.C.b: <i>“Consider the impact on ecology and microclimate”</i> - Consideration of impact on ecology and microclimate encompasses daylight, sunlight and wind, examined in detail below. Impact on ecology could also include impact on the flight of birds and other flying creatures, but this is only likely to be relevant adjacent to open countryside, a large open space or open waterway, which is not the case here. <p>15. There are no existing residential buildings close enough to these proposed towers to have their amenity affected. The neighbouring residential buildings within this development are to the south of this proposal and not adversely affected.</p> <p><u>Private, Communal and Public Amenity Spaces</u></p> <p>16. All residential units are provided with private amenity space in compliance with or better than London Plan and Mayoral Housing SPG requirements, in the form of balconies or roof terraces. Balconies are generally inset, especially on street facing elevations, located on corners benefiting from daylight from and views in two directions, and usually benefit from direct sunlight.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>17. All flats would also be able to use one or two private communal external amenity spaces; H1 has a private communal roof terrace at the 10th floor, the two separate cores of H2-3 both have access to two roof terraces, at the 2nd floor podium facing the square and at the 14th floors. All contain an equipped children's play area, seating both close to and separate from the play area and planters and would benefit from plentiful sunlight. Edges of the podium visible from the surrounding streets will see the trees and bushes and on the 10th & 14th floor terraces contain large communal sun loungers to exploit the generous sun they will receive.</p> <p>18. Nevertheless, these homes will benefit from less private communal amenity space than any of the previous phases of Clarendon Square, inevitably due to the nature of their being in the highest density, most urban part of the development, with the most town centre character. Residents will still be able to enjoy the other large areas of publicly accessible recreation and playspace created by this wider Clarendon Square development, in the public park, central garden court and pocket park beside the Community Room and Residents Facility, itself also available to these residents, and all a short walk away and accessible from residents doors without crossing a road. They will also benefit from better access than any earlier phases to nearby public parks at Wood Green Common and Alexandra Park, a 10-15 minute walk away along pedestrian friendly routes being improved as part of this and other neighbouring developments.</p> <p>19. Entrances to and circulation within blocks is spacious and benefits from external windows providing a decent amount of natural light to some upper floor corridors. Each core has a prominently located street entrance, in highly legible and active</p>	
--	---	--

locations, a double height entrance hall opening off a double height porch, leading through a relatively short corridor to double stairs and double lift. At some floors the centrally located lifts and stairs is close to a floor-to-ceiling window or a glazed door onto one of the roof terraces. No floor of any of the three cores ever has more than eight flats per core per floor, as recommended in the Mayors Housing SPG, the layout as two separate corridors leading in opposite directions off the central lift, stair and window make it more like five and six flats per floor, as well as the lower floors containing a higher proportion of smaller one bedroom flats, so, in this case the number of flats per floor can be considered acceptable. From the 10th floor, H1 has only 6 flats per floor, and from the 14th floor H2 & H3, now separate tops, have just 5 flats per floor.

Residential Quality, including Aspect and Privacy

20. All flat and room sizes comply with or exceed minima defined in the Nationally Described Space Standards, as is to be routinely expected.
21. The proportion of single aspect housing is reasonable, and better than in the approved-in-outline illustrative scheme; due to the changed layout, the cut-out creates two dual aspect corner flats where there was one per floor, and this application achieves 62% dual aspect, compared to a predicted 45-55% dual aspect in the consented illustrative scheme for these blocks. There are no two or more bedroom single aspect flats and most face east or west. So although it would be preferred if there were no single aspect north and south facing flats, it is unsurprising that in this part of the development, with a larger proportion of smaller flats, and considering the importance of built form providing enclosure and legible urban form to the network of streets and squares, as well as being an

	<p>improvement on the consented outline scheme, the number is considered a good achievement.</p> <p>22. In general, the quality of residential accommodation proposed is consistently high, and the clear layout, generous, high quality and well naturally lit communal circulation and landscaped outdoor amenity space, further enhance the quality of accommodation proposed.</p> <p><u>Daylight and Sunlight</u></p> <p>23. Of relevance to this section, Haringey policy in the DM DPD DM1 requires that:</p> <p><i>“...D Development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development’s users and neighbours. The council will support proposals that: Provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity spaces where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land; Provide an appropriate amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and residents of the development...”</i></p> <p>The applicants have prepared a Day and Sunlight Statement broadly in accordance with council policy following the methods explained in the Building Research Establishment’s publication “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice” (3rd Edition, Littlefair, 2021), known as “The BRE Guide”.</p> <p>24. Daylight and sunlight levels to the proposed residential accommodation within this proposal generally meet the BRE standard, a good result for a higher density scheme. For daylight, 378 of the sample of 542 rooms assessed (70%) would</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>receive daylight of or over the BRE Guide recommended levels. Many of the rooms that do not meet the BRE guidance levels are Living/Dining/Kitchens or Studios that would meet the levels recommended for Living/Dining Rooms but don't meet the higher levels for Kitchens, although the kitchen is at the darker back of the room. They are also often in rooms relying on windows opening off a balcony with a further balcony above, which itself will be of greater benefit to residents, but reflects the more repetitive, more formal architectural approach. Nevertheless, the proportion in compliance is comparable to or better than the illustrative scheme at outline application, the results achieved in earlier phases of this development, and given the higher density nature of this development area, the result is considered a good daylighting performance.</p> <p>25. For sunlight, the applicants' consultants tested all habitable rooms facing within 90° of due south and then teased out the living rooms, which are the only rooms considered relevant to sunlight access in the BRE Guide. Their assessment found that 169 south facing habitable rooms (40%) meet the recommended sunlight, out of 297 applicable living rooms. Given the high-density nature of the development, this is again considered a good sunlight achievement, comparable to or better than earlier phases of this development and to that achieved on other comparable high density developments.</p> <p>26. Each block has a large private communal rooftop amenity space. With respect to public spaces, all exceed the BRE Guide recommended access to sunlight, of at least 2 hours at the solstice, with the most challenged, the market square, which was predicted in the outline scheme to only just achieve the BRE recommendations, somewhat improved in this detailed</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>design. All the roof terraces receive very generous sunlight. All flats also benefit from a private balcony or roof terrace, most of which also receive more than the recommended sunlight. It is generally recognised, in the applicants own marketing research and in published reports such as “Superdensity” (Recommendations for Living at Superdensity - Design for Homes 2007), that residents value sunlight to their amenity spaces more highly than to their living rooms, valuing the ability to sit outdoors in the sun, and to have a view from their living room, and if possible, from their flat entrance hall, onto a sunny outdoor space, whilst excessive sunlight into living rooms can create overheating and television viewing difficulties. Given that all residents will have access to sunny private communal amenity space, most with sunny private amenity space, and a reasonable number sun to their living rooms, the sunlight levels are considered acceptable.</p> <p>27. The impact of their proposals on neighbouring dwellings was generally addressed satisfactorily in the Hybrid Application and does not need to be changed for this. However, there was a condition on the Outline Approval that reserved matters for this (and other adjacent) parcels must confirm their impact on a reasonable illustrative scheme on the Bittern Place site. The applicants’ consultants’ study in Design & Access Statement shows that the areas of the illustrative scheme that would not get access to good daylight are not significantly increased, only affecting a part of the ground floor and a very small part of the first floor, with the expectation being these floors would be in non-residential use, to meet the Site Allocation Requirements for town centre and employment uses on that site. It was accepted, when the Outline Application was granted, that a development of matching height and setback to the illustrative scheme and parameter plans of that Outline Application on the</p>	
--	---	--

Bittern Place side of the Silsoe Road frontage, north of site of this application, would not benefit from great daylight.

28. Normally in the case of higher density developments it is necessary to note that the BRE Guide itself states that it is written with low density, suburban patterns of development in mind and should not be slavishly applied to more urban locations; as in London, the Mayor of London's Housing SPG acknowledges. In particular, the 27% VSC recommended guideline is based on a low density suburban housing model and in an urban environment it is recognised that VSC values in excess of 20% are considered as reasonably good, and that VSC values in the mid-teens are deemed acceptable. Paragraph 2.3.29 of the GLA Housing SPD supports this view as it acknowledges that natural light can be restricted in densely developed parts of the city. This proposal therefore achieved a high quality of day and sunlight access.

Quality Review Panel

29. Haringey's independent, objective, expert Quality Review Panel (QRP) has reviewed Clarendon Square proposals all the way through it's progress, including these reserved matters detailed proposals twice, 21st September 2022 and most recently on 7th December 2022. At that last review, the panel still had a number of concerns, explained in their detailed report, but concluded expressing overall support for the proposals, and confidence that all the remaining concerns could be resolved in further amendments, in consultation with Haringey officers. Further amendments were indeed made and justifications given, between that last QRP and this scheme finally under consideration for Reserved Matters Approval. These are generally mentioned in the discussions on specific topics above, but this final section of the Design Officer Comments specifically

	<p>itemises the final QR concerns, amendments, justification and design officer commentary.</p> <p>30. Scheme Layout – whilst supporting high density development of brownfield sites such as this, to provide much needed housing, the QRP were concerned about housing quality issues with the proposals, specifically: overlooking distances; particularly where habitable rooms in different flats face each other, especially where one or both are single aspect flats; the proportion of single versus dual aspect flats; fire safety, where a single stair core could be relied upon and that few of the common circulation spaces would have any natural light. In response to these concerns, the applicants have substantially reconfigured the internal layouts of both buildings to provide two separated stairs to all three cores, and moved H1 west, so the closest distance between windows, which are to bedrooms rather than living rooms, will be a reasonable 12m, with many at least 16m apart. The tightly designed cores, with short corridors, miraculously including a second stair without any increase in footprint, cannot provide natural light to many floors, but do to parts of eight residential floors, .</p> <p>31. Height and Massing – The QRP retain an in principle concern at the overall height of these proposals, but acknowledge that planning permission has already been granted, hybrid planning permission HGY/2017/3117, as revised in non material amendment HGY/2021/1392, which increased the maximum parameter height of Building H1 from 91.10m AOD to 110.2m AOD, where the ground level was to be 24.1m AOD, and these detailed reserved matters proposals use all of that permitted height. This extra 19.1m height is a 27% increase in building height over the hybrid permission. The QRP expressed a view that they consider 15 storeys the maximum appropriate eight for</p>	
--	---	--

the location. The originally approved height of 67m could accommodate 21 storeys at a typical residential floor to floor height of 3.1m (notwithstanding non-residential floors). The increase permitted in that NMA is to an 85.1m tall building, which could on the same basis house a maximum of 27 floors, an extra 6 storeys. 26 floors are proposed for the tallest part of Building H1 in this detailed Reserved Matters application, a 23% increase in number of floors. Nevertheless, not only is the decision to permit that height already made, and not open for being reversed, the QRP concede that the proposals are “probably as elegant as can be within these parameters”, with which officers concur. QRP also considered that although this height had been shown to them to be acceptable on long distance views, they remained concerned about short range views. A number of additional short range views have been produced by the applicants, such as those on pages 146, 147, 148 and 149 of their Design and Access Statement, which officers consider demonstrate these proposals will look elegant, well designed and appropriate for this emerging town centre location surrounded by other developments likely to be of similar scale and significance.

32. **Placemaking, Character and Quality** – QRP questioned whether the location is right for such “metropolitan scale”, but officers would assert that metropolitan scale is precisely what is desired in this central place within the Heartlands adopted growth zone, directly connected, as it will be, to the heart of the existing designated Metropolitan Centre of Wood Green and acting as a “3rd pole” to that centre, with increased intensity of town centre, employment and residential use essential to regenerate Wood Green. QRP felt this proposal had more the look and feel of Canary Wharf than of an “arts quarter”, but officers would disagree, noting that the ground and 1st floor

commercial space proposed is designed to be subdivided into a range of different unit sizes, the town centre uses envisaged would compliment creative industries, and that it will be between expanding artist studio and creative workspace developments, including Collage Arts within Plot E. They also expressed concern the white stonework proposed could attract graffiti (not presumably thinking of graffiti's creativity!), but the applicants have been able to demonstrate effective maintenance of their estate to prevent that.

33. **Wider Landscape Masterplan** – the QRP's concern on this topic was that the Council's masterplan intention, expressed in the draft Wood Green AAP, that Coburg Road, the street marking the northern boundary of this application site, become a wider tree-lined boulevard, be contributed to in the landscaping included within the boundary of this application. Coburg Road extends a short distance west of the site, up to Western Road and the north-western corner of the wider Clarendon Square masterplan (future phases), where it forms crossroads with the Penstock Tunnel Path continuing west under the railway to Alexandra Park, and slightly longer, via a bend, east-north-east to Mayes Road. It is intended to form the western end of the east-west link connecting the Heartlands Growth Area to Wood Green Metropolitan Centre and be an attractive commercial destination street. Since the last QRP there has been extensive discussion between the applicants, neighbouring applicants, the Council's highways and regeneration officers to agree the width and cross section of the street, and what trees will be where. This, along with pressure from council planning and design officers to improve tree cover, has resulted in one extra tree and improved spacing of trees along this application site's Coburg Road frontage, and it has

been confirmed this will fit in with the agreed masterplan for the tree-lined boulevard.

34. **Public Realm** – QRP expressed support for the straight route from the north-eastern corner of the square to Coburg Road, open to the air above apart from the lightweight, open canopy at 2nd floor (podium) level, compared to the diagonal undercroft pedestrian route to the corner of Coburg and Silsoe Roads proposed in the illustrative masterplan, part of the previous hybrid approval. QRP questioned whether the canopy should not be solid, particularly to provide greater shelter from wind, followed up by officers, but the applicants pointed out that it would need to be open air for the proposed trees. QRP were more concerned with the consistency (or lack of) of building (or shoulder) heights around the proposed square, suggesting a consistent 8 storey shoulder to all 4 sides would be preferable, but the applicants explained that whilst the north and south sides would have a matching 8 storeys to the shoulder of H1 and the overall height of E2, the east side (H3) & potentially the west side (part of future phases) were intended to be less prominent, to give greatest prominence to H1, the landmark tower marking the key crossroads of Coburg Road with the north-south spine, and the centre of the Heartlands area. QRP also suggested the landscaping to the square should be more structured, echoing points made by Haringey design officers through the pre-app process, but also wanted *more* greenery, not less, and this proposal is considered by design and other officers to be the best combination of that desire for formality in landscaping, maximising greenery, maximising usability and flexibility of the square and where planting, especially trees with deep roots, is compatible with the basement car park beneath, especially given the desire for flexibility, usability and open

	<p>appearance of the square that any raised panting beds be of minimal height.</p> <p>35. Environmental Response – Again, wind testing was requested under this topic, along with further information on noise & air quality assessments, overheating, and energy strategy. This further detail has now been supplied, or in the case of some of the more technical aspects especially of energy assessments, are agreed by specialist council officers will be supplied at later stages in construction, to be secured by condition. QRP noted particular design concerns over these detailed proposals’ concentrating Air Source Heat Pumps on one roof (entailing long pipe runs and possible noise concentration), and whether floor to ceiling heights are sufficient to accommodate under-floor heating, mechanical ventilation heat recovery and access to servicing, but it is understood the council’s specialist officers are satisfied with further detail supplied by the applicants in these respects.</p> <p>36. Architectural Language – Finally, the QRP had some relatively minor quibbles about architectural detailing, which have all been resolved to design and planning officers’ satisfaction, as well as the further requested 3d views having been provided. Specific design concerns included to the “crown”, the top-most floors of Building H1 not being consistent to all sides, which it now is. They also expressed concern that H2-3 didn’t have a strong enough relationship in architectural expression to H1, such that it could be read as a “value engineered” version, that there could be more consistency in their base, middle and top treatments and the mass could be further broken down by making elements more “filigree”, more finely proportioned and detailed. These have been addressed by the applicants with banding to H1 being made more slender,</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>and more similar banding applied to more of H2-3, and a crown of the same proportions and more similar composition to H1 being applied to H2-3. Design officers would note that these changes further improve the pleasing appearance of these proposals, especially in views where H2-3 has more prominence, such as the key middle distance view south-west down Coburg Road.</p> <p>37. Conclusions on QRP Response – All issues noted by the QRP as outstanding in their last report, that of 7th December 2022 and noted as being capable of being addressed by the applicants' team in liaison with Haringey Officers, have indeed been addressed fully to officers' satisfaction.</p>	
EXTERNAL		
3 rd Party Wind Expert	<p>The Council's independent wind microclimate consultants, Windtech, in their latest comments on the assessment by the applicants' wind microclimate consultants, Urban Microclimate, dated 15th January 2024, have requested further information from the applicants' consultants.</p>	<p>In the event that this further information results in the Council's consultants recommending wind mitigation measures would need to be designed into the final building(s) under consideration in this application a condition is recommended.</p> <p>Potential design modifications could include projecting baffles, fins or ledges</p>

		<p>attached to one or both of the buildings, H1 or H2-3, and hard or soft landscape features such as free-standing canopies or pergolas, trees and shrubs. The planning authority would be seeking the designs of any such features to be compatible and harmonious with the proposed development and its context.</p>