



London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: College of Haringey, Enfield and North-East London

Wednesday 17 January 2024

AH Level 6 Collaboration Space, Alexandra House, Station Road, London N22 7TY

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Phil Armitage

Attendees

John Kaimakamis	London Borough of Haringey
Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Joshua O'Donnell	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Kirsty McMullan	Frame Projects
Bonnie Russell	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Biplav Pageni	London Borough of Haringey
Elizabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Bryce Tudball	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.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

College of Haringey Enfield and North-East London (CONEL), Tottenham Centre, High Road, London N15 4RU

2. Presenting team

Ashley Furlong	Capital City College Group
Linda Odiase	Atkins
John Ridgett	Atkins
Steven Bee	Urban Counsel
Mo Poswall	Peter Marsh Consulting
Louise Morton	Quadrant Town Planning
Riyaz Ali	Peter Marsh Consulting

3. Planning authority briefing

The site forms part of the College of Haringey, Enfield and North-East London (CONEL) and is located on the High Road, on the western edge of Tottenham Green Conservation Area. The site is constrained by its dense built context and the historic frontage of the conservation area. It sits behind the 1970s tower block of the college, near to the locally listed Tottenham Technical College and statutorily listed buildings immediately to the north. The site is identified as an 'Area for Change' in the Tottenham Area Action Plan.

The existing campus comprises approximately 19,930 square metres of education floorspace, providing a range of vocational courses. The proposal seeks permission for a new six-storey building to host the Construction and Engineering Centre of the college, which is no longer functionally suitable for teaching. The proposals are part of a phased wider masterplan intended to improve and facilitate the reconfiguration of the campus and the activation of the courtyard space. Further phases of the masterplan will restore the original quadrangle that shaped the main 2005 building.

The existing building in the western corner of the campus, which currently houses the Construction and Engineering Centre, does not form part of the application. Once vacated it will be demolished, and this parcel of land made available for a future residential redevelopment.

Officers are very supportive of the proposal in principle and asked for the panel's views on the height and massing, impact on heritage, sustainability, biodiversity and urban greening, as well as how the scheme will affect the future development of the wider phased masterplan.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the proposals for a new college on this site. This will be of strategic importance to the borough. It thinks that the project team has responded positively to the panel's previous comments.

The long-term masterplan is helpful to understand the wider ambitions for this site. The panel is now convinced that access issues have been resolved, enabling the future residential development in the western corner. The project team is encouraged to develop the detail of the masterplan, including a construction management plan that considers the potential impact on public transport services in the immediate area. The reduction in height and massing creates a more comfortable relationship with the scheme's context. While some heritage impact remains in views from Isobel Place, this is justified by the public benefits that the college will bring. The architecture has developed well since the previous review. The horizontal banding detail successfully references the surrounding context. The north elevation, seen from Isobel Place, should not distract from the local heritage assets.

The panel commends the project team's approach to sustainability but asks for further thought on the western elevation, as this must be designed to mitigate both overheating and overlooking. The drainage strategy should have the capacity to withstand one-in-one-hundred-year storms. The panel also suggests taking advantage of the Greater London Authority's sustainability reporting tools. The panel understands the challenge of delivering biodiversity and urban greening uplift on this part of the site. It encourages the project team to develop the landscaping designs to ensure that this will be delivered in future phases, and to find opportunities such as on rooftops to increase provision wherever possible.

Masterplan

- The panel welcomes the development of a wider masterplan. It is helpful to understand the long-term ambitions for the site's phased development and how this application will fit in. Further work is required to progress the detail, but this provides a good base to build upon.
- It is not yet clear whether the residential scheme indicated in the western corner of the campus will go ahead. However, the panel is now convinced that the issues of access via Isobel Place have been resolved, which will enable the future development of this site.
- The panel encourages the London Borough of Haringey to employ the appropriate planning mechanisms to ensure that the application includes a construction management plan for the masterplan.
- This should consider the spillover of construction traffic from this site onto Tottenham High Road. The panel recommends engaging with Transport for



CONFIDENTIAL

London in advance regarding the potential impact on public transport services, and the mitigation measures that will be required to minimise this.

Height, massing and heritage impact

- The combined reduction in height and setback of the top floor constitutes a significant improvement. While this has resulted in a small loss of classrooms, the scheme is now hardly visible from the High Road and has a more comfortable, subservient relationship with the college's 1970s tower block.
- In the panel's view, some impact on heritage remains, particularly in views from Isobel Place. However, the impact is now acceptable and is outweighed by the public benefits that this scheme will bring.

Architecture

- The panel supports the idea of using brickwork with a lighter tone horizontal stone or concrete banding. This solution successfully references the banding of both the adjacent 1970s tower and the statutorily listed buildings of the conservation area to create a family of buildings.
- The panel suggests that the north elevation, which will protrude above the existing building line on Isobel Place, should have a relatively calm architectural treatment that does not detract from the fireman's cottages.

Sustainability

- The panel can see that the proposals are being shaped in response to the analysis and encourages the project team to continue this iterative process.
- The western façade is sensitive to overheating and could also overlook future homes on the western corner of the site. To deal with both constraints, the panel advises minimising the use of glass on this elevation. This will also help with cooling.
- A more satisfactory solution should be found than the glass fritting currently proposed for the west-facing windows, which addresses the symptoms rather than the root cause. The balance required between daylight, overheating, and privacy could be resolved through careful window design. It is positive that the windows on this elevation are set back.
- The amount of hard standing is a practical choice for the landscaping considering the building's use, but there must be a strategy for water run-off in the event of flooding, to avoid damage to the building. The panel recommends that the sustainability consultant's drainage strategy is designed with sufficient capacity to withstand one in one-hundred-year storms, as these are becoming more frequent.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel understands that the project team has its own sustainability tracking process but encourages use of the Greater London Authority templates. These are a helpful reporting tool on carbon and circular economy. While the scheme is not Greater London Authority referable, and the templates may be too detailed, the principles will still apply, and the format may help the project team to ensure that all aspects have been adequately considered.

Urban greening and biodiversity

- The application boundary for this proposal is much more constrained than the wider masterplan ownership boundary. It is therefore difficult to meet the requirements for urban greening and biodiversity net gain within this scheme.
- The panel acknowledges the challenges that this entails. It encourages the project team to continue to develop the landscaping design and strive for the delivery of the full masterplan as this will meet the ambition for a significant urban greening and biodiversity uplift in future stages.
- There could be a small increase in this scheme through efficient use of the rooftop, and potentially through a green wall to the north of the site.

Next steps

The Quality Review Panel wishes the project team every success with its planning application. CONEL does not need to return to review again.



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.

