



London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Haringey Warehouse District

Tuesday 3 May 2023
Via Microsoft Teams

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Joanna Sutherland

Attendees

Philip Elliott	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
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Tom Bolton	Frame Projects
Hanako Littlewood	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.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

Gateway to the Haringey Warehouse District, 341A Seven Sisters Road,
London N15 6RD

2. Presenting team

Chris Horn	Provewell
Kehinde Pereira	Morris+Co
David Storrington	Morris+Co

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 site is located on the junction of Seven Sisters Road and Eade Road, at the southeast corner of the Haringey Warehouse District, and forms an important gateway to the district. The site includes a small parcel of neighbouring land, consisting of an end of terrace property fronting Seven Sisters Road and a former garage, fronting Tewkesbury Road. This is separated from the rest of the site by a steep, narrow alleyway with a flight of steps.

The Warehouse District contains a collection of industrial buildings of varying age, size and quality. Over the last 10-15 years, many of these have been gradually occupied by a form of communal living and working, which has become known as 'warehouse living'. Provewell, the largest landowner within the district, propose an incremental approach to developing the area, aiming to retain the warehouse living community and allow the renewal of existing buildings alongside new infill development. This scheme proposes new build with commercial at ground floor and basement levels, and a contemporary interpretation of warehouse living above. This is accommodated in an eight-storey building (plus basements levels) and a four-storey building, with larger than usual floor-to-ceiling heights. Provewell has been working on a framework for the wider site, alongside their site-by-site discussions.

Planning officers asked for the panel's feedback on the amendments made since the last review, and in particular the sustainability of the scheme including measures to avoid overheating.



CONFIDENTIAL

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel strongly supports the scheme, which is characterised by imaginative design work and an intellectually rigorous approach. While the new warehouse living concept proposed carries risks, the panel considers it could also prove an important model for providing affordable space in future developments. The panel is now reassured that the majority of the materials proposed will be durable and sustainable, but asks for information on how cementitious board surfaces will weather. However, corrugated metal doors to the rubbish and cycle stores must also be robust and resistant to damage. The panel identifies some areas of detail that require some further attention. These include potentially extending the banding between floors onto the south-east elevation, which would create greater coherence in views of the building from the north. Reassurance is also needed that the double-height, glazed, south-east corner of the building will not lead to overheating. The quality of the public realm has also progressed well. The panel encourages maximisation of planting across the development, and potentially beyond the site on nearby land owned by the applicant. A green buffer should be considered for Cara Yard, the roof of the area separating Cara and Tewkesbury Yards could be greened to ensure it provides a pleasant view for residents, and walls should be covered with climbing plants.

These comments are expanded below.

Architecture

- The panel commends the proposals, which it considers have been developed with passion and imagination. It thinks that the proposed approach, and the materials chosen, can result in a very high quality building.
- The removal of ground floor columns decorated with graffiti level since the previous review are an improvement. The building now appears better connected to the ground, and the ground floor is more integrated with the overall design.
- The panel notes the need for careful detailing of the junction between northern and eastern elevations, where curved surfaces meet at an unusual angle.
- The panel also suggests bands between floors could be extended onto the south-east façade between the circular windows. They would help to knit this façade together more effectively in views from the north along Seven Sisters Road.
- The panel suggests that the blank wall facing onto Eade Road would benefit from artwork, for example a mural, to soften its impact. Options should be considered to make this elevation a brighter presence.
- If the scheme is referred to the Greater London Authority, the panel emphasises the importance of demonstrating the quality of the design



CONFIDENTIAL

development process, including showing design iterations. It is available to support this process if required.

Materials

- The panel supports the choice of materials for the building, but asks that large-scale mock-ups are provided to show how detailing will prevent water damage to cementitious board surfaces. It also asks for information on how cementitious board weathers over time.
- The green corrugated metal doors to rubbish and cycle stores are a prominent part of the building's ground floor frontage. It is therefore important that the materials used are robust and can resist the cumulative damage that is likely to result from their use.

Solar gain

- The panel asks for further reassurance that further shading will not be needed to prevent excessive solar gain. It appreciates that testing has been carried out, but emphasises the importance of ensuring the double height south-east corner windows will not cause rooms to overheat, even with blinds installed.

Landscaping and public realm

- The panel considers that the quality of public realm design has improved significantly since the previous review, with important benefits in terms of both public safety and attractiveness.
- Options for adding greening to the site are limited, but the panel encourages the applicant to maximise all opportunities, potentially on Provewell's wider local land holding as well as on site.
- In particular, the panel asks that walls are greened wherever possible, using climbing plants such as ivy or vines to maximise the amount of planting on the site.
- The panel suggests that the area of Grasscrete in Cara Yard could be reduced to create a more defined vehicle route. This would leave space for a wider buffer between the yard and the buildings which could be filled with planting. The yard should be considered as a landscaped space that people can enjoy spending time in.
- The panel asks that views are produced to show how the triangular area of land between Cara Yard and Tewkesbury Yard will be experienced. It is an important space because it is overlooked from two sides of the building. While it is not a space that people will move through, it needs care and attention to ensure it provides the most positive possible visual amenity, avoiding views of plant access, roofs and the escape route as far as possible. This could include cover the plant access to provide a green roof.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The success of the Tewkesbury Yard route is dependent on the proposed shipping containers. These should therefore be included in the planning application for the Gateway building, and delivered as part of the development.

Next steps

The panel does not need to review the scheme again, assuming no further major changes are made to the design. It is happy for the remaining issues it has highlighted to be resolved in discussion 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.





London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Haringey Warehouse District

Wednesday 14 December 2022

Via Microsoft Teams

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Louise Goodison

Alan Shingler

Joanna Sutherland

Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Biplav Pageni	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Abigail Joseph	Frame Projects
Kirsty McMullan	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Aikaterini Koukouthaki	London Borough of Haringey
Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	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

Gateway to the Haringey Warehouse District, 341A Seven Sisters Road,
London N15 6RD

2. Presenting team

Chris Horn	Provewell
Funmbi Adeagbo	Morris+Co
Kehinde Pereira	Morris+Co
David Storing	Morris+Co
Ben Taylor	Morris+Co
Ruth Campbell	Campbell Cadey Architects
Jennifer Ross	Tibbalds
Telma Sugimoto	Expedition

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 site is located on the junction of Seven Sisters Road and Eade Road, at the southeast corner of the Haringey Warehouse District, and forms an important gateway to the district. The site includes a small parcel of neighbouring land, consisting of an end of terrace property fronting Seven Sisters Road and a former garage, fronting Tewkesbury Road. This is separated from the rest of the site by a steep, narrow alleyway with a flight of steps.

The Warehouse District contains a collection of industrial buildings of varying age, size and quality. Over the last 10-15 years, many of these have been gradually occupied by a form of communal living and working, which has become known as 'warehouse living'. Provewell, the largest landowner within the district, propose an incremental approach to developing the area, aiming to retain the warehouse living community and allow the renewal of existing buildings alongside new infill development. This scheme proposes new build with commercial at ground floor and basement levels, and a contemporary interpretation of warehouse living above. This is accommodated in an eight-storey building (plus basements levels) and a four-storey building, with larger than usual floor-to-ceiling heights. Provewell has been working on a framework for the wider site, alongside their site-by-site discussions.

Planning officers are comfortable with the public realm proposals but would welcome the panel's feedback on the industrial appearance of the scheme, as well as the environmental aspects of the design.



CONFIDENTIAL

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel supports the project, which offers an exciting opportunity to reinterpret warehouse living to contemporary standards, while retaining the existing community. The panel commends the project team for its clear responses to the comments raised at the previous review meeting (17 August 2022), and the amount of work completed to meet this challenging brief. It encourages the team to continue its ambitious design approach and to refine the design without losing the industrial feel. However, it suggests that the non-industrial character of the wider neighbourhood should be reflected more in the design, to help make the proposals more palatable to a wider audience and to help it sit more comfortably in its context. The scheme could also do more to celebrate the site's dramatic topography.

The panel considers that the scale of the development is justified by its prominent location. The generous internal floor heights are a positive feature, allowing mezzanine adaptations. The façade treatment is well articulated but would benefit from further examination of all elevations, strengthening of the ground floor to read as the base, and refinement to ensure details will look elegant and can be delivered. The choice of industrial materials is appropriate, but the panel suggests further work to strengthen these design choices, including testing alternative materials and colours to help ensure longevity. The panel also suggests that entrances to the buildings should be more celebratory. Connectivity would be improved if the upper-level bridges could be used on a daily basis. The fire strategy, particularly core access, should be revisited. Natural light levels should be tested throughout. The space between Tewkesbury Road and Cara House requires definition. A landscape strategy is needed to show how residents can take ownership within a structured framework, and more mature trees should also be included. The graffiti management approach should engage the existing community while also helping the building to age well.

These comments are expanded further below.

Brief and design approach

- Warehouse living plays an important role in providing affordable live/work accommodation, supporting the growth of creative industries and small businesses in the borough. This scheme sets a challenging brief to reinvent warehouse living, bringing it up to today's standards in terms of sustainability, fire safety and quality of living space. It must do so without losing the community that has built up here incrementally.
- The panel supports the brief's ambition, and the boldness of the design approach thus far. There are inherent risks in projects that break new ground, but the panel thinks that this location, with its established pattern of living and strong community, is the right place to test a new typology.
- However, the panel understands the hesitancy shown by groups including planning committee members and neighbours. It encourages the project team



CONFIDENTIAL

to consider how local stakeholders can be brought on board, helping them to understand the design moves that have been made.

- In the panel's view, the industrial aesthetic is probably the most significant factor in generating negative reactions. While the proposed aesthetic is an appropriate response to the brief, it is difficult to implement authentically for a non-industrial building. This scheme is also unapologetic in its use of industrial materials, which are not conventionally considered beautiful.
- The panel suggests that the right balance can be found by responding to the site's wider context as well as to its current warehouse state. The character of the wider place will remain once the warehouse buildings are gone, and this could help to make the proposals more palatable to a wider audience.

Response to wider context

- This site sits at an important nodal point in the urban landscape. The scheme should be acknowledged not only as the gateway to the Warehouse District, but also as the meeting point of the Seven Sisters and Amhurst Park Roads, where the London Boroughs of Haringey and Hackney meet, and where the New River pulls away from Finsbury Park.
- The panel advises the project team to carry out further analysis of nearby non-industrial buildings to identify aspects of its character that can be incorporated into the project's design. For example, the use of brick (referenced from nearby residential streets) may help to stitch the proposal back into its context without losing its industrial feel.
- This would also help to ensure that the industrial aesthetic does not overpower the surrounding buildings. The project team should aim to retain the bold approach to contemporary warehouse living, while also complementing other buildings along Seven Sisters Road.
- The site benefits from dramatic topography which is somewhat hidden from view. The panel recommends further celebration of the seven-metre landscape drop to the yard level. The new staircase successfully does this, but it could be enhanced through views celebrating the level change.
- Cara House and Vivian House are significant nearby buildings which are expected to remain in place. The project team should refine the scheme's relationship with them, exploring the views to and from these important neighbours, and showing how the scheme completes the family of buildings.

Height and massing

- The scheme is quite tall for its surroundings, but the panel is comfortable that this is justified by its prominent location as a nodal point in the streetscape, as well as the gateway to the Warehouse District.



CONFIDENTIAL

- While the building is much taller than a conventional residential four and eight storey building, the panel supports the generous floor-to-ceiling heights. These are essential for flexibility of the internal space usage, allowing room for sitting height mezzanines or similar adaptations that warehouse living is known for.

Façade treatment

- The panel commends the project team's work on the façade treatment which is detailed and exciting. The rhythm of the upper floors is well articulated, and the staggered windows help break up the verticality of the development in elevation.
- The corner view of the taller building works well, aided by the wraparound balcony, but it appears that the project team has focused its attention on this one view. The building's other elevations would benefit from further examination.
- The panel thinks that the architecture of the ground floor needs strengthening. The upper floors currently push down on it, creating an uncomfortable hierarchy of the top, middle and base. The ground floor should be reinforced to read as a base and to minimise a top-heavy appearance.
- The panel also considers that the wide, flat appearance of the horizontal bands that project to become balconies are overbearing. The panel suggests exploring ways in which these could elegantly taper instead. The parapet details could also be refined.
- The panel enjoys the layered nature of the façade – referencing the patina that has built up on the surfaces of the Warehouse District over the years. It encourages the project team to resolve the detailing of these shadow gaps early on to ensure that this can be delivered.
- The panel applauds the project team for considering thermal bridging issues at an early stage. The detailing for this should also continue to be developed.

Colour and materiality

- The materials chosen are appropriately industrial in nature. However, their application, while inventive, lacks the authenticity of warehouse buildings which typically express their construction honestly. For example, the staggered window pattern in elevation obscures the building's structural lines. The site analysis and design testing to justify these decisions is currently missing and would strengthen the scheme's design narrative.
- The negative reactions of some local stakeholders to the scheme's materiality could be due to the cementitious board, which is reminiscent of asbestos. The panel suggests exploring darker colours to minimise this association.



CONFIDENTIAL

- Alternative cladding materials should also be tested. Zinc is a sustainable material which would work (budget depending), as it ages well. Brick would also be a good option as it is widely used across the Haringey Warehouse District, unlike the current choice of blockwork.
- The panel suggests exploring whether warmer colours could be used with the cementitious board as it currently appears rather cool. While the green used for the window frames is in fashion at the moment, the panel is also concerned that it will quickly date the building. Classic colours could have more longevity.

Layout

- The panel acknowledges the improvements made to the layout since the previous review. However, it recommends that the entrances are refined to create a more celebratory arrival experience. The ground floor entrance to the smaller block feels particularly tight and understated at present.
- The panel is not yet convinced of the strategy for fire access to the cores. This requires reassessment in discussion with fire consultants.
- The panel understands that the bridges at the upper levels between the two blocks are proposed as additional fire escape routes only. If these could be used as access points on a day-to-day basis as well, it would increase the social connectivity of the scheme. The panel also questions whether more internal connectivity to Tewkesbury Road could also be included.
- If the toilet doors could face into the internal corridor (rather than opening immediately next to bedroom doors), it would reduce the potential for noise disturbance and circulation issues.
- The panel supports the use of double height windows and advises further testing to ensure that sufficient natural light reaches deep into the plans. It also suggests including the circular windows at every level of the building if this works compositionally on the elevations and to provide the right range of internal spaces (from bright to cosy).

Landscape

- Although the space between Tewkesbury Road and Cara House includes visual amenity, a garden, and some workspaces, the panel would like to see further detail on this area as it will be a key view for a considerable number of residents, particularly those living in Cara House.
- The project team should continue to develop a strategy for residents to take ownership of some of the planting, within a structured framework. This should also include provision of more mature trees than currently shown on the drawings, particularly on the street frontages.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The manufactured green of the façade detailing sits uncomfortably with the natural greens of the planting. The panel suggests finding a more complementary colour palette.

Graffiti

- The panel finds the project team's approach to graffiti interesting, especially the idea of allowing resident graffiti artists to contribute to the yard façade. This could help to create a sense of ownership and build a strong relationship with the existing warehouse living community. However, clarification is required to explain how this process will be managed.
- The panel recognises the challenge of legitimising graffiti, and of ensuring that the spaces still look cared for in the long term. This issue captures the challenge of the brief as a whole – how to design that which has developed organically, how to curate the ad hoc. This tension is embedded throughout the scheme and requires careful thought and collaboration with residents to find a resolution that does not feel too forced.
- The Lord Napier pub in Hackney Wick has a curated approach to graffiti which could be a helpful point of reference.

Next steps

The panel is available to review the proposals again at a Chair's Review once the project team has had the opportunity to respond to its comments.



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.





London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Haringey Warehouse District

Wednesday 17 August 2022

Clockwise Wood Green, Greenside House, 50 Station Road, London N22 7DE

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Louise Goodison
Dieter Kleiner
Craig Robertson
Joanna Sutherland

Attendees

Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Adrian Harvey	Frame Projects
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	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.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

Gateway to the Haringey Warehouse District, 341A Seven Sisters Road,
London N15 6RD

2. Presenting team

Chris Horn	Provewell
David Storring	Morris+Co
Funmbi Adeagbo	Morris+Co
John Hodges	Dakota
Ruth Campbell	Campbell Cadey
Jennifer Ross	Tibbalds

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 site is located on the junction of Seven Sisters Road and Eade Road, at the southeast corner of the Haringey Warehouse District, and forms an important gateway to the district as a whole. The site also includes a small parcel of neighbouring land, consisting of an end of terrace property fronting Seven Sisters Road and a former garage / breakers yard behind it, fronting Tewkesbury Road. This is separated from the rest of the site by a steep, narrow alleyway / flight of steps, and improvements to this will be an important part of the proposals.

The Warehouse District contains a collection of warehouse and industrial buildings of varying age, size and quality, many of which have, over the last 10-15 years, been gradually occupied by a form of communal living and working, which has become known as 'warehouse living'. Provewell, the largest landowner within the district, propose an incremental approach to developing the area, to retain the existing community and to allow the renewal of existing buildings alongside new infill development. Provewell have been working on a Framework for the wider site, alongside their site-by-site discussions.

Officers would welcome feedback on the proposed heights and massing, the architectural treatment, and whether the approach to these early proposals build constructively on earlier proposals. In addition, comments are sought on the approach to daylight/sunlight, and wider microclimate effects.



CONFIDENTIAL

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel thanks the design team for their presentation and offers its support for the approach taken within the proposals. It also welcomes the strategic overview contained within the framework for the wider Haringey Warehouse District, especially as this relates to landscape and public realm considerations. This is a challenging scheme, seeking to purposefully recreate the organic character of warehouse living that has arisen informally through the reuse of existing buildings: the proposals represent an encouraging response to this challenge. Further detail is required, however, to demonstrate that the scheme can be delivered in a way that ensures the affordability of the units to the intended residents.

The proposed scale and form are broadly appropriate, but there is scope for the buildings to make a greater contribution in townscape terms. This could be a significant gateway building and be a positive addition to Seven Sisters Road, and the panel would encourage the design team to be bold in their architectural approach, especially of the corner building. Further refinement of the internal arrangement of the units would be beneficial, to enhance the opportunities for communality and to ensure that they provide a comfortable environment for residents. In particular, thorough testing of overheating risks needs to be undertaken, with mitigation measures put in place where necessary. The panel would also like to see specific and quantifiable targets established for the scheme's environmental performance.

Strategic approach and viability

- The panel welcomes the ambition of the scheme to formalise the informality of warehouse living and feels that the proposals represent a good attempt at achieving this.
- The proposed framework is positive and will be essential to ensuring that the wider site is successful, as individual plots are brought forward.
- The panel questions the location of the residential entrances on the street, since moving through the sequence of communal spaces is fundamental to the principles underpinning the framework for the wider site. It feels that locating entrances on the yards and courts within the Warehouse District could also help to activate these spaces.
- The panel notes that there are significant challenges to the scheme's viability which need to be resolved as early as possible, to ensure that the proposals can be delivered in practice and be affordable. The panel notes in particular the intention to relocate the substation, but it also feels that discussions with the Highway Authority should be prioritised, as the proposals for Tewkesbury Road are critical to the success of the scheme and need to be delivered.



CONFIDENTIAL

Scale, massing and townscape

- The proposed volumes appear to be developing well, but the panel would like to see further illustrations of how the scheme sits within its context. Given the significance of the corner building, signifying the entry point to the wider site, the panel feels that there is scope for it to work harder in townscape terms.
- The panel feels that the language of a gateway is a positive metaphor but that this is not currently delivered by the scheme, with the actual gateway pushed to the side, between the two buildings, rather than being focused on the steps. The panel questions whether the access to the top of the steps could be relocated to fall between the two buildings, to form an actual gateway.

Landscape and public realm

- The needs-based analysis that underpins the landscape strategy is encouraging and this should be embedded within the framework to ensure that the aspirations for site-wide permeability and wayfinding are realised from the outset.
- The panel welcomes the ambition to widen the steps to a minimum of three metres, but it would like to see the generosity of this clearance tested. This is the key public benefit of the scheme and the panel would like reassurance that this space will be as good as it can be.
- The function of the courtyard between Cara House and the Eade Road building needs clarifying if it is to be truly valuable.
- The scope for introducing a platform lift within the gated courtyard behind the Eade Road building should be explored, to enhance the accessibility of the site. By locating it here, rather than in the public space at the top of the steps, many of the concerns about security and maintenance could be mitigated.
- The panel feels that there are some discrepancies between the visualisations and the plan, which appears to show that the key ground floor façade fronting onto the steps is blank. This would have significant implications for the animation and overlooking of this critical space, and the panel would like reassurance that this will not be the case.
- The frontage to Eade Road is currently largely inactive, dominated by bin stores and cycle parking, and this should be considered further.

Internal layout

- The panel would like to see options explored for linking the two buildings, as this could mean that one of the stair cores could be removed, creating the potential for a more generous internal layout.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The geometry of the corner building could be exploited to create more interesting circulation spaces than the proposed corridors to the bedrooms.
- The panel questions the rationale for arranging the entrance to units in the Eade Road building through the bedroom corridor, rather than the communal living space (as in the corner building). If it is not possible to rearrange the entrance sequence, then opportunities for fostering communality will need to be created in other ways.
- The panel questions the proximity of the bathroom doors to some bedroom doors, as this could create significant disruption to those residents. It would rather that these entrances faced out onto the corridor to create greater separation.
- The panel notes that, in the absence of a goods lift, there is unlikely to be substantial making at the upper storeys of the building, and it would like to see further thought given to the kinds of activities that might be associated with these units, with this reflected their design.

Sustainable design

- The scheme's energy strategy needs further development, with specific and quantifiable targets set for the scheme's environmental performance. It feels that these targets should go beyond a 35 per cent improvement on Part L and should instead target the LETI Guide on embodied and operational carbon.
- The panel has concerns about the potential for overheating in the residential units, particularly given the levels of noise and air pollution related to Seven Sisters Road. It would therefore like to see these issues fully and rigorously tested.
- To mitigate the risks of overheating, the south elevation of both buildings will need dynamic façades to manage solar gain.

Architecture and materials

- The panel recognises that the proposed reflective metallic façades reference the industrial, maker character of the wider site, but it would like to see options explored for a softer materiality, perhaps including planting and greening.
- The panel would like to see flexibility designed into the façades to allow for personal expression here, as well as in the internal spaces.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome the opportunity to see the scheme again for a further Formal Review.



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.

