



FRAME PROJECTS

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review: St Ann's New Neighbourhood Phases 1b and 2

Wednesday 21 June 2023

Room 5:M1, Clockwise Wood Green, Greenside House, 50 Station Road, London N22 7DE

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Rosie Bard
Gavin Finnan
Andy Puncher
Andrew Tam

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Biplav Pagéni	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Kirsty McMullan	Frame Projects
Bonnie Russell	Frame Projects

Apologies / copied to

Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Rob Krzyszowski	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.

Declaration of interest

Panel member Gavin Finnan's practice Maccreevor Lavington worked on a study of this site prior to appointment of the current project team. Gavin was not involved in this work in any way, and Maccreevor Lavington's work ended in 2016.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

St Ann's New Neighbourhood (Phases 1B and 2), St Ann's Road, London N15 3TH

2. Presenting team

Paul Karakusevic	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Suzie Prest	Karakusevic Carson Architects
Rob Reeds	Lambert Smith Hampton
Graeme Sutherland	Adams and Sutherland

3. Planning authority briefing

St Ann's Hospital is a Victorian-era former fever hospital located on St Ann's Road and bordered by Hermitage Road to the east, the residential properties of Warwick Gardens to the west, the Overground train line to the south and Chestnuts Park to the north.

The land is designated as Site Allocation SA28 which identifies the site for residential development, consolidated medical activities and town centre uses. The northern part of the site, not included in this application phase, is located within the St Ann's Conservation Area. The Mayfield House building is locally listed. Other heritage assets are located within a short walk of the site including the Grade II* Listed St Ann's Church. The hospital site is designated as an Area of Change and a Critical Drainage Area. The south of the site includes a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), an Ecological Corridor, and is also covered by a woodland Tree Preservation Order.

Hybrid planning permission was granted in 2022 (ref. HGY/2022/1833, resolution to grant subject to S106 signing) for the redevelopment of approximately two-thirds of the hospital site, with the remaining land to the east being retained for medical purposes. This hybrid permission is for 995 homes, plus commercial and community uses, public realm, and new routes into and through the site. The hybrid permission has already permitted the site-wide general development principles including phasing, land use, layout, landscaping, car and cycle parking and affordable housing provision. Several historic buildings on site are to be refurbished for non-residential, employment and community uses. St Ann's New Neighbourhood will be delivered in multiple phases, supported by a site-wide masterplan and design code, and subsequent reserved matters applications, of which this is the first.

This review considers the detailed design of Phases 1B and 2 Reserved Matters, including Plots E to J. It will deliver 464 homes and 100 sqm non-residential uses, as well as provision of the enhanced SINC, the southwest link and one of the pocket parks. There are no retained existing buildings in Phases 1B or 2.

Planning officers consider the proposals to be progressing well, following the principles established by the outline permission, design codes and Phase 1A, which has been approved in detail. Officers would particularly welcome the panel's views on landscaping and ecology, public realm definition, boundary treatments, shared amenity spaces, architectural expression, energy and sustainability.



4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel welcomes the proposals for Phases 1B and 2 of St Ann's New Neighbourhood. The work completed to date builds on the comments of the previous chair's review and the successes of Phase 1A. The percentage of affordable housing is particularly commendable, and, with some improvements, this scheme could raise the bar for sustainable, high-quality, affordable development.

The project team's holistic approach to sustainability is supported. Overheating and embodied carbon mitigation could be pushed further to make the scheme more climate resilient. The landscaping is ambitious, but the panel is reassured by the maintenance strategy. The public realm between Plots J1 and J2 should be widened, and the design less formal, drawing through the character of the Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). The ecological conservation needs of the SINC should be balanced with the amenity needs of local residents. The cargo bicycle store façades should not present blank frontage to the courtyards. A non-residential use fronting onto the new southwestern link and square is a positive feature, but a café here may not receive adequate footfall. Tenants who create a destination use and provide passive surveillance should be attracted as early as possible, to activate this important corner of the site. The ground floor layouts should be tested to ensure that the privacy of bedrooms is protected while activating the streetscape. The entrance experience of some buildings would be improved by creating direct views through straight internal corridors. Further work is required on the gardens of Plot E to balance the needs of private residential amenity space with the green corridor. The internal layouts of floors with single aspect south-facing flats should be revised. The panel is concerned that overheating and noise from the railway will undermine the liveability of these homes. The panel encourages the project team to develop the architectural expression of Plots G and J. These buildings could have a distinct identity from the rest of the scheme, perhaps through choice of materials. The appearance of southern elevations from the Overground and the screening, or celebration, of plant equipment on the roofs requires careful design.

These comments are expanded below.

Sustainability

- As this scheme is on the scale of an entire neighbourhood, it is an important opportunity to holistically address all aspects of sustainability. The panel commends the project team for its integrated approach to the wider St. Ann's masterplan, which includes consideration of the One Planet Living framework, embodied carbon, circular economy, fabric first principles, renewable energy and tackling fuel poverty.
- The detailed response for Phases 1B and 2 is promising, but could be improved by a focus on climate resilience. For example, with increasing summer temperatures, overheating could be further mitigated through recessed windows and projecting balconies for shading.

CONFIDENTIAL

- In terms of embodied carbon, the amount of concrete required could be reduced by careful detailing of efficient structures.

Landscaping

- The landscape design is ambitious, and the panel is pleased to hear that Peabody is taking on the management role that will ensure it is well-maintained in perpetuity.
- The public realm between Plots G2 and J1 successfully bring the SINC to the south through into St. Ann's New Neighbourhood.
- However, the public realm between Plots J1 and J2 creates a bottleneck rather than building on this permeable, green vision for the site. The panel suggests making this space more generous and less formal. Opportunities for play could also be incorporated, informed by the woodland nature of the SINC.
- The project team should consider how the 'ecology walk' through the SINC might be used in ways that create conflict with the ecological conservation needs, for example, by dog walkers. This should be considered to ensure that the needs of wildlife protection and amenity space are balanced.
- The panel supports the idea of fencing around the SINC. This will help it to feel like a special place to visit, separate from the rest of the open landscaping.
- The panel understands that the cargo bicycle stores along one edge of the courtyards for Plots F, H and J will be clad in a metal mesh, and therefore will appear more transparent than on the plans. However, it recommends that they are further integrated into the landscape design, so as not to create a blank frontage on approach to the courtyards.

Non-residential use

- The panel supports the non-residential use incorporated into the scheme to activate the new southwestern link and square.
- However, the panel is not yet convinced that this area will receive adequate footfall to support a café, and it thinks that a café business would be better suited to a location fronting onto the central Peace Garden in Phase 1A.
- A destination use, such as a bicycle repair shop, yoga studio or corner shop could work well, and the panel suggests an open brief for the non-residential use, allowing flexibility for local businesses. This space could also have community uses in the evenings to create passive surveillance around the clock.
- It is important to ensure that the commercial corner unit is occupied early on as this will ensure overlooking and bring life to the new entrance. To attract tenants, the panel recommends reducing fit out costs and subsidising rents.



CONFIDENTIAL

Ground floor plan

- The panel is concerned about the privacy of bedrooms located on the ground floor. It understands that the project team has built successful precedents with this layout previously, and therefore asks for further detail on how this works, including the long-term management of any planting used to create a buffer zone.
- Alternative layouts should be tested that would better activate the streets and courtyards. For example, ground floor flats could be accessed directly from the street but still include defensible space, as is common in London's Georgian housing.
- The project team is encouraged to create more generous entrance experiences, particularly for the L-shaped eastern buildings of Plots F and H. If the ground floor cycle storage can be rearranged, the dog-leg internal entrance corridors could be straightened, allowing views all the way through the building.
- The gardens of the terraced houses in Plot E are small and appear to be filled with the retained vegetation along the western edge of the site. While it is positive that the project team aims to keep as much existing planting as possible, the needs of the green corridor should be balanced with the needs of private amenity space and daylight for residents.

Internal layout

- The panel understands the project team's rationale for repeating upper floor plans. However, this has created some single aspect, south-facing flats in Plots G, H and J which are at odds with the liveability of the rest of the scheme.
- The panel is concerned that these residents will experience extreme discomfort from overheating in the summer – particularly those on the floors above the tree line. In addition, the noise from the Overground railway line to the south will make window ventilation unappealing as a method of cooling.
- The internal layouts should be revisited to design these issues out, ensuring that the scheme will meet its aspirations for long-term sustainability.
- It is noted that the upper floor flats on the eastern side of Plot J are very close to the hospital building. This should be examined to ensure that there will be no overlooking or privacy issues.
- Natural daylight should also be designed into internal corridors wherever possible. This will create a stronger relationship with the outside and help people to orientate themselves when navigating inside the buildings.

Architectural expression

- It is logical that Plots E, F and H follow the design of the terraced housing and courtyard typologies developed in Phase 1A, but Plots G and J are a new building



CONFIDENTIAL

typology. They are not oriented orthogonally in plan and sit instead as pavilions in the landscape. The panel encourages the project team to develop the architectural expression of Plots G and J further.

- The external appearance of these plots could respond more to the SINC, and have an architectural identity of their own, beyond the design code. One option to create character would be to test alternative materials. This would also help to ensure that the masterplan does not feel overly dominated by brick.
- As the southern elevations will be very visible to everyone passing by on the Gospel Oak to Barking Overground Line, it is important that this view is well considered and does not feel like the back of the scheme.
- The panel encourages the project team to give some attention to the design of the rooftops from key views. The plant equipment located here will need to be either carefully screened or deliberately exposed, especially G2 which contains the largest amounts accommodation. The project team could take inspiration from the retained Victorian water tower in Phase 1A as an example of how architectural expression can celebrate engineering.

Next steps

The Quality Review Panel supports the proposed development and is confident that the applicant team can address these refinements in liaison with the London Borough of Haringey. If officers would consider it helpful, St Ann's New Neighbourhood Phases 1b and 2 could return for a chair's review focusing on sustainability and architectural expression.



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.

