

London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: 25-27 Clarendon Road

Wednesday 3 July 2024

AH Level 8 Collaboration Space, Alexandra House, 10 Station Road,
London N22 7TY

Panel

Esther Everett (chair)
Gavin Finnan
Neil Matthew
Craig Robertson
Ann Sawyer

Attendees

Daniel Boama	London Borough of Haringey (observing)
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Valerie Okeiyi	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
Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Tania Skelli	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

25-27 Clarendon Road, Wood Green, London N8 0DD

2. Presenting team

Chris Blamey	RGP (online)
Alan Harries	Integration UK (online)
Robert High	PRP
Craig Sheach	PRP
Jim Kelly	Match (online)
Richard Quelch	Q Square
Andrew Sissons	AND (online)
Mike Calder	J Group
Sarah Christie	J Group

3. Planning authority briefing

The site is located at the southern end of Clarendon Road and north of Turnpike Lane. It currently contains a single L-shaped industrial building, which is two storeys to the front of the site and single storey to the rear. It is neither listed nor within a conservation area. Clarendon Road runs along the eastern perimeter of the site, providing vehicular and pedestrian access. The adjoining sites are the Alevi Cultural Centre to the south and the Election Centre to the north. The railway is to the west.

The site is within the southernmost part of the Clarendon Road South Site Allocation (SA23). This seeks to 'realign Clarendon Road and create employment-led mixed-use development to compliment the Clarendon Road Square development site and the emerging Wood Green Area Action Plan Site Allocation'. The site is suitable for a tall building in line with Development Management Policy DM6. The site is also designated as an ecological corridor and an area of archaeological importance.

The applicants propose redevelopment of the site, including demolition of the existing building, to provide a mixed-use co-living and workspace scheme.

Officers broadly support the principle of the proposed uses. The Greater London Authority's guidance on 'Large-scale Purpose-built Shared Living' will be a fundamental policy document for assessing the proposed land uses.

Officers have requested the panel's views on how well the proposals fit into the wider context, and on the quality of the design in relation to the panel's previous comments.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Haringey Quality Review Panel commends the significant improvements made since the last review, and is now largely supportive of the co-living and workspace development at 25-27 Clarendon Road. The panel urges the project team to address its remaining concerns, and to ensure that the intended level of quality is fully embedded in the design.

The panel asks that the massing of the two blocks is broken up more. This could be achieved by reducing the eastern block sufficiently and decreasing overall the number of units, or by increasing the height of the western block and decreasing the height of the eastern block, to create a clearer distinction between the blocks without adding more co-living studios. The enlarged public realm is welcome, and the panel encourages the project team to develop the landscape character of the pocket park, drawing on the site's industrial history. The external and internal amenity spaces relate well to one another. Further work on sunlight, shading and soil depths should inform the planting mix.

The panel thinks that the workspace and co-living uses can successfully co-exist, but that the internal layout should be refined. The circulation spaces should be more generous, especially around the ground floor entrance area and first floor shared amenity spaces. The panel suggests that an internal route to the bicycle store would feel safer and be more inclusive. The project team should investigate whether the upper floor layout can be reconfigured to create a simple 'L'-shaped corridor, to improve natural light. As the scheme evolves, neurodivergent needs could be considered through the provision of calmer, more intimate communal spaces, particularly as the typical studios are not wheelchair accessible. All communal facilities and entrances must be fully accessible.

Adjustments to the elevations may be required to meet the scheme's ambitious sustainability targets. A detailed overheating study should be carried out for each studio type and location. The architectural detail is not yet sufficiently developed. Studies should be completed to refine the expression of internal functions in the external façades, and the articulation of the bays.

Height and massing

- The panel reiterates its view that the desire for the building to remain under 30 metres tall – at which point it would become referral to the Greater London Authority – is placing an artificial constraint on the scheme.
- While the panel appreciates the changes made to articulate the two blocks, it is still difficult to differentiate them. A greater contrast in height would help to break up the massing by creating two distinct volumes.
- The panel asks that the height of the western block overlooking the railway line is increased by a few storeys. If this is possible, then the eastern block



CONFIDENTIAL

should be decreased in height to create a distinction between them, and to ensure that more co-living studios are not added to the development, as the pressure on the shared amenity spaces is already high.

- Alternatively, the same result could be achieved by decreasing the eastern block sufficiently, reducing the number of co-living studios overall.

Landscape

- The panel welcomes the work to envision a wider future masterplan that this development could fit into. The idea of extending the pocket park across Clarendon Road is beneficial for the site opposite. The panel encourages the local authority to make this a requirement of any future scheme coming forward on that site.
- As the ground floor public realm space has been enlarged, it can now be considered a pocket park, and successfully continues the pattern of pocket parks established by the recently built Clarendon Road masterplan.
- While the pocket park is large enough to work, it is nevertheless constrained. The space along the eastern frontage of the building is too narrow to be usable. The project team is encouraged to find opportunities to increase the size of the pocket park further, perhaps by removing another metre or so from the gym. As the elevational details develop, care should be taken that the façade line does not intrude into the pocket park space.
- The panel encourages the project team to continue to develop a more meaningful character for the pocket park landscape design. This could draw on the site's industrial history, perhaps through a more natural planting palette.
- The lighting ideas for the pocket park are promising, but the public art screens may take up too much space. The panel suggests instead integrating public art into the lighting design, and elevating it to frame the space while allowing for circulation and gathering. This strategy could be replicated on the podium garden level, linking the two spaces in street views.
- A signage strategy should be developed, ensuring clarity on the different entrances, and that the hierarchy is coherent.
- The project team should obtain advice on the distances of planting from façades. There could be issues for fire safety with planting so close to the façade on the podium level, and a sterile zone may be required in front of the substation at ground floor level.
- The panel enjoys the way the external and internal amenity spaces relate to one another. This will help to generate spill-out activity and ensure that the external spaces are well-used. The podium garden layout is well considered.



CONFIDENTIAL

- Soil depths, and structural implications, should be checked to ensure that trees are deliverable at podium level. The panel also recommends further work on sunlight and shading to inform the choice of plant species throughout the landscape design, ensuring that they will thrive in their location.
- The greenery of the scheme could also be improved by adding balustrade edge planting to the upper-level outdoor spaces. It may be possible to provide more diversity of species and to soften the edges of the parapets through planting that only requires a low depth substrate.

Ground floor layout and servicing

- Small changes to the internal layout would allow views through to the outside as residents enter the building. This would be consistent with the creation of views on the first floor.
- There is concern about women's safety and user experience in relation to the bicycle store. At night, the alleyway to the north of the building may not feel safe, even if it is gated, and it may be difficult and unpleasant to pass the bin store with a bicycle if rubbish or bins are blocking the route.
- The panel suggests introducing a robust internal access route instead, as is common with many student accommodation buildings.
- The panel understands that the bin store layout has evolved and that it will be managed, but there are also concerns that the space is too tight. Further work is required to check that there will be sufficient space for people to access the bins and to rotate them as needed.

Internal layout

- The panel commends the post-occupancy evaluation work by the project team on a previous co-living scheme. 25-27 Clarendon Road can learn from the useful occupant feedback, as well as the team's experience, for example on the distribution of amenity spaces throughout the scheme.
- The communal spaces are improved since the previous review. It is good to see that events and programming have been considered, but that the spaces do not hinge on these being delivered, as they are flexible enough to work well when no events are happening.
- The visualisations of the evening terrace are very promising. The project team should ensure that it can be used separately when the cinema room is occupied. The panel also assumes that the panels in the cinema room can be removed to provide natural light when the room is not used for screenings.
- The addition of natural light to the ends of the straight corridors on the upper floors is a significant improvement. However, the corridors towards the eastern side of the building do not benefit from this and take a convoluted route



CONFIDENTIAL

around the stair and lift core. The project team should investigate whether the upper floor layout can be reconfigured to create a simple 'L'-shaped corridor, perhaps by moving the stair, to improve views and natural light.

- On the first floor, it would also help to add more generosity to the circulation spaces, especially between the cinema and communal kitchen spaces where it could get congested at the start and end of screenings. The panel recommends designing a larger, squarer lobby area.
- The project team should continue to refine the studio layout. For example, the hob and the sink could be switched in the kitchenette so that residents do not look directly at their sink when sitting on the sofa.

Accessible and inclusive design

- The visual connections from the corridors into the communal internal spaces, and splitting the kitchens into smaller sub-divided areas, are positive features.
- While the corridor space in front of the cores and accessible studios has been slightly increased, the corridor widths are still too narrow to facilitate incidental encounters. The panel asks again that opportunities are taken to encourage social interaction through the design.
- The typical studio layout has a gap of only half a metre between the wall and the end of the bed. The panel understands that this layout has been informed by post-occupancy feedback, but notes that wheelchair users will not be able to visit friends in these studios.
- In the panel's view, this increases the need for more variety in the size and type of shared meeting spaces, allowing friends to meet outside their studios on a more intimate scale. It would also help if the beds were not fixed, so residents have the option to rotate them 90 degrees, making their studio wheelchair accessible.
- It is essential that all communal facilities are accessible. This should include varied working heights in kitchens, and outdoor furniture that is not fixed so wheelchair users can sit at the tables.
- The panel also recommends changing the main entrance door, as revolving doors are not accessible, so that everyone can use the same entrance.
- The project team is encouraged to address neurodivergent needs as the design develops to the next stage of detail. As well as the need for variety in the scale of spaces, the use of colour, contrast and materials should be considered in the provision of some calmer spaces. The Greater London Authority's co-living guidance has a small section on this.
- The panel again advises checking that enough Blue Badge parking spaces are provided, both for now and for possible future needs.



CONFIDENTIAL

Sustainable design

- The scheme's sustainability targets are welcome, but the panel is concerned that they will be difficult to meet if mechanical cooling is required. This could create reputational risk and have an impact on the success of lettings.
- The panel is not yet convinced by the overheating strategy. It is challenging to meet the current building regulations with a co-living typology, particularly at night when the building's thermal mass is released. The panel acknowledges the work to mitigate this, but asks for a detailed study of overheating relative to solar gain and ventilation panel sizes.
- The panel thinks that this may require adjustments to the elevations, such as deeper window reveals and vertical or horizontal shading fins, depending on orientation, to mitigate evening solar gain.
- This should be checked for all co-living studio types and locations, but especially for the west-facing studios which are most susceptible to overheating.
- There is also a southeast-facing accessible studio on each of the typical upper floor plans which only has one small window and no space for a side ventilation panel. This studio type should be scrutinised to ensure it will deliver good quality of living.
- The project team's ambitions on circular design and longevity of equipment are positive. The panel encourages the local authority to find a planning mechanism to ensure that the ambitions are delivered.

Architecture

- The architectural detail is not sufficiently developed. Further detail is required to ensure that high quality results will be delivered, as some of the ideas described are not yet evident in the drawings. For example, careful should be given to the articulation of bays, and the brickwork where the two blocks meet.
- The scheme could also be improved by further work on how the internal functions are expressed in the external façades. Studies should inform a different architectural treatment for the base and top of the building where there are shared amenity spaces. The windows should be expressed differently where natural light is brought to internal corridors, and the entrances should be celebrated through their architectural treatment.

Next steps

The Haringey Quality Review Panel is confident that the remaining issues can be resolved in collaboration with officers. 25-27 Clarendon Road does not need to return to the panel 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.

