

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.



London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: 25-27 Clarendon Road

Wednesday 17 April 2024

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

Panel

Esther Everett (chair)
Martha Alker
Gavin Finnan
Craig Robertson
Ann Sawyer

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey (online)
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
Alan Harries	Integration UK
Rob High	PRP
Jim Kelly	Match
Richard Quelch	Q Square
Andrew Sissons	AND
Mike Calder	J Group
Sarah Christie	J Group

3. Planning authority briefing

The site is located within the southernmost part of London Borough of Haringey's Clarendon Road South Site Allocation. This seeks to 'realign Clarendon Road and create employment-led mixed-use development to complement the Clarendon Road Square development site and the emerging Wood Green Area Action Plan Site Allocation'. The site is considered suitable for a tall building in policy terms.

The site currently contains a one to two storey L-shaped industrial warehouse. The building occupying the site is neither listed nor within a conservation area. Clarendon Road runs along the east 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. To the west of the site is an Ecological Corridor, Article 4 Direction for Heartlands Rail Corridor and an Area of Archaeological Importance.

The developers of the previous mixed-use residential proposals for the site (reviewed by the panel in January 2023) faced deliverability issues due to rising rates. A new project team is now proposing a mixed-use co-living and workspace scheme, comprising 215 studios, plus associated amenity space, and 262m² workspace.

Officers are considering the principle of a co-living use, which would be the first of its kind in the borough. The scheme will be assessed against current planning policy, including the Mayor of London's latest guidance on co-living.

Officers have requested the panel's views on how well the proposals fit into the wider Clarendon Road masterplan, and on the quality of the design in relation to the latest co-living guidance.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Haringey Quality Review Panel thinks that a co-living development could work on this site in principle, as long as it remains employment-led. However, there are significant challenges around the amount and quality of public realm and shared amenity spaces which need to be resolved before it can fully support the proposals.

The panel recognises the challenging constraints the project team is working with but asks that more is done to ensure that the scheme is driven by quality rather than number of studios. The block to the west of the site could be increased by a few storeys to allow for more generous internal floor-to-ceiling heights, and to reduce the pressure on the ground floor. This could also help to break up the massing, but must be tested in context. The public realm proposal breaks with the pattern of pocket parks established by the wider Clarendon Road masterplan, and appears likely to be dominated by servicing. The panel advises the project team not to rely on the future neighbouring development, but to provide adequate public realm as part of this scheme, perhaps by relocating some of the workspace to the first floor. This could also relieve some of the pressure for space on the ground floor and help to better integrate the living and working spaces. The panel asks for a greater quantity and variety of shared amenity spaces to be provided throughout the building. These spaces should enable different kinds of social interactions and activities, including opportunities for incidental encounters, and should be of a high quality. The project team should refer to the Greater London Authority's latest co-living guidance while developing the detail.

The quality of the internal corridors should be improved by widening them and bringing in natural light at both ends. The architecture could be enlivened by articulating the internal functions externally, and by introducing changes in material or colour in reference to the Clarendon Road development to the north. The elevations should also draw on the area's industrial heritage to create a stronger identity and street presence. The panel suggests committing to a clear sustainability target and improving the circular design strategy.

Co-living use

- The panel thinks that a co-living use could work on this site. As this relatively new type of housing would be the first of its kind in the London Borough of Haringey, the project team should clearly demonstrate to the local authority how the scheme will contribute toward its aspirations, for example by adding variety to the local housing offer.
- The proposals should also take into account the London Borough of Haringey's aspiration for employment-led mixed-use development on this site allocation. As well as providing employment space, the scheme should read as a place of employment. This could be achieved through the design and allocation of street-facing lower floor uses.



CONFIDENTIAL

- Co-living relies on the quality of communal space to compensate for the small size of private studios. It is not yet clear from the information provided whether the design quality and amount of space is sufficient. The panel understands that the design is at an early stage, but asks that a high bar is set for the quality of communal space as this scheme will create a precedent for future co-living schemes in the borough.
- It would be helpful to identify co-living precedents of a comparable scale, learning from their successes or missed opportunities.

Height and massing

- In the panel's view, the desire for the building to remain under 30 metres tall has created an artificial datum level that compromises the quality of internal spaces. The precedents presented all have more generous internal floor-to-ceiling heights than this proposal. The panel is concerned that the internal spaces will not feel spacious or pleasant, especially when the exposed services are added. It asks for assurances that this scheme can match the quality of the benchmark schemes discussed.
- The height of the western block overlooking the railway line could be increased by a few storeys. This would allow for more generous floor-to-ceiling heights and would reduce some of the pressure on the ground floor, while maintaining or increasing the quantity of shared spaces.
- Increasing the height of this block could also help to break up the massing by creating two distinct volumes. All potential solutions should be tested in sections showing the wider site context, including the relationship to the adjacent railway embankment, which is currently missing from the drawings.

Public realm

- The Clarendon Road development to the north of the site has created successful, functional streets structured by a series of pocket parks. The scheme should build on this approach, drawing from the wider context to inform the scale, proportions, and function of the public realm proposals.
- As the ground floor public realm space is too small to be considered a pocket park, it breaks with the succession of pocket parks along Clarendon Road established by the wider masterplan. The panel is therefore not convinced that it will perform a function other than as a visual amenity.
- The public realm appears likely to be dominated by servicing because the entrances for the cycle store, bin store and substation are all located off this relatively small space. If not rigorously managed, there is a risk that it will become cluttered and that the planting will be destroyed by daily activity. The panel also questions whether the trees are deliverable, as maintenance vehicles for the substation may need to park directly outside.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel recommends resolving these management and maintenance issues before developing the public realm design any further.
- The proposal assumes that, when the site to the south is developed, it will position a public realm space on the northern side of the plot, joining up with this scheme to create a pocket park in the future. However, the neighbouring developers may prefer to put their amenity space on the southern side, where it will receive better sunlight. As there is a lack of certainty around the future context, the panel advises the project team not to rely on future development to make up sufficient provision, but to increase it on this site.
- One solution would be to relocate some of the workspace to the first floor, making space on the ground floor for a greener and more generous public realm that is not compromised by servicing.
- The sun path diagrams do not take the emerging context into account. The panel recommends testing how well the external amenity spaces perform if there is overshadowing from the potential future development to the south, and adjusting the design in response.
- The project team should also check that there is adequate space and planting in front of windows where a buffer is required for privacy.

Ground floor layout

- The panel understands that co-living requires more servicing and shared spaces than conventional residential schemes. However, the high number of co-living studios is putting significant pressure on the ground floor plan to accommodate this. The panel recognises the challenges of balancing site constraints with the provision of homes, but more must be done to ensure that the development is led by quality rather than numbers.
- To free up the ground floor plan, the panel recommends relocating back of house spaces to the first floor and moving plant equipment to the roof where possible. The gym, proposed for the amenity space on the western side of the ground floor, could also be relocated, allowing better use of a space that has good natural light and overlooks the green railway embankment.
- In the current ground floor layout, the workspace is cut off by a plant room and an escape corridor. It also feels disconnected from the shared amenity spaces on the first floor. The panel suggests finding ways to better integrate the living and working spaces, such as through double height spaces. This link between the floors could be visual-only, if fire separation is required.

Amenity spaces

- The panel understands that the indoor amenity spaces are illustrative at this stage, but the quantity seems low for 215 studios, nor is it yet clear how they will be used. It encourages the project team to check that there will be



CONFIDENTIAL

sufficient amenity space to support high quality co-living, and to draw these spaces in detail to define the provision early on and ensure that it will fit.

- The upper floor layouts currently encourage residents to go straight to their private studios, rather than creating opportunities for incidental encounters. The first-floor amenity spaces appear to only provide spaces for large groups. This could create kitchens with an industrial feeling.
- The panel asks for different types and scales of amenity spaces. Smaller kitchens and break-out spaces could be distributed throughout the development. The project team should also refer to the Greater London Authority's co-living guidance which clearly sets out the variety expected and includes consideration of neurodivergent needs.
- There should be a visual connection from the corridors or cores to the indoor first-floor amenity spaces. This will help to alleviate social anxieties and build a sense of community, as residents will be able to spot a friend or neighbour before they enter the space.
- Further work is needed to assure the panel that the external first-floor terrace will be usable and green. As it is exposed and faces southeast, it will be challenging to realise a rain garden here. The panel suggests incorporating irrigation into the planters and providing shade for residents in the summer.
- The height of the terrace balustrade affects both its usability and its verdancy. A higher balustrade may need to be set further back from the edge, reducing the usable space and space for planting, and the urban greening factor that the scheme can achieve. The panel encourages the project team to work on these details, as they will also have a knock-on effect on proportions in the elevation designs.

Accessibility

- The internal corridors are long and narrow. This width will be challenging for wheelchair users to navigate which, combined with low head heights and lack of natural light, does not make for high quality and legible circulation spaces. The corridors should be widened and carried through to add natural light at both ends.
- It is possible for the premium and accessible studios to be interchangeable as they both have larger spatial requirements. However, it is important that this is properly managed so that ten per cent of the accessible studios remain available to those who need them.
- The panel advises checking that enough Blue Badge parking spaces are provided. It may also be necessary to add wheelchair refuge spaces to each stair core for compliant layouts.



CONFIDENTIAL

Architecture

- The architecture currently feels apologetic, rather than bold and intentional. The panel encourages the project team to draw on the industrial heritage of the area to create a stronger identity and street presence.
- It may help to introduce a change in material or colour when there is a change in volume. As well as creating interest, this would better integrate the scheme into the wider Clarendon Road masterplan, where this rule has been established across many plots.
- The panel suggest enlivening the elevations by articulating the internal functions externally where possible. The first floor, which accommodates a substantial area of communal amenity space, should be recognisably different to the elevations of the floors above; and any double height spaces should be legible in the elevational treatment.

Sustainable design

- The panel encourages further work on circularity, particularly focusing on improving the structural materials and on ensuring that the building is demountable for reuse.
- If full Passivhaus certification is not achievable, the panel suggests finding a more specific performance metric that is, rather than applying Passivhaus principles. This will avoid spending time and money on aspects of the design that cannot be checked or followed through.

Next Steps

The Haringey Quality Review Panel would welcome the opportunity to review the scheme again once the proposals have progressed.



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.

