

**Appendix 4 -  
QRP 2 -  
03 June 2026**



**London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Full Review Meeting: YMCA, Tottenham Lane**

Wednesday 3 June 2026

Alexandra House, 10 Station Road, London N22 7TY

**Panel**

Esther Everett (chair)  
Alberto Campagnoli  
Nuno Correia  
Dieter Kleiner  
Sela-Jaymes Talyor

**Attendees**

|                  |                            |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| Phillip Elliott  | London Borough of Haringey |
| John McRory      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Ruth Mitchell    | London Borough of Haringey |
| Richard Truscott | London Borough of Haringey |
| Wendy Charlton   | Frame Projects             |
| Bonnie Russell   | Frame Projects             |

**Apologies / report copied to**

|                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| Suzanne Kimman     | London Borough of Haringey |
| Rob Krzyszowski    | London Borough of Haringey |
| Biplav Pagéni      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Saloni Parekh      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Gareth Prosser     | London Borough of Haringey |
| Roland Sheldon     | London Borough of Haringey |
| Ashley Sin-Yung    | London Borough of Haringey |
| Tania Skelli       | London Borough of Haringey |
| Catherine Smyth    | London Borough of Haringey |
| Kevin Tohill       | London Borough of Haringey |
| Elisabetta Tonazzi | London Borough of Haringey |
| Alice Tsoi         | 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

YMCA, 184 Tottenham Lane, Homsey N8 8SG

## 2. Presenting team

|                   |                            |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Gilian Bowen      | YMCA London City and North |
| John Faulkner     | YMCA London City and North |
| Esme Brooker      | Levitt Bernstein           |
| Kimbo Fidelo Sito | Levitt Bernstein           |
| Ben Monteagle     | Levitt Bernstein           |
| Tim Gaskell       | CMA Planning               |
| Oliver Brench     | XC02                       |
| Caroline Toogood  | Altair                     |

## 3. Planning authority briefing

The YMCA hostel at 184 Tottenham Lane currently comprises a part two, four and five-storey building with lift overrun and rear service yard with vehicular access. The building spans the length of Tottenham Lane between Elmfield Avenue and Rosebery Gardens. Constructed in the late 1920s, the existing building has undergone various extensions and refurbishments over the years, but no longer meets the operational requirements of YMCA London City and North. A large part of the floorspace behind the Elmfield Avenue frontage is taken up by the Crouch End Fitness Centre – a popular local gym which would not be included in the new scheme. An adjacent semi-detached property is owned by the applicant and used as move-on accommodation. Rokesly Infant and Nursery School is located to the north of the site. The built form to the northwest is made up of residential properties of two to three-storeys. The site is located adjacent to, but not within, the Crouch End District Centre. The site is on the main road, with good bus services and the closest train station, Hornsey Station, is approximately a ten-minute walk to the northeast.

The site is not allocated for redevelopment in the development plan. Crouch End Conservation Area is located to the south and southeast but is not adjacent to the site. The application site is visible in views looking northwest along Tottenham Lane / Broadway Parade from The Queen's Pub Grade II\* listed building and from Crouch End centre and its clock tower. Tottenham Lane forms the northeast approach to the Broadway. It is a shopping street with three-storey terraces of red brick and stone elevations with repeated roof level gables that give a substantially consistent appearance along both sides.

The proposed redevelopment will deliver circa 180 to 200 bedspaces. Accommodation will be provided through a mix of cluster flats and 'move-on' units, each designed to support residents in progressing toward independent living.

Planning officers welcomed the panel's comments on the design development in response to the previous QRP.



# CONFIDENTIAL

## 4. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel strongly supports the project's aspirations and welcomes the progress made since the previous review. The case for demolition rather than remodelling is now clearly set out and is broadly endorsed by the panel. The proposed scale and massing are considered appropriate. However, the panel feels the design requires further refinement to better reflect the building's important civic role and prominent high street location.

The building does not respond convincingly enough to its setting, and further work is needed to develop the high street typology. The panel recommends introducing greater articulation and hierarchy across the elevations, through the use of setbacks, colour variation and different window treatments. Particular attention should be given to the Tottenham Lane and Rosebery Gardens corner, which terminates the vista along Tottenham Lane. Expressing this corner with greater confidence would strengthen the building's overall presence.

The main entrance should convey a stronger civic character. The layout could be made more generous, with the double-height space expressed externally to create a more legible, welcoming and identifiable point of arrival. The replacement of curtain walling with glazed brick at the ground floor is supported. However, a broader colour palette and more varied treatments would help distinguish between spaces and communicate the building's different uses. Further consideration should be given to uses that support residents while also encouraging integration with the local community. For example, a community café could provide opportunities for training, employment pathways and social interaction.

The panel supports the holistic sustainability approach but would welcome more detail on how systems will be managed and communicated to residents. The evolving landscape strategy is also welcomed, though it would benefit from further development to embed inclusive design principles.

### *Scale and massing*

- The panel broadly supports the proposed scale and massing.
- The roofline could be better articulated so the building reads as a coherent whole.
- The mansard roof differs from surrounding high street precedents and reads as an addition to, rather than an integrated part of, the main building. The panel suggests further consideration of the roof articulation, perhaps creating a larger set-back with roof terraces which could be connected to the sky room.



# CONFIDENTIAL

## *Ground floor and streetscape*

- The panel supports the use of glazed brick at street level in reference to the Victorian and Edwardian precedents. However, the team is encouraged to explore other colours besides terracotta.
- While the previously proposed curtain walling felt too open, the ground floor now feels overly defensive. Further refinement of the rhythm and proportions of the windows should be considered to create a more generous and welcoming street-level frontage.
- Given the significant scale of development, the scheme should be an exemplar of how pathways to employment can be supported. Uses such as a community café would bring activity to the entrance and provide training opportunities as well as social integration.
- The meeting room elevations could be treated differently to the offices to emphasise the different uses and bring back some of the openness of the previous scheme. This would also help with wayfinding on entering the building.
- The main entrance should have a stronger civic presence, clearly signalling the importance and purpose of the building. At present, it reads as a narrow slot and relies on YMCA signage for identification. The entrance needs to be more legible, intuitive and welcoming, creating a positive arrival experience, particularly for vulnerable users.
- The double height entrance area should be expressed and celebrated on the façade to create a more obvious entrance. It could be made more generous by making use of the meeting room kitchen space.
- The Exeter College precedent provided illustrates how the entrance could be better emphasised by being pushed out rather than recessed.

## *Architecture*

- The architecture should more clearly express and celebrate the building's purpose of supporting residents and improving lives.
- The high street typology could be developed further by drawing on local precedents. An emphasis on the piano nobile is recommended, to create more variety across the elevations.
- The corner of Tottenham Lane and Rosebery Gardens lacks sufficient emphasis.
- The wraparound meeting room also reinforces the horizontality, rather than expressing the corner.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- Testing setbacks, different window treatments and colour variation is recommended to better differentiate the corner and create a more significant presence.
- The Tottenham Lane elevation is the most successful, but further refinement is needed to achieve a more coherent and higher-quality architectural expression across all façades.
- Detailed sections are recommended to develop the depth and articulation of the elevations.
- Shading devices such as brise soleil should be considered.
- The window proportions are constrained by overheating requirements but could be articulated with setbacks to read as larger elements, particularly on Tottenham Lane.
- Spandrel panels could be used to create a deeper perceived recess, adding variation and breaking up the façade.
- The window pairing feels too close. Variation in the spacing could be introduced as the building rises to retain the sense of verticality across the overall composition.

### *Sustainability*

- The panel supports the sustainability strategy development and the holistic approach.
- The change from curtain walling to a masonry ground floor is welcomed, with improved thermal and daylight performance.
- Further detail on the shading strategy should be provided to understand how the previously proposed overhang compares to deep window reveals in preventing overheating. There could be a case for retaining the overhang.
- The ventilation and acoustic strategies show a good understanding of the issues, and the panel welcomes the analysis carried out around the design and sizes of openings.
- The panel is generally supportive of the operable window strategy to reduce the need for mechanical cooling. However, more detail on cooling demand and how this will be managed and communicated to residents would be helpful.
- The comparative analysis of retrofit versus new build is helpful to understand the embodied carbon impact.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The team is encouraged to consider whether the demolition materials can be re-used on site, or on other projects.
- The additional photovoltaic panels (PVs) are welcomed, but those in shaded locations will not be efficient.
- Greening could be introduced in place of PVs in these areas to improve biodiversity net gain. Alternatively, mechanical plant could be relocated from its prominent location to the shaded areas.
- The panel acknowledges the challenges in meeting biodiversity and urban greening targets. The suggested roofscape greening could help.
- The integrated sustainable urban drainage system is welcomed.

### *Landscape*

- The panel welcomes the additional landscape areas proposed.
- The Rosebery Gardens spill-out zone could be strengthened by making more of its relationship with the adjacent kitchen, potentially creating a more active and useful outdoor space.
- Inclusive design should be used as a driver for the landscape strategy, with different spaces for different needs.
- Seating could be integrated into the landscape to signify the main entrance, making the area more welcoming and reducing the amount of constrained defensible space.
- The panel questions whether the amount of permeable paving could be increased to reduce the attenuation tank size.
- Sunshade analysis is recommended to ensure planting will thrive, particularly in the shaded courtyard. The team is encouraged to consider plant varieties which are suited to these conditions.
- The northern boundary mural is welcomed. A mirrored surface could also be considered to give the perception of more space.
- The courtyard should be welcoming to all users and should provide a variety of spaces to address different needs and feelings. For example, a quiet space and a gardening area.

### *Next steps*

- The Quality Review Panel would welcome the opportunity for a Chair's Review if substantial changes are made. However, it is confident the issues raised can be resolved through discussion with the council.



# 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

