

# **Appendix 1 - QRP 22 April 2026**

**London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel**

**Report of Full Review Meeting: Cannon Factory and Ashley House**

Wednesday 22 April 2026

Alexandra House, 10 Station Road, London N22 7TY

**Panel**

Esther Everett (chair)

Martha Alker

Rosie Bard

Dieter Kleiner

Neha Tayal

**Attendees**

|                  |                            |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| Philip Elliot    | London Borough of Haringey |
| John McRory      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Richard Truscott | London Borough of Haringey |
| Nicola Viselli   | 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 |
| Ruth Mitchell      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Biplav Pagani      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Saloni Parekh      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Stefania Pizzato   | 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 |
| Jacob Sturdy       | 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 |

# CONFIDENTIAL

## **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

Former Ashley House and Cannon Factory sites, Ashley Road, Tottenham Hale, Haringey N17 9LZ

## 2. Presenting team

|                    |                          |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Jermaine Browne    | Re:shape                 |
| Robbie Nightingale | Re:shape                 |
| Jade Cox           | Carbon Climate Certified |
| Charles Jabre      | DLA                      |
| Chris Levett       | DLA                      |
| Amy Jones          | Lichfields               |
| Ben Kelway         | Lichfields               |
| David Taylor       | Montagu Evans            |
| Matt Lloyd-Ruck    | Savills                  |
| Oliver McKay       | Studio Bosk              |

## 3. Planning authority briefing

The site comprises two significant sites in Tottenham Hale, within and just to the north of the emerging District Centre. Planning permissions for redevelopment were granted for a different applicant in 2018 and 2020. These were implemented with the existing two-storey commercial buildings being demolished and the sites cleared, but construction work did not start.

The site has now been taken on by a new applicant team. The scheme proposes three buildings, one on the Cannon Factory site and two on the Ashley House site, to include a mixed-use redevelopment of residential and employment-generating uses. A part seven, part 23-storey building to the southern part of the Ashley House site will comprise circa 500 shared living units with high quality shared amenities throughout, ground floor active and publicly accessible uses, and commercial and community floorspace. A six-storey building to the north of the Ashley House site will comprise circa 70 affordable homes. A part nine, part 25-storey building is proposed on the northernmost Cannon Factory site. This will comprise employment floorspace at ground and first floor level and a flexible community use activating the corner of Ashley Road and Burdock Road. The building will contain circa 500 purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) units above, with high quality shared amenities throughout.

Officers asked for the panel's comments on height and massing, the design quality of the scheme, and the impact of the large number of single occupancy homes on the existing community. Comments on the public realm and continuity of the Green Link were also sought.



# CONFIDENTIAL

## 4. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel thanks the applicant for presenting the proposals at this early stage. The comments include high level detail in the context of the wider masterplan, as well as more specific comments relating to each site.

As these sites complete the Tottenham Hale masterplan, it will be important that they create a unified sense of place. However, each site should be considered on its own merits, context and function. The applicant has a responsibility to deliver them to the highest standard as they are the final sites to deliver the overall vision. The panel broadly supports the proposed height, massing and placement of the buildings on both sites subject to environmental testing and further design development. Further understanding of the sites' relationships to Down Lane Park, Tottenham Hale Station and the Welbourne Health Centre is needed to inform the organisational strategy across the sites.

The panel supports the proposed building uses and tenure mix. However, it recommends that the applicant considers the long-term adaptability of the purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) and shared living blocks, by providing some larger units to accommodate couples or families. Facilitating social cohesion will be important to create a strong community, particularly given the high proportion of single-occupancy units.

The panel welcomes the continuation of the Green Link and the pedestrian route through the Ashley Road affordable housing block. Further assessment of how residents and the public will use the links and amenity spaces is recommended to develop a hierarchy of routes and sequence of spaces. The panel expects the layout and building footprints to change and adapt based on the findings of this exercise. The type and mix of amenity spaces and facilities should be carefully planned, taking into consideration the differing uses and requirements of short and long-term residents.

### **Masterplan**

#### *Strategic approach*

- The sites should create a unified sense of place as part of the wider masterplan vision. The applicant has a responsibility to deliver them to the highest standard, as this is the last phase of the masterplan.
- The panel recommends consideration of the schemes in three stages: the wider context, the sites themselves, and finally the buildings.
- The panel broadly supports the proposed height, massing and placement of the buildings on both sites subject to environmental testing and further design development.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The façade strategy for both sites will require a well-considered approach given the reduced number of balconies. Reference should be made to local history with features embedded in the project rather than superficially applied.

### *Connectivity*

- Further understanding of the sites' relationship to Down Lane Park, Tottenham Hale Station and the Welbourne Health Centre is needed, to guide the organisational strategy of the sites, uses and buildings.
- Mapping pedestrian routes to and from the sites is required to understand the arrival sequence and movement through the sites. This will help establish the most suitable positions for ground floor uses and building entrances, the hierarchy of routes, and sequence of amenity spaces.

### *Mix of uses and amenity*

- The type and mix of amenity spaces and facilities should be carefully planned, taking into consideration the differing uses and requirements of short and long-term residents.
- Facilitating social cohesion will be important to create a strong community, particularly given the high proportion of single-occupancy units.
- Amenity spaces could be distributed throughout the buildings rather than being grouped on the ground floor. This would create clusters within each block and support communities to establish.
- The overall quantity of employment space has been reduced therefore care is needed to ensure no loss to the sense of space that is being created.
- The applicant is encouraged to consider the long-term adaptability of the PBSA and shared living buildings by providing some larger units to accommodate couples or families. These could be provided within the shoulder blocks.
- Cycle storage should be accommodated within the buildings rather than in external sheds. This will improve safety, security and accessibility, as well as providing a better outlook for residents.



# CONFIDENTIAL

## *Sustainability*

- The panel commends early consideration of the sustainability strategy and welcomes the ambitious targets. However, it would like to see more detail on how these targets will be achieved and how overheating will be addressed.
- Given the large number of residents in the overall masterplan, thought should be given to water usage and preservation to safeguard against shortage.
- Microclimate assessment should be provided, to understand the daylight and sunlight, overshadowing and wind impact. These studies should also inform the landscape strategy for both sites.

## **Ashley House site**

### *Layout and massing*

- The tower completes the cluster of high-rise blocks around the station and successfully fronts the park. Setting it further back from the park could be considered to better address the open space.
- The tower could also be brought forward towards the Green Link, and the linear shared living block set back to break up the building's length. This could create a better variety of public and semi-private spaces.
- The proportions and façade treatment of the long blocks require further thought to ensure they relate well to the open spaces. Articulation of cores and entrances should not rely on colour or materials to create interest.
- The affordable housing block is a good opportunity to deliver a high-quality scheme in its own right. In its current form it appears under developed and further detailed design is required.
- The external cycle store for the shared living units could restrict future development of the adjacent terraced houses. Integrating the store within the building footprint is recommended.

### *Public realm, placemaking and landscape*

- Consideration should be given to the ground floor uses along the Green Link to ensure the route is safe and well-used. Good visual connection to the park should be maintained.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel supports the continuation of the pedestrian route through the affordable housing block. The design team is encouraged to develop this in more detail with consideration of ground floor uses and how the corner units address the route.
- Although this link is not a major route, creating a public space that responds to the homes overlooking it would be positive.
- The design team should consider the planned improvements to Down Lane Park as the park edge will be more permeable in the future. The pedestrian link should be designed to allow for future adaptation.
- The Green Link does not read as a continuous public route to the park. While the northern section outside the site feels like a primary route, the Ashley Road section reads as semi-private. The design of this space should reinforce its public character.
- The narrow buffer spaces around the buildings are likely to restrict the scale of new trees and planting would be very small. Further thought is encouraged to ensure the landscape can be delivered successfully and maintained over the long term.
- The ground-floor amenity space could serve both as a resident spill-out area and an access route. Consideration of how this space could be used will inform its design.
- A well-considered lighting strategy will be essential to support the safe and comfortable use of the Green Link after dark.

### **Cannon Factory site**

#### *Layout and massing*

- The panel supports the placement of the student accommodation block. However, alternative options that provide greater presence on Burdock Road and a better connection through the site should be considered.
- The social infrastructure space might be better located on the Ashley House site where there is a more diverse community and student numbers are lower.

#### *Public realm, placemaking and landscape*

- The legibility and presence of the student accommodation entrance is important. The panel recommends further thought on its location and relationship to the courtyard.
- The common spaces should be considered in the context of the wider area, complementing those at The Gesner and Berol House.





# CONFIDENTIAL

## *Next steps*

- The Haringey Quality Review Panel would welcome the opportunity to review the proposals again.
- It recommends each site is the subject of a separate full review, to ensure each scheme can be considered in detail. Precedents for both sites should be provided.



# 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

