



FRAME PROJECTS

## **London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel**

### **Report of Planning Application Review Meeting: The Northumberland Development Project**

Wednesday 21 October 2015

Committee Room 2, First Floor, Civic Centre, High Road, London, N22 8LE

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (Chair)  
Deborah Nagan  
Tim Pitman  
Chris Twinn  
Selina Mason

#### **Attendees**

|                     |                            |
|---------------------|----------------------------|
| Richard Truscott    | London Borough of Haringey |
| Nairita Chakraborty | London Borough of Haringey |
| Neil McClellan      | London Borough of Haringey |
| Deborah Denner      | Frame Projects             |
| Sarah Carmona       | Frame Projects             |

#### **Apologies / report copied to**

|                 |                            |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Stephen Kelly   | London Borough of Haringey |
| Emma Williamson | London Borough of Haringey |

## **1. Project name and site address**

The Northumberland Development Project, High Road, N17  
Planning application reference: HGY/2015/3000

## **2. Presenting team**

|                |                   |
|----------------|-------------------|
| Tom Jones      | Populous          |
| Chris Bearman  | Allies & Morrison |
| Laurie Hallows | Allies & Morrison |
| David Roach    | DP9               |
| Rebecca Rogers | DP9               |
| Chris Goddard  | DP9               |

## **3. Planning authority's views**

Tottenham Hotspur Football Club were granted planning permission by Haringey Council in 2011 for the redevelopment of White Hart Lane Stadium and the land around it. This scheme was known as the Northumberland Park Development (NDP) scheme. Phase 1 of the NDP scheme has been completed and comprises the new Sainsbury's superstore on Northumberland Park Avenue and Lilywhite House which is home to Tottenham University Technical College and the football club's offices. Tottenham Hotspur have now submitted a new planning application that revises their proposals for the rest of the site.

The new application comprises a larger stadium – 61,000 seats rather than the 56,250 approved in 2011 and more flats – 579 rather than 285 previously approved. Other features of the revised proposal are a new club store and museum described as 'the Tottenham Experience', an extreme sports centre, a 180 bed hotel, a community medical centre and new public square. Part of the site lies within the Tottenham High Road Conservation Area. The proposals also include works to the Grade II Listed Warmington House and the demolition of three locally listed buildings (located in the Conservation Area), which were to be retained within the existing planning permission. The impact of these alterations to the existing listed buildings and their setting will need to be carefully considered.

At a strategic level Council policy promotes development in the Northumberland Park area of change. The recently approved Tottenham Area Action Plan supports the comprehensive regeneration of North Tottenham and Northumberland Park including taller or higher density development near to the redeveloped Tottenham Hotspur FC Stadium. While the Council is supportive of the Football clubs ambitions and the regenerative effect of an expanded stadium, increased non-football leisure offer and additional housing, the transport and environmental impacts need to be understood and where necessary mitigated.



#### **4. Quality Review Panel's views**

##### *Summary*

The panel welcomes the level of detail in the design of the public realm, however they feel that the design of the podium-level public space requires further refinement in order to deliver a comfortable, welcoming places. The panel have concerns about the visibility and viability of the public space as a destination.

The panel is supportive of the design of the stadium building, and welcomes the improvements that have been made since the last review, concerning the fluidity and visual coherence of the different facades.

The panel recognise the long-standing need for a community health building, and supports the scale of the proposal for the building, but feels that access and layout issues require further consideration.

The panel supports the use of cast iron in the façade of the Tottenham Experience, but feels that its success will depend on the quality of the detailing and the articulation of visual rhythms that reflect the proportions of Warmington House.

The panel broadly supports the design of the hotel, and feels that the elevational treatments are exciting. Further consideration of the public realm at the entrance would be welcomed, as would the introduction of a canopy to reduce negative wind effects from the tower above.

The panel accepts the broad scale and indication of quality of the extreme sports building, but has concerns over the viability of the use, and would like to see more detail concerning the proposals.

Whilst the panel broadly supports the scale and level of detail of the residential section of the development, they strongly advise the Council not to accept an outline planning application for the residential tall building on such an important and prominent site. There is a risk that the scheme may be 'dumbed down' in design quality once the principle of development has been established.

More detailed comments on the masterplan and public realm, stadium, community health building, Tottenham Experience, hotel, extreme sports hub, and the residential development are listed below.

##### *Masterplan and public realm*

- Full planning permission sought.
- The panel acknowledges the investigations into retaining the three locally listed buildings (including providing a shared surface) that have been undertaken since the previous review.



- Whilst the panel understands that the option to remove the buildings has been supported by the Council's independent crowd safety specialist, it remains disappointed at the proposed loss of heritage assets from the High Road..
- The panel is concerned that the landscaping scheme (around the stadium and extending onto the High Road) is too focused on leading spectators up to the stadium, and believes that the public realm design should strike a better balance between the line of the High Road and the attraction of the stadium.
- The panel welcomes the idea of a linked series of spaces extending beyond the site in the wider master plan for the area.
- However, concerns were expressed about the main public space at podium level in that, as it is at a higher level and not visible from the street, it may lack vitality and footfall.
- An ongoing programme of events and activities within the main space is required in order to encourage people up the three flights of stairs to the podium on non-match days.
- Careful consideration of the layout with regard to sun, wind, overshadowing and enclosure is required to make sure that the space is attractive and comfortable, both for local residents and for visitors to the stadium.

### *Stadium*

- Full planning permission sought.
- At the initial review (July 2015), concerns were raised about the prominence of the five storey elevator projecting out from the façade on the west elevation.
- The panel welcomes the response to their previous comments, of extending the glazing out to create a canopy, visually integrating the escalator.
- The panel notes that the square form of the front door is a little subdued, and offers an opportunity for a more distinctive entrance.
- The panel welcomes the amendments to the east elevation (Worcester Avenue), aligning the peak of the perforated metal skin with the entrance below.
- The panel commented that the addition of signage (not currently shown on the proposals) would add another level of complexity to the façade.
- The scale and illumination of the signage will help to identify the hierarchy of the primary and secondary entrances.
- The panel feels that there is now much more coherence between the different facades, and supports the elegance and unity created within the muscular form of the architecture.



### *Community health building*

- Outline planning permission sought; detailed approval sought for “access”, “layout” and “scale”. The application seeks to reserve matters relating to “appearance”.
- The panel questions the layout of the community health building in relation to the other parts of the scheme.
- The panel feels that the community health building has been designed around the requirements of the service yard adjacent, to the detriment of the eventual users who will be using the health building.
- The nature of the service access (ramping up next to neighbouring houses) creates a poor and unfriendly edge to the neighbouring houses at Worcester Avenue.
- Careful consideration of the entrances is required as the use of the building is public facing. The panel would welcome a more visible and accessible entrance at street level.
- The panel supports the scale of the community health building, and welcomes the stepping-down of the massing to the neighbouring buildings.
- The panel understands that more detailed design will be undertaken when a specific user for the building has been found, and would welcome the opportunity to comment on the detailed proposals.

### *Tottenham Experience*

- Full planning permission sought.
- The panel questions the use of a glazed element to separate the new buildings from Warmington House as it potentially is difficult to manage and maintain, especially at roof level.
- The panel feels that the quality of the detailing will be critical to the overall success of how the new buildings forming the Tottenham Experience integrate with Warmington House.
- The overall massing of the Tottenham Experience is suggestive of a large building, rather than a continuation of a terrace.
- The panel welcomes the use of cast iron within the façade, and supports the principle of reflecting the visual rhythms of Warmington House as a mechanism to integrate the new with the old.
- The ground level of the new buildings is currently shown as a continuous horizontal element.



- The panel would encourage greater articulation of this ground level element, to reflect the rhythms and breaks continuing down to ground level.
- The panel is broadly supportive of the direction of the proposal, but feels that it will be very important to achieve an active frontage for this part of the development.

#### *Hotel*

- Full planning permission sought.
- It was recognised that whilst the hotel entrance has a lobby, there is the opportunity to reduce external wind downdraughts from the tower through the provision of an external canopy.
- The canopy could also provide a visual link to the architecture and materials of the stadium building.
- It was noted that there is an uneasy relationship between the hotel entrance and the public realm immediately outside, often highlighted by the placement of trees in tubs aiming to create a more exclusive area of pavement.
- Careful consideration of the public realm adjacent to the entrance should create a balance between the needs of the hotel and those of the users of the space outside.
- The panel welcome the refinements within the design of the façade, and feels that the diagonal slashes that have been introduced will create an exciting elevation.

#### *Extreme sports building*

- Outline planning permission sought; detailed approval sought for “access”, and “layout”. The application seeks to reserve matters relating to “appearance” and “scale”.
- The panel expressed concerns over the viability of the proposed extreme sports building.
- Comprehensive analysis on predicted use levels would be helpful, in order to ensure that the proposal is viable.
- It was noted that there is not currently an operator for the building.
- The panel expressed concerns that the very specific nature of the building precludes a loose-fit design, and so will not easily convert to other uses if this venture does not prove commercially viable.



- The panel accepts the broad scale and design principles of the scheme, but feels that more detail is required to demonstrate the quality and viability of the extreme sports building.

### *Residential*

- Outline planning permission sought; detailed approval sought for “access”, “layout” and “scale”. The application seeks to reserve matters relating to “appearance” and “landscape”
- The panel expressed concerns that the residential tower to the south of the site would effectively put the plaza into shade for a significant period of the day which would impact upon the amenity value of the space.
- The panel felt that the images of the proposed spaces and gardens were very persuasive and aspirational, but noted that they may not reflect the true climatic environment within a development of this scale.
- It was suggested that more solid shelter would be required to alleviate the wind climate generated by the towers.
- The panel would recommend more careful consideration of the planting schemes, bearing in mind the microclimate created by tall buildings, and suggested mixed rather than native planting in this context.
- Residents will need to have well-designed shared amenity space, as the public space on the podium has a more commercial focus.
- The panel welcomed the use of corner balconies as an elegant articulation of detail on the façade, but recommended that one side of the balcony be glazed to reduce wind pressure (maximum wind pressure occurs at the corners).
- It was suggested that the light wells should have openable windows to support natural ventilation.
- The panel would support measures to reduce the numbers of internal corridors and single aspect dwellings; additionally, rooflights in stairwells would be welcomed.
- The panel feels that measures to combat overheating should be embedded in the detailed design and construction of the residential development.
- The panel understands that viability discussions regarding the provision of affordable housing are underway.
- Despite concerns over high maintenance charges, the panel would expect a development of this stature to meet policy requirements for affordable housing.



- The panel feels that if the details presented were carried through to the detailed application stage, then they would warmly support the proposals, subject to some minor adjustments.
- The proposals have developed in a positive way, and the panel accepts the general principle and scale of the residential development, and notes that the hotel and residential blocks are visually related.
- The panel notes that tall buildings succeed or fail on the quality of their detailed design, and concerns were expressed that the current application is for outline permission only.
- In this respect, the panel strongly advises that the Council does not accept the outline application on such an important and prominent site.
- It was felt that there is a risk of the design and construction quality being 'dumbed down' (through value engineering) subsequent to the precedent for development being established through outline permission.

#### *Next steps*

- Masterplan and public realm: the panel recommends further thought about the nature of the podium level plaza, before planning permission is granted, and would welcome a further opportunity to comment on this.
- Stadium: the panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the comments on this element of the scheme, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- Community health building: the panel would welcome the opportunity to comment further upon the detailed design of this element.
- Tottenham Experience: the panel records its disappointment that these proposals involve the loss of heritage assets from the High Road. If the Council accepts this is unavoidable due to safety concerns, the panel broadly supports the proposed design, subject to the detailed comments above.
- Hotel: the panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the comments on this element of the scheme, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- Extreme sports building: the panel has concerns about the viability of this element of the scheme, and would welcome a further opportunity to comment on more detailed proposals.
- Residential: The panel recommends that an outline planning application should not be accepted due to the prominence and importance of the site, and recommends a detailed planning application, to allow the planning authority to secure high quality design and construction.

