

Appendix Four: QRP Note

Chair's review April 2017

Summary

It was clear from the design team's presentation that the proposals have improved enormously since the previous review. This has resulted in a scheme that optimises the development potential of the site, takes advantage of the site's unique qualities and promises high quality development. Whilst the density of the scheme is quite high, the panel supports the scale, massing, residential typology, and architectural expression proposed. They note that the construction of such a project within the context of the site will present a number of challenges, but feel that once the development is completed it could represent a potentially award-winning residential scheme. They highlight some comments about the landscape, public realm and management issues. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- The Quality Review Panel feels that whilst the proposed development density remains quite high for the site, the reduction of 'perceived' density achieved through the loss of one pavilion is significant.
- The panel warmly welcomes the approach taken to utilise the changing site levels to accommodate re-distribution of the 'lost' units from the fifth pavilion. This is successful in optimising the development on site whilst mitigating the impact on the bulk and massing of the remaining four pavilions.
- The relationships between the blocks themselves, and the neighbouring dwellings on Plevna Crescent has significantly improved, allowing for much greater amenity within the accommodation itself, and in the common spaces between.
- The loss of one pavilion has allowed the spaces between the blocks to increase, whilst also allowing the orientation of a number of the blocks to be rotated slightly. This has increased the scope of the views through the development and reduces overlooking issues, as the façades of a number of the pavilions are angled away from each other and from the existing accommodation on Plevna Crescent.
- The panel notes that the relationship to the adjacent housing on Plevna Crescent will be perceptually closer during winter months when views onto the site are not as screened by foliage, but they consider that this would be acceptable.

Place-making, character and quality

- The panel welcomes the work undertaken to establish and understand the key existing landscape features and constraints for the development.
- A clear landscape design and maintenance strategy should be submitted for the inhabited / accessible green areas.
- A good balance between access and security could be achieved with entry gates that are open during the day, but can be closed to provide controlled access at night.
- The level of the pathways seems to work well; privacy of accommodation fronting onto the pathways has been improved by setting the pathways at a lower level.
- There is potentially further scope for additional landscape features within the interstitial spaces between pavilions; provision of additional trees could help to punctuate the long elevation as seen from the railways.
- The panel would also support an overarching play strategy for the development; they welcome the provision of the primary play area within a well-surveilled location, and feel that the other spaces within the development could also frame smaller, more informal and incidental play opportunities.
- The panel understands that a wildlife trust is to be established for the protection of the landscape, and that access to the landscape to the north of the site would be facilitated a couple of times a year.
- The panel would encourage the relationship between the trust and the residents to be formalised through the s106 agreement.

Scheme layout and architectural expression

- The plan form of the individual blocks seems very well-considered and efficient; all units are dual aspect, and seem to work very well.
- It was clear from the presentation that the location and orientation of all four pavilions has been carefully considered in order to achieve the optimum outlook for the individual units whilst also framing and opening up different views beyond the site boundary.
- The panel warmly supports the proposed architectural expression and palette of materials to be used within the development; they applaud the simplicity and purity of the design, and support the intention to avoid visual clutter.
- The creation of a solid gabion base with cedar shingle-clad volumes on top will contribute to the unique setting of the scheme, and should also help to reduce the perception of scale of the pavilions.

- They support the move to increase the angles of the roofs, which helps to enhance the drama and simplicity of the built forms. Inclusive and sustainable design
- The proposals represent significant challenges for the construction phase; however once completed, the scheme potentially promises a very high quality and unique residential development.
- The panel notes that the site is essentially a greenfield site, and as such they would expect full compliance with affordable housing provision policy, and a well-considered management strategy / regime that supports all tenure types.

Next steps

- The panel offer warm support for the proposals, and express confidence that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers.

Full review November 2016

Summary

The Quality Review Panel feels that the site represents a fantastic opportunity for development. They welcome the conceptual approach of pavilions within a landscape setting. However, the panel thinks that the development density is currently too high, and would suggest a starting point of four pavilion blocks instead of five. This would create more generous spaces between the proposed blocks, and avoid problems of windows in close proximity. It could also improve the relationship of the development with existing homes on Plevna Crescent. They note that the proposed plan form of the pavilion block seems very efficient.

The panel would encourage the design team to explore how the development could more creatively exploit the different levels of the undulating landscape, and would strongly recommend that an arboricultural survey is undertaken as soon as possible, to identify critical tree (and tree-root) locations. They would welcome further consideration of the nature and location of pedestrian movement into and through the site, and would strongly support moves to create high quality amenity space within the site, in addition to improving access to parts of the landscape within the heart of the site. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- The Quality Review Panel feels that the proposed development density is too high for the site, and has resulted in very difficult relationships between the blocks

themselves, and between the development and the existing residential accommodation on Plevna Crescent.

- As the plan form of the individual block seems well-considered and efficient this could be retained, however the panel would like to see a reduction from five blocks to four in order to resolve the conflicts created through proximity.
- They note that the current planning permission allows for development of the site to create 42 residential units, and suggest that a reduction from five blocks (75 units) down to four blocks (60 units) would not be unreasonable.
- An approach could be to vary the heights of the four pavilions, and utilise the changing site levels to optimise the development density.

Place-making and landscape

- The panel welcomes the conceptual approach of siting pavilions in the landscape, but feel that the different site levels resulting from the undulating topography could be utilised more to create a site layout and configuration that relates more closely to the landscape.
- A detailed arboricultural survey should be undertaken as soon as possible to establish the key landscape features and constraints for the development (for example tree roots that would preclude certain locations for development).
- The panel would encourage the design team to make more of the landscape accessible to the residents, and improve the amenity of the accommodation.
- Within the current proposals the landscape primarily offers visual amenity, and is largely inaccessible.
- The panel understands that a wildlife trust is to be established for the protection of the landscape, and would encourage the relationship between the trust and the residents to be formalised through the s106 agreement.
- Lighting design will be really important in order to ensure that residents feel safe when walking through the development at night.

Scheme layout and architecture

- The panel express concern about the relationship between the proposed blocks and the existing houses on Plevna Crescent.
- The proposed blocks are also currently situated too close to each other, resulting in overlooking issues and constraints within the interstitial spaces between.

- Planting shown between blocks is unlikely to be successful due to restricted light levels due to the relative proximity.
- The western-most block is shown as extremely close to the existing houses on Plevna Crescent.
- The panel would suggest that this block is removed, which would allow a more spacious and informal placement of blocks, and would free up the geometry of the spaces created between them.
- There may also be benefit to be gained from pulling the blocks northwards, away from the existing houses on Plevna Crescent, and away from the landscaped bank/mound.
- This may help to avoid building over tree roots, and would enable additional circulation and/or amenity space to the south of the site.
- The panel would encourage the design team to consider how the different levels might work if the blocks were sited behind the bank; whether it may be possible to gain access to different levels of the block from the front and rear.
- The architectural expression of the proposed development was not discussed in much detail at this review, as the panel's comments were at a more strategic level.
- However, they suggested that housing at Accordia in Cambridge may provide a good precedent for the gabion wall podium plinth perforated with slots, with apartments above.
- The panel would like to know more about the strategic approach to energy efficiency and environmental sustainability for the scheme as a whole.

Access and circulation

- The panel feels that circulation within the site would benefit from further consideration.
- They note that the pedestrian and vehicle entrances are separated, and would like to see in more detail how this would work and what it would look like,
- The panel would welcome further consideration of the route of the pedestrian access route through the site; there may be benefit in locating the path to the south of the blocks.
- The panel would also encourage further thought around the scale of the podium; if the level of parking were to be adjusted then this basement level could expand or contract accordingly.

- They would encourage the design team to maximise the amount of daylight and natural ventilation into the podium level.

Next Steps

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals. They highlight a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.

Appendix Five: DM Forum minutes

Meeting	: Development Management Forum – Plevna Crescent N15
Date	: Wednesday 22 nd March 2017
Place	: St Ann's Library, Cissbury Road
Present	: John McRory (Chair), Wendy Robinson, Tay Makoon
Minutes by	: Wendy Robinson

John McRory welcomed everyone to the meeting, introduced officers, members and the applicant's representatives. He explained the purpose of the meeting that it was not a decision making meeting, the house keeping rules, she explained the agenda and that the meeting will be minuted and attached to the officers report for the Planning Committee.

Presentation by Ayre Chamberlain Gaunt Architects

Comments from Cllr Bevan

- Glad QRP have been involved
- Require internal light standards to be met
- Affordable housing is very important and should not be pepper potted throughout the development
- Balconies are of concern and may not be usable in winter because of weather and noise from trains. Would prefer winter gardens.
- All units need to be dual aspect
- There needs to be a balance between nature areas needing darkness versus the development needing lighting for safety purposes

Q & A

Q: Will access to the corpse be provided? Not want people roaming across site.

A: No. Landscaping and boundary treatment will be used to keep people away softly not abrasively.

Q: Are there residential units on the ground floor?

A: No. There is a level difference.

Q: Which parts are for public access?

A: Shown on model.

Q: Will the rear pathways feel safe? Also, the pedestrian access looks dark and scary too.

A: Use of light and space will ensure safety.

Q: Any likelihood of pedestrian access between either of the other triangles (Gorley Triangle or Ermine Road)?

A: This was considered and the opportunity exists for future access but Network Rail is tough.

Q: Where is the cycle and rubbish storage?

A: Within cores and basement.

Q: Will there be a management company?

A: There will be freeholders and a management company.

Q: Is the development caught by zero carbon?

A: Development will need to be policy compliant.

Q: Green or brown roof options being proposed?

A: Both will be used where they work best and with solar panels amongst where appropriate.

Q: Any development on a charitable trust for the ecological area?

A: No. This will come from s106 legal agreement.

Q: Is there car parking onsite?

A: There will be 29 spaces in the part basement with appropriate electric spaces.

Q: What are the construction impacts?

A: This is being looked at now in detail because it is a known issue.

Q: Has the number of units changed since the previous appeal scheme?

A: Yes the number of units has increased but there has been a significant change in style of development.

End of meeting