



## **Haringey Quality Review Panel**

### **Report of Chair's Review Meeting: Hornsey Town Hall**

Monday 6 November 2017

River Park House, 225 High Road, London, N22 8HQ

#### **Panel**

Peter Studdert (chair)

Hari Phillips

#### **Attendees**

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Nairita Chakraborty	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
James Hughes	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Rebecca Ferguson	Frame Projects

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

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey

#### **Confidentiality**

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.

## 1. Project name and site address

Hornsey Town Hall, The Broadway, London, N8 9JH  
 Planning application reference: HGY/2017/2220

## 2. Presenting team

Doris Lam	Far East Consortium
John Ferguson	Collective Planning
Katy Ghahremani	Make Architects
Yuting Jiang	Make Architects

## 3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of highly experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice, and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

## 4. Planning authority's views

The site is located on the east side of the Crouch End Broadway and is 1.3 Ha in area. The key buildings on the site are the Hornsey Town Hall (statutory listed Grade II\*), the Weston Clinic Building, and the Broadway House building (statutory listed Grade II). The site also contains green space (including the town square fronting the Hornsey Town Hall), and surface car parking.

The site has extensive planning history including previous permissions for the redevelopment of the site and change of use of the Town Hall (granted in 2010). Whilst the 2010 consent established the principles of the development, and the footprint of the new accommodation, officers suggest that the scheme presented should be considered on its own merits as informed by the previous consents.

A full planning application for the site was received by the council on 1 August 2017. Minor revisions to the proposal were received on 24 August 2017, following on from the deposit of the full planning application, primarily addressing the Mews Block and Broadway Annexe.

Since the previous review on 3 October 2017, some amendments to the overall massing have been made, in addition to the inclusion of 11 affordable residential units within the conversion section of the scheme.

## 5. Quality Review Panel's views

### *Summary*

The Quality Review Panel warmly supports the proposals to restore and refurbish the Town Hall, and bring it back into positive use. It notes that the current proposals represent the absolute maximum that the site will support, and that in this regard, a high quality of development is required. The panel feels that (subject to some outstanding comments outlined below), it is able to offer broad support for the application.

The panel welcomes the adjustments to the massing that have been enabled by the reduction in floor-to-floor heights, in addition to the reconfiguration of the entry sequence to Block B. However, scope remains to further improve the quality and amenity of the design of the entrance, the internal circulation, and the 'edge' of Block B at ground level.

The panel remains to be convinced about the architectural expression of some elements of the proposals. As at the previous review, it feels that some further refinement could help achieve a calmer and more elegant counterpart to the existing buildings on site. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

### *Massing and development density*

- The panel welcomes the adjustments to the massing that have been enabled by the reduction in floor-to-floor heights, achieved following removal of comfort cooling within the residential blocks.
- It reiterates that the current proposals represent the absolute maximum quantum of development that the site will support, and in this regard, the panel notes that a high quality scheme is required, that will transform the site and its immediate environment.

### *Place-making, character and quality*

- Further to the previous review, the winter view of the proposal from the eastern end of Haringey Park (Winter View 06 proposed) is now available. The panel notes that it would be useful to include an overlay wire-line view of the consented scheme to enable comparison of the relative impact on the street scene.
- The panel welcomes the additional detail in the landscape design of the Town Hall Square.
- It notes some concern around plans to utilise the grassed area for winter festivals, as it may cause high levels of damage to the turf. However, the panel understands that the location of the external power sockets will provide flexibility for festival events, either on the grassed areas or on the paved areas.



- The panel questions how the limited area of grasscrete parking within the site will be managed and enforced in order to avoid open parking by both residents and non-residents.

#### *Scheme layout, access and integration*

- The reconfiguration of the entry sequence to Block B is welcomed, allowing grade access into the main entrance of the block.
- However, scope remains to further improve the quality and amenity of the design of this entrance and the internal circulation, in terms of internal daylight levels, directness and simplicity of circulation, and generosity of the lobby area.
- Potential solutions for consideration could include reconfiguring the ground floor to bring the entrance and circulation core closer together by moving the entrance away from the corner of Block B, and placing it next to (or closer to) the core.
- Introduction of a window into the eastern end of the circulation corridor could also be explored to increase daylight levels internally.
- If the entrance to Block B is located away from the main north-south pedestrian route, it will be critical to ensure that the entrance (and approach) to Block B is attractive and visible, to aid legibility for residents and visitors.
- Despite the improvements that have been made to the lower levels of accommodation within Block B, the panel still feels that there would be significant benefit in removing the four units that remain at lower ground level. This would allow greater flexibility within the configuration of the building plan and of the public and private realms adjacent, through avoidance of problems associated with the external semi-basement 'well'.

#### *Architectural expression*

- The panel also remains to be convinced about the architectural expression of the proposals; it feels that some further refinement could help achieve a calmer and more elegant counterpart to the existing buildings on site. In this regard, the panel reiterates their comments from the review on 3 October 2017, included below.
- The panel welcomes the level of thought and analysis that has been undertaken within the design of the building elevations. It notes that detailed articulation of the facades includes inset reveals, banding and different brick bonds. The panel feels that the architectural expression of the new blocks of accommodation would benefit from a calmer approach, with perhaps a more limited palette of materials and construction detailing.



- This is particularly the case with Block A, which needs to visually 'recede' in relation to the Town Hall. The panel thinks earlier iterations of the design, with a larger proportion of brick, and less white brick and stone, was more successful in achieving this.
- The panel understands that using white elements within the roofline of block B helps mitigate the visual intrusion on the key view of the Town Hall. However, elsewhere the white elements could be used with greater simplicity, to highlight window openings, as seen in the existing buildings on and adjacent to the site.
- The quality of materials and construction, for example the bricks used, and the design of metalwork elements, will be essential to the success of the completed scheme. The panel would support planning officers in securing this through planning conditions.
- It notes that in order for an informed decision to be made about the choice of material elements within the façades of the different buildings on site, elevational drawings and/or three-dimensional graphic images will be required that illustrate the alternative compositional treatments. Consideration of material samples alone will not adequately illustrate the options available.

#### *Next Steps*

- The panel feels that (subject to the outstanding concerns outlined above), it is able to offer broad support for the application.
- The panel highlight a number of outstanding comments for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- It would strongly encourage the Council to establish clear heads of terms within the Section 106 agreement, to ensure guaranteed delivery of the wider public benefits as part of the development, each of which should be explicitly identified in a phasing plan.



## Appendix: Haringey Quality Charter

### Policy DM1 Delivering High Quality Design

All development is required to be of a high standard of design and compatible with, and contributing to, the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. The Council expects proposals to be design-led, and will support proposals for new development that:

- a) make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;
- b) relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole;
- c) confidently address feedback from local consultation;
- d) demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built; and
- e) is inclusive and incorporates sustainable design and construction principles.

*Haringey Consultation Draft Development Management Policies DPD (2015)*

