

APPENDIX 6 – Quality Review Panel Reports

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review: 19 Bernard Road

Wednesday 3 July 2019

1. Project name and site address

19 Bernard Road, London N15 4NE

2. Presenting team

Simon Robinson MSMR Architects
Alvin Ormonde Planning and Project Management Services

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of 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

A key requirement of the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP) is that development proposals are supported by a masterplanned approach. The site forms part of a strategic allocation (TH12 Herbert Road) and is the remaining parcel of land following approval of the Bernard Works proposal (HGY/2017/3584). This will be a new build mixed-use scheme.

Officers are supportive of the principle of completing this allocation with a mixed-use scheme, and the initial proposals for the site are considered to generally relate well to the approved scheme in the area. Following two Quality Review Panel formal reviews, a planning application has recently been submitted and is currently under consideration.

While the scale of the building and its footprint are broadly similar to the previous iteration of the scheme, the applicant has attempted to refine the scheme in response to the panel's comments.

Officers welcome the panel's views around the height, massing and layout of the

revised proposal, and also seek comments on the elevational treatment and interface with the street at ground floor. A view on the quality of the residential units, and the quality and amenity of the open spaces and play provision, is also sought

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

As at the previous reviews in December 2018, the Quality Review Panel considers that the site at 19 Bernard Road presents many challenges for development. It is at the transition point between the consented proposals for new development at the Bernard Works and the industrial area immediately adjacent to the west and south. It also notes that the orientation and shape of the site present significant challenges for configuring the residential accommodation.

The design team has broadly responded well to previous comments around the location of ancillary functions (for example the bin and cycle stores), and the architectural expression and materiality of the proposals. The commercial accommodation and the amenity space are also much improved. Some scope for improvement remains in the design of the circulation cores, to enable a direct view through to the amenity space at the rear of the development.

While it generally supports the approach to scale and massing, the panel feels that some important work remains to be done to reduce the number of single-aspect apartments, particularly those on the southern elevation. The panel feels that subject to a reduction in the number of south-facing single aspect units, it would be able to offer support for the proposals, and the current planning application.

Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- As outlined at the previous review, the panel considers that the three-dimensional scale and massing of the proposal is at an acceptable maximum.

Scheme layout, public realm, access and integration

- The panel feels that, while the design team has broadly responded well to comments around the layout and configuration, some important work remains to be done to reduce the number of single-aspect apartments, particularly those on the southern elevation.
- The north-facing single-aspect units will have an open outlook over the landscaped space immediately to the north. This will go some way towards mitigating the perceived impact of reduced sunlight.
- However, the single-aspect south-facing units will have significant issues from overheating, problems with natural ventilation, and potential nuisance from the adjacent railway. The panel would encourage the design team to explore alternative means of designing or reconfiguring the accommodation to minimise these issues on the south side of the development.
- If a reduction of south-facing single-aspect units were to be achieved, it would

represent the best route to resolving an extremely challenging brief and would potentially create a successful high-density neighbourhood.

- One option to achieve this reduction would be to provide a third core, to enable a greater number of through units. This would have the added benefit of reducing the length of the corridors.
- The panel would also encourage the design team to explore re-locating the circulation cores to the southern face of the building, which may also help to reduce south-facing single-aspect units.
- In addition, further work to rethink the design of the circulation cores to allow direct views (through glazed elements) through to the shared amenity space at the rear of the development would be welcomed. This would significantly improve the visibility and usage of the amenity space and would also serve to indicate the standard of quality and thoughtfulness underpinning the design process.
- Subject to the proposals being adjusted to reduce the numbers of south-facing single-aspect units, the panel would be able to offer support for the proposal, and the current planning application.
- The panel supports the approach that locates active frontages at ground floor level next to landscaped open space and fronting onto Ashby Road.
- Regarding the interface between the building and the public realm at ground floor level, the panel considers that provision of defensible space is most important for where bedrooms look onto the public realm.
- It welcomes the adjustments to the plan that enable the ancillary accommodation (bin stores and cycle stores) to be located away from the primary residential entrances.

Architectural expression

- The panel highlights the scheme's challenging brief, especially with regard to how the architecture of the corner (at the east of the site) will respond to the transition between Ashby Road, the Square, and the industrial buildings immediately to the south.
- While it regrets the loss of the gabled roof-line (incorporated within a previous iteration of the design), the panel is generally happy with the architectural expression of the scheme, subject to high quality materials and construction details.

Next steps

The panel is confident that the project team will be able to address the points above, in consultation with Haringey officers.

Appendix: Haringey Quality Charter

Policy DM1: Delivering High Quality Design

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 - 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.

Haringey Development Management DPD (2017)

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review: 19 Bernard Road

Wednesday 24 April 2019

1. Project name and site address

19 Bernard Road, London N15 4NE

2. Presenting team

Simon Robinson MSMR Architects

Amy Crellin MSMR Architects

Tom Donoghue MSMR Architects

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of 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

A key requirement of the Tottenham Area Action Plan (AAP) is that development proposals are supported by a master planned approach. The site forms part of a

strategic allocation (TH12 Herbert Road) and is the remaining parcel of land following approval of the Bernard Works proposal (HGY/2017/3584). This will be a new build mixed-use scheme.

Officers are supportive of the principle of completing this allocation with a mixed-use scheme, and the initial proposals for the site are considered to generally relate well to the approved scheme in the area. Following the first QRP consideration of the scheme, the applicant presented the pre-application proposal at a Development Management (DM) Forum and to Planning Sub-Committee as a 'for information' briefing. The applicant has updated the scheme in response to initial QRP feedback and Member's comments. While the building footprint and massing are broadly similar to the previous iteration of the scheme, the current proposal incorporates a flat roof design that is more varied in character. The number of units remains the same, however there has been an amendment to the area of some units. Officers welcome the panel's view around the height, massing and expression of the development, especially in terms of the relationship of the scheme to the neighbouring development, and the existing housing adjacent. A view on the relationship of the commercial to residential space within the scheme, the updated layout and the quality of the residential units created is also sought.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

As at the previous review in December 2018, the Quality Review Panel considered that the site at 19 Bernard Road presents many challenges for development, being at the transition point between the consented proposals for new development at the Bernard Works and the industrial area immediately adjacent to the west and south. It also notes that the orientation and shape of the site present challenges for configuring the accommodation.

Whilst it generally supports the approach to scale and massing of the development, the panel feels that a further iteration of the design is required. It considers that there is still some important work to be done to improve the quality of the accommodation through reducing the number of single-aspect north- and south-facing apartments.

The panel understands that the architectural expression and roofline of the proposals have evolved following pre-application feedback. However, scope remains for refinement of the elevations and roofline, to create a neighbourly and human-scaled frontage to the adjacent residential properties.

Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- As outlined at the previous review, the panel considers that the scale of the proposals is acceptable, and within the limits of what can be appropriately accommodated on the site. It accepts the approach to optimising the amount of residential and commercial space and considers that the quantum of development currently proposed is at an acceptable maximum.

- At a detailed level, scope remains for some adjustment / redistribution of the massing of the block, at plan levels 04 and 05, to optimise the quality of accommodation, as well as private and communal amenity spaces.
- An option for consideration could be to relocate some of the residential accommodation from plan level 05 to level 04, whilst relocating the photovoltaic (PV) panels to the uppermost roof. This could potentially enable provision of a generous shared roof terrace at plan level 05, whilst also improving the outlook of the end residential unit at the eastern edge of plan level 04.

Scheme layout, public realm, access and integration

- The panel understands that the proposals have evolved in response to feedback received at the pre-application stage. It feels that as the design work progresses, the liveability of the scheme would benefit from more thought to ensure that the development is a high-quality place to live, work and visit.
- The panel highlights the number of north- and south-facing single-aspect units as being of particular concern due to issues around poor sunlight / daylight levels, overheating, problems with natural ventilation, and potential nuisance from the railway adjacent. It would encourage the design team to explore alternative means of designing or reconfiguring the accommodation to minimise these issues.
- One option would be to provide an additional core to enable a greater number of through-units. This would have the added benefit of reducing the length of the corridors.
- Alternatively, provision of deck access corridors could allow through-units with openings on both sides; however the design would also need to strike a careful balance between privacy, amenity and access to sunlight and ventilation.
- Other possibilities include a partial re-distribution (or reduction in quantum) of some of the residential accommodation to allow for more generous circulation spaces and a 'loosening up' of the layout to allow a greater proportion of multiple-aspect dwellings.
- One panel member suggested exploring interlocking duplex units, with access corridors on alternate floors enabling dual aspect two-storey dwellings. Whilst this requires additional circulation space within the units themselves (i.e. private stairs), this is perhaps partly off-set by a reduction in communal circulation.
- The panel welcomes the adjustments to the ground floor layout to enable active frontages next to landscaped open space and fronting onto Ashby Road. Provision of individual dwelling entrances accessed from the public realm along the north and east faces of the block will also help to improve passive surveillance and activity on the street.
- The panel also supports the relocation of the residential bin and cycle storage areas but feels that the commercial bin store would benefit from being located away from the westernmost residential entrance. This would enhance the visual qualities of this important entrance area, alongside minimising potential nuisance to residents.
- It would also encourage the design team to increase the generosity of the entrance and cycle store at the western end of the development, adjacent to

the commercial units.

- A buffer zone of planting is located at the northern edge of the building where the residential units front onto the public realm. Detailed designs for this area will need to balance privacy, amenity, passive surveillance and activation of the public realm.
- The panel questions the amenity of the private terraces at the corner of the building at the east of the site, especially at ground level. Careful consideration of the detailed design of these elements will be required, that also balances the privacy and amenity of the occupants against the need to define an important corner within the streetscape.
- The panel welcomes the move to merge the amenity space for the affordable and market housing, in order to deliver a more generous shared provision of higher quality amenity space.
- The panel's suggestion that the design team explore the creation of a roof terrace (see above) could also present an opportunity to explore provision of private amenity space for the ground level units.

Architectural expression

- The panel highlights that the scheme has a challenging brief; especially with regard to how the architecture of the corner (at the east of the site) will respond to the transition between Ashby Road, the Square, and the industrial buildings immediately to the south.
- The panel feels that the articulation of the facades is potentially elegant, and that the proportions of brickwork and glazing should work well, if its materials and detailing are of high quality.
- Further work to reinforce the verticality of the primary elevation could help break down the bulk of the façade.
- It considers that the main entrances to the residential accommodation would benefit from additional design development to enhance their visual prominence within the streetscape.
- The panel would encourage further in-depth analysis of the site context in terms of the detail and nature of the architectural expression. Drawing inspiration from neighbouring buildings to add richness and depth to the architecture, could also help ensure it is well integrated into the area. For example, residential entrances in the area are often framed with darker, glazed brick areas.
- As at the previous review, the panel considers that adopting a more contextual and domestic architecture within the eastern elevation at Ashby Road would help to soften the transition between the new development and the existing terrace of housing opposite.
- The panel would also encourage the use of lighter materials on the primary elevation fronting onto the consented landscaped space to the north of the site. This will be visually prominent, but will receive limited sunlight because it faces north.
- Projecting balconies on the southern façade should be avoided or minimised, at this difficult interface between the residential and industrial uses. Recessed balconies on the southern elevation could provide a greater degree of separation and privacy.
- In addition, careful consideration of how the detailed design of the

accommodation might mitigate potential nuisance (especially in terms of noise) from the industrial uses and railway to the south would be welcomed.

- The panel feels that the design, materiality and profile of the roofline requires some further consideration. It would encourage the inclusion of a more visually robust palette of materials in the top level of accommodation in order to create greater coherence between the roof level and the building below. An option to explore could be the use of brickwork at roof level, perhaps with open brickwork framing to link the different elements, to unify the different parts of the building.
- The detailed design and location of PV panels should be carefully considered, to minimise visual impact locally, and in views from further afield. Guard rails required for safety reasons can be very prominent if not carefully considered.

Inclusive and sustainable design

- The panel applauds the way that the provision of affordable housing has been considered and integrated at the start of the project. It welcomes the approach to unifying the communal amenity spaces to enable better overall provision of amenity space within the development.
- The panel would encourage the design team to consider sustainable approaches to rainwater management and drainage.

Next steps

If the proposals continue to evolve, the panel would welcome the opportunity to comment on the amended scheme at a Chair's Review.

Appendix: Haringey Quality Charter **Policy DM1: Delivering High Quality Design**

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 - 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.
- Haringey Development Management DPD (2017)*