

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: High Road West

Wednesday 23 June 2021

Video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Dieter Kleiner
Joanna Sutherland
Paddy Pugh
Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliott	London Borough of Haringey
Graham Harrington	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Kiki Ageridou	Frame Projects
Zainab Malik	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Stéphane Pietrzak	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Tim Starley-Grainger	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

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.

1. Project name and site address

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

2. Presenting team

Matthew Maple	London Borough of Haringey
Greg Greasley	Lendlease
Selena Mason	Lendlease
Avni Mehta	Lendlease
Sarah Brooks	Studio Egret West
Nick James	Studio Egret West
Lucas Lawrence	Studio Egret West
Martin Lee	Studio Egret West
Duncan Paybody	Studio Egret West
Tricia Patel	Pollard Thomas Edwards
Alina Toosey	Pollard Thomas Edwards
Simon Whitley	Pollard Thomas Edwards
Chris Hartley	DP9
Tom Horne	DP9
Katharine Woods	DP9

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 briefing

The High Road West site, approximately 11 ha, is located in the Northumberland Park ward in North Tottenham, between the Great Anglia railway line and the High Road, and adjacent to Tottenham Hotspur Football Club. North Tottenham is a diverse neighbourhood with many different characteristics, land uses, urban structures, typologies, and a rich heritage. Parts of the wider masterplan site fall within the North Tottenham Conservation Area; and while Whitehall Mews, Plot F and Plot D are not within the conservation area, they are located adjacent to – or nearby – the conservation area, and are subject to Article 4 directions, governing alterations to facades in conservation areas. The area of masterplan to the south of White Hart Lane includes several locally listed buildings (in the location of the proposed library and learning centre), and sits adjacent to a statutory listed building, on White Hart Lane. Policy SP1: Managing Growth identifies High Road West within the North Tottenham Growth Area. It requires development in Growth Areas to deliver new housing and business accommodation, maximise site opportunities, provide



necessary infrastructure, links and benefits for local communities and surrounding areas.

The application site is allocated in the Tottenham Area Action Plan (TAAP) as NT5: High Road West, which highlights the need for a comprehensive new residential neighbourhood and a new leisure destination for London. The Tottenham Area Action Plan was in part shaped by the High Road West Masterplan Framework prepared by Arup and approved by the Council's Cabinet in 2014. This document represents the latest Council 'masterplan', for the site and should be considered with the Tottenham Area Action Plan in setting the context for regeneration in this location. The Council's development partner, Lendlease, is preparing a masterplan to form the basis of a hybrid planning application. Previous reviews were held in 2018, 2019 and 2021. The applicant team has secured grant funding from the Greater London Authority, which makes the delivery of policy compliant levels of affordable housing more viable; the ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority funded estate regeneration process has been pushed back to beyond June 2021.

The applicant team is planning to submit a hybrid application later in the year (subject to review) which will consist of a part outline, part full application for residential-led mixed use development consisting of up to 2,600 homes; new public park and civic square; a library and learning centre; new shops, civic and leisure spaces; and an energy centre. The panel's consideration of the evolving masterplan is sought. This includes a review of the vision, objectives, and masterplan principles; the development's approach to context, routes, and connections; the approach to sustainable, lifetime neighbourhoods; the potential impact on heritage assets; the approach to height, massing, and urban structure; and advice on the next steps for the project.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to comment further on the draft proposals and strategic approach for High Road West as it continues to evolve. It thinks that the project is hugely ambitious and clearly very challenging, with some significant constraints, including the need to decant residents from the existing housing estate, crowd management on match days, the relationship to the station, the concentration of different activities and the impact on the Tottenham High Road Conservation Area. In this regard, High Road West represents one of the most complex current regeneration schemes in London. Moving forward, the panel feels that more detail of the proposals needs to be 'tied down' and, as part of this, additional time is needed to ensure that key buildings and spaces within the masterplan can be comprehensively reviewed by the panel. As design work continues and the project team moves to the next level of detail, it will be extremely important to focus on how the individual blocks and places created will work, for those that live there, work there or visit.



This review focused on the southern half of the master plan, south of White Hart Lane, in particular the detailed proposals for Whitehall Mews west of the railway embankment, and the emerging detail of Blocks D and F which are to be submitted in outline. Further reviews will be necessary to evaluate the emerging details of the remaining blocks and landscaping on the southern part of the site, as well as the totality of the northern half.

At a detailed level, the panel thinks that Whitehall Mews proposal promises high quality development. While the scale and massing of the proposals seem comfortable within the context, further consideration of some detailed aspects of the architectural expression; the landscape, play and public realm proposals; the design of the interface between the new buildings and the adjacent public realm; and solutions to mitigate noise and outlook issues for the block beside to the railway would be supported.

In terms of Plot F and Plot D, the diagrammatic plan-forms of the proposals represent good starting points, but further consideration – and reduction, where necessary – of the three-dimensional form, scale and massing of both Plot F and Plot D is required. This work should be informed by evaluation of the impact of the massing upon microclimate and sunlight / daylight penetration into key spaces and residential units; the impact upon townscape views locally and from further afield; and the impact upon the conservation area, and the setting of listed buildings, and how this may be off-set through a programme of enhancement within the conservation area. Further consideration of the podiums of both Plot F and Plot D should include strategic decisions about the design, functionality and character of the podium spaces; their relationship to the public realm and the entrance sequence; defensible spaces to protect residential amenity; and the visual expression of the podium as distinct from the buildings that contain it. Increasing the quantity and quality of private and communal amenity and play spaces within both Plot F and Plot D will also be necessary to ensure high quality, liveable development. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Scope of the review and application process

- This review focused on the southern half of the master plan. Due to time limitations within the review process it was not possible for the panel to consider the full range of issues concerning this part of the masterplan, the design of the public realm and the landscape proposals, and all of the individual sites in detail.
- The panel's comments were limited to a brief evaluation of Whitehall Mews, Plot F and Plot D. It would welcome the opportunity to also review the overall masterplan, landscape and public realm proposals, and all individual plots at a greater depth in future reviews.
- The aim for the outline elements of the application should be to have a clear view of the 'nuts and bolts' of the proposals, including impacts upon adjacent



conservation areas and the approach to – and detail of – the tall buildings. The panel understands that the outline parts of the application will comprise drawings, parameters plans, heights and a design code. It highlights that discussion on these outline parts at the current review should be at a strategic level, to establish whether this configuration of scale and mass provides a good basis for the subsequent reserved matters application.

- The panel was not able to review the proposals for the library at any depth during the review; however, it notes that it is yet to be convinced by the stepped terrace of trees at roof level of the proposed library. It considers that the new library should be designed at a detailed level, so that issues of design quality, area and facilities, in addition to the impact on the adjacent conservation area, can be ‘tied down’ and firmly established. The panel questions whether this can be achieved through an outline application. Establishing the details of the library proposal will also be extremely important in terms of the Section 106 provisions for the development.
- Further discussion regarding the conservation impact of the proposed demolition at the southern section of the masterplan is required, at a future review.

Approach to development and masterplan

- The panel welcomes the community consultation that is informing the emerging master plan. It would encourage the project team to take a fully integrated approach to the design, and in so doing identify local needs alongside opportunities to establish a legacy, perhaps in the form of ongoing community governance. It would like to see further work on the places within the scheme that will engender a real sense of ownership within the community.
- The panel would like to know more about the arboricultural survey of the overall masterplan; it highlights that there are some very attractive trees within the Love Lane Estate, and it would encourage the project team to retain as many of the mature trees as possible.
- It would also like to know more about the nature of the proposed commercial space within the different building plots, to ensure that the spaces provided are commercially viable for the long term, and will help to support a variety of commercial uses that will give the local area distinctiveness and character as a place to live, work and visit.

Whitehall Mews

- The panel found it difficult to comment in depth due to time constraints within the review. However, it feels that the design team has worked hard on the



proposals for Whitehall Mews, and that the scheme appears to promise high quality development.

- The predominant scale of the surrounding neighbourhood is two to three storeys; while introducing development at five to six storeys represents a step up from this datum, the panel feels reasonably comfortable with the scale and massing proposed in this location.
- Consideration of how to mitigate noise and outlook issues for the five to six storey block running adjacent to the railway will be very important.
- The panel supports the approach to architectural expression within the principal elevations. It considers that the gable ends are visually more austere, but this will be acceptable if the primary elevations have enough detail and articulation to offset them.
- It would encourage further consideration of the interface between the buildings and the public realm, where there are habitable rooms on the ground floor. Exploration of ways to mitigate these issues – through raising the floor level of the ground floor accommodation, or carefully designing defensible space and thresholds – would be supported.
- The panel likes the simplicity of the architectural expression of Whitehall Mews, and supports the choice of materials. The quality of materials and construction, for example the bricks specified, will be essential to the success of the completed scheme. It would support officers in securing this through planning conditions.
- While the panel understands that older residents within the existing housing estate may wish to retain the Tenterden shared garden as a quieter amenity space, it will be important to consider the scope and location of new play space as part of the scheme.
- An opportunity exists to draw the space bounded by the gable ends of the two blocks and the curve of the route under the railway into the site, and to include this area within the landscape proposals, to create additional communal space.
- The panel notes that a number of trees on site are very attractive, and it welcomes the ambition to retain as many as possible within the proposals.

Plot F

- As a plan-form diagram Plot F seems workable, comprising four buildings with spaces in between. The panel would like more information on the podium, and how it is perceived at street level in terms of the visual relationship between it and the four buildings that contain it. It thinks it would be beneficial to achieve



further clarity on how these four buildings read in three dimensions, as visually distinct from the podium. Ensuring that the primary buildings are seen as 'landing' on the ground, rather than on the podium, would be welcomed.

- The panel understands that the 'mansion blocks' (Plot F, Buildings B and D) are ten storeys from pavement level and eight storeys from podium level, which is a significant height. It notes that only a small part of the podium receives a minimum of two hours of sunlight, and that the larger part of the podium fails to receive even two hours of sunlight. The panel considers that if Buildings B and D are brought down in scale (Building D should be limited to no more than four storeys above podium level to maximise sunlight penetration), then this would significantly improve the quality of the podium space – and accommodation adjacent – in terms of daylight, sunlight and wind microclimate.
- The panel would also like to see the scale and massing of Plot F tested at a strategic level through townscape views, to enable evaluation of the impact of Buildings A and C (at 25 and 15 storeys respectively), in addition to Buildings B and D, before it can provide conclusive feedback on the scale of the overall plot development.
- Testing of the townscape impact of Plot F – and in particular within views from the conservation area to the north and east – will help to inform consideration of the development's strategic impact on the adjacent conservation area. The panel feels that further discussion is required on this important matter to establish the details of how the development will provide material enhancement to the conservation area in mitigation of these impacts, as required by the Tottenham Area Action Plan (TAAP).
- The panel would like to know more about the liveability aspects of Plot F, and the way it will function on a daily basis in terms of how people will access their homes, how they will meet neighbours, how deliveries will be accommodated and how visitors will navigate the development.
- It applauds the proportion of dual aspect units within the proposals for Plot F.
- It would encourage the project team to further explore the nature of the balconies – whether recessed or projecting – and their relationship to main streets. Projecting balconies at lower floors adjacent to main streets can create an uncomfortable relationship.
- Duplexes and triplexes (as in Building B) can work well at – and below – podium level; however, bedrooms looking out onto the podium space can be very problematic, so require very careful designing. One solution is to make the units oversized to enable location of living space looking out onto the central podium area.



- The panel would like to know more about the visual relationship between the lower-level maisonettes and the mansion blocks above (Building B), as this can be very difficult to resolve successfully.
- Given that there are a significant number of homes in a very constrained amount of space, the panel feels that provision of garden and podium space is not sufficient for the number of residents it will be serving. The scheme will require a large amount of play and amenity space, especially as the numbers of children will depend upon the height of the building. It would like to know how much doorstep play will be required within Plot F, and how this quantity will be accommodated.
- The panel is also not convinced by the quality of the play and amenity space. It notes that doorstep play provided on rooftops is problematic, whereas enabling residents to meet in an easily accessible and well-populated amenity space such as the podium courtyard would reinforce a sense of community.
- However, due to the three-dimensional volume of the podium space, it will lack a human scale and will potentially feel cavernous and unwelcoming. The three-dimensional design and landscape proposals for the podium space should be the focus of a separate design process that will inform the design of the buildings that contain the space, at a detailed level.
- The panel thinks that, at 6.5m above pavement level, the podium is very high, and risks feeling very divorced from the adjacent public realm. It understands the aspiration to create a visual and physical connection through steps up from the pavement, but has concerns that as the entrance to the podium at the top is gated, then this creates a conflict between a grand architectural gesture from street level that leads only to a private area. Further consideration of the access arrangements to the podium would be supported.
- The panel questions the location of refuse storage within the central podium space, and notes that if rubbish starts to pile up it will create significant problems. If retained in this location, it will require further thought and careful management strategies.
- Opportunities to 'celebrate' the cycle parking – by combining different cycle storage areas and moving the refuse storage from the podium – should be explored.
- The panel questions why there is no basement within such a substantial building, as basic plant and other elements could be located there. It notes that the current plant space does not seem sufficient to accommodate everything required.



Plot D

- The panel welcomes the ambition to create a slender profile on Building D-1, but feels that while the north and south elevations are elegantly proportioned, the east and west elevations present a visually solid bulk. It thinks that the upper setback to the roofline of Building D-1 is not significant enough, and it would encourage the project team to start the setback at a much lower level, to create a more elegant east and west profile.
- As with Plot F, testing of the townscape impact of the proposals for Plot D (with Building D-1 at 29-30 storeys) – and in particular within views from the conservation area to the north and east – will help to inform consideration of the development's strategic impact on the adjacent conservation area, and the overall acceptability of the proposed scale and massing of Plot D. The panel feels that further discussion is required on this important matter to establish in detail how the development will provide material enhancement to the conservation area in mitigation of these impacts, as required by the Tottenham Area Action Plan (TAAP).
- Building D-2 is lower in scale and has a different relationship to Moselle Square than Building D-1, which sits further to the west. The architectural expression of Buildings D-1 and D-2 feels very different; Building D-2 is expressed as visually solid, with brickwork elevations, while the tallest building, D-1, has a more lightweight expression with a visual 'exoskeleton'.
- The panel feels that these visual differences in expression of Buildings D-1 and D-2 should be articulated where the individual buildings 'land' at ground level, to enrich the experience of the public realm.
- As with Plot F, it would encourage the project team to further explore the nature of the balconies – whether recessed or projecting – and their relationship to main streets. Projecting balconies at lower floors adjacent to main streets can create an uncomfortable relationship. In addition, providing recessed balconies for taller blocks makes sense higher up the building.
- The proportion of active frontage within Plot F is welcomed; especially considering the pressure on space within the ground floor. The panel wonders whether provision of a basement could help to relieve pressure on the ground floor, and enable more flexibility and generosity in layout.
- It also questions whether the amount of amenity and play space is adequate for the residential numbers proposed. It notes that the scale of development is much higher than outlined within the TAAP, and suggests that there should be further discussion with officers about a realistic development density and amenity space provision. It notes that such decisions are very complex, and will need to take into account amenity, liveability, shadowing, sunlight / daylight and issues of quality.



- The podium could work quite well, but the panel would like to know more about the potential quality of the space, in terms of the relationships between building heights and configurations, and the way these will impact upon the microclimate of the space.
- Further work to ensure that the cycle storage is convenient and secure would be supported. It should be located as close to the entrance as possible, to ensure that people will use it. The panel notes that there are two storeys of cycle storage; if there was a basement within the development some cycle storage could be located there, which would enable a better connection with the street.

Next steps

- As design work continues, the panel would welcome the opportunity to review the overall masterplan and the individual plots at a greater level of detail – especially those that have not been considered yet. An opportunity to consider the parameter plans and design codes would also be very useful.
- Sufficient time should be allocated for further consideration of the southern half of the masterplan, including Plot D and Plot F, as they continue to evolve. It notes that a detailed discussion will also be required on the proposed library, and the overall public realm and landscape design, including Moselle Square.
- In terms of the northern section of the masterplan, the panel thinks that a full day will be required to enable adequate consideration of the proposals in the context of the existing permissions for some of the plots, the higher densities involved, and the proposals for the major open space of Peacock Park. It suggests that strategic content is covered in the morning, followed by detailed content in the afternoon.
- The panel notes that the dimensions of Peacock Park appear to have been reduced since the previous review, as the overall masterplan now shows the alternative proposals and existing permissions within the northern section of the masterplan. It highlights that, as design work continues on the overall masterplan and individual plots, there should be no reduction in the size of Peacock Park. The overall provision of useable green space within the development will be expected to meet Local Plan and London Plan standards.
- It will be important to retain panel continuity for future reviews, where possible.



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.

