

Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review of High Road West (Lendlease)

Friday 17 September 2021

Zoom video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Hugo Nowell

Tim Pitman

Andy Puncher

Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| John McRory | London Borough of Haringey |
| Elisabetta Tonazzi | London Borough of Haringey |
| Richard Truscott | London Borough of Haringey |
| Philip Elliott | London Borough of Haringey |
| Graham Harrington | London Borough of Haringey |
| Deborah Denner | Frame Projects |
| Kate Trant | Frame Projects |
| Marina Stuart | Frame Projects |

Apologies / copied to

| | |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| Rob Krzyszowski | London Borough of Haringey |
| Robbie McNaugher | London Borough of Haringey |

Confidentiality

This is a pre-application review and therefore confidential. As a public organisation, the London Borough of Haringey 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.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

High Road West, Tottenham, London N17

2. Presenting team

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Lucas Lawrence | Studio Egret West |
| Alix Roberts | Studio Egret West |
| Nick James | Studio Egret West |
| Duncan Paybody | Studio Egret West (for presentation 3) |
| Chris Miele | Montagu Evans |
| David Taylor | Montagu Evans |

3. Planning Authority briefing

The High Road West site, measuring approximately 8.55 hectares, is located in the Northumberland Park ward in north Tottenham and sits between the Great Anglia railway line and the High Road, and adjacent Tottenham Hotspur Football Club.

North Tottenham is a diverse neighbourhood with many different characteristics, land uses, typologies and a rich heritage. The High Road West site itself, however, is characterised by a fragmented urban form with a poor street and block layout and a lack of connections. Parts of the site also fall within the North Tottenham Conservation Area, which includes a number of Statutory and Locally Listed Buildings.

The northern part of the site is predominantly occupied by a number of local industrial businesses (forming the Peacock Industrial Estate), as well as a supermarket and large car park adjacent to the recent 22-storey Brook House development.

The southern part of the site is mainly characterised by the Love Lane Housing Estate, which has 297 properties. The estate was built in the 1950s and includes three 10-storey 'Y'-shaped blocks and several four-storey blocks set in areas of grass and landscaping.

White Hart Lane runs east–west across the centre of the site and is characterised in this location by a range of older and smaller properties including The Grange, a Grade II Listed Building. White Hart Lane Station at the western end of this section of the Lane has been upgraded as part of major transformation by London Overground in accordance with the site allocation for this element of the allocated site.

A significant section of the site adjacent to the railway is currently being used as a temporary construction compound for the stadium development and contains other business uses.

Part of the site, known as Whitehall Mews, also falls the other side of the railway to the west off Whitehall Street and currently accommodates the Whitehall and Tenderden Estate community buildings.

CONFIDENTIAL

The ballot required as part of the Greater London Authority-funded estate regeneration process ran between 13 August and 6 September 2021; the outcome was positive, unlocking Council funding and increasing certainty that the project can move forward.

The applicant team is looking to submit a hybrid application in October 2021 (subject to review), which will consist of a part outline, part full application, with a view to starting on site in spring 2022.

There have been several pre-application meetings since the last review to discuss land uses, affordable housing, scale and massing, heritage and views. Amendments to the southern and northern parts of the masterplan, and to the public realm, movement and landscape have been made since it was last reviewed by the Quality Review Panel on 23 June 2021.

Officers asked for the panel's consideration of the following matters:

- advice on the proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—south of White Hart Lane
- advice on the proposed layout, scale and massing, heritage impacts and 'liveability'—north of White Hart Lane
- advice on public realm, movement and landscape.

This full-day review was divided into three sections:

- Presentation 1: southern part of masterplan
- Presentation 2: northern part of masterplan
- Presentation 3: public realm, movement and landscape.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to comment on the development of the High Road West scheme since the last review on 23 June 2021, which examined proposals for Whitehall Mews, Plot F and Plot D. The panel thanks the applicant for the set of three presentations, and for the time committed to a full-day review.

With this review looking firstly at the southern and northern parts of the masterplan, the panel identifies several fundamental issues yet to be addressed; the third presentation of the day, which looked at the public realm, movement and landscape across the scheme, gave the panel greater confidence in the quality of the scheme as a whole. However, the panel thinks further work is needed before submission of a planning application, to achieve a high quality of life for future residents.



CONFIDENTIAL

Despite commending elements of the overall site layout, the panel is concerned about the density of the scheme as well as the amount of green space. The new neighbourhood could be 9,000–10,000 residents, and the panel is not convinced that the proposals will provide a liveable environment, particularly in the context of the latest revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework, which stress the importance of high-quality design and creating liveable places.

The panel's primary concerns are as follows:

- the current density of the proposal, especially in relation to the provision of public green space and other resident amenities such as internal courtyards
- deliverability and phasing
- liveability
- the challenges of ensuring sufficient public and private open space, in relation to the density of development, for each of the proposed phases
- the scale, massing and height of the proposed buildings, for example, the taller towers in Blocks B and F.

As such, the panel cannot support the proposal as it stands. It asks for further design work to address its concerns, particularly those to do with the balance between open space and development density, building scale and heights. Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Planning process

- The panel recommends that further design work is needed before a planning application is submitted, to address the issues raised at the review.
- The outline application needs to pin down the maximum floor space allocation and unit numbers in each block across the masterplan.
- The panel questions the wide latitude shown in the draft parameter plans, which does not provide the certainty needed to ensure a high quality development.
- The panel recognises the design and conservation challenges caused by nearby consented towers, particularly to the north of the site. These will result in a significant variety in design and height across the area.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel highlights that Peacock Park is envisaged as providing public open space that will be crucial to the success of the scheme as a whole. The panel asks the applicant to demonstrate how delivery of Peacock Park early in the process can be achieved, as this is pivotal to decision-making about the number of homes, and quality of life.
- It also recommends that the planning authority considers the use of mechanisms such as Section 106 agreements and Grampian Conditions to provide certainty about the delivery of open space for each phase of development.
- In the panel's view, the area south of White Hart Lane is the most challenging in terms of the proportion of open space to the number of homes proposed. The character of the public space in this part of the masterplan is also likely to have a more civic / less residential character, because it is on the route from the station to the stadium and high street.
- Proposals for the area to the north of White Hart Lane show a more convincing balance between the quality and quantity of open space and number of homes.
- The panel emphasises the importance of design codes, which will be especially important for the tall buildings across the proposal, in particular in relation to distances between blocks, how blocks coalesce or maintain visual separation, and the material difference between blocks.

Presentation 1: southern part of masterplan

- The panel thinks that, while the layout of the southern part of the masterplan appears to be reasonably logical and effective, if only this first phase of development is delivered, the open space will be insufficient for the population density.
- The panel also thinks that building heights of over 30 storeys will create a townscape character more appropriate to a metropolitan centre, than the town centre context of this part of Haringey.

Layout

- The panel has significant concerns about the impact of the 27-storey building on Block F on the setting of The Grange on White Hart Lane and this part of the conservation area. This was not fully covered at the previous review and the panel requests close scrutiny of this relationship, suggesting that a significant reduction in the height of Block F will be needed.
- As regards the tall building on Block B, the panel feels that the sheer 27-storey wall rising from the small internal courtyard will have a negative impact on the quality of that courtyard for residents.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel's general view is that there is a role for one tall building to mark White Hart Lane station, and that the tall building on Block D is the logical candidate—if it can be demonstrated that there will be no negative environmental impact at ground level.
- To create a more generous internal courtyard at Block C, the panel proposes removing the central leg of that block, which would enable workable internal amenity space at podium level.
- The panel refers to Block J, which has similar dimensions to Block C, yet feels more comfortable, offering a more generous and appropriate space for play.

Pedestrian wind comfort

- The panel stresses the importance of ensuring that the route to and from the station is comfortable for users.
- It is concerned that the heights and relative positions of the buildings in Blocks D and F are likely to create uncomfortable wind conditions.
- Similarly, it is concerned about draught wind where the 14-storey wall of Block D (not fully covered in the previous review) creates a narrow gap on the route from Moselle Square towards White Hart Lane station. The panel suggests a reduction in the number of storeys to six or eight.
- The panel notes that the Technical Summary relating to wind indicates speeds at ground level, pointing out that wind speeds at higher levels will be greater, and will be exacerbated where there are 'pinch points' between buildings.
- In general, the panel is interested to view more detail on the wind, sunlight / daylight, overshadowing and micro-climate considerations for the full scheme.

Conservation and heritage

- The panel recognises that the new THFC stadium has changed the context for this part of the High Road Conservation Area and accepts that it is appropriate that the conservation discussion should take account of this new context.
- The panel feels that the most challenging element of the southern masterplan from a conservation and heritage perspective is the heights of the buildings on Block F as they relate to The Grange and the White Hart Lane section of the conservation area.
- The panel believes that the location of the 27-storey block at the corner of Block F will profoundly harm The Grange and this part of the White Hart Lane conservation area and that full consideration must be given to reducing the scale of the tower.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel asks for confirmation of the distances between blocks in terms of overlooking, where, for example, the north side of F1 appears to include units with an eight-metre distance from the adjacent block.

Residents' amenities and public space

- Moselle Square has the potential to be an important civic space on the route between White Hart Lane station and the stadium. It will be animated by the surrounding ground floor uses and, whilst this promises to be a high-quality urban space, it is unlikely to act as a residents' space.
- The panel is concerned that residents will be reliant on small-scale amenities or courtyards at first floor level that will be in shady conditions for a considerable part of the day.
- The panel is also concerned that the play provision within the sunlit podium areas will clash with other users of the sunny areas, and that, overall, the scheme will be relying considerably on Peacock Park to the north for green space.
- The panel suggests looking at examples of open space provision in successful developments of similar population size for comparison.

Presentation 2: northern part of masterplan

Layout

- In general, the panel feels that the layout of the northern part of the masterplan is working logically.
- However, the panel recognises the challenge of the alternative live Tottenham Hotspur Football Club application for the K1 / Printworks site. Similarly, the existing planning permission for this part of the site has a bearing on the current Lendlease proposals.
- There may be a need to revise the Lendlease masterplan if the alternative K1 / Printworks scheme is approved. The Printworks scheme has not been reviewed by the Quality Review Panel, and an opportunity to comment on it would be welcomed.
- Notwithstanding this, the panel questions the viability of the two narrow alleyways north and south of the K1 site that link it to Tottenham High Road.
- The panel questions how the road layout on the west side of K1 will be resolved and managed in terms of service and delivery access, and pedestrian elements, suggesting a reconsideration of the layout in order to avoid the park being effectively surrounded by vehicles.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel is not yet convinced as to the legibility of the desire lines leading south through the park to White Hart Lane station and suggests that this may be handled through the public realm work.
- The panel likes the way that the building massing around the park steps down in height towards the park's narrower, southern tip.
- However, building heights are considerably greater than those adjacent on the High Road, and the panel would like to be reassured about the 'back-to-back' relationship between the new and existing buildings. For example, will there be a five-storey blank wall facing the existing buildings?
- The panel is interested to see more detail on the proximity of units in a number of locations in the northern part of the masterplan. For example, it appears that Blocks K1 and K2 are very close together, which the panel feels may cause issues with privacy in relation to the units that face each other across the relatively narrow alleyway.

Introduction of deck access

- With the proportion of single aspect units currently around 50%, the panel suggests that the proportion of dual aspect units could be improved significantly if the majority of the units in this section of the scheme became deck access.
- The panel also suggests that making Blocks L2 and J2 shallower in plan, creating deck access at the rear and moving the blocks a small distance westward, would extend the park size along that frontage. Taking Block M3 back slightly would also achieve more space for the park.

Presentation 3: public realm, movement and landscape

- The panel applauds the presentation, which demonstrates a compelling narrative and an aspirational vision, with an admirable play strategy, and looks forward to more detailed proposals.
- The panel enjoys the qualities of the different spaces throughout the scheme, particularly the connection through the park down to Moselle Square. Where it had earlier concerns about the planting in Moselle Square, the panel now feels that the proposed planting scheme appears robust.
- The panel still has concerns as to the extent to which the circulation and servicing across the scheme is compatible with the planting.
- The panel endorses the proposal to drain Moselle Square water gardens on match days to accommodate the increased number of people crossing the square to the stadium.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel is heartened by the park proposals, which present shared routes, and the introduction of swales, though the likely extent of the roads surrounding the park remains a concern.
- The panel's main concern is the delivery of these ambitious proposals, as well as the importance of high-quality management and maintenance.
- The panel points out the critical need for the rain gardens to look good all year round, and that this form of sustainable urban drainage requires considerable maintenance.
- The panel stresses the value of reorientating Block K1 in order to add space to the park, adding that further benefits will be achieved from continuing the connection from the park further into the southern part of the masterplan.
- The panel enjoys the proposals for the Block D1 courtyard, which look convincing. However, it questions whether this approach will work as well for some of the smaller, more constrained courtyards.
- The panel suggests further investigation into how issues such as micro-climate and overshadowing might impact on the quality of the spaces being created.
- The panel has some anxiety in relation to the park being viewed as a destination and the associated number of visitors this will attract to the area, and would like to see more consideration of how the more private courtyard spaces will cater for residents' needs.
- The panel expresses how critical lighting will be to safety and placemaking, throughout the development, particularly in Moselle Square.
- Overall, the panel feels that the demands placed on the open spaces across the scheme by the density of development, and match day crowds, are considerable. Ensuring that this remains in balance will be key to the success of the proposals.

Next steps

The panel is unable to support the proposals in their current form and considers that they represent a significant overdevelopment of the site that would create a generally poor quality living environment.

It recommends further work before a planning application is submitted, in light of its comments above.

In particular, it highlights the need for the applicant to demonstrate adequate open space for all phases of development—bearing in mind the risk that later phases may not be delivered.



CONFIDENTIAL

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 that 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.

