

London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Mallinson Sports Centre, Highgate School

Wednesday 2 February 2022
Highgate School, London, N6 4AY

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Georgios Askounis
Marie Burns
Stephen Davy

Attendees

Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Adrian Harvey	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Aikaterini Koukouthaki	London Borough of Haringey
Tobias Finlayson	London Borough of Haringey

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.

CONFIDENTIAL

1. Project name and site address

Highgate School, Mallinson Sports Centre (MSC), Bishopswood Road, Highgate, London N6 4NY

2. Presenting team

Ed Toovey	Ed Toovey Architects
Chris Birkbeck	Highgate School
Stephen Freeth	Highgate School
Gwyn Jones	Highgate School
Simon Martini	Highgate School
Daniel O'Connell	Highgate School
Mike Derbyshire	Bidwells
Christian Milner	Bidwells
Fiona Williams	Bidwells
Jack Gregory	Hopkins Architects – observer
Adrian Holmes	Peter Deer & Associates
Danny Campdifiore	Peter Deer & Associates
John Edmondson	Aecom

3. Planning authority briefing

The Mallinson Sport Centre falls within site allocation SA41 Highgate School for the exploration of how school facilities can be enhanced while simultaneously benefitting local communities and increasing accessibility through the landholdings. All of the Highgate School campus is within the Highgate Conservation Area and therefore development should preserve or enhance its character and appearance as per the statutory requirements. With specific regard to Mallinson's Sport Centre, the relevant appraisal (Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan – December 2013) states at paragraph 10.4.32 that:

“There are, however, a number of buildings connected with the School which detract from the environment, especially the sports centre swimming pool.... These have a somewhat industrial appearance and the cladding and roofing materials are not well maintained”

Part of the Sport Centre site falls within Metropolitan Open Land. Therefore, the relevant requirements of the NPPF 2021 (paragraph 149) and the London Plan 2021 (Policy G3) need to be met, in this specific case, whether the facilities would preserve the openness of the Metropolitan Open Land and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Officers would therefore welcome the panel's comments on the relationship of the scheme with MOL, as well as the alignment, rhythm and geometry of proposed buildings in relation to their immediate context.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel thanks the design team for their presentation and feels that the strategic approach that the design team has adopted promises to deliver a successful facility that offers much to the school and wider community. It welcomes the ambitions for sustainable design that have been adopted, but urges further progress here, where possible. In particular, given operational energy requirements of the swimming pool, the panel would like to see every opportunity taken to minimise the emissions associated with it, now and in the future. The functional limitations of a sports hall are noted, but the panel feels that some opportunities exist for enriching the architecture, through materials, detailing and fenestration. The approach taken to the southern elevation, incorporating the five courts, successfully enhances what is currently a bland façade, and the panel feels that this justifies the minor encroachment onto Metropolitan Open Land.

Sustainable and low carbon design

- The panel is pleased to see that most of the existing buildings are to be retained, with surplus materials reused where possible.
- Targeting a 35 per cent reduction in carbon emissions is welcome, but the panel would urge the design team to aim for best practice over and above this target. With this in mind, any opportunities to further improve the energy efficiency of the fabric of the swimming pool should be taken.
- The panel recognises that the gas-fired heating for the swimming pool has recently been upgraded and that it is unlikely to be possible to replace it at this point. However, it feels that provision should be made for the transition to low carbon energy in the future. For example, sufficient space should be made available to allow for heat pumps to be installed.
- The panel would also like to see consideration given to options for reducing chemical use in the pool, for example by installing ceramic membrane filtration.
- The panel feels that a thorough assessment of the value of the proposed green roofs should be undertaken, to ensure that the benefits justify their inclusion.
- The panel welcomes the ambitions for roof-top PVs, but would like to understand how these will work with the proposed green roofs. It also would like to consider given to ways in which the visual impact of roof-top PVs on the elevations can be mitigated.



CONFIDENTIAL

Architecture and elevational treatment

- The panel understands that there is a clear and limited specification for a sports hall, but would nonetheless like to see a richer architectural expression brought to the elevations. Opportunities exist to use fenestration and roof-form to create a stronger response to the building's setting, particularly along the long elevation fronting Bishopswood Road.
- The classroom block fronting Broadlands Road could benefit from a simpler form, particularly at the corner with Bishopswood Road. The panel does not feel that it is necessary to reflect the geometry of the existing building line in order to relate to the residential context of the street.

Landscape and public space

- The panel does not have concerns about the encroachment onto Metropolitan Open Land along its southern edge and feels that the treatment of the five courts improves the façade facing onto the sports fields.
- The panel feels that the gardenesque approach to landscape design is aesthetically interesting but notes that, given the role of landscape in surface water management, planting and species will need to be sufficiently robust to cope with water flows and flooding.
- The panel are very supportive of the proposals for the sunken playing field, but notes that care will be needed in selecting materials and plant species to ensure that they are appropriate to their setting, in all conditions.

Community access

- The panel is supportive of the intention to make the facilities available to the wider community but notes that, to achieve this, provision will need to be made for cycle parking for visitors, as well as a clear and legible visitors' entrance.

Next steps

The panel is confident that the design team, working with Haringey officers, can resolve the issues identified by the review, and does not need to see the scheme again.



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 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.

