

London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Science Block, 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
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 Science Block Refurbishment and Extension project, North Road, Highgate, Haringey, London, N6 4AY

2. Presenting team

Ed Toovey	Ed Toovey Architects
Danny Pattle	Troup Bywaters & Anders
Jon Moraza	Troup Bywaters & Anders

3. Planning authority briefing

The Science Block 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 the Science Block, the relevant appraisal states that: *“All the statutory buildings make a positive contribution to the character of the area”*.

Given that the Science Block, while not specifically listed itself, is at this stage considered to be ‘curtilage listed’ by the listing of the adjacent Grade II ‘Old School Building’, it makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. Officers would therefore particularly welcome the panel’s comments on the way in which the proposals relate to the existing building and the two quadrangles.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel thanks the design team for their presentation, which demonstrates the degree of careful thought that has been applied to an ostensibly simple project. The result is a very successful set of proposals that relate well to and enhance the existing buildings and spaces. The panel is particularly appreciative of the way that the scheme restores the form and function of the two quadrangles. The approach to sustainability is welcome, although some further analysis of the potential for overheating in the Science Quad extension is necessary. Finally, the panel suggests that some modification to the alignment of the southern elevation of the Science Quad extension may help to refine the visual impact of the building as viewed from Southwold Lane.

Building form and relationship to context

- The panel feels that the Science Quad extension is a sensitive modern addition that is wholly appropriate for a science building. It appreciates the openness of the building, which allows views onto the activity within. The subtle but extensive glazing also has the potential to create a beautiful interior environment.
- This extension will, however, require careful detailing, as it will restrict the public view from Southwold Lane into the square and onto the Edwardian façade of the main building. The panel suggests that aligning the southern elevation be to the main building (at right angles to its western façade), rather than to the main gable end of the eastern wing, may be beneficial.

Landscape and public realm

- The proposals successfully restore the quadrangles, in form and function. The proposed landscape also provides a collegiate environment to the squares, and creates a strong sense of identity
- The restored symmetry of the Science Quad, in particular, enhances the space and clarifies the primacy of the main entrance.
- The north facing colonnade onto Garner Quad will be relatively dark and gloomy, and particular attention should be paid to materials and detailing.

Sustainable design

- The panel commends the scheme for adopting an all-electric energy strategy, which it feels sets a good precedent for other buildings in a heritage setting.
- Further detail on the bridging connections for the Science Quad extension would be helpful, to ensure that energy loss is minimised.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel would like to see rigorous modelling undertaken to ensure that the potential risk of overheating within the Science Quad extension is properly understood and addressed. In particular, the louvred southern elevation may require a greater degree of solidity to mitigate this.

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.

