

Design for inclusion, sustainability and healthy neighbourhoods

- The panel commends the ambition to design the development to Passivhaus standards and feels that the Cranwood House development has the potential to be an exemplar scheme for the wider industry.

Next steps

The Quality Review Panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals and adds that panel continuity at the next review will be extremely important. It highlights a number of points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.

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.

Panel Review 2

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: Cranwood House

Wednesday 26 August 2020

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Esther Everett
Craig Robertson
Tim Pitman
Lindsey Whitelaw

Attendees

Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
Philip Elliot	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Shamiso Oneka	London Borough of Haringey
Kyriaki Ageridou	Frame Projects
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Emma Williamson	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Dean Hermitage	London Borough of Haringey
Ian Pinamonti-Hyde	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Sadhbh Ní Hógáin	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.

1. Project name

Cranwood House, Cranwood Woodside, Highgate, London N10 3JH

2. Presenting team

Peter Exton	London Borough of Haringey
Martin Cowie	London Borough of Haringey
Jo McCafferty	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Matt Flannery	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Andrew McKay	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited
Marcus Ball	Levitt Bernstein Associates Limited

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 application site lies within Site Allocation Development Plan Documents (SA51 – Cranwood Care Home) which provide for redevelopment comprising new residential development and improved connections linking Highgate Wood and the Parkland Walk. The site is 0.43 hectares and has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of two with a forecasted rating of three for 2021. It contains a vacant care home to the north of the site and a row of low-rise (predominantly) Council-owned housing to the south. Highgate Wood, a designated Historic Park, Strategic Local Open Land and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (Borough Grade II) adjoins the site's southern boundary. The southern boundary of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area is located on the opposite side of Woodside Avenue immediately to its north. St James Church of England Primary School and its playground adjoins the western boundary, with Muswell Hill Road and the Parkland Walk subway link abutting the site's eastern boundary.

The Council has embarked on an ambitious Council Housing Delivery Programme and this site could help to deliver a sizable proportion of the 1,000 homes that the Council has committed to building by 2022. Planning officers sought the panel's consideration of the revised block / building heights, massing and the design quality of the scheme; its relationship to the surrounding area and heritage assets; the public realm proposals and linkages between Highgate Wood, the Parkland Walk and the north / northeast of the site; and the legibility of the scheme on approach to the site and within it.

The scheme presented to the panel excludes the row of terraced homes that abut the wood. The current proposal seeks to retain these homes and only redevelop the land where the former care home is currently located. The proposals still show the potential future redevelopment of the row of homes within the southern part of the allocation as this is required by policy; however, this is only shown for indicative purposes.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to consider the evolving proposals for Cranwood House. It recognises the level of thought shown in the design process so far, and considers that the design team have done a very good job of addressing the concerns that were raised by the panel at the previous review. The panel feels that the proposals are coming together really well.

The site is located on a key corner opposite the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and adjacent to Highgate Wood. The panel supports the aspiration for the development, in addition to the reduced scale of the amended proposals. It welcomes the removal of the proposed additional pedestrian access into Highgate Wood, and supports the approach to make the courtyard function primarily as an amenity space for the residents.

The panel is generally supportive of all the broad principles of the scheme, in terms of the scale, massing, architectural expression, public realm and landscape design. However, it feels that scope remains for refinement of some of the details, especially in terms of the landscape design, the architectural expression and roofscape, and the detailed configuration of some of the units. The panel commends the aspiration to design the buildings to Passivhaus standards and feels that the scheme could be an exemplar in this regard.

The panel understands that Building A has been designed in greater detail than Buildings B and C, for which there is limited information at this stage. It notes that the review focuses primarily on the design of Building A. The panel would like to see further details of Buildings B and C at a further review, when these are available. Further information on the panel's view is provided below.

Massing and development density

- The site sits at a prominent junction between the Muswell Hill Conservation Area to the north and Highgate Wood to the south. Its immediate context is defined by richly-detailed three storey Edwardian townhouses to the north and east, and a more plain four storey parade of shops to the south.
- The panel feels that the reduction in scale as outlined in the current proposals works well. The loss of two storeys in Building A onto Muswell Hill Road

results in the appearance of a five storey building, with an additional storey at the lower level in the courtyard to bring it to six storeys in total. The panel feels that this is appropriate for the site's location.

- The scale of Building B works well, as it mediates between the scale of the block onto Muswell Hill Road and the scale of the school adjacent. The scale of Building C could potentially be increased by a storey, which could help to set a new scale - and also typology - for any future redevelopment of the terraces adjacent.
- While accepting that the partial view of Highgate Wood behind the development is not formally recognised or protected, the panel feels that having a glimpsed visual link in some way to the trees beyond is important, when approaching the site from the north down Muswell Hill Road. Retaining a glimpsed view between the separate buildings within the site might be a successful way of preserving a visual link.

Place-making, public realm and landscape design

- The panel welcomes the removal of the proposed additional pedestrian access into Highgate Wood from within the site, and supports the approach to make the courtyard function primarily as an amenity space for the residents.
- It would like to see more detail about the design and landscape proposals for the central courtyard space – and it would encourage the design team to be more explicit about the intended uses and activities that will occur within the different parts of the space.
- There will potentially be many families living in the development, so optimising the amenity value of the central space for children will be very important. In this regard, the panel would encourage the design team to establish a more integrated and responsive play strategy that also looks beyond the site to the different types of existing play provision in the area.
- Consideration of how a child would use the space is important, alongside identifying potential opportunity for doorstep play. While Highgate Wood is close at hand, this is not always an appropriate place for all ages to play, so good amenity play on site is required. The panel notes that the opportunity exists to create interesting natural play on the woodland edge bank.
- The panel understands the design team's aspiration to increase footfall, activity and natural surveillance at the junction of the underpass and the site, through the inclusion of steps up to pavement level on Muswell Hill Road, but notes that this will also reduce the level of greenery and tree cover at this important edge of the site. Further consideration of how to incorporate or retain further trees and greenery would be supported.