APPENDIX 4 QUALITY REVIEW PANEL

CONFIDENTIAL

FRAME PROJECTS

London Borough of Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Intermediate Review Meeting: Tiverton Road Estate

Wednesday 21 May 2025
Level 6 Collaboration Space, Alexandra House, 10 Station Road, London N22 7TY

Panel

Esther Everett (chair)
Khalifa Abubakar
Joanna Sutherland

Attendees

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Biplav Pagéni	London Borough of Haringey
Gareth Prosser	London Borough of Haringey
Catherine Smyth	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Kirsty McMullan	Frame Projects
Bonnie Russell	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Ruth Mitchell	London Borough of Haringey
Saloni Parekh	London Borough of Haringey
Roland Sheldon	London Borough of Haringey
Ashley Sin-Yung	London Borough of Haringey
Tania Skelli	London Borough of Haringey
Elisabetta Tonazzi	London Borough of Haringey
Bryce Tudball	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

Open space in front of 2 - 240 Tiverton Road, London N15 6RS

2. Presenting team

Andrew King	London Borough of Haringey
Kevin Tohill	London Borough of Haringey
Michael Hickey	Bubble Architects
Joe Todd	Turkington Martin

3. Planning authority briefing

In May 2018, London Borough of Haringey committed to delivering a new generation of council homes. This will provide affordable, high-quality and secure council housing for those on the housing register in the most urgent need.

This scheme will contribute to Haringey's house building programme. It is located within a post-war residential estate, to the north-east of Finsbury Park. The site is a poorly used green space, made up of a grassed area with small trees and raised beds. It is surrounded by four and five storey residential blocks, car parking and highways. A modest church structure is immediately to the north.

This proposal is for approximately 16 new homes in two blocks, alongside open space, public realm improvements, and associated cycle parking and refuse storage. The development will also provide upgrades to three existing amenity spaces within the wider housing estate: Tewkesbury Road Open Space and 2-24 Tiverton Road open space to the south, and a playground to the north.

Officers asked for the panel's comments on the strategy for amenity space, parking and biodiversity net gain, as well as on the site layout, height and massing, and emerging landscape and architectural designs.

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Haringey Quality Review Panel welcomes the proposal for new council homes, but asks for further work to find the best site layout for both new and existing residents. This should tie into a landscape-led approach to the wider estate, informed by community engagement.

The quantum of development feels comfortable, but the panel is not convinced by the layout. It recommends consideration of a linear block, with duplex family homes at lower levels and smaller flats above. This could be more efficient to build, and would provide more dual aspect homes, with clear fronts and backs, and better privacy.

The panel asks if there is scope to reduce the amount of parking, or consolidate this on the space in front of 2-24 Tiverton Road. Freeing up more space would create an opportunity for a linear green space, with a better relationship between new and existing homes. It could be designed to form part of wider green routes linking open spaces across the estate. The central public courtyard will be an appealing space for new residents, but is unlikely to feel welcoming to existing residents as it is heavily overlooked. A linear green route between the new and existing homes would feel more inclusive and accessible to all.

The panel also offers detailed comments about the architectural expression and internal layout, and asks for further work to integrate the proposal into its context, drawing on the surrounding neighbourhood to create distinctiveness.

Wider integration and site diagram

- Upgrades to the three amenity spaces outside the site boundary will offer residents of the wider estate enhanced facilities, and help the scheme to meet biodiversity net gain requirements.
- The panel supports these ambitions, but encourages the project team to make sure that they are achievable in addition to the new housing. The creation of high-quality new homes should be prioritised.
- It is not clear how the various open spaces across the estate relate to one another, especially where they are not visible from the site.
- Servicing, parking, amenity and biodiversity should be looked at together as part of a landscape-led approach. The panel suggests widening Green Street and designing it as a linear park. This would provide existing residents with positive outlook onto a landscaped space that feels accessible to everyone.
- If some vehicular access is required for servicing and re-provided parking spaces, an integrated shared surface interspersed with planting could work.

- The placement and orientation of the new blocks further fragment the public realm. The site layout should place emphasis on the new link, Green Street, and help to reconnect the public realm.

Parking strategy

- Rationalisation of the parking strategy is key to ensuring that this development will be a significant improvement on the existing car-dominated environment.
- As there is now an opportunity to reduce the number of parking spaces that must be re-provided, the project team is encouraged to explore this option. This could unlock the site to deliver more homes.
- A completely car-free scheme might not be appropriate in this location. The panel recognises that parking can be a contentious issue that impacts people in different socio-economic groups differently.
- Given the current parking stress analysis, the panel recommends engaging with the existing community to inform an appropriate solution.
- The parking could be consolidated on the adjacent open space at 2-24 Tiverton Road, allowing the site and other open spaces to be greener and more pedestrian focussed. An efficient parking court layout here would allow for trees and planting between the spaces.
- It would also help if the site boundary can be expanded to include the playground next to the Baptists Church and the parking spaces to the north and the south of the site. These spaces are currently uninviting and would also benefit from enhancement. If they could be included in the proposals, a better solution could be found for the whole site.

Housing typology and site layout

- The panel is comfortable with the quantum of development proposed, but encourages a rethink of the site layout.
- It is important to understand the internal layouts of the existing homes overlooking the site, both to create a well-integrated community, and to minimise impact on neighbours.
- More could be taken from the successful aspects of the lower floor maisonettes of the existing block to the east. Residents take care and ownership over their front gardens, the first-floor overhang creates a welcoming, covered entrance, and the vertical rhythm adds to the streetscape.
- Community engagement should also be carried out as soon as possible to inform the scheme. Residents will bring valuable experience of what works well here and what does not.

- The existing front gardens could be mirrored in the proposal to animate the public realm and provide positive aspect for the existing residents.
- Further work is needed to simplify the entrance sequence and create clear fronts and backs.
- The entrances on the western elevations appear too deep-set for accessible homes and should be reconsidered.
- The panel suggests looking at how front doors and gardens can successfully face each other in precedents such as Marmalade Lane in Cambridge, by Mole Architects.
- A linear block set back from Tiverton Road, with maisonettes at lower level and flats above, would achieve more dual aspect homes, reduce the extent of external envelope, and provide more distance between blocks. It would also be a more effective use of deck access, which currently feels out of place applied only to the upper floors of Block A.
- To avoid creating a long barrier in the urban grain, the linear block could have an opening at ground floor level, perhaps double height, allowing views and access through to Green Street.
- This arrangement could also take advantage of the half metre level change across the site, with level access to the rear, and a raised ground floor enhancing privacy on Tiverton Road.
- It could be helpful to examine the successful nearby Rowan Court scheme, by Satish Jassal Architects, in more detail. The building typologies, distribution and sizes of homes, and entrance sequences could inform this scheme.

Landscape and amenity space

- The existing open space on the site has a low biodiversity value in the ecology assessment, but does provide residents with outlook onto verdant planting. The impact of this loss will need to be mitigated.
- The central public courtyard will be an appealing space for new residents, but is unlikely to feel welcoming to existing residents as it is heavily overlooked.
- If the site layout remains in this configuration, then the panel suggests enclosing the courtyard for the new residents only. This is more likely to encourage ownership over the space.
- There is a disjunct between the size of the flats, which are mostly larger family homes, and the amenity provision on the site. The panel asks for careful consideration of how the quantity and quality of amenity, including play space, will meet resident needs within the site boundary.

- The play offer across the whole scheme needs to be reviewed and a clear strategy put in place. The play space next to church should be included in the wider play space offer. Visibility and access to the space should be improved.

- The safety and security of ground floor homes should be further considered. The panel suggests clearly articulating the defensible space with low walls or planting buffers.

- It would also be good to understand more about how the slope up to entrances from the central courtyard work as part of the landscape design. Ideally, slopes would be avoided.

- The panel enjoys the diagrams and precedents shown for the landscape design ideas. These should be developed to clarify the scheme's proposals.

- A stronger relationship to the site context should integrated into the landscape designs. For example, the richness of the graphics in the nearby Haringey Warehouse District could inform the wayfinding for the new green link and upgraded amenity spaces.

Architecture

- The panel asks for exploration of the proportions, detailing and materiality of the architecture, to create elegant elevations and respond to the context.

- Precedent studies should inform the architecture, and be included in the presentation and submission documents, including interesting buildings in the wider context, such as the Warehouse District.

- The ground floor needs particular attention. The entrances should be designed to create a street presence and a welcoming arrival home. Details such as different sill materials will contribute.

- It is not clear why the blocks have chamfered corners. These create challenging internal layouts and should be reconsidered.

- The white structure for the balconies appears to be a remnant from a previous iteration of the scheme, and should be removed.

- The bolt-on balconies may be efficient to construct, but lack privacy and are not part of the context or precedents. Alternatives should be explored.

Internal layout

- Some of the homes are larger than the Greater London Authority enhanced home sizing requirements. To maximise value and the number of homes that can be provided, the project team should check that the homes do not over-provide on floorspace, head height, and the resulting external envelope.

- The panel recommends locating larger family homes at ground floor level where possible. This will allow direct access to open space for families with children.
- The stair cores, circulation spaces, refuse and cycle stores should be checked, removing any excess space. Externally accessed cycle stores could help to alleviate pressure on the ground floor.
- If the family homes are reconfigured as ground floor-accessed maisonettes, then those bicycles could be stored in private gardens, reducing the number of spaces that the store must accommodate.
- The outdoor cycle stores in the Central Middlesex Hospital scheme, by Haworth Tompkins, show how this approach can free up space on the ground floor and increase the sense of ownership and security.
- The project's limited resource should be focused on providing the best possible homes and accompanying external amenity spaces.

Next steps

- The Haringey Quality Review Panel would like to review the scheme again once it has been developed in response to the panel's comments and feedback from community engagement.

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.