



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Intermediate Review meeting to discuss: Tiverton Road Estate

Wednesday 17 September

Microsoft Teams

Panel

Esther Everett (chair)

Khalifa Abubakar

James Halsall

Attendees

John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Saloni Parekh	London Borough of Haringey
Gareth Prosser	London Borough of Haringey
Catherine Smyth	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Edward Bailey	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
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
Mamta Toohey	London Borough of Haringey
Ashriya Gurung	Bubble Architects
Michael Hickey	Bubble Architects

3. Planning authority briefing

The site at Tiverton Road forms part of the council's programme to deliver a new generation of council homes. It is located within a post-war residential estate, to the north-east of Finsbury Park. The site has no specific planning policy designations, but is within a critical drainage area which covers a significant area of the borough. Locally significant industrial land is to the south-east, with local employment regeneration areas to the south and west. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no heritage assets on the site or nearby. The site has a public transport accessibility level rating of 3.

The site is currently poorly used green space, made up of a grassed area with small trees and raised beds, parking spaces, pavements and an access road. It is surrounded by four to five storey residential blocks, car parking and highways. A modest church structure is immediately to the north within additional green space.

Officers support the principle of a residential development, the proposed massing, and the reconfiguration of green space on site. Delivering biodiversity net gain will be essential to the successful delivery of the development. Pre-application discussions have included potential solutions which are more directly associated with the site.

Officers would welcome comments on the general scale and configuration of development, particularly the principle of the accommodation split between two blocks. Comments are also sought on the design of the shared surfaces, boundary treatments, play space and public garden.



CONFIDENTIAL

4. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Haringey Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to comment again on the proposal for Tiverton Estate and accepts that a two-block layout has been adopted. Positive progress has been made, and the panel welcomes the additional detail on landscape and vehicular and parking strategies to help unlock the site's potential. However, significant work is needed to improve the internal arrangement and arrival experience so that the homes feel safe, secure and enjoyable for all residents. The emerging architectural language is not yet of a sufficient quality and a more characterful and distinct response to the context is required. More legible and welcoming entrances, changes to the balconies, and improvements to the useability and accessibility of the homes are needed. Detailed drawings will be essential to provide assurance on the quality of what will be delivered.

The public realm and landscape improvements, both within and beyond the red line, are positive and important to the success of the scheme. However, a clearer and more compelling landscape approach is required, and the panel recommends setting a vision to create child friendly streets across the site. In addition, engaging the local community will provide valuable insights and a greater sense of ownership. The shared surface street is welcome, but more work is needed to ensure that pedestrians are prioritised. Managing level changes across the site requires a more holistic approach. Ensuring all landscape and public realm improvements are secured as part of the planning application is essential.

Block layout

- The two-block arrangement works well. While the central courtyard is constrained, it has potential to become a space that residents and the wider community can use and enjoy.
- Residents of the ground floor units will benefit from direct access to their homes from the street, which is positive. However, the overall ground floor arrangement requires further thought to ensure homes feel safe, secure and enjoyable for all residents.
- Changes to the vehicle parking layout, opportunities for soft landscape, and more prominent and characterful entrances are needed to create a generous and uplifting arrival experience for residents.
- The inclusion of a raised planting area in front of one of the ground floor units' windows helps create clear separation between public and private space. Similar approaches should be considered for the other ground-floor windows and doors, where possible.
- Plant selection within the raised beds should be considered carefully to ensure the plants can thrive, add value to the street, and be easily maintained.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The cycle stores should be easily accessible and able to accommodate items such as buggies, given the proportion of family units and the lack of a lift.
- Cycle stores should be located adjacent to the ground floor entrances for the upper flats, and accessible internally to help maximise useability.
- Locating cycle store external entrances on the courtyard side would also make them more secure.
- The panel advises against adding signage to the bike stores to avoid highlighting their contents and improve security.

Internal arrangements

- The panel welcomes the updates to the internal layout, ensuring that all homes are dual aspect, which will provide improved natural daylight, ventilation, and visual benefits.
- However, further consideration of the day-to-day experience of residents is needed to improve the internal layout. This should include consideration of the journey home, the generosity of communal areas, access to the courtyard, sense of privacy and ownership, and the outlook from homes.
- Simplifying and reconfiguring some of the flat layouts will help to make the spaces and junctions between rooms more generous.
- The absence of a lift in either block is a concern, particularly given the high proportion of family-sized units. The panel asks the council to review this decision to ensure the homes can accommodate people with different access needs.
- While two lifts would be preferable, one option could be to incorporate a lift into one of the blocks and reorganise the units so that larger family units are in this block, where possible.
- The panel is supportive in principle of deck access, but this approach urgently requires testing to ensure it will meet fire regulation requirements. If an alternative approach is required, it would have significant design implications.

Landscape and public realm

- The commitments to creating a shared surface street, as well as improvements to the nearby playground, Tewkesbury Road open space, 2-24 Tiverton Road open space, and Tiverton Road, are welcome. However, a stronger vision and clearer proposals are needed.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel recommends further engagement with the existing community to inform a more compelling public realm approach, bringing valuable insight into what works well currently and what does not.
- The proposed street tree planting is welcome, but the council should consult those who will be affected by them.
- A holistic approach to managing level changes across the site would improve the design and reinforce the council's emphasis on inclusivity. Instead of ramps, integrating a gradual gradient across the courtyard could be considered to avoid the need for steps and ensure the courtyard is fully accessible.
- Detailed information is required for the design of the different boundary treatments, such as the height and quality of the railings proposed.
- The 1500mm high railing for the private terraces fronting the courtyard should be reduced to improve the experience for those using the private terraces as well as the courtyard.
- The size of the ground floor flats private terraces should be increased and direct access to the courtyard provided to enhance their functionality and quality.
- If direct access from the private terraces is provided, it will be important that the landscape proposal for the courtyard enables this.
- The potential to capture water on site should be considered as part of the overall water management strategy. This should include the integration of rain gardens and the potential re-use water for landscape maintenance.
- A robust management and maintenance strategy is required for the landscape and public realm. This should provide clarity on the ownership of different spaces, what is required to maintain them, and when the courtyard will be open to the public.
- It will be important that landscape and public realm proposals, within and beyond the red line, are secured as part of the planning application. Appropriate planning conditions will be needed to provide assurance on what will be delivered, and to ensure aspects such as surface materials and planting strategies are carefully considered.
- A detailed delivery strategy should be developed to test the feasibility and provide assurance that the proposal can be delivered as submitted.



CONFIDENTIAL

Shared surface street

- The shared surface area is welcome in principle, but it is not yet working and further work is needed to develop a more characterful approach and a clearer sense of how it will be used.
- Defining the shared surface area as a child friendly street would establish a stronger vision to inform further design development across the site.
- How pedestrians use the street requires careful consideration, including opportunities for play and to dwell. Furthermore, thought is needed to define spaces without these becoming overly cluttered.
- Meandering and narrowing the width of the vehicle route, and changing the surface materials would help make it clear that it is a pedestrian priority zone.

Architecture

- The panel supports the overall massing, the use of brick and the scale and articulation of windows. However, a richer and more characterful architectural language is needed.
- Rather than repeating elements from the context, the panel recommends focussing on a complementary language which builds on the materiality and craftsmanship within the area.
- Rowan Court by Satish Jassal Architects' and Tower Court by Adam Kahn Architects are good examples of how distinctiveness and character can be integrated successfully, both in the architecture and the public realm.
- The definition and user experience of all entrances, including gates, requires further thought. These should have a clear hierarchy and consistent language, while ensuring that each entrance has a distinct identity through the application of materials, lighting, architectural detailing and signage.
- The balcony structure facing the courtyard appears relatively overbearing in what is a small space. The panel feels that a lighter approach could be more successful.
- Integrating a variety of balcony sizes, including larger ones for the family units, should also be considered. Balcony railings should provide a sense of privacy without feeling solid.
- Opportunities to change the fenestration in response to the spaces they face, should also be considered. For example, the elevations which look onto the courtyard could share a common language to add to its character.



CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel welcomes the emphasis on accessibility. It encourages the applicant to consider how this can influence the architectural language, the signage and wayfinding design, the lighting strategy, and the quality of communal areas.
- The detailed design of the scheme should be embedded in the information submitted for approval. Bay studies, balcony details (including soffits and railings), the colour and texture of brick, and the patterned brickwork below windows, should all be provided.

Sustainability

- As the applicant advised that the scheme is close to reaching full Passivhaus standard, the panel encourages the team to make the additional adjustments needed to achieve it.
- If the intention is to integrate external blinds to help manage overheating, these should be integrated now.

Next steps

- The quality review panel does not expect to be involved with the scheme again prior to submission.
- However, it would like to see the wider landscape, once this has been further refined in discussion with officers and the community. This could happen post submission.



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.

