

HAVERING QUALITY REVIEW PANEL

ANNUAL REPORT

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH

Frame Projects Unit 14 Waterside 44-48 Wharf Road London N1 7UX 020 8164 9980 office@frame-projects.co.uk frame-projects.co.uk

INTRODUCTION

The Havering Quality Review Panel was set up in 2018 by Frame Projects on behalf of the London Borough of Havering. It is chaired by Selina Mason and includes 22 members, selected through an open recruitment process in collaboration with Havering officers.

Terms of reference, available on the planning authority's web site, set out the role and remit of the panel, and the way in which it supports the planning process. Schemes requiring design advice are identified by planning officers and referred to the panel for review. Officers provide a briefing on the planning context and key issues, both in writing for the meeting agenda, and in person at the panel meeting. Advice given by the panel is recorded in a report, to assist with continuing pre-application negotiations, or to advise the planning committee on submitted schemes.

The Havering Quality Review Panel has advised on 12 schemes in the year from October 2020 to September 2021. Two of these schemes have been reviewed on more than one occasion. First reviews usually take place at a stage when a client and design team have decided their preferred option for the development of a site, and have sufficient drawings, models, etc. for a comprehensive discussion. There will often be a second pre-application review, to provide advice on more detailed design matters, before planning submission.

Frame Projects has developed a process for monitoring and evaluating the impact of quality review panels. This process allows us to obtain insight into the effectiveness and performance of each of our panels, as well as valuable information on the significant emerging issues from panel reviews. It also provides public transparency and allows for continual improvement of our services. This process includes collecting quantitative information based on reviews carried out. This report covers the period from 1 October 2020 to 30 September 2021, and includes feedback from panel members, applicants and local planning authority representatives gathered through anonymous surveys.

This framework builds on the initial work done by Public Practice to develop a monitoring tool for design review.



Quantitative data was gathered from reviews that took place from 1 October 2020 to 30 September 2021.

Due to government restrictions relating to Covid-19, all review meetings managed by Frame Projects were conducted online via video conference during the reporting period.

PANEL

Authority

Review Panel name Panel management Contact name for panel Contact email address Report produced by London Borough of Havering Havering Quality Review Panel Externally managed, Frame Projects Reema Kaur, Frame Projects Reema@frame-projects.co.uk Reema Kaur, Frame Projects

Image: Drapers Academy, Fielden Clegg Bradley Studios, RIBA National



REVIEW TOTALS

Total number of reviews

12

Number of site visits (virtual)

11

Formal reviews (chair plus four panel member)

Number of follow up reviews

2

Number of site visits (in person)

0

Chair's reviews (chair plus one panel members)

5

PANEL COMPOSITION

PANEL MEMBERS USED THIS YEAR

No. of different panel members used

15

Male panel members

40%

Female panel members

60%

BAME panel members (based on 18 diversity forms)

20%

PANEL EXPERTISE USED THIS YEAR





PROPOSALS REVIEWED

APPLICANT TYPE





Frame Projects has worked with the local planning authority to identify schemes to assess as part of the monitoring and evaluation process. These consist of schemes that have been reviewed by the Quality Review Panel, and where a planning decision has been determined between 1 October 2020 to 30 September 2021.

The schemes used for feedback in this evaluation are:

•	Beam Park School	P1896.20
•	RTS Motors	P1022.20
•	St George's Health Care	P1039.21
•	Tesco Extra	P1190.21

Anonymous survey responses were collected from the applicants (planning agent and lead architects), panel members who attended the reviews, and local authority representatives (planning officers) who were leading on the schemes. Surveys took the format of yes / no questions with options to provide further specific feedback. Participants were sent an e-mail inviting them to take part in the survey and given two weeks to provide feedback, with one follow-up reminder.

Image: Rom Valley Way, Sheppard Robson

APPLICANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Eight applicants were contacted twice to complete the feedback questionnaire. One out of eight applicants responded to the following questions:

- 1. Did you find that the review sessions were conducted in a constructive manner?
- 2. Were you clear about the information you needed to provide prior to the review?
- 3. Did you consider that the advice from the panel helped to improve the proposal?
- 4. Did you feel that the panel reports accurately captured review discussions?
- 5. Did you think that the panel's advice assisted with officer and council discussions?
- 6. Would you recommend using the Place Shaping Panel?
- 7. Any other comments?

APPLICANT FEEDBACK

One applicant responded to the questionnaire, noting that they were clear about the information that they needed to provide prior to the review; that the meeting was conducted in a constructive manner; and that the panel report accurately captured the review discussions. Even though some questions and comments raised by the panel were beyond the parameters of the brief, the respondent felt that the panel's advice was relevant and worthwhile.

The applicant would recommend using the Quality Review Panel, but stressed that feedback would have been more helpful earlier in the planning process. It was also noted that it would have been helpful if Havering officers had overlaid their views onto the panel's advice, to assist with interpretation.

LOCAL AUTHORITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Six local planning authority representatives were contacted twice to complete the feedback questionnaire. Two out of six local authority representatives responded to the following questions:

- 1. Were you clear about the information you needed to provide and your role in the review process?
- 2. Did you find the panel's comments during the review clear and constructive?
- 3. Did you find the review session and report clear and useful?
- 4. Did you find the panel's advice helped support negotiations on design quality?
- 5. Did you incorporate the panel's comments into a delegated planning report or reported to committee?
- 6. Did you feel that the planning committee gave weight to the design review advice during decision making?
- 7. Any other comments?

LOCAL AUTHORITY FEEDBACK

Both local authority officers who responded to the questionnaire agreed that they were clear about their role in the review process, and that the panel's advice helped support negotiations on design quality. The respondents confirmed that the panel's comments were typically incorporated into an officer's planning report, and that the planning committee gave weight to the design review advice in the decision-making process.

Image: Harrow Lodge Park © Havering in Pictures

PANEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Nine panel members were contacted twice to complete the feedback questionnaire. Three out of nine panel members responded.

- 1. Did you feel that the level of information provided prior to the review session was appropriate?
- 2. Did you consider the site visits a benefit to the review session?
- 3. Did you consider the information presented at the review to be sufficient to enable a thorough review?
- 4. Did you consider planning officer written and verbal briefings provided clarity on design and policy issues?
- 5. Did you feel that panel reports accurately captured review discussions?
- 6. Did you feel that you could contribute your advice fully?
- 7. Any other comments?

PANEL FEEDBACK

Although physical site visits were not possible, due to government restrictions, panel members agreed that, even when virtual, they were an important element of the design review process. All respondents considered that the reports accurately captured review discussions, and that the level of information provided prior to the review was appropriate. Panel members also agreed that both the verbal and written planning officer briefings provided clarity on design and policy issues.

Image: RSPB Environment and Education Centre, van Heyningen & Haward Architects © James Brittain



During the 2020-2021 reporting period, only 68 per cent of the panel attended a review meeting. Frame Projects will review membership of the Havering Quality Review Panel, with Havering officers, to ensure that the appropriate expertise is available (minimising the reliance on guest panel members), and that the panel as a whole remains representative of the population of the borough.

Based on survey feedback, both the local authority and applicant teams appear happy with the Quality Review Panel process and the panel's contribution. Frame Projects will continue to maintain regular contact with Havering officers and will encourage schemes to come to the panel earlier in the design process, to allow applicants more time and flexibility to take on board the panel's comments. Frame Projects also recommends that, where appropriate, schemes return for a follow-up review so that panel members can provide further advice on the developing proposals.

Frame Projects recognises the importance of physical site visits. Since November 2021, it has resumed in-person review meetings for some of the panels that it manages and Frame will discuss the possibility of returning to in-person meetings with Havering officers, ensuring appropriate measures are in place to ensure the safety of attendees.

Image: Hylands Primary School, Walters & Cohen Architects © Dennis Gilbert

