

Assessment Details

BRE Reference Number:	BREEAM-0081-6108
Development Name:	Hornsey Town hall
Assessor Organisation:	Whitecode Consulting Ltd
Assessor Name:	Katy Venables
BREEAM Scheme/Version:	BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014
Building Type:	Other: Non-residential Institution
Assessment Stage:	Post Construction Stage
Date Report Received:	14/07/2025

6 Month Certification Deadline

Date of 1st submission feedback:	06/10/2025	Certificate Deadline:	06/04/2026
For further information regarding this, please refer to KBCN0510 .			

Confirmation of QA Fee:

Total Area:	4496	Certification Fee:	£1400.00
-------------	------	--------------------	----------

Part 1	Part 2	Part 3	Part 4
✓	✓	✓	✓

QA Outcome	Number of Major NCs:	Number of Minor NCs:	Assessment certified:
Resubmit	0	6	No

Action Required:

Requires attention. Please see feedback below and reissue to BRE Global via BREEAM Projects

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

QA Status Explained:

QA classification	Definition
Major Non-Conformance (Major NC)	In the event of an audited issue failing the QA on the basis of a significant error, a 'Major Non-Conformance' will be identified. This will occur where a considerable technical error is identified which must be addressed prior to certification.
Minor Non-Conformance (Minor NC)	In the event of an audited issue failing the QA on the basis of a less significant error a 'Minor Non-Conformance' will be identified. This will occur where a procedural or minor technical error is identified which must be addressed prior to certification
Observation (Obs)	In the event of an audited issue not failing on a technical or procedural basis, but requiring an advisory comment to be raised it will be identified as 'Observation'. Assessors should be aware of these comments for next-stage assessments or future projects (to avoid potential non-compliances in future assessments).

If the status is blank, the credit has either not been audited, or has passed the audit process.

The audit is a sampling process and as such the lack of findings in any category or within the report as a whole cannot be taken as confirmation that there are no nonconformities whatsoever.

Summary of QA findings:

Thank you for your submission. Unfortunately, there are still a number of issues which require further clarification. Please address the feedback within the individual issues together with the general feedback below and re-submit when ready to do so.

Areas of focus

To help reduce the number of non-conformance issues (NCs) identified, it is recommended the following are addressed:

Robustness of evidence: Please make sure that all documents provided to QA follow the robustness of evidence requirements listed in the manual and include as a minimum 'key' information i.e., date, author, building name etc. Please see **The BREEAM evidential requirements - Robustness of evidence** section within the technical manual.

Referencing: Assessor notes and references should be provided to clearly indicate where compliance with each applicable criterion can be found within the evidence provided (for example, providing section and page numbers within specific documents). This should provide the auditor with a clear locational reference (auditable trail) to the evidence that has been used to reach the assessor's decision and should avoid references to whole documents or zip files containing multiple documents. Please refer to **KBCN0522** and apply throughout the assessment.

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

Administrative Audit:	OK?
Address of Development (suitable for certificate)	
Project team names (suitable for certificate)	
Project team roles (suitable for certificate)	

BREEAM Quality Assurance Service Feedback

Please click [here](#) to complete a quick survey on your experience with this audit.

We would love to hear your feedback as this will allow us to identify where there are areas upon which we can improve.

Thank you

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

Detailed Audit:

Credit		Comment	Status
Management			
Man 01	Project Brief and design		
Man 02	Life cycle cost and service life planning	Capital cost reporting Criterion 4: The letter (Ref Man 02b) is noted, however, it is dated 12/07/24, during RIBA Stage 5 and therefore it is unclear this represents the final capital cost. Please provide further evidence to clarify. Please also report the capital cost in BREEAM Projects. (Obs)	Minor NC
Man 03	Responsible construction practices		
Man 04	Commissioning and handover		
Man 05	Aftercare		
Health and Wellbeing			
Hea 01	Visual comfort		
Hea 02	Indoor air quality		
Hea 03	Safe containment in laboratories		
Hea 04	Thermal comfort		
Hea 05	Acoustic performance	Industrial, Retail, Prisons and Other building types Criterion 4: It is not clear how the <i>Criteria</i> and <i>Testing requirements</i> for Reverberation within Table 25 have been addressed in the submitted evidence. Please review and clarify. We refer you to KBCN0130 and CN6 - Building types without areas used for speech and for further guidance. Additionally, please refer to the feedback under Pol 05 - Suitably Qualified Acoustician and address accordingly. (Obs)	Minor NC
Hea 06	Safety and security		
Energy			
Ene 01	Reduction of energy use and carbon emissions		
Ene 02	Energy monitoring		
Ene 03	External lighting		

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

Ene 04	Low carbon design		
Ene 05	Energy efficient cold storage		
Ene 06	Energy efficient transportation systems	Energy consumption Criterion 1a: It is unclear how this sub-criterion has been addressed, please provide further evidence to confirm how the transportation demand and usage patterns for the building have been analysed to determine the optimum number and size of newly specified lifts (see CN7). Criterion 1b: The reports (Ref Ene 06a) are noted, however, they are not suitably robust as they do not contain the building name. Please see Summary of QA Findings regarding Robustness of Evidence. Criterion 1d: Supporting post-refurbishment evidence is required to confirm the lift types (traction/ hydraulic) with the lowest energy consumption are installed. Energy efficient features Criterion 2: Please address the non-conformances above. Criteria 3a - 3c: Whilst Section 3.2 (Ref Ene 06a) is noted, it has not been clearly shown that the lifts specified have three energy efficient features. Please provide further supporting evidence to confirm the energy efficient features that have been specified for each of the installed lifts. Based on the design stage documents (Ref Ene 06a), there are three types of lift specified, however, the site inspection report only shows one type installed. Further post refurbishment evidence is required to confirm the lifts that are installed. Criterion 4: The comparison of systems with and without regeneration (under section 3.1, page 5) appears to show that use of a regenerative drive should provide an energy saving for two of the lift types specified, therefore, please clarify the reason for not specifying a regenerative drive in these lift types with reference to supporting evidence.	Minor NC
Ene 07	Energy efficient laboratory systems		
Ene 08	Energy efficient equipment		
Ene 09	Drying space		
Transport			
Tra 01	Sustainable transport solutions		
Tra 02	Proximity to Amenities	Criterion 1: The amenities document (Ref Tra 02a) is noted, however, it is not suitably robust as it is undated. Please see Summary of QA Findings regarding Robustness of Evidence.	Observation
Tra 03	Cyclist facilities		
Tra 04	Maximum car parking capacity		

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

Tra 05	Travel plan		
Water			
Wat 01	Water consumption		
Wat 02	Water monitoring		
Wat 03	Water leak detection and prevention		
Wat 04	Water efficient equipment		
Materials			
Mat 01	Life cycle impacts		
Mat 03	Responsible sourcing		
Mat 04	Insulation		
Mat 05	Designing for durability and resilience		
Mat 06	Material efficiency		
Waste			
Wst 01	Construction waste management	Diversion of resources from landfill Criterion 7: The SWMP (Ref Wst01a) indicates it covers the residential new build as well as the town hall refurbishment (page 1). Therefore, it is not clear the waste figures reported are specific to the refurbishment project under assessment. Please refer to KBCN00036 and clarify what areas of the refurbishment and site are covered by the SWMP. Waste figures reported on BREEAM Projects should be updated if required.	Minor NC
Wst 02	Recycled aggregates		
Wst 03	Operational waste	Operational waste Criterion 1a: Evidence of permanent/fixed signage for the recycling area alerting building users and collection agencies to the location of the recycling facility has not been provided. Please refer to KBCN1577 (Label the recycling area) and provide further evidence. Criterion 1c: It is unclear how it has been determined that the waste storage area is of sufficient size. Please clarify with reference to supporting evidence (see CN7 and CN7.2). Criteria 2b and 2c: Please clarify the applicability of food waste storage for this assessment with reference to supporting evidence. While entries on BREEAM Projects indicate this is N/A, assessor notes and the site inspection report state there is a tap. Post construction evidence confirming the presence of a water outlet could not be seen.	Minor NC
Wst 04	Speculative finishes		

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
BREEAM UK Refurbishment & Fit-out 2014**

Wst 05	Adaptation to climate change		
Wst 06	Functional adaptability		
Land use and ecology			
Le 02	Protection of ecological features		
Le 04	Enhancing site ecology		
Le 05	Long term impact on biodiversity		
Pollution			
Pol 01	Impact of refrigerants		
Pol 02	Nox Emissions		
Pol 03	Flood risk management and reducing surface water run-off		
Pol 04	Reduction of Night Time Light Pollution		
Pol 05	Noise attenuation	Criterion 2: It is not clear from where within the submitted evidence compliance with the requirements of the sub-criteria 2.a.i and 2.a.ii have been verified by the Assessor. Please clarify expanding the Assessor notes. Criterion 3: Whilst the CV (Ref Pol 05c) is noted, it is unclear the author holds a recognised acoustic qualification as per Relevant definitions - Suitably qualified acoustician. Please clarify (see also KBCN1661).	Minor NC
Innovation			
Inn 01	Innovation		

Detailed Audit Outcome:

Total Number of Major Non-Conformances:	0
Total Number of Minor Non-Conformances:	6