

Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form: Home Quality Mark - BETA

Assessment Details

BRE Reference Number:	BREEAM-0081-5787
Development Name:	Hornsey Town Hall
Assessor Organisation:	Whitecode Consulting Ltd
Assessor Name:	Katy Venables
BREEAM Scheme/Version:	Home Quality Mark - BETA
Building Type:	
Assessment Stage:	Post Construction Stage
Date Report Received:	14/07/2025

6 Month Certification Deadline

Date of 1st submission feedback:	27/08/2025	Certificate Deadline:	27/02/2026
For further information regarding this, please refer to KBCN0510 .			

Confirmation of QA Fee:

Total Area:	12557	Certification Fee:	£8646.00
--------------------	-------	---------------------------	----------

QA Outcome	Number of Major NCs:	Number of Minor NCs:	Assessment certified:
Resubmit	0	12	No

Action Required:

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

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

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 the submission of the assessment and evidence for certification. Your commentary throughout this assessment was exemplary and extremely helpful in detailing your thought process. Thank you!

Unfortunately, this QA audit has identified a large number of Non-Conformances and has resulted in the assessment being halted.

What does this mean?

Some issues within the audit which have been selected for audit have not yet been reviewed. When the assessment is resubmitted, it is expected that all of the QA feedback is actioned and implemented throughout the assessment, including for issues which have not currently been reviewed. If this means resubmitting updated evidence for the assessed issues and also for the issues that are still to be assessed, then please do so.

What happens when resubmitting?

The 12 issues with NCs raised will be reaudited. If the total number of NCs have reduced, the remaining issues selected for audit will now also be audited, however if the assessment reaches 12 NCs again, the assessment will once again be halted. Please note that where a halt is applied within the next submission, the QA Audit Failure charge (see fee sheet) will be applied.

You may wish to refer to KBCN1467 for further detail.

Please address the comments below and all non-conformances raised under specific issues before resubmitting.

1. Project Timeframes - It is noted that a project timeline has not been provided. Please review and provide further detail on the Timeframe for Project Phases with reference to appropriate supporting evidence. These details can be entered in the Additional Assessment Details section of BREEAM Projects and should include the month and year for each key project stage as a minimum. In presenting a detailed project overview in this section it will negate the need to provide further clarification for individual credit issues throughout the body of the assessment report.

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

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:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

Detailed Audit:

Credit		Comment	Status
Our surroundings			
Transport and Movement			
1.01 01	Accessible Public Transport		
1.01 02	Alternative Sustainable Transport	01 Cycle Storage Criterion 2: Please note that the evidence files [10687-E-02-AS-0099] and [10687-E-02-B-0099] could not be opened and so evidence to confirm the location of cycle storage spaces could not be found. It is therefore also unclear how the Assessor has confirmed compliance with the definitions - adequate lighting and close proximity. Criterion 3: It is unclear where within the evidence is can be seen that there is a compliant safe pedestrian route from the entrance of the dwellings within the Mews to the associated cycle storage. Please clarify. 02 Cycle Networks Criterion 4: The evidence referenced within the Assessor commentary could not be found and so compliance cannot be confirmed. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 03 Electric Charging Points Criteria 5 and 6: It is unclear how these criteria have been addressed or how compliance has been confirmed. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
1.01 03	Local Amenities		
Outdoors			
		03 Early Appointment Criterion 3: Evidence to confirm the project timeframes could not be found. It is therefore unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the suitably qualified ecologist appointed under criterion 2 was appointed prior to site clearance and construction. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 04B - Ecologist Survey Criterion 12: It is unclear how compliance with CN2, CN3 and CN6 has been confirmed within the evidence provided. Please clarify. 04B - Maintaining and enhancing ecological value Criterion 13: Please refer to the feedback regarding criterion 12. Criterion 14: It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed compliance as the recommendations identified within the ecology appraisal provided do not seem to match	

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

1.02 04	Ecology Review	those within the letter [e. Post Construction Letter from Robert Anthony at Phlorum]. Furthermore, it is noted that at least one of the recommendations within the letter has yet to be installed. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance. <u>04B - Protecting against invasive or diseased species on site</u> Criterion 15: Please refer to the feedback regarding criterion 12. Criterion 17: The evidence [e. Post Construction Letter from Robert Anthony at Phlorum] has been noted however evidence to confirm that the plant species used at the asset are native or non-invasive could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. <u>04B - Maintaining ecology in communal areas and Local Biodiversity Records</u> Criteria 18 and 21: Please refer to the feedback regarding criterion 12. Criterion 22: Evidence to confirm that all the information collected as part of the ecology survey as well as any new ecology on site arising from enhancement is added to the local biodiversity records centre database could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
1.02 05	Recreational Space		
Safety and Resilience			
1.03 06	Flood Risk		
1.03 07	Managing the Impact of Rainfall	<u>02B - Peak rate run-off</u> Criterion 5: It is unclear within the evidence it is confirmed that the peak rate run-off calculations account for the <u>6 hour</u> storm for the 1-year and 100-year return period events. Please clarify. Furthermore, evidence of calculations to determine the equivalent greenfield peak run-off rate could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 6: It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the allowance for climate change has been done in accordance with the <i>current best practice national planning guidance</i>. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. <u>02B - Volume run-off</u> Criterion 7: It is unclear where within the evidence it can be confirmed that the volume run-off calculations consider the 100-year-6-hour event. Please clarify. Criterion 8: It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the volume run-off calculations include an allowance for climate change and that this has been done in accordance with the <i>current best practice national planning guidance</i>. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 9: Evidence to confirm that additional run-off from the event which considers	Minor NC

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

		climate change is prevented from leaving the site using suitable techniques could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	
1.03 08	Security	01 Prerequisite Criterion 1: Please note that in the absence of project timeframes it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the SQAA has conducted an evidence based SNA during or prior to RIBA stage 2. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Furthermore, it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that an individual who satisfies the definition - Suitably Qualified Security Specialist has conducted an evidence based assessment that satisfies the requirements of Security Needs Assessment. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 02 Security Features Criterion 2: As stated above, in the absence of verified project timeframes it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the SQSS has developed a set of recommendations prior to RIBA stage 2. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 3: Suitable <u>post-construction</u> evidence to confirm that all recommendations proposed by the SQSS have been implemented in line with CN2 could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 4: Evidence to confirm the home information pack includes details regarding the SNA as specified under 6b within Table 41 could not be found. Please clarify.	Minor NC
My home			
Comfort			
2.01 09	Indoor Pollutants	01 Minimising emissions from building product types Criterion 1: Evidence to confirm compliance with the additional requirements regarding interior paints and varnishes within Table 9 could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Furthermore, it is unclear how compliance with CN1 and CN5 has been confirmed within the evidence provided. Please clarify.	Minor NC
2.01 10	Daylight		
2.01 11	Internal and External Noise		
2.01 12	Sound Insulation		
2.01 13	Temperature	01 Core home information Criterion 1: Evidence to confirm that details of any maintenance required for any temperature control measures could not be found. Please clarify. 02B - Current Conditions Criteria 5-7: The evidence provided has been noted however in the absence of project timeframes it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that the reports are based on as-built evidence. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

2.01 14	Ventilation		
Energy and Cost			
2.02 15	Energy Forecast and Cost	02 Energy Performance Criterion 2: Please note that pdf copies of the SAP files based on as-built evidence could not be found. It is therefore unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that an Accredited energy assessor has used Approved building energy calculation software to confirm compliance with this criterion. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. CN2: Please note that copies of BRUKL output documents for all dwellings could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
2.02 16	Decentralised Energy	03 Implementation of feasibility study findings CN3: It is unclear how the Assessor has addressed and confirmed compliance with this compliance note. Please clarify.	Minor NC
2.02 17	Impact on Local Air Quality		
Materials			
2.03 18	Responsible Sourcing of Construction Products		
2.03 19	Environmental Impact from Construction Products		
2.03 20	Life Cycle Costing of Construction Products		
2.03 21	Durability of Construction Products	01 Integral elements and 02 Finishing elements Criteria 2 and 5: The evidence provided has been noted however it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed the definition - Appropriate measures has been satisfied. Furthermore, it is unclear how CN2 has been addressed and compliance confirmed. Please clarify. Please also note that sufficient post-construction evidence to confirm that the appropriate measures have been installed onsite as designed could not be found. The evidence [c. Letter from Elliot Bacon at Ardmore dated 11.12.24] on its own is not enough to confirm compliance. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
Space			
2.04 22	Drying Space		
2.04 23	Access and Space		
		01 Consultation with the waste collection authority Criterion 1: Please note that documentary evidence of the consultation process with the waste collection authority, including the content and findings, could not be found. Furthermore, it is unclear what number of recyclable waste streams there are for each	

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

2.04 24	Recyclable Waste	dwelling. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 02 Recyclable waste Criterion 2: As it is unclear where within the evidence provided the Assessor has confirmed the number of recyclable waste streams collected by the local authority compliance with this criterion could not be confirmed. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 3: Suitable post-construction evidence to confirm that all dwellings satisfy the combined capacity for internal <u>recyclable</u> waste facilities requirement could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. CN3: It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed that waste will be carried no more than 30 from each dwelling entrance. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 03 Composting Criteria 4 and 5: It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed compliance with these criteria with suitable post-construction evidence for all dwellings. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
Water			
2.05 25	Water Efficiency	01 Water efficient fittings Criteria 1c and 1d: The evidence [a. Letter from Bethan Street at Ardmore dated 02.02.25] has been noted however please refer to CN1 and note that suitable post-construction evidence to confirm the water efficiency data for all of the fittings entered into the calculator tool could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance.	Minor NC
Knowledge sharing			
Home Delivery			
3.01 26	Commissioning and Performance	01 Commissioning and testing strategy Criterion 1: The evidence provided has been noted however it is unclear where it can be confirmed that the commissioning and testing schedule is in line with the appropriate commissioning best practice guidance as per the definition. Please clarify. 02 Commissioning building services and control systems Criterion 3: Please refer to the feedback under criterion 1. Criterion 5: Post-construction evidence to confirm that the applicable building systems <i>have</i> been commissioned in line with appropriate commissioning best practice guidance could not be found. Please provide further evidence to confirm compliance. Criterion 6: Evidence to confirm that the energy control solutions were appointed during the design stage could not be found. Furthermore, it is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed with the requirements of CN1 regarding seasonal commissioning. Please clarify and provide further evidence to confirm compliance. 03 Testing building fabric Criterion 7: Please refer to the feedback under criterion 1.	Minor NC

**BREEAM Quality Assurance (QA) Feedback Form:
Home Quality Mark - BETA**

3.01 27	Quality Improvement		
3.01 28	Considerate Construction		
3.01 29	Construction Energy Use		
3.01 30	Construction Water Use		
3.01 31	Site Waste		
User Experience			
3.02 32	Aftercare		
3.02 33	Home Information		
3.02 34	Smart Homes		
Future Learning			
3.03 35	Post Occupancy Evaluation		

Detailed Audit Outcome:

Total Number of Major Non-Conformances:	0
Total Number of Minor Non-Conformances:	12