

BREEAM and HQM Remediation Plan

Hornsey Town Hall, London Borough of Haringey

Prepared for:
FEC

5th January 2026

Revision number	Date	Report completed by	Report checked by
1	05/01/2026	KV	EH

Introduction

This report has been prepared at the request of FEC to discharge planning condition 37 which states:

IN THE EVENT the Local Planning Authority provides written notification that details submitted to discharge the condition above demonstrate a failure of the development to achieve the agreed ratings of BREEAM 2014 Refurb: Good and Home Quality Mark, 3 stars, as set out in the post construction certificate, a Remedial Works Plan (RWP) shall be submitted in writing to and for approval by the Local Planning Authority within 3 Calendar Months.

The RWP shall provide a full schedule and costings of remedial works required to achieve the agreed ratings. The remedial works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved plan OR the full costs of remediation (including management fees) shall be paid to the Council to an agreed schedule.

Background

Whitecode Consulting were appointed by Ardmore in 2019 to carry out a BREEAM assessment for the Town Hall and Home Quality Mark Assessments for the residential units in Blocks A, B and The Mews.

The assessments were registered with the BRE as follows:

BREEAM UK Refurbishment and Fit-Out 2014 BREEAM-0081-6108

Home Quality Mark Beta BREEAM-0081-5787

Whitecode Consulting worked closely with Ardmore to gather evidence to satisfy the criteria of the credits targeted in the pre-assessment prepared by Sweco for the planning application, however, due to staff turnover at Ardmore and COVID restrictions slowing down communication, the assessments had to be reviewed several times and alternative credits targeted where possible to maintain the required ratings. As a result, the window for submitting the Design Stage assessments passed and the decision to submit a joint Design and Post Construction Assessment was made. Every possible credit has been targeted for the assessments.

The assessments were submitted to the BRE for certification in July 2025.

Since the assessments were submitted, the Ardmore project team are no longer available to provide additional evidence to address the comments received from BRE which has resulted in formal certification not being possible for this project.

BREEAM Review

Following submission of the Post Construction Assessment, the BRE identified 6 **minor** non-compliances with the evidence provided and requested further evidence to demonstrate compliance with the targeted credits. Whilst action has been taken to address some of these issues, it has not been possible to obtain BREEAM level compliance for other issues which has resulted in the assessment of the Town Hall being unable to achieve formal BREEAM certification.

The issues raised by BRE are set out in the table below, along with the BREEAM Assessor's response and remediation actions to be undertaken.

Credit Ref	BRE Comment	BREEAM Assessor Response	Remediation Action
Man 02	The letter confirming the final capital cost for the project is dated 12/07/24, during RIBA Stage 5 and therefore it is unclear this represents the final capital cost.	The aim of this credit is to provide information to assist BRE's research into the cost and savings of developing sustainable or BREEAM-assessed buildings, to inform the business case for sustainability and the ongoing development of BREEAM. Ardmore are no longer available to provide this information.	This does not impact on the sustainability of the Town Hall and therefore no remedial action is required.
Hea 05	It is not clear how the Criteria and testing requirements for reverberation have been addressed in the submitted evidence.	The report produced by Pace tested against BS8233 reverberation time criteria. BREEAM requires testing against performance standards set out in table 6 in section 1 of BB93. Whilst this does not match the BREEAM criteria exactly, testing for reverberation times has been carried out and confirmed by Pace as acceptable.	Reverberation times have been tested by Pace, a compliant test body, and confirmed as acceptable in accordance with BS8233. No remedial action required.
Ene 06	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.	A Kleeman lift analysis touches on this but does not give the level of detail required for BREEAM compliance. Whilst this cannot be used as BREEAM evidence, the report clearly confirms that KLEEMANN provides a traffic analysis in order to	No remedial action is required.

	Additionally, it has not been clearly shown that the lifts specified have three energy efficient features.	determine the optimum design of the vertical transportation equipment. Ardmore have also provided written confirmation that these lifts do include the 3 energy efficient features.	
Wst 01	The SWMP final figures include the residential new build as well as the town hall refurbishment. The waste figures reported must be specific to the refurbishment project.	Ardmore are no longer available to split the waste volumes for refurbishment and residential elements however, the total waste diverted from landfill for the entire project meets the requirements for the targeted credits for both the BREEAM and HQM assessments.	No remedial action required.
Wst 03	Photographs required of a permanent/fixed sign for the waste and recycling store.	These have been installed and photographic evidence provided in Appendix A .	No remedial action required.
Pol 05	It is not clear from where within the submitted evidence existing of background noise levels at the nearest or most exposed noise-sensitive area to the proposed development and the existing background noise levels can be found.	Pace Consults plant noise results report refers to Sandy Brown's Noise Survey ref 17119- R02-C dated 20th July 2017 which does identify the background noise levels. Their report confirms that plant noise testing has been carried out and meet HQM limits.	No remedial action required.

Conclusion

The above demonstrates that, whilst evidence to satisfy the strict requirements of BREEAM cannot be provided in some cases, the Town Hall still complies with the principle of the criteria for credits and would achieve a Good rating with a score of 46.08%. As there are no remedial works required, there are no costs associated with achieving this rating.

HQM Review

Following submission of the Post Construction Assessment, the BRE identified 11 **minor** non-compliances with the evidence provided and requested further evidence to demonstrate compliance with the targeted credits. Whilst action has been taken to address some of these issues, it has not been possible to obtain HQM level compliance for other issues which has resulted in the assessment of the residential units being unable to achieve formal HQM certification.

The issues raised by BRE are set out in the table below, along with the BREEAM Assessor's response and remediation actions to be undertaken.

Credit Ref	BRE Comment	HQM Assessor Response	Remediation Action
Transport and Movement	Mews bike store - It is unclear how the Assessor has confirmed compliance with the definitions - adequate lighting	As built drawings show Encapsulite MT50-LED Linear light fitting however this appears to have been missed on site as no photographic evidence can be provided.	FEC has instructed their multi-trade contractor to install a linear light fixture within the bike shelter.
Ecology Review	The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal does not include the recommendation that all those working on site have been briefed on the protection measures put in place and the areas that are not accessible. Additionally, the recommendations provided in Phlorum's Post Construction statement do not match the recommendations stated in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal and also states that one of the recommendations is yet to be implemented. The Phlorum statement does not confirm that the plant species used are native or non-invasive. 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.	The PEA was only missing one small piece of information to be BRE compliant but cannot be amended at this stage of the project. The PEA was carried out at the planning stage of the project, recommendations provided and, has met all other HQM criteria. Phlorum also provided a post construction report confirming that the recommendations have been implemented. This is provided in Appendix B .	All ecologist recommendations have been implemented. No remedial action required

Managing the Impacts of Rainfall	The Drainage Report by Bradbrook does not confirm that the peak rate run-off and volume of run off calculations account for the 6 hour storm for the 1-year and 100-year return period events. Furthermore, evidence of calculations to determine the equivalent greenfield peak run-off rate could not be found. The report does not confirm that the calculations include an allowance for climate change that is in accordance with the current best practice national planning guidance and that any additional predicted volume of run-off for this event is prevented from leaving the site by using infiltration or other sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) techniques.	Although the Drainage Strategy report by Bradbrook does not address all of the HQM criteria in specific detail, the overall result is that the development complies with main requirement – to achieve greenfield run off rates and, attenuate run off volumes. The letter from Heyne Tillett Steel confirms that the SuDS strategy agreed through the planning process was to restrict and attenuate the surface water flows from the areas of the site with new construction down to the greenfield rate. The attenuation has been designed for no flooding in the 100 year peak storm event. Ardmore have provided written confirmation that the drainage has been installed in accordance with the design and specifications. Both letters can be found in Appendix C.	The development has met greenfield run off rates and provides attenuation for 100 year peak storm event. No remedial action required.
Security	Suitable post-construction evidence to confirm that all recommendations proposed by the SQSS have been implemented could not be found.	Secured By Design Certificates were provided to the BRE as evidence, however they also require photographs and as-built drawings demonstrating compliance.	The development has achieved SBD certification demonstrating implementation of all security measures. No remedial action required.
Indoor Pollutants	Evidence that paints used in wet areas (e.g. bathrooms, kitchens, utility rooms) protects against mould growth. It is not clear that Eurofins Product Testing A/S is accredited to ISO/IEC 17025 and covers Sampling: Pumped sampling for formaldehyde in air; pumped sampling for VOCs in air; and Chemical analysis: Determination of formaldehyde; determination of VOCs.	Eurofins Quality Policy Statement confirms that they follow BS EN ISO 17025:2017. Please refer to appendix	No remedial action required.
Temperature	As Built Thermal Analysis results required	These are Included in Appendix D.	No remedial action required.
Energy and Cost	As Built SAP worksheets required	These are included in Appendix H.	No remedial action required.

Decentralised Energy	MCS certificate for installed PV is required.	This is provided in Appendix E .	No remedial action required.
Durability of Construction Products	Sufficient post-construction evidence to confirm that the appropriate measures have been installed onsite as designed could not be found. The evidence - Letter from Elliot Bacon at Ardmore dated 11.12.24, on its own is not enough to confirm compliance.	The apartments are occupied and it is not possible to obtain photographic evidence of implementation.	Ardmore have provided written confirmation that the design measures specified have all been implemented. This can be found in Appendix F . No remedial action required.
Recyclable Waste	Confirmation that consultation took place with the local authority on the required waste and recycling provision is required. Evidence is also required to demonstrate that sufficiently sized internal recycling bins have been installed in all dwellings and that bin stores are located within 30m distance from the home entrance. Post construction evidence is also required to demonstrate that all homes have been provided with internal composting waste storage that is a minimum of 10 litres in volume.	The Operational Waste Strategy from the planning stage confirms that the waste storage proposed is in line with LBH requirements demonstrating that consultation took place however no formal communication can be provided. Photographic evidence of internal recycling bins, and drawings show the travel distances for residents to the bin stores are provided in Appendix G . Email confirmation that an order was placed with LBH for the internal bins has been provided as evidence for the HQM assessment.	No remedial action required.
Water Efficiency	Datasheets confirming the flow rates from all installed WHB taps, showers, baths, WCs and kitchen taps must be provided. The flow rates test results provided by Ardmore was not deemed robust enough as evidence on its own.	The flow rates test results provided by Ardmore was not deemed robust enough as evidence on its own. Datasheets for flow restrictors and delivery notes confirming these products were delivered to site could not be obtained from Ardmore.	Flow rate testing was undertaken by Ardmore to confirm these comply with HQM requirements. No remedial action required.
Commissioning and Performance	The commissioning schedule must include the standards to which all systems will be commissioned in accordance with and must include air tightness testing. Additionally, Post-construction evidence to confirm that the applicable building systems have been commissioned in line with appropriate	Although the construction programme included commissioning of all systems, the standards were not stated and it is no longer possible to include them. Ardmore have however, provided commissioning certificates for the building services confirming compliance with CIBSE, BSRIA and Building Regulations. Energy Control Solutions	No remedial action required.

	commissioning best practice guidance must be provided. Evidence to confirm that Energy Control Solutions Limited were appointed as the Specialist Commissioning Manager during Stage 4 is required and that the scope of their appointment includes all HQM requirements.	appointment letter is dated November 2022 which falls between Stage 4 and Stage 5. Although their appointment does not specifically include all of the HQM criteria, it is sufficiently detailed to ensure that full commissioning support, and commissioning activities are provided.	
--	---	--	--

Conclusion

The above demonstrates that, whilst evidence to satisfy the strict requirements of HQM cannot be provided in some cases, the residential units in Blocks A, B and The Mews still comply with the principle of the criteria for the credits and would achieve a 3 Star rating with the lowest scoring unit achieving a score of 55.80%. As there are no remedial works required, there are no costs associated with achieving this rating.

Appendix A – Bin Store Signs

Appendix B Ecology

Appendix C – Drainage

Appendix D – Summer Overheating Assessments

Appendix E – MCS Certificates

Appendix F – Durability

Appendix G – Recycling