

Appendix 5 – Quality Review Panel Reports

Panel Review 1

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Formal Review Meeting: The Roundway

Wednesday 13 October 2021
Zoom video conference

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)
Phil Armitage
Martha Alker
Phyllida Mills
David Ubaka

Attendees

Kevin Tohill	London Borough of Haringey
Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Chris Smith	London Borough of Haringey
Sarah Carmona	Frame Projects
Adela Paparisto	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied to

Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects

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.

Declarations of interest

Quality Review Panel member Phil Armitage is currently working on a project which is currently on site, in which Glenn Howells Architects are also involved.

Report of Formal Review Meeting
13 October 2021
HQRP118_The Roundway

1. Project name and site address

The Roundway, 313-315 The Roundway, London, N17

2. Presenting team

Holly Mitchell	Simply Planning
Lee Fitzpatrick	Lindhill
Luke Ttakoushis	Lindhill
David Henderson	Glenn Howells Architects
Alex Smith	Glenn Howells Architects
Issy Spence	Glenn Howells Architects
Chris Horn	Chris Horn Associates.co.uk
Franca Carassai	Campbell Cadey
Ruth Campbell	Campbell Cadey
Jacob Friedman	The Bellview Group

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

4. Planning authority briefing

The development site is a 0.32 hectare angular plot of land located within an 'island site' created by Lordship Lane, Church Lane, All Hallows Road and The Roundway. It has a substantial frontage onto both The Roundway and Church Lane, as well as fronting onto Lordship Lane. The site has a PTAL of 5. The majority of this 'island' location is designated as Site Allocation SA63, which includes the development site, the petrol station on Roundway, an electricity sub-station on Church Lane and other nearby vehicle garages. The Allocation identifies the site for mixed-use employment-led development, and also requires an east-west cycle connection.

The site is located in close proximity to several heritage designations including Bruce Castle and Tower (Grade I Listed) and its adjacent boundary wall (Grade II Listed), the Bruce Castle and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas, and several locally listed buildings, including the nursery to the north and The Elmhurst public house to the south. The site is also within an Archaeological Priority Area. Adjacent to the site are two Historic Parks, Metropolitan Open Land, a Grade II SINC, a Local View Corridor (no. 19 unfolding view of Alexandra Palace from Bruce Castle) and a Critical Drainage Area. The character of the surrounding area is unique and varied.

The scheme is car-free and has elements ranging from three to five storeys. It would be predominantly finished in red brick with dark grey cladding to the roof element. The



brief includes 77 dwellings, including 18 per cent family-sized units and 23 per cent affordable housing (with 60 per cent affordable rent units). 525sqm of commercial space in the form of workspace and a retail unit is also included. The scheme is supported by a masterplan which considers potential future development options for all land within the site allocation area.

Officers seek the panel's views on the scale and massing of the proposals on Lordship Lane and Church Lane, the detailed design and materiality, heritage impact, detailed layout, sustainability, and parking.

5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The Quality Review Panel welcomes the opportunity to review the proposals for The Roundway, and thanks the project team for the comprehensive presentation. It is a very difficult site and the panel commends the project team for their work to date. The proposals have clearly evolved over the last month and are beginning to resolve some of the challenges seen in earlier scheme drawings.

The panel thinks that the current proposals represent a good starting point for the development, but there is still a great deal of design work required to address some outstanding problems, particularly in relation to the three-dimensional form, the detailed layout, the architectural expression and the landscape proposals. Further work is also needed to improve the quality of accommodation generally and to ensure that the scheme does not have a negative visual impact on heritage assets locally, either from nearby or within longer views. It would also encourage the project team to inject some elegance and distinctiveness at the prominent corner on Lordship Lane.

Further details on the panel's views are provided below.

Massing and development density

- The panel feels that a proposed scale, with four storeys plus one set-back at roof level on The Roundway and three storeys plus one set-back on Church Lane, is a sensible starting point for analysis and testing of the visual impact of the proposals within the heritage setting. However, until such analysis and testing are undertaken, it is not possible for the panel to definitively assess whether the current scale is acceptable.
- The primary corner of the site at Lordship Lane requires further consideration. The panel would like to see the height reduce to four plus one set-back storey rather than five full storeys, and the building itself visually turn the corner with a less strident and more elegant architectural language.
- The panel notes that the additional structures at roof level – including plant, photovoltaic panels, and balustrades or raised parapets – could result in the

perceived massing being a storey higher than proposed, which is not currently shown within drawings.

- At a detailed level, the three-dimensional modelling and articulation of the proposals should respond more to the elegant and richly detailed forms of the surrounding buildings, rather than adopting the more 'generic' approach shown in the presentation.

Heritage issues

- The site is surrounded by important heritage assets, and a more thorough analysis of the visual impact of the proposals will be needed from a variety of viewpoints, both locally and further afield. As part of this work, the panel would like to see views over the houses from the conservation area. It notes that views showing the visual impact in winter – when the trees have no canopies – will be important.

Commercial uses

- The panel is not yet convinced by the workspace allocations within the proposals, in terms of use and location. Designation of the ground floor as Class E may be the best approach, so that the future use can respond to market conditions.
- The panel agrees that avoiding residential development on the ground floor of The Roundway is sensible.

Scheme layout

- Due to the configuration of the site, there are some difficult challenges in terms of how the development will relate to the existing uses adjacent: the panel notes that there is no guarantee that the remaining plots of land within the urban block will come forward for redevelopment, so the proposals should be able to stand upon their own merits as a separate development. In this regard, the panel is not yet convinced by the southern section of the scheme.
- Regard should be given to the parts of the proposals that are located very close to existing non-residential uses, to ensure that the floorplans and building footprints are adjusted where necessary to achieve a greater separation.
- The panel welcomes the variation in building lines along Church Lane, where the new development steps back to align with the nursery, and steps forward to align with the substation.
- The little courtyard in the centre of the site looks very promising.

- Removing the building entrance at the northern end of the courtyard would enable more generosity in the entrance off Church Lane, which would also reinforce Church Lane as the address of this section of development.
- The panel welcomes the creation of the east-west pedestrian route through the site but would encourage further exploration of the scale of the opening between the buildings, in addition to consideration of how it will connect to local desire lines.
- The panel would encourage further consideration of the planform of the proposals, to improve the liveability and generosity of circulation spaces and the interiors of flats. It highlights that the current proposals include long corridors and rooms, with low light levels. Improving the configuration at a detailed level will have a significant effect on the basic layout of the scheme, so this exercise needs to be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.
- Further consideration should also be given to the entrance lobbies and entrance experience, in terms of how residents and visitors will access secure cycle parking, and where the post-boxes and parcels will be located. The panel notes that the cycle storage is quite peripheral and it feels that this should be better integrated and more convenient to access.
- The work is also required to improve the quality of the accommodation. The proportion of single aspect flats is too high, with a number of them south-facing, so vulnerable to overheating, while others are located very close to relatively 'unfriendly' uses like a petrol filling station or a car wash. More work is needed to adjust the floorplans and detailed configuration, to reduce the number of single aspect units and to optimise the design of the facades to achieve shading and cooling.

Architectural expression

- Given the scheme's location among some significant heritage assets, the architectural expression should be not only be visually 'polite' but should also add something special to the townscape. An approach that seeks to achieve simple but delicately wrought buildings would be supported by the panel.
- The setting is close to several heavily trafficked roads and will likely be a noisy environment. The panel would like to see the design of the elevations respond to – and mitigate – the constraints of noise and air quality.
- The panel is not yet convinced by the overall architectural expression of the proposal and would welcome more analysis to inform the design of the facades, so that they can better reflect the rich detailing and expressiveness of significant local buildings.

- Balcony enclosures should be carefully detailed, to ensure a good balance between openness and screening. Balcony details also provide opportunities for bespoke and distinctive craftsmanship.

Public realm and landscape design

- The panel welcomes many of the ideas within the public realm proposals and thinks that the ramp and the pedestrian route through the centre of the site hold a lot of promise. It would encourage the project team to undertake wider analysis to establish how the route fits in with wider routes, informal crossings and places of safety, bus stops and the loading bay, and to ensure that all of these elements and routes into, through and out of the site are in the correct place.
- The panel notes that the urban greening factor requirement for the site is 0.4, not 0.3 (as proposed), so 30% more greening will be required, which will have a significant impact upon the landscape and floor plans of the development.
- The panel would like to know more about the arrangements for access to and maintenance of the gardens – at grade and at roof level – including how communal access will be controlled, who will maintain the gardens, and what equipment will be required.
- The panel highlights that the microclimate of the gardens at grade and at roof level will impact upon how active and populated they are: if they are windy or shady then people will not want to spend much time there.
- Lift overruns should be shown on the drawings, as these will have an impact on the microclimate at roof level.
- An increase in the amount of greening at roof level would be welcomed.
- The panel questions how secure the ancillary spaces will be, and notes that landscaped frontages and railings might be a sensible addition.

Inclusive and sustainable design

- A low / zero carbon approach to design should inform the earliest strategic design decisions and should be part of the ongoing narrative as the scheme continues to evolve. The panel would like to see a target driven approach to sustainable design adopted.
- Noise from Lordship Lane and the roundabout will have a significant impact on the scheme, and the panel would like to see how the proposals will mitigate traffic noise, especially in the more exposed areas of the development.
- Consideration of operational energy requirements should start with a 'fabric first' approach – optimising the performance and design of the building envelope, components, and materials to achieve sustainable and energy-



efficient design. Making use of renewable energy sources, natural light, cross ventilation, and nature will also form part of this work.

- Recessed balconies are a useful mitigation element, but the panel would encourage the project team to further optimise the glazing, shading and ventilation of all facades. It notes that some of the elevations look the same but will have very different needs in terms of the microclimate.
- The panel notes that the top floor of the development does not look as well-protected from the sun as other floors.
- Careful management of trees over the long term can help to strike a delicate balance between achieving a good level of shading, while allowing adequate daylight penetration into dwellings.
- The panel welcomes the adoption of an all-electric approach to heat generation. However, it notes that the needs of air source heat pumps are very different to gas heating, and this should be anticipated and accommodated within the design of the dwellings at an early stage.
- The panel would like to know more about the design of the roof area, especially in terms of the provision of photovoltaic panels (PVs). It notes that there can be a tension between the use of roofs for amenity and for PVs and careful consideration is required to strike a successful balance.

Next steps

- The panel would welcome a further opportunity to review the proposals at a chair's review. It highlights a number of action points for consideration by the design team, in consultation with Haringey officers.
- It also offers a focused chair's review specifically on the approach to low carbon design and environmental sustainability.

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.

Panel Review 2

CONFIDENTIAL



Haringey Quality Review Panel

Report of Chair's Review Meeting: The Roundway

Wednesday 2 March 2022

The Grange Community Hub, 32 White Hart Lane, N17 8DP

Panel

Peter Studdert (chair)

Tim Pitman

Attendees

Richard Truscott	London Borough of Haringey
Chris Smith	London Borough of Haringey
Oscar Gregersen	London Borough of Haringey
Joe Brennan	Frame Projects
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Cindy Reriti	Frame Projects

Apologies / report copied

Suzanne Kimman	London Borough of Haringey
Rob Krzyszowski	London Borough of Haringey
Robbie McNaugher	London Borough of Haringey
John McRory	London Borough of Haringey
Elizabetta Tonazzi	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.

1. Project name and site address

The Roundway, 313-315 The Roundway, London, N17

2. Presenting team

David Henderson	Glenn Howells Architects
Issy Spence	Glenn Howells Architects
Lee Fitzpatrick	Lindhill
Luke Ttakoushis	Lindhill
Chris Horn	Chris Horn Associates
Jon Lowe	Jon Lowe Heritage Ltd
Holly Mitchell	Simply Planning

3. Aims of the Quality Review Panel meeting

The Quality Review Panel provides impartial and objective advice from a diverse range of experienced practitioners. This report draws together the panel's advice and is not intended to be a minute of the proceedings. It is intended that the panel's advice may assist the development management team in negotiating design improvements where appropriate and in addition may support decision-making by the Planning Committee, in order to secure the highest possible quality of development.

4. Planning authority briefing

The development site is a 0.32 hectare angular plot of land located between Lordship Lane, Church Lane, All Hallows Road and The Roundway. It forms part of Site Allocation SA63, which includes the development site, the petrol station on Roundway, an electricity sub-station on Church Lane and other nearby vehicle garages. The Allocation identifies the site for mixed-use employment-led development, and also requires an east-west cycle connection.

The site is located in close proximity to Bruce Castle and Tower (Grade I Listed) and its adjacent boundary wall (Grade II Listed), the Bruce Castle and Peabody Cottages Conservation Areas, and several locally listed buildings, including the nursery to the north and The Elmhurst public house to the south. It is also within an Archaeological Priority Area. Adjacent to the site are two Historic Parks, Metropolitan Open Land, a Grade II SINC, a Local View Corridor (no. 19 unfolding view of Alexandra Palace from Bruce Castle) and a Critical Drainage Area. The character of the surrounding area is unique and varied.

The scheme is car-free and has elements ranging from three to five storeys. The brief includes 76 dwellings, including 12 per cent family-sized units and 23 per cent affordable housing. 600sqm of commercial space in the form of workspace and a retail unit is also included. The applicant has produced a masterplan which considers potential future development options for all land within the site allocation area. Officers seek the panel's comments on the detailed design and materiality and heritage impact of the proposals. Comments are also sought the location of blue badge car parking.



5. Quality Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel finds much to admire in the proposed design and offers some comments where it feels there is scope for refinement at a detailed level. It supports the scale and massing, the brick materiality, and welcomes the careful thought that has been given to landscape design. It feels that the architectural expression sits comfortably in the surrounding townscape, but would encourage a more confident approach to the southwest corner. It also suggests exploring semi-recessed balconies on the elevation facing Bruce Castle, and feels that entrances to Block D would be better located on Church Lane. The panel is confident that the design team will be able to address these minor comments, in consultation with planning officers.

Plan and layout of units in Block D

- The panel welcomes the improved layout of the units in Block D. Moving the living spaces to the east, facing onto Church Lane, will provide residents with views of the street and to Bruce Castle and the park beyond.
- While the panel appreciates the design team's consideration of the long-term masterplan there is no guarantee that the Shell Petrol Station site will be redeveloped.
- It feels that Block D would benefit from moving the entrances to the east, to activate Church Lane and improve the legibility of the homes for postal and other deliveries.

Architectural expression and materiality

- The panel supports the scale of the proposals and welcomes the visually 'polite' architecture which sits comfortably within the wider context of surrounding conservation areas.
- It welcomes the design development of the east façade facing Bruce Castle, but encourages further thought about integrating the balconies into the architecture.
- Semi-recessed balconies could respond more appropriately to the Grade I listed Bruce Castle, and would also partially screen any residents' belongings, which are often stored on balconies.
- The panel supports further development of the proposed metal railings. The inclusion of bespoke and distinctively crafted elements will add welcome visual interest and elegance to the scheme.
- It welcomes the presentation of the design options considered for the prominent southwest corner of the scheme, facing onto Lordship Lane, and supports the design team's decision to integrate the balconies with the brickwork.

- The panel noted the opportunity to enhance the architecture through the materials and detailing of the balcony soffits, particularly those on the Lordship Lane corner.
- This corner would benefit from a more confident expression, and the panel would encourage exploration of different materials, more detailed brickwork, and/or the addition of an element of decoration.
- The developing architecture and materiality have the potential to work well, with the specification of high-quality materials and carefully considered detail design.
- As part of this process, careful thought should be given to the location of the rooftop photovoltaic panels and their ongoing maintenance. The aim should be to avoid visibility of the panels and/or any safety railings required to meet Health and Safety regulations.

Landscape design and parking

- The panel applauds the retention of mature trees on The Roundway, with enhanced planting, and similar attention to the landscape setting of the scheme on Church Lane.
- Because of this, it strongly supports the proposed location of the blue badge car parking on Church Lane. This allows space for trees and planting which will both enhance the streetscape, and quality of life for residents.

Ground floor use

- The panel agrees with the decision to provide non-residential uses at ground floor level facing The Roundway.
- This is currently shown as workspace / retail on the plans. However, retail may not be successful given the low pedestrian footfall and the lack of car parking in the area.
- A restaurant or cafe may be more viable than retail, and could also enliven the corner facing Lordship Lane.

Tenure

- The panel recommends that Block D is allocated to private sale units, to ensure that all potential occupants have a choice as to whether they live adjacent to the Shell Petrol Station car wash.

Next steps

- The panel offers its support to the proposals, subject to the minor comments above, which it is confident the applicant team can address in consultation with Haringey planning officers.

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.

Appendix 6 – Development Management Forum minutes

Summary of Discussion Topics

STAKEHOLDER	TOPICS OF DISCUSSION
Joseph Nicholas	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Height and massing;• Impact on nearby heritage assets;• Tree planting and screening of development.
Cllr Gideon Bull	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design quality;• Construction management;• Contribution to the 'up and coming' character of the area;• Impact on neighbouring homes and nursery.
Martin Ball	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Impact on nearby heritage assets.
Klaus Kuerner	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Construction management;• Impact on Bruce Castle Park footpath access;• Financial contributions to offsite children's play area.
Local residents/other	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Affordable homes;• Construction management;• Parking;• Impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

Appendix 7 – Pre-Application Committee minutes

Minutes:

The Committee considered the pre-application briefing for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of a three to five storey building with new retail and workspace at ground floor and 76 dwellings plus new landscaping, car and cycle parking.

Christopher Smith, Planning Officer, highlighted that there had been an error in the report and it was clarified that the scheme was not an entirely rented development and would be available for sale with a proportion of the affordable housing being made available to rent.

The applicant team and officers responded to questions from the Committee:

- It was noted that the Quality Review Panel (QRP) had expressed some concerns about long corridors and rooms with low light levels. The applicant team explained that the internal layout and sequencing was still being developed and was being considered alongside environmental testing for noise, air quality, and ventilation. It was added that the longer corridors had light and ventilation and it was not considered that the corridors were excessively long.
- The Committee noted that the QRP had considered that there were too many single aspect flats and it was enquired whether the applicant would be making any adjustments. The applicant team noted that this element of the scheme had been improved and it was now proposed to have 74% of units with dual aspect. Where a unit was single aspect, it tended to be south facing with good access to light.
- It was noted that there was a busy junction between the railway and Lordship Lane located near the site and it was enquired how traffic and other noise could be mitigated. The applicant team explained that air quality and noise had been tested and there was confidence that they could provide a high level of residential amenity. It was added that there would be different approaches to the balconies on each side of the proposal to mitigate issues.
- The QRP had commented that the top floor of the proposals did not look as well protected from the sun. The applicant team noted that there had been some amendments to the design following QRP comments and that the corner of the proposal would now be set back, wrapped around, and more interesting.
- In response to questions about the layout of the buildings and the site, the applicant team stated that the site was complicated and that, with advice, they had tried to bring forward a coherent scheme. It was noted that some previous attempts to develop the site had been unsuccessful as there had been insufficient land but that additional land had now been secured. It was explained that the proposals would have a route through the site and views to Bruce Castle. The applicant team noted that buildings would be set back in order to minimise the impact on Bruce Castle. There would be playspace, a garden, and areas where residents could have allotments. There would also be greening of the frontage and all roofs would have water storage. The applicant team also noted that it had been highlighted from the outset of the project that it would likely not be possible to meet affordable housing targets on the site due to the heritage setting. It was explained that this was a modest scheme and that, although costs could be reduced to provide additional affordable housing, the applicant did not want to compromise on the quality of the scheme.

- In relation to noise issues, it was noted that there was a small area of private amenity for the family sized units in Block D. It was explained that this space would provide a buffer between the units and the adjoining garage and car wash area. It was envisioned that the garage may be used less over time, as more sustainable modes of transport were developed, and that there could be scope to include the area within the site. It was added that the scheme had been re-orientated so that it faced towards Bruce Castle.
- It was noted that there had been some discussions about removing the gate to the site. It was explained that this would provide some additional amenity and would allow free movement across the site but that some safety concerns, particularly concerns about overnight access, were being considered.
- It was clarified that the applicant had designed the scheme so that the business operations of the petrol station were not impeded but so that it would be possible for the site to be further developed if the opportunity arose. The applicant team also noted that the substation adjacent to the site was considered to have some architectural merit but that it would be beneficial to improve the boundary treatment; the applicant would be willing to contribute to this.
- In relation to schools, the applicant team stated that there had been and would be child yield assessments but there was no indication that the development would have a significant impact on the capacity of local schools. It was added that the applicant would pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) contributions.
- In response to queries about the availability and accessibility of cycle storage, the applicant team explained that they were trying to encourage the use of bicycles. They were considering the practicalities of cycle storage, including the access routes for cycle storage, the availability of two smaller stores rather than one large store, and the availability of single stacking for those who could not reach taller storage options. It was confirmed that the proposal was due to have 140 cycle spaces for the 76 flats.
- The Committee commented that the overhanging balconies could create a dark passageway and it was enquired how this would be made safe by design. The applicant team stated that the passageway was quite short and that, due to the orientation, the area would receive a lot of light during the day and would be well lit at night. It was added that the QRP felt that the scale of the proposal was impressive.
- The Committee asked how Church Lane would reflect the heritage of Bruce Castle Park. The applicant team explained that they had originally wanted to use brick to reflect Bruce Castle but that they felt it was important not to have a pastiche or detract from Bruce Castle itself. Instead, the applicant was seeking to reflect Bruce Castle more subtly through dark brick and red lintels, windows, cornices, and the progressively set back pavilions.

The Chair thanked the applicant team for attending.