



Unit 1, Tilers Road
Milton Keynes, Buckinghamshire
MK11 3LH, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)1908 776970
Fax: +44 (0)1582 470259
E-mail: solutions@rwdi.com

MEMORANDUM

DATE:	2018-10-03	RWDI REFERENCE #: 1801555
TO:	Calum Cockerill	EMAIL: calum.cockerill@quod.com
FROM:	Daniel Hackett	Email: daniel.hackett@rwdi.com
RE:	Wind Microclimate Peer Review Response Tottenham Hale Masterplan London, UK	

Dear Calum,

Please find below our responses to the peer review carried out by Urban Microclimate for the wind microclimate assessment of the Tottenham Hale Masterplan development.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Hackett
Senior Engineer | Associate
RWDI



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
Legislation, Planning Policy and Guidance	<i>No actionable comments</i>	N/A
Assessment Methodology	[comments regarding in-construction effects] (Page 2)	As outlined within section 13.3 of ES Chapter 13: Wind (July 2018), potential construction effects were considered during the scoping process. It was concluded that they would not be significant (the completed Development being the expected worst-case scenario). As a result, construction effects were scoped out of assessment within the ES as agreed with the LBH via the Scoping Opinion.
	[regarding "designed-in" mitigation] It would have been more appropriate to include these features in the assessment [of Configurations 2 and 3] (Page 2-3)	<p>The ES presents the findings of the EIA process undertaken for the Development as described within ES Chapter 5: Description of Development. No open passage is included in the design of Building 1 that has been submitted for approval and this area is enclosed. Therefore, Config 2 and 3 do not omit this design feature.</p> <p>All additional mitigation measures outlined within the assessment form part of the design as submitted for approval, and it is therefore appropriate that these measures are included in Configurations 4 to 6 to demonstrate their effectiveness compared to the un-mitigated scenario (i.e. Config 2 and 3).</p>
	Discrepancies between model photos included in Appendix 13.2 and the assessment configurations as described. (Page 3)	Noted. Incorrect photos were included in the Appendix 13.2: 180718 RWDI Project 1801555 Tottenham Hale Centre. This is not material to the assessment or its findings, and an updated technical report has been provided to the LBH as part of the ES Addendum (October 2018) which includes the correct photos.



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
	<p>Clarify the configurations assessed [with regard to inclusion of One Station Road] (Page 3)</p>	<p>Only Configurations 3, 5 and 6 included One Station Road. Configurations 1, 2 and 4 did not. See paragraph 13.3.13 of ES Chapter 13: Wind (July 2018) for configurations that were assessed within the wind tunnel.</p>
	<p>Extending suitable conditions for recreational uses from summer into spring and autumn would be considered beneficial, though this would generally represent an enhancement rather than a mitigation requirement. (Page 3)</p>	<p>Noted. For the sake of not overly complicating the assessment, only material that is essential to the assessment has been included. However, the wind tunnel assessment has shown that many of the amenity spaces would indeed have appropriate conditions during the spring and autumn (in addition to summer).</p>
	<p>[comments regarding the classification of "beneficial" effects] (Page 3)</p>	<p>RWDI's view on how "beneficial" significance should be applied to the results for an EIA Assessment is different from the reviewer's, and we do not consider this to be a deficiency in the assessment. The assessment is concerned primarily with "adverse" effects and their necessary mitigation. Whether an effect is "negligible" or "beneficial" is not material to the assessment, as neither of these effects would require mitigation. We stand by our methodology that stipulates that conditions that are better than the minimum threshold for suitability (by one category or more) are a benefit to the users of the area, and that it is therefore appropriate to classify them as "beneficial" effects.</p>
	<p>It is recommended that a significance be applied to the effects [in relation to strong winds/safety] (Page 3)</p>	<p>This is not a deficiency, but again a difference in opinion between wind practitioners in respect of applying significance to strong winds. Material to the assessment is that strong winds are clearly identified and mitigated, which has been done.</p>



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
	<p>It is recommended that the applicant clarify the full extent of amendments applied subsequent to the tests (Page 4)</p>	<p>Following submission of the planning application, extensive consultation has been undertaken with LBH which has resulted in amendments to the scheme. These amendments focus primarily on internal reconfigurations of residential units and commercial areas, and residential tenure mix and building entrance locations on the Welbourne, North Island and Ferry Island plots. An ES Addendum (October 2018) has been prepared and submitted to LBH which details the full extent of amendments to the scheme and how they affect the assessment of wind microclimate.</p>
<p>Baseline conditions</p>	<p>Clarify the suitability of existing conditions for existing activities (Page 4)</p>	<p>Existing suitability is not relevant to the assessment (in which suitability in the proposed scenario is the primary concern). Nevertheless, with regard to the specific areas highlighted by the reviewer:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Volunteer Pub spill-out area: mix of sitting and standing conditions during summer in the baseline (slightly windier than required); 2) Down Lane Park play areas: standing/strolling during the windiest season, sitting/standing during summer (suitable for a play area); 3) Entrances on Chestnut Rd, Fairbanks Rd, The Hale, Ferry Land and the Station: sitting/standing during the windiest season (suitable); 4) Private gardens (noting that these would be sheltered by boundary fences): sitting during summer (suitable); 5) Bus Stop on Monument Way: standing during windiest season (suitable); and, 6) Public space on the Hale: standing during windiest season, sitting during summer (suitable).



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
<p>Completed Development</p>	<p>[comments regarding the classification of "beneficial" effects] (Page 4)</p>	<p>RWDI's view on how "beneficial" significance should be applied to the results for an EIA Assessment is different from the reviewer's, and we do not consider this to be a deficiency in the assessment. The assessment is concerned primarily with "adverse" effects and their necessary mitigation. Whether an effect is "negligible" or "beneficial" is not material to the assessment, as neither of these effects would require mitigation.</p>
	<p>[Welbourne Site; podium-top courtyard] Clarify the intended uses and resulting suitability of conditions within the courtyard (Page 4)</p>	<p>The courtyard will have mixed amenity use suitability during the winter season. During the summer season wind conditions are suitable for sitting use across the whole of the courtyard, besides location 205, which has strolling use conditions as outlined within Section 6 of the updated Pedestrian Level Wind Assessment (October 2018) submitted within the ES Addendum. The Applicant has confirmed that seating areas will be located specifically within the calmer areas of the courtyard, with no sitting at location 205. Conditions will be suitable for the intended usage.</p>
	<p>[Ashley Road East; College Square and Watermead] Clarify the intended uses of these spaces and resulting suitability of conditions (Page 5)</p>	<p>College Square is intended for outdoor seating (e.g. outdoor terrace space for a restaurant), as well as a congregational space for the college. The conditions in this area are predominantly suitable for sitting in the mitigated scenario, which would be suitable for the intended use. Watermead Place is intended more as a transitive/thoroughfare area. Conditions would be suitable for strolling during the windiest season and standing during the summer, which would be suitable for the intended use.</p>



	<p>[Island Sites: comments regarding enclosed passage through building 1] (Page 5)</p>	<p>The ES presents the findings of the EIA process undertaken for the Development as described within ES Chapter 5: Description of Development. No open passage is included in the design of Building 1 that has been submitted for approval and this area is enclosed. Should planning permission be granted, the design of the Development as submitted would be constructed. It is also noted that the design could only be changed if an amendment to the planning application was submitted to LBH and approved. Should this occur, the necessary supporting documentation would need to support the application to confirm that there are no issues with the new design.</p>
--	--	--



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
	<p>[Island Sites: regarding strong winds at the corner of Building 3] (Page 5)</p>	<p>RWDI and the reviewer have different views on how strong winds should be classified in terms of their significance. None the less, the strong winds at this location have been clearly identified in the ES together with measures proposed to mitigate them in both the completed Development and Cumulative assessments (see section 13.6 and 13.7 of ES Chapter 13: Wind).</p>
	<p>[Island Sites: Pavilion building on Ferry Square] Clarify the intended uses and resulting suitability of conditions (Page 5)</p>	<p>A flexible retail/office use has been applied for the Pavilion building. It is anticipated that some external seating would be included for these flexible uses, which would only be known once tenants are confirmed. However, it is noted that the area is suitable for amenity and outdoor seating use which would be suitable for the uses proposed by the planning application for the Pavilion building.</p>
	<p>[Building 1] Clarify the suitability of conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances (Page 5-6)</p>	<p>Conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances within Building 1 is provided within the ES Addendum (October 2018) which has been prepared and submitted to LBH. The ES Addendum details the full extent of amendments to the scheme and how they affect the assessment of wind microclimate.</p>



	<p>[Building 1, L07 terrace] Clarify the intended uses and resulting suitability of conditions on the L07 terrace (Page 5-6)</p>	<p>The L07 terrace will be used as a play space. Standing conditions identified in both the mitigated completed Development and Cumulative assessments (see section 13.6 and 13.7 of ES Chapter 13: Wind) are suitable for the intended use as a playspace.</p>
	<p>[Building 1, balconies: confirm that side screens have been implemented as specified in the wind mitigation] (Page 5-6)</p>	<p>See page 56 of the Tottenham Hale Centre Design and Access Statement (DAS) Addendum (October 2018) for confirmation that full height screens have been added to balconies.</p>



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
	<p>[Building 2] Clarify the suitability of conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances (Page 6)</p>	<p>Conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances within Building 2 is provided within the ES Addendum (October 2018) which has been prepared and submitted to LBH. The ES Addendum details the full extent of amendments to the scheme and how they affect the assessment of wind microclimate.</p>
	<p>[Building 2, L07 terrace] standing conditions may cover too much of the space to make appropriate layout of seating areas viable (Page 6)</p>	<p>In the mitigated scenarios (configurations 4 to 6) only one location out of four on this terrace has standing conditions during the summer season (see paragraph 13.6.108 of ES Chapter 13: Wind). The other locations have sitting conditions. There would be sufficient space within this area for seating areas to have suitable conditions.</p>
	<p>[Building 3] Clarify the suitability of conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances (Page 6)</p>	<p>Conditions for pedestrian ingress/egress at proposed entrances within Building 3 is provided within the ES Addendum (October 2018) which has been prepared and submitted to LBH. The ES Addendum details the full extent of amendments to the scheme and how they affect the assessment of wind microclimate.</p>
	<p>[Surrounding Area; regarding strong winds at the corner of the Hale and Hale Rd] (Page 7)</p>	<p>RWDI and the reviewer have different views on how strong winds should be classified in terms of their significance. None the less, the strong winds at this location have been clearly identified in the ES together with measures proposed to mitigate them in both the completed Development and Cumulative assessments (see section 13.6 and 13.7 of ES Chapter 13: Wind).</p>



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
	<p>[Surrounding Area; regarding sensitive receptors not discussed directly in the chapter] It is recommended that the likely effects are confirmed by the applicant (Page 7)</p>	<p>Sensitive receptors in the surrounding areas are not made materially worse (i.e. such that they would become unsuitable for their intended use) unless specified in the ES. The effect on these receptors as a result of the Proposed Development can therefore be considered negligible.</p>
<p>Mitigation and Residual Effects</p>	<p>Full height solid side-screens on Building 1's corner balconies are not entirely clear in the DAS (Page 7)</p>	<p>See page 56 of the Tottenham Hale Centre DAS Addendum (October 2018) for confirmation that full height screens have been added to the balconies.</p>
	<p>In addition, we are not clear on the rationale for using enlarged L01 balconies on Building 3 to protect ground level spaces (Page 7-8)</p>	<p>The enlarged balconies at L01 do provide some additional shelter to ground level (in combination with the other mitigation measures in this area). As these balconies are partially sheltered by the balconies above, we anticipate that there would be sufficient area within each balcony with suitable conditions for their intended use (similar to the smaller balconies higher up on the building). Consequently, both ground and balcony spaces are anticipated to be suitable for their intended uses.</p>
	<p>It is understood that the landscaping plan is illustrative only and is not submitted for approval (Page 8)</p>	<p>This is not the case. The landscaping plan has been submitted for approval as part of the design.</p>
	<p>[regarding residential entrance on Hale Rd] It seems likely that this may be just due to very marginal conditions within the accepted repeatability of the assessment methodology, but it is recommended that this is clarified by the applicant. (Page 8)</p>	<p>Conditions were indeed marginal. We would also note that due to the direction of prevailing winds, the conditions on Hale Road are affected (positively) by the same mitigation measures that improve the conditions at the corner of The Hale and Hale Rd.</p>



Section	Peer Reviewer Comments	RWDI Response
<p>Cumulative effects</p>	<p>[regarding consented changes to the bus station] the applicant should confirm that the assessment takes account of the changes (Page 8)</p>	<p>Our understanding is that the proposed design of the bus station will continue to have bus shelters, albeit in a different arrangement from the current layout. The wind tunnel model did not include these shelters (worst case assessment); however, they would be expected to provide additional shelter against the wind for pedestrians waiting at the bus station. This would be the case in both the existing and consented configurations.</p>
	<p>[regarding future surrounding developments] potential effects on sensitive uses within these developments should be clarified by the applicant (Page 9)</p>	<p>Sensitive receptors in the surrounding areas are not made materially worse (i.e. such that they would become unsuitable for their intended use) unless specified in the ES. The effect on these receptors as a result of the Proposed Development can therefore be considered negligible.</p>
<p>Review Conclusion</p>	<p>[Regarding landscaping plan] on the understanding the landscaping is illustrative only, and does not form part of the proposal submitted for approval... (Page 9)</p>	<p>This is a detailed planning application. The landscaping plan (which includes wind mitigation measures) has been submitted in detail for approval as part of the application. See the Tottenham Hale Centre DAS (July 2018), DAS Addendum (October 2018) and ES Addendum (October 2018) for full further details.</p>