

## **Appendix 6**

Fenwick consultation response letter and Document 1



# GERALDEVE

P Alsop Esq  
Strategic Planning and Regeneration  
London Borough of Barnet  
Barnet House  
1255 High Road  
Whetstone  
London N20 0EJ

72 Welbeck Street London W1G 0AY  
Tel. 020 7493 3338  
[www.geraldeve.com](http://www.geraldeve.com)

15 September 2017

**Our ref: HJWB/ALK/J7073**

**Your ref: F04687/13**

Dear Sir

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (As Amended)  
Reserved Matters Application Ref No.17/2963/RMA for Phase 1B (North) of the  
Brent Cross Cricklewood Regeneration**

We write on behalf of our client, Fenwick. We have carefully read the letter submitted by Quod, dated 21 August 2017.

Our response to the schedule numbered Document 1, which was enclosed with the Quod letter, is noted below.

The response by Quod was disappointing for the following reasons:-

**Pre-Application Consultation**

Whilst there has been some engagement with Fenwick, the simple point remains that design issues of key importance to Fenwick, as a major anchor to the Centre, have simply not been assimilated and addressed in the submission of the Reserved Matters Application. It is clearly in the public interest that Fenwick, as a principal anchor, should be as effectively integrated into the Centre, in accordance with policy, and that its design should be optimised. This reflects the proper planning of the area, which is the basis on which the Compulsory Purchase Order was promoted.

**Design**

The response to the schedule ( Document 1) will follow next week. The design teams will be starting to engage and consult on design issues raised in Document 1.

**Pedestrian Flow**

This matter was canvassed in detail at the Public Inquiry into the Compulsory Purchase Order. Once again, the fundamental point is to achieve an optimised, acceptable, design for the long term, not a compromised design for the short term.

## **Public Transport**

The discussions which Fenwick's advisory team have had with TfL indicate clearly that TfL has no objection to the improved layout and circulation which could be provided as recommended by Fenwick.

Once again, it seems wholly irrational to promote a less than optimum outcome. The developers of the shopping centre wish to secure the long-term success of the Centre.

Given that we understand that TfL is content in principle with the Fenwick proposal, which is demonstrably to be preferred, this would surely represent a better outcome of public policy.

## **Other Material Considerations**

The scheduled works are indeed relevant to the determination of the application because, again, they represent the most appropriate design as the basis on which public policy has been put into practice.

## **Summary**

In conclusion, the proposals as a whole and as they affect Fenwick, do not optimise efficient pedestrian movement into and around the Centre nor do they provide the world class bus station as part of the intended transport modal shift that is asserted.

As the premium fashion anchor store for Brent Cross, the design of the Fenwick elevation must reflect the intended 'Luxury Quarter' of the Centre. The exterior design in terms of appearance and finishes must demonstrate the sophistication of Fenwick and a prerequisite of the detailed design.

Yours faithfully

*Gerald Eve LLP*

## **Gerald Eve LLP**

hbullock@geraldeve.com  
Direct tel. +44 (0)20 7333 6302  
Mobile +44 (0)7831 172974

## Fenwick BRENT CROSS

Response to Quod Letter on 21<sup>st</sup> August 2017

20<sup>th</sup> September 2017

Leonard Design Architects' Comments	DP Response	14.09.2017 Meeting Response
<b>F01- COLUMNS</b>  Submitted plans show single column along the Western facade, but perspective (RMA report p437) shows double columns, obstructing views from mall into the store.	For the purposes of the RMA, the external cladding has been submitted for approval. The Fenwick cladding to the malls is indicative only. The internal Fenwick arrangements are shown as existing until they can be resolved with Fenwick. However, revised drawings are being submitted which will accurately identify the columns.	Details of the columns and existing Fenwick interior are subject to further surveys.  Hammerson understood the additional width from the "double" column, and the need to tie together as close as possible so as to minimize the combined column width.
<b>F02 - FIRE ESCAPE</b>  Door should be provided for escape route on lower ground floor to the car park from the escape stair core on the Eastern side.	A revised drawing is being submitted which will reintroduce the existing fire escape.	Noted, awaiting revised drawing.
<b>F03 - ESCAPE CORE</b>  Remove escape core on western side to improve views into the store. JGA - fire consultant, has commented that the escape strategy can accommodate this in principle. As discussed on 14.07.2016.	For the purposes of the RMA, the external cladding has been submitted for approval. The Fenwick cladding to the malls is indicative only. The internal Fenwick arrangements are shown as existing until they can be resolved with Fenwick.  To understand the implications of removing the stair a dialogue with Fenwick, JGA the fire consultant needs to take place. The consequences may include other adverse impacts on Fenwick's store or the wider shopping centre. The Fenwick facades facing into the mall are indicative only and therefore should it prove possible for Fenwick to remove the stair the necessary changes can be made to the mall facade without the need for planning permission.	Noted. Look forward to on going discussions .
<b>F04 - BULKHEAD</b>  Fenwick bulkhead in the void of the new Southwest entrance to be featured on the soffit of the floor above. Lower ground floor drawing does not indicate a soffit feature above. Fenwick concerns the	For the purposes of the RMA, the external cladding has been submitted for approval. The Fenwick cladding to the malls is indicative only. The internal Fenwick arrangements are shown as existing until they can be resolved with Fenwick. Further work on mall void bulkheads will be undertaken.	As the bulkhead design is an important part of the Fenwick's new southwest entrance. Fenwick design team to liaise with development design team to resolve the design of the bulkhead, signage, mall width and mall void bulkhead work.

<p><b>F04 - BULKHEAD (con't)</b></p> <p>diminished bulkhead from Workshop 5 shape will have an impact on achieving the 3D effect as shown on RMA Report p.437.</p> <p>Fenwick preference for design of bulkhead soffit to be angled to enhance the entrance presence and experience, as discussed in Design Workshop 5. However, CGI visual in RMA Report p.437 does not show the angled bulkhead.</p>		
<p><b>F05 - SOUTHWEST CORNER ENTRANCE &amp; DOORS</b></p> <p>Entrance door locations are not shown in the drawings. First Level Plan does not show connection from escalator into Fenwick store.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the RMA, the external cladding has been submitted for approval. The Fenwick cladding to the malls is indicative only. The internal Fenwick arrangements are shown as existing until they can be resolved with Fenwick.</p> <p>However, revised drawings will be submitted identifying the indicative locations of the entrance doors along the mall.</p>	<p>Entrances doors to the SW corner of Fenwick will be provided. We understand that the plans are indicative and only show existing arrangements but will be revised to identify door locations. Details of shutter line, column positions and CAD update are subject to further survey.</p>
<p><b>F06 - DIRECT ENTRANCE ROUTE</b></p> <p>F6.1. Shape of the void has changed. It is too large by the bullnose and does not allow straight line access route or visibility into Fenwick Southwest entrance.</p>	<p>The void footprint as submitted for approval responds to Fenwick's aspirations for bulkhead advertising.</p>	<p>Refer to note F04.</p>
<p><b>F6.2.</b> First Floor plan shows slab stops short in front of Fenwick, severing access to North side of Fenwick Southwest entrance corner.</p>	<p>Revised drawing are being prepared that identify that this slab does not stop short.</p>	<p>Noted, awaiting revised drawing.</p>
<p><b>F07 - SOUTHWEST ENTRANCE WIDTH</b></p> <p>Submitted scheme currently provides only 5m wide walkway leading to Fenwick entrance on Upper Ground and First Floor levels. Fenwick preference for the walkway to be enlarged to 7m by reducing the void space in the East, as discussed in Design Workshop 5.</p>	<p>The width proposed, which is being widened slightly to 6.25m, is sufficient for pedestrian movement and it should be noted that there are two entrances to the store on that corner.</p>	<p>Agreed that widening walkway width from 5m to 6.25 is an improvement. Awaiting revised drawing.</p>

<p><b>F08 - EXISTING RISER</b></p> <p>Existing riser on Upper Ground Level serving the store. Its location will obstruct future door connection to the car park. Suggest moving door Northwards.</p>	<p>For the purposes of the RMA, the external cladding has been submitted for approval. The Fenwick cladding to the malls is indicative only. The internal Fenwick arrangements are shown as existing until they can be resolved with Fenwick.</p> <p>The riser position in this location requires surveying and the door is intended to abut the riser.</p>	<p>Noted, that riser location needs to be surveyed and door location needs to be repositioned to avoid riser as well as creating a strong entrance experience from car park</p>
<p><b>F09 - WALKWAY COLUMNS</b></p> <p>Discrepancy of 3 columns on CGI view (RMA Report p.436) and 2 columns shown on plan. Fenwick preference for 2 columns and one to be within the glazed entrance wall.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there is a discrepancy which is being amended on the revised drawings for structural reasons.</p>	<p>Noted, awaiting revised drawing.</p> <p>Fenwick 's preference to reduce the number and size of columns where possible</p>
<p><b>F10 - EXTERNAL ACCESS</b></p> <p>Lower Ground Floor plan does not show opening and access on external facade.</p> <p>Existing restaurant on Lower Ground Level will be relocated to Southeast corner to take advantage of external views to Fenwick Place</p> <p>Preference to create external access into Fenwick Place.</p> <p>08069-CTA-FN-LG0-DR-A-20601-P4</p> <p><b>LOWER GROUND FLOOR</b></p> <p>In line with RMA Report P462, the entrance + new openable door will "provide an attractive threshold space to the Eastern pedestrian entrance" -RMA Report p.462, for alfresco dining to animate and create vibrancy to the facade.</p>	<p>The RMA submission does not show a restaurant opening out as this is not the current intention.</p> <p>This restaurant element is not part of the RMA submission however there is seating outside of Fenwick within Fenwick Place which provides additional activation for this area.</p> <p>Should Fenwick wish to provide a restaurant in this location they can submit a planning application for such a proposal.</p>	<p>Fenwick's preference is for the F&amp;B opening to the Lower Ground façade to the East, be included into this planning submission.</p> <p>Fenwick to submit internal plans to RMA design team to indicate where the opening should happen.</p>
<p><b>F11 - VOID SPACE</b></p> <p>Protect future kitchen area in the void space, to serve the relocated restaurant with openings in existing facade. Void space may need external escape door subject to fire strategy - Design Workshop 4 29.11.2016.</p>	<p>Please see response to F10.</p>	<p>Fenwick's preference is for the escape doors for kitchen/utilities to the Lower Ground façade on the south, be included into this planning submission.</p> <p>Fenwick to submit internal plans to RMA design team to indicate where the opening should happen.</p>



<p><b>F12 - RAINSCREEN FACADE</b></p> <p>Current design shows a single pane glass system (RMA Report p.456-458). How is the thermal insulation resolved in the design proposal? Fenwick preference for the SE corner void space to be used as Kitchen / Utilities and space for restaurant, as discussed in Design Workshop 5, with external insulation line provided approx 200mm behind glass facade.</p>	<p>The RMA submission does not show a restaurant opening out as this is does not for part of the RMA scheme. The void in the RMA submission is faced externally with a single pane rain screen.</p> <p>The building regulations approved inspector working on the project has confirmed that as a 'cold' rain-screen over-cladding system the new facade treatment does not impact on the thermal status of the current Fenwick facade and as such no new insulation is required.</p>	<p>Refer to Note F10</p>
<p><b>F13 - FACADE DESIGN</b></p> <p>Hammerson scheme shows single skin 90-100% frit (RMA Report p.456-458) which will create a solid, opaque layer. Fenwick has concerns as the facade design does not show depth and transparency, instead, a solid highly fritted single layer. Preference for facade to be more transparent in the first layer of glass to show depth of second facade behind, as per images on RMA Report p.442,443 (image shows double skin facade).</p>	<p>The RMA proposals or the Fenwick facade is for a single-glazed solution. As such there is only a limited scope for generating depth within the facade glazing. Fenwick's own suggestions - see F11 - are contradictory as they would prevent the effects they profess to prefer as the available depth would be taken out by the kitchen area necessary for any cafe. The net result would either be a much weakened design or one that was varied across the overall facade</p>	<p>Fenwick strongly believe that the façade design is critical to the Luxury brand, hence the importance of being unique. It is agreed that the façade needs to be sophisticated.to create a special jewel like design. To achieve this a glass skin with a void is important to create depth.</p> <p>Both Fenwick and Hammerson design team to workshop further to develop an agreeable solution system.</p>
<p><b>F14 - FACADE 'MOIRE EFFECT'</b></p> <p>As discussed in Design Workshop 3 (08.11.2016), Fenwick preference for a clear glass on the first layer with approx 25% solid frit and with pattern on second layer to create depth in the elevation. The architectural design intent is to create the "Moire Effect" and to add lighting within the depth. Fenwick concerns the solid fritting pattern cannot create the effect. Moire Effect below as tabled in Design Workshop 3 08.11.2016.</p>	<p>The RMA proposal does not have a second layer of glass and we consider that the proposal design is of the highest quality and provides for the best integration of Fenwick into scheme.</p>	<p>The façade design for Fenwick is critical for the brand and needs to be sophisticated to reflex the luxury brand. Fenwick's preference is for a 'Moire Effect' façade with a void behind the glass skin to create depth and point of difference with strong lighting design.</p> <p>Solutions has been suggested. Both design team to work together to create a façade design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p> <p>Design of the Fenwick façade will need to work coherent with the car park façade design. Details of the car park lighting scheme will need to be agreed and needs to work with Fenwick's façade lighting design.</p>

<p><b>F15 - REDUCED VISUAL IMPACT &amp; FACADE PARAPET HEIGHT</b></p> <p>Concerned about reduced Fenwick frontage from A41 due to Car Park &amp; Former Hotel. Preference for increased parapet height will improve presence and also allow for safe maintenance access to flat roof behind.</p>	<p>The top of the external walkway is higher than the existing parapet. The buildings around Fenwick are in accordance with parameters and principles of the 2014 Permission.</p>	<p>Fenwick 's preference is for increase visual impact from A41.</p> <p>Solutions has been suggested. Both design team to work together to create a façade design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>
<p><b>F16 - BUILDING FACADE</b></p> <p>New scheme against current scheme: Existing store is a building of high architectural merit. Our existing store will be reduced in visual impact due to reduced expose elevation and a new proposed facade of inferior architectural merit.</p>	<p>The buildings around Fenwick are in accordance with parameters and principles of the 2014 Permission. The design and materials proposed for the external elevation and its striking architectural treatment have been chosen so as to ensure that Fenwick continues to be a key focus within this location.</p>	<p>Refer to Note F14.</p>
<p><b>F17 - FENWICK CIRCUS ROOF</b></p> <p>Parameter Plan 003 identified High Street North as a main 24hr street connecting Fenwick place and new Main Square, Fenwick Circus as part of Fenwick place experience is seen as a key part of the overall improvements and attractive threshold gateway space.</p> <p>Submitted roof plan and section below shows the glazed area above Fenwick Circus atrium to be over 30% lower than most of High Street North. The roof drops down in 2 steps towards Fenwick entrance and the amount of glazing is insufficient to cover the atrium space. Fenwick preference for the atrium roof is to at least match the same height as high street North as well as Brent Cross Main Square or John Lewis atrium.</p> <p>There is a concern that Fenwick Place/ Circus is the weakest in terms of width, height and activity compared with M&amp;S and John Lewis entrances/ threshold.</p>	<p>The level at which the roof glazing is set relates to the internal Fenwick elevation in that it provides enough height above the signage bulkhead to give the store prominence in the space without dwarfing the scale of the store nor necessitating the need for a large supporting wall just behind the facade.</p> <p>The roof profile in this location has been reconsidered and is to be identified on revised plans. The level of glazing in this location and its height are considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The design of Fenwick Place and the buildings that frame it has been designed in accordance with the parameters and principles of the 2014 Permission.</p>	<p>Following presentation (dated 01/09/2017) by Hammerson, a series of views from High Street North was tabled (page 28) showing a level roof with no reduced roof height towards Fenwick place. Fenwick's preference is for this design showing clear views of South west entrance bulkhead. Roof height is part of RTKL's remit, RTKL will present the latest roof height arrangement in future design workshop.</p> <p>Both design team to work together to create a design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>



<p><b>F18 - SECOND FLOOR PLAN</b></p> <p>F18.1 - Line of external and internal is unclear</p> <p>F18.2 - Concern about current placed roof too low for Fenwick to incorporate future F&amp;B on southwest corner of level 2 with balconies looking into High Street North. Preference for height of Fenwick place to be at least 4 stories.</p> <p>F18.3 - Concern about Fenwick Circus experience facing Fenwick building. The blackbox cinema lobby to the west with no window or active frontages and hotel facade to the south is to bland with no activity.</p>	<p>The line of the external and internal elements will be clearly identified on revised drawings to be submitted.</p> <p>The RMA proposal does not include any proposals for the second floor of Fenwick.</p> <p>We consider that the design of Fenwick Place is appropriate and the cinema is proposed to be clad in metal.</p>	<p>Noted, awaiting revised drawing.</p> <p>Refer to Note F17</p> <p>Noted that the latest cinema design to be glazed Shopfront &amp; signage, open on Level 1, with self-serving ticket sales, not a solid wall against the mall face. This is welcomed by Fenwick as preference is for Fenwick place to be animated on all sides. Awaiting revised drawings</p> <p>Noted that potential for a leisure operator to animate the old Hotel site. Awaiting revised drawings</p>
<p><b>F19. THIRD FLOOR/ ROOF PLAN LDA DESIGN CONCERNS ON RMA DRAWING</b></p> <p>Fenwick Place Roof: F19.1 Fenwick end of High Street North shows extend of roof too limited. A solid roof covers large portion of the "knuckle" space and the roof drops down before meeting Fenwick SW Entrance corner. Design workshops showed larger glazed roof.</p> <p>F19.2 Our preference is for higher and fully glazed roof on Fenwick Circus as per the threshold space connecting Fenwick Place to the 24 hour route.</p>	<p>Please see response to F17</p>	<p>Refer to Note F17.</p>

<p><b>F20. ROOF ABOVE MALL 3</b></p> <p>F20.1. Other new malls roofs are full glazed or partially glazed, on the south and on the west except for Mall 3 or eastern mall west of Fenwick.</p> <p>F20.2. Not to have a solid blank hole at that level</p>	<p>Please see response to F17 also there is no "solid blank hole".</p>	<p>Following presentation (dated 01/09/2017) by Hammerson, a series of views from internal street was tabled (page 32) showing a roof with three gradual steps rising towards Fenwick place. This new design is much improved from RMA design.</p> <p>Both design team to work together to create a design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>
<p><b>F21. GROUND FLOOR LANDSCAPING</b> LDA DESIGN CONCERNS ON R.M.A. DRAWING</p> <p>F21. Cafe Seating -for future restaurant with temporary external canopies. Discrepancy of restaurant glazed opening on 3D image (RMA Report p.389) but not shown in plans.</p> <p>C3. Car Park Core -concerned about the bulky size of car park entrance block. Details on page 11.</p> <p>C6. Car Park Landscaping -Fenwick preference for landscaped area at SE of car park and have green wall around car park entrance. Submitted design shows solid wall.</p>	<p>Seating within the awnings is shown on the RMA submission, but it is general public seating not cafe seating</p> <p>The design of the entrance to the car park is considered to be appropriate.</p>	<p>Fenwick preference is for the restaurants seating to spill out at ground floor with door openings. Ref to Note F10</p> <p>Design solutions has been suggested. Both design team to work together to create a design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>
<p><b>C1 -CAR PARK ESCALATOR</b></p> <p>Hammerson scheme L (22.02.2016) showed escalator connection between LG and UG in the car park core. Submitted drawing shows the escalator removed.</p>	<p>The escalators have been removed from proposals due to the core footprint and circulation space. This does not reduce accessibility or movement between the levels.</p>	<p>Until there is a footfall study to show the potential improvement to footfall numbers, there is currently no plans by Hammerson to include escalators into the carpark lobby, nor allow space to put in the escalator in the future. Fenwick preference is for escalator connecting LG and UG.</p>
<p><b>C2 -CAR PARK ENTRANCE</b></p> <p>Fenwick preference for level access or ODA compliant ramp as a worst case scenario between car park to store levels, but not with steps and lifts, discussed in Design Workshop 5.</p>	<p>The lobby as submitted is DDA compliant.</p>	<p>Fenwick stressed the importance of providing a good customer arrival experience for wheelchair users and push buggies. Preference for ramp instead of platform lift.</p> <p>Both design team to work together to create a design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>

<p><b>C3 -CAR PARK CORE</b></p> <p>Concerned about size &amp; height of buildings on either side of Fenwick, namely the former Hotel building on the left and the car park on the right. Preference for car park design to read like part of Fenwick facade as per sketch issued on 14.07.2016</p>	<p>The LDA response partly contradicts what they say in F.15. The building to the south of Fenwick RMA is significantly lower than the height parameter allows (maximum building frontage height of 50m and building height of 55m) and significantly lower than the early illustration LDA have included in their submission (bottom right).</p>	<p>Fenwick 's preference is for less intrusive core design.</p> <p>Solutions has been suggested. Both design team to work together to create a façade design that is agreeable. Design Workshop will commence this week.</p>
<p><b>C4 - FENWICK CAR PARK FACADE LDA DESIGN CONCERNS ON RMA DRAWING</b></p> <p>C4.1. Car Park Facade Structure - no details of the supporting structure for the facade elements are shown. Unable to determine the impact on view points from the carpark</p> <p>C4.2. Car Park Facade Lighting - lighting design should consider enhancing distant views from A41 vehicular bridge.</p>	<p>The fixing points of the facade fins are from the floor structure and do not interrupt views.</p> <p>External lighting will be considered as part of a lighting scheme under an anticipated condition.</p>	<p>Noted that the 3D image of the car park façade does not show quality and sophistication of detail.</p> <p>Chapman Taylor to present benchmarking of the façade panels to show quality of detailing and lighting.</p>
<p><b>C5 - CAR PARK CONNECION TO FENWICK</b></p> <p>C5.1. Of the 8 new car park levels, only 3 have direct connections to Fenwick as per section below.</p> <p>Concern about lack of connection of direct access to Fenwick 2nd floor. Fenwick preference is for all carpark levels to have a direct access to existing 4 levels of Fenwick.</p>	<p>The connection to the second floor of Fenwick from the MSCP has not been provided as that the second floor is not utilised for trading and has no public access.</p>	<p>Connection into Fenwick Level 2 will be dealt with in the future phase. Height of lobby structure can allow future connection to Level 2.</p>
<p><b>B1 BUS STATION CONNECTION LDA DESIGN CONCERNS ON R.M.A. SUBMISSION</b></p> <p>Eastern pedestrian link-from the bus station to the Southern Mall is not provided</p>	<p>Please see the response in the main body of the letter i.e. this route has been discounted due to safety issues.</p>	<p>Fenwick preference for route between bus station and southern mall as public transport will be more important in the future.</p> <p>Noted that Hammerson will not be providing the secondary route.</p>
<p><b>B2 BUS STATION CONNECTION WALKING DISTANCES PRESENTED IN CPO PROOF OF EVIDENCE (22 APRIL 2016) (SEE ILLUSTRATION PROVIDED)</b></p>	<p>This was presented at the CPO Inquiry however this is not relevant to the determination of the RMA which is consistent with the parameters and principles of the 2014 Permission.</p>	<p>Refer to Note B1</p>