

6.6 Design and appearance

6.6.1 The comments raised in respect of landscape issues during Phase Two Consultation are summarised in Table 6.5, together with the Applicant's response.

Table 6.5: Comments on Design and Appearance received in Phase Two Consultation

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
Reasons for supporting the proposals								
6.6.2	Looks nice, pleasing to the eye.	GLA	-	-	33	10093; 10117; 10118; 10119; 10114; 10115; 10116; 10105; 10110; 10111; 10098; 10100; 10101; 10095; 10096; 10097; 10091; 10092; 10094; 10086; 10089; 10090; 10080; 10083; 10085; 10075; 10077; 10079; 10045; 99; 80; 78; 87	Support for the design is noted and welcomed.	-
6.6.3	It is welcoming; family and environmentally friendly; responds to the environmental sensitivities of the corridor along the River Lee Navigation.	-	LBE	-	7	10080; 10107; 10112; 10088; 10099; 10104; 10082		-
6.6.4	It looks better than the existing facility/other large buildings in the vicinity.	-	-	-	8	72; 99; 10087; 10113; 10084; 79; 86; 68		-

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
6.6.5	It integrates well with the surroundings, including the river Lee.	GLA	LBE; WCC	-	8	10080; 10108; 10109; 10102; 10103; 10106; 10082; 10100		-
6.6.6	Other reasons to support the proposed design and appearance include: a) the prominent features that make it look like a landmark; b) the split into two separate areas; c) the two-layered approach to the facade; d) the "step" approach; e) the introduction of a design code; f) the fragmentation of the building; g) the raising of the ground towards the eastern elevation.	CRT	LBE; WCC	-	1	94		-
6.6.7	Support with caveats: a) The design looks good but the information is too technical	-	-	-	2	10120; 10076	Support for the design is welcomed. Information on the design was presented in a variety of forms including a video and images which were accessible to all.	N
	b) The design looks good but oppose the facility overall.						Support for the design is welcomed, please refer to the table of responses to comments on the Need theme for information on the overall need for the Project.	

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
Reasons for opposing the proposals								
6.6.8	Elements that are challenged include:	-	LBE	LVRP A	0	-	The scale of the Viewing Platform has been significantly reduced by 7m to 5m/6m height.	C
	a) the viewing platform at the north eastern corner of the ERF building as it is visually intrusive/ obtrusive/ a discordant element;						The Viewing Platform has been relocated to the south eastern edge of the ERF. It remains on the eastern edge as this is the only edge which offers views of the EcoPark and LVRP. Also the eastern edge is within the publically accessible part of the EcoPark.	N
6.6.9	EcoPark House too high and there is no need for the second floor.	-	-	LVRP A	0	-	EcoPark House has been reduced from three storeys to two storeys. Refer to the Visitor Centre Table for more information.	C
Appearance								
6.6.10	The facility should blend in/be appropriate for the area.	-	LBE	-	2	5; 62	The Project is being designed to respond to its surrounding context and minimise its visual impact. The massing of the ERF would step down towards the Lee Valley Regional Park and landscaping would integrate the site into the wider landscape. The use of materials across the Project would be appropriate for its	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
							use and consider the surrounding context.	
6.6.11	The facility should be interesting/attractive/Interactive.	-	LBE	-	2	5; 10081	The ERF would be a new facility of a high quality of design which responds to its surrounding context.	N
6.6.12	Keep it simple, in line with its function.	-	-	-	1	66	The overall design approach to the ERF is simple and in keeping with its function.	N
6.6.13	Suggest the following buildings that can serve as an example: a) Hunderwaser incinerator in Vienna in respect of overall design;	-	-	LVRP A	1	88	The Hundertwasser incinerator is designed to stand out, it is therefore not considered to be a good example for this Project which has been designed to blend in.	N
	b) Cladding design: John Lewis depot in Northampton and Here East in the Queen Elizabeth Olympic Park (although this was noted to be less palatable).						The suggested examples of cladding will be considered at the detailed design stage in line with the Design Code Principles (AD02.02).	N
6.6.14	Other suggestions include: a) aim for a more rounded exterior;	-	-	-	3	83; 10078; 10047	The massing of the ERF has been reduced to use the minimum operational outline. Creating a rounded exterior would create unnecessary volume, increasing the overall scale and massing which is contrary to the Project's design objectives.	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
	b) sink as many of the large buildings into the ground as possible;						For operational reasons and the Edmonton EcoPark's location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone it is not appropriate to sink buildings into the ground. However the visual impact of the ERF would be reduced through the appropriate use of materials and landscaping features.	N
	c) install bird's perches;						Bat and bird boxes are proposed within the Application Site.	N
	d) aim for an exterior that does not have unnecessary features prone to dust accumulation;						The Design and Access Statement (AD05.07) explores a functional design, the detail design of the façade will be developed in accordance with the Design Code Principles which state that materials should be chosen to meet all the principles including on-going maintenance requirements.	N
	e) ensure that the cladding can be accessed easily for future maintenance.						A management and maintenance regime will be in place. As detailed in the Design and Access Statement the building design is such that there will be appropriate access for maintenance.	N
Chimney stack								
6.6.15	The design of the chimney stack should: a) be carefully considered and different from the current grey structure;	-	LBE	LVRP A	0	-	The existing EfW facility stack is a circular concrete structure whereas the proposed ERF stack is a rectangular clad structure. The Design Code Principles establish	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
							that the stack should be a light coloured material.	
	b) build a positive image						The stack has been designed as an integral part of the overall proposals which will promote a positive image of the Edmonton EcoPark.	N
	c) not be rectangular.						A rectangular stack is proposed to reduce the visual impact to sensitive areas, by having a narrower edge facing the Lee Valley Regional Park.	N
Colours								
6.6.16	Support the proposed darker colouring scheme for the lower level.	-	LBE		0	-	Support is noted and welcomed.	N
6.6.17	Suggestions for the colour scheme include:	-	LBE; HBC	LVRP A	1	10047	The colours will be selected at the detailed design stage from the colour palette within the Design Code Principles and an appropriate management regime will be in place.	N
	b) should include accent colours but not orange / should be blue-grey;						The Design Code Principles includes a palette of colours, which will inform the detailed design.	N
	c) should be appropriate to minimise visual impact.						The Design Code Principles would reduce the visual impact by using lighter colours on the upper elements of the ERF. As set out in the Design Code Principles there is	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
							a variety of materials which could achieve this aim.	
Materials								
6.6.18	Oppose the proposed cladding as it is impractical.	-	-	LVRP A	0	-	The Design Code Principles state that materials selected should be durable, low maintenance and appropriate to the function of the building. A management and maintenance regime will be in place.	N
6.6.19	Support the proposed materials for the chimney stack and RRF; the proposed facing materials are of high quality.	GLA	LBE	-	0	-	Noted	N
6.6.20	The materials should: a) require minimum maintenance; b) give a clean-lined appearance; c) provide robust exterior; d) be of high quality.	GLA	LBE	LVRP A	1	10047	Materials will be selected at the detailed design stage in accordance with the Design Code Principles and subsequent approvals process.	N
Other specific design suggestions								
6.6.21	Install solar panels or wind turbines;				2	60; 82	PV panels will be provided on the ERF and/or RRF subject to feasibility and a cost benefit analysis. Roof area has been safeguarded in the proposed design.	C

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
							Wind turbines are not a practical solution for this site, further information is set out in the Building Energy Assessment, appended to the Sustainability Statement (AD05.13).	
6.6.22	Concerns over the design of the bunker, in particular in respect of the maintenance of a single bunker.	EA	-	-	0	-	There are important operational reasons for the proposed design of the bunker which serves to minimise the impact on the environment by improving the process efficiency of the operation of the ERF resulting in lower emissions to the atmosphere.	N
6.6.23	The proposed facility should be of flagship quality.	-	LBE	-	0	-	The ERF would be of a high quality of design.	N
Scale								
6.6.24	The scale is justified and well mitigated	GLA	LBE	-	0	-	Support for the scale of the ERF is noted and welcomed.	N
6.6.25	The development should be smaller.	-	-	-	1	89	The size of buildings is informed by their functional requirements and has been minimised as far as possible without compromising their function.	N
Signage								
6.6.26	Suggestions include: a) should be considered at the design stage;	CRT	LBE	-	0	-	Signage will be considered at the detailed design stage.	N
	b) should link to the lighting strategy;						Signage will be designed to meet operational requirements and will only be lit where required.	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
	c) should integrate with existing wayfinding along the Navigation by providing legible London signage at the towpath entrance.						Signage in the Lee Valley Regional Park (LVRP) will be agreed with Lee Valley Regional Park Authority and consistent with LVRP approach to signage.	N
Comments on specific buildings								
6.6.27	Comments on the proposed design of the EcoPark House include:	-	LBE	LVRP A	1	10046	EcoPark House has been reduced from three storeys to two storeys. Refer to the Visitor Centre Table for more information.	C
	a) should be a 2 storey instead of a 3 storey building;							
	b) alternative design options should be explored to avoid dominating the landscape;						The approach to developing the design for EcoPark House is set out in the Design and Access Statement.	N
	c) should be incorporated into a gateway entrance that promotes both the Project and the LVRP;						EcoPark House would be a gateway for the EcoPark. It would also overlook and provide activity when viewed from Lee Valley Regional Park.	N
d) the design is approved as it both functional and visually attractive.	Support for the design is noted and welcomed.	-						
6.6.28	Comments on the proposed design of the ERF include:	-	LBE	LVRP A	0	-	The proposed 'steps' of the ERF relate to the internal components and uses. Introducing more 'steps' would increase the overall bulk and massing of the facility which is contrary to the design objectives.	N
	a) the series of 'steps' should be more intense and incorporate areas of landscape;							
b) the proposed approach to the facade is supported.	Support is noted and welcomed.	-						

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
6.6.29	Comments on the proposed design of the RRF include:	-	LBE	-	0	-	Support is noted and welcomed.	N
	a) its height and massing are acceptable;							
	b) it should be designed to provide a welcoming and attractive public space;						The RRC which is the publically accessible part of the RRF is designed to provide a welcoming and attractive environment.	N
	c) explore the possibility to create separate disposal facilities for the public and businesses.						A RRC for both the public and small business vehicles makes efficient use of space and is in keeping with other RRCs in north London.	N
Further studies are required								
6.6.30	Views analysis to understand the full level of impact on the neighbouring conservation area; the viewpoints should be agreed with GLA officers.	GLA	-	-	0	-	The nearest Conservation Area is located on Tottenham High Road and is therefore not affected by the Project. Viewpoints used in the Vol 3 of the ES (AD06.02) have been agreed with LB Enfield as the local planning authority. Discussions with the GLA have continued however no further comments on this matter have been provided.	N
Requests for more information								
6.6.31	These include: a) full details on the final design and materials used to build the new facility;	GLA; CRT	WCC	LVRP A	2	85; 95	Full details on the final design will be available at the detailed design stage. The Design Code Principles set out guidelines for the design and materials to be used in the detailed design.	N

Ref	Comment	SC	LA	LI	No. CC	CC IDs	Applicant's response	Change
Design and appearance								
	b) visualisations of the new facility;						Visualisations of the Project were provided during Phase Two Consultation and more are included in the Design and Access Statement.	N
	c) more information on how NLWA will specify and procure its steam turbine and its heat off-take provisions; request for this information to be presented in a diagrammatic format, showing capacity as well as temperature and pressure levels;						This comment will be taken into account at the procurement stage.	N
	d) is the extra storey in the Visitor centre needed to provide views over the Park and assist in creating a future gateway to this section of the Park;						EcoPark House has been reduced from three storeys to two storeys. Refer to the Visitor Centre Table for more information.	C
	e) more detail on the proposed future use of the EfW plot, whether Lee Park Way could be used as an entrance for future facilities in this area and consequences for the LVRP.						The EfW plot will be available for future waste uses in accordance with the site's designation as a waste site. Any future facilities will need to secure planning permission, at which time the potential effect on the Lee Valley Regional Park would be considered.	N

Account Taken of Phase Two design and appearance comments

6.6.32 Many comments supported the overall design and appearance of the Project, noting that it is an improvement on the existing facilities on-site, integrates well with the surroundings, and is attractive to look at.

- 6.6.33 Some comments challenged the size of the viewing platform on the ERF, in response the Applicant has reduced the height of the viewing platform by 7m to 5/6m. Another comment considered that the viewing platform should be moved away from the eastern edge of the building, the design has not been changed to reflect this suggestion as the eastern edge is the only edge which offers views of the Edmonton EcoPark and LVRP. The eastern edge is also located within the publically accessible part of the site.
- 6.6.34 In response to comments that the height of EcoPark House was too high and the need for three storeys had not been demonstrated the building has been reduced from three to two storeys.
- 6.6.35 Several respondents suggested that the ERF should blend in, with others requesting that it is an interesting design. The Project has been designed to minimise its visual impact and will be of a high quality of design. A number of more detailed suggestions were made including a more rounded exterior and sinking building elements into the ground. A more rounded exterior has not been progressed as this would increase the overall massing of the building. Due to operational reasons and the Edmonton EcoPark's location within a groundwater Source Protection Zone it is not appropriate to sink buildings into the ground.
- 6.6.36 Other respondents referred to other buildings which can serve as examples, where this is in respect of detailed design, for example the type of cladding, this would be considered the appropriate stage in the design process.
- 6.6.37 There were a range of views on the colours to be used, with general support for the approach to have lighter coloured materials on the upper elements. Other respondents suggested specific colours which should/should not be used. The colours of the accent elements would be selected at the detailed design stage in accordance with the Design Code Principles.
- 6.6.38 The materials to be used were noted as an important element in the overall design, one respondent considered the proposed cladding to be impractical, whilst others noted that it must be easy to be maintained and be of a high quality. Further information about the approach to cladding is set out in the Design Code Principles.
- 6.6.39 A comment was made that there should be solar panels. In response the roof area has been safeguarded on the ERF and/or the RRF for PV panels, subject to feasibility and cost benefit analysis at detailed design stage.