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Case Study

Cannon Factory and Ashley House, Tottenham

Key Issues –
As described in the ‘purpose of the project’ section, the development site falls within a wider ‘Ashley Road South Masterplan’ area. Due to various requirements on the different parcels of land and the different commitments of the two developers, two separate planning applications were being prepared and were progressing on different timelines:
1. The development site (‘the CFAH development’); and
2. The second development (‘the CJBH development’).

Given the potential for interconnectivity between the two schemes and as the assumption was they would be submitted to London Borough of Haringey (‘LBH’) concurrently, it was originally envisaged that one Environmental Statement would cover both. Subsequently, one Scoping Request was submitted to LBH to cover all development within the masterplan.

As it became evident that the two applications were working to different timelines and two EIAs would be needed, it was key to ensure that appropriate assessment was undertaken of the CFAH development, whilst ensuring a robust cumulative assessment was carried out of the CJBH development given the interconnectivity. It was clearly also important to ensure that the main technical chapters within the CFAH Environmental Statement assessed the development in its own right assuming it could function on its own in the scenario that the CJBH did not come forward.

Purpose of the project
The development site falls within the wider ‘Ashley Road South Masterplan’ area, which encompasses over 2.67 hectares of land controlled by two respective developers, Notting Hill Housing and Berkeley Square Developments. At a local level, LBH has identified Tottenham as an ‘Action Area’ and Tottenham Hale as a new District Centre. The Masterplan site lies in a highly prominent and important location within Tottenham Hale and within the opportunity and action areas and housing zone.

The Masterplan area comprises four development parcels, of which, two were brought forward as part of this development - ‘the CFAH development’ - for residential and commercial floorspace, as described below.

Description of the project
Demolition of the existing buildings at Cannon Factory and Ashley House and erection of three buildings to provide up to 3,600sqm of commercial floorspace (Class A1/A3/B1/D1), up to 265 residential units (Class C3), new public realm, landscaped amenity space, car and cycle parking and all associated works.
Lessons learnt

The complexities of the CFAH Environmental Statement when considered alongside the CJBH scheme meant that many complications had to be resolved.

1. When instructing the consultant team, it was important to be clear how the assessment needed to separate the relevant elements and, particularly, the cumulative assessment. As such, the following were requested:
   a. A description of the baseline environment within the main technical assessment;
   b. An assessment of the CFAH development during operation as a standalone scheme within the main technical assessment;
   c. An assessment of the development during operation with the CJBH scheme also assessed, within the cumulative assessment;
   d. An assessment of the development during operation with the CJBH scheme and other committed developments within the cumulative assessment.

2. Given the different methodologies of each technical assessment, it was important to be flexible with the approach; however, it was key to ensure there was a consistent of approach undertaken for the wider masterplan. To do this it was important that the scheme architect for the CJBH scheme understood the importance of what was required as a ‘design fix for cumulative purposes’. To ensure robust assessment we requested that maximum parameters and assumptions were used for the CJBH scheme.

Lessons learnt cont. -

This way, it was possible to identify what the likely worst-case scenario would be in the (likely) event that the CFAH and CJBH schemes were brought forward as a complete masterplan.

Additionally, it was important for each technical team to understand that there was a ‘cut off’ point for obtaining information for its cumulative assessment. Although it was likely that the CJBH scheme would evolve as design work continued, it was important to ensure that the technical teams had enough time to undertake their assessments prior to submission of the CFAH scheme and that there was a consistency across assessment. This was particularly difficult for some of the modelling work as certain consultants were trying to assist the design team with the design development for the CJBH scheme and would have up-to-date plans not consistent with what other consultants had received to assess.

As such, it was important to reiterate that whilst there was the possibility that the cumulative assessment would not assessment the CJBH scheme that was eventually submitted, it was robust to undertake a cumulative assessment with information that could be considered ‘best available at a point in time’ and consistent across all technical areas, particularly as the information was considered ‘worst-case’. The developer was also advised of the need for reassessment if the CJBH scheme evolved beyond the assessed parameters during ES consideration.
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