

4.0 ALTERNATIVES & DESIGN EVOLUTION

Introduction

4.1 Regulation 18 and Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations require an applicant to provide:

“a description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment”.

4.2 Alternative options typically comprise:

- The ‘do nothing’ alternative, where the Development is not progressed;
- Consideration of Alternative Locations or Uses; and
- Consideration of Alternative Designs.

The ‘do nothing’ Alternative, Consideration of Alternative Locations and Uses

4.3 Under the ‘do nothing scenario’ the Site would remain undeveloped. The beneficial and adverse effects outlined in this ES would not occur. This option was not considered. Furthermore, the Applicant did not consider alternative locations and the scheme has always been a residential development with a minor element of retail use.

Consideration of Alternative Designs

4.4 The Development assessed within this ES is the result of a thorough analysis of the constraints and opportunities on the site, the character of the surrounding area and the aims of the redevelopment. The Applicant’s architects, JTP, engaged with the London Wildlife Trust to ensure a positive development for biodiversity; held series of pre-application meetings with LBWF and the Greater London Assembly; and partook in a Design Review Panel meeting focused on the quality of the design. All of these helped shape the Development and are discussed in detail in the Design and Access Statement. In addition, and as discussed in Chapter 2 EIA Methodology, public consultation was undertaken with politicians, stakeholders, businesses, community groups and residents in the local area. The issues raised through the meetings with statutory consultees and the public consultation exercise were addressed in the design evolution. Table 4.1 sets out the issues raised and the amendments made to the scheme design which led the final development option as assessed in this ES and a high level comparison of environmental effects.

Table 4.1: Issues raised in the design and consultation process which have been addressed in the evolution of the Development

Issues Raised	Where addressed within Development Evolution	Comparison of environmental effects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for adverse overshadowing effects raised during design meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heights to the northern blocks were reconsidered and reduced; The daylight/sunlight quality of the amenity space located at Hawker Place was reviewed; and Further studies were done to review quality of light in spaces that were considered at risk from overshadowing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development would give rise to less adverse overshadowing effects than the earlier alternative design iteration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of proposed landscaping and potential impacts following loss of trees on site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The landscape and open spaces were reviewed to minimise car traffic and allow for an increase in landscaped areas, with the overall site layout revised so that hierarchies of spaces and character areas were clearer and more defined; and Buildings along Forest Road have been set back from the street allowing mature trees and an enhanced landscape to dominate the street scene while creating positive frontage along Forest Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development would give rise to less adverse effects on ecology and trees than the earlier alternative design iteration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height of the proposals and the effect on the townscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design meetings identified that 20 storeys did not seem appropriate in south east corner of the site, where this height was proposed, consequently the height of the scheme was reduced; The heights of buildings along the northern boundary where directly affecting neighbours to the North were also reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development would give rise to less adverse effects on townscape and views than the earlier design iteration
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on wildlife 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing trees are to be retained and 85 new trees are to be planted as part of the proposals; and Provision of a large linear space trough the site which will link with an ecological corridor adjacent to the railway line, and include rain gardens and appropriate ecological species. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development would give rise to more beneficial effects on ecology than could otherwise have been the case
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact on local traffic and parking, as well as pressure on community amenities and public transport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development will create a pedestrian and cyclists first proposal, with low traffic speeds and shared spaces dominated by landscaping; and The development will also provide parking in accordance with LBWF's guidance and will include over 1000 cycle parking spaces and cycle storage facilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committing to prioritising those on foot and bicycle will reduce effects in terms of traffic, pressure on public transport and indirect effects on air quality, noise and climate change than could otherwise have been the case
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of decent, affordable housing in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mix of homes is in accordance with LBWF's needs and it includes a mixture of 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom and 3 bedroom family homes as well as 10% wheelchair adaptable homes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development would lead to more beneficial effects on housing than could have been the case with a less diverse unit mix