

Agenda Item number:	7.3
Reference number:	PA/08/2292
Location:	443-451 Westferry Road, E14 (Island Point)
Proposal:	Erection of six buildings from 2 to 8 storeys in height to provide 189 residential units, with provision of basement and surface car parking, associated servicing and landscaping, together with other works incidental to the proposals.

- 1.1 On page 91, paragraph 4.6, the case officer report states that 96 car parking spaces and 37 motorcycle spaces are proposed. However, this should be corrected as the scheme proposes 95 car parking spaces and 18 motorcycle spaces as noted in paragraph 8.66.
- 1.2 Through the report (pp 86, 87, 115-7,124), references to 41% affordable housing per habitable room are incorrect. The correct affordable housing percentage is 40% by habitable room.

2.0 Further neighbour comments received

- 2.1 A further 61 submissions were received following finalisation of the Committee report, comprising of:
 - 53 letters of objection, including:
 - 46 were pro-former (identical) letters
 - 3 petitions with a grand total of 47 signatures
 - 7 letters of support, including:
 - 5 were pro-former letters
 - 1 petition with 110 signatures
 - 1 neutral response requiring further details

Objecting

- 2.2 The objections raised the following issues:
 - Density
 - Housing mix including trade-off between City Pride and Island point sites
 - Height and impact to the conservation area
 - Appearance and impact external facing materials proposed
 - Design detail of Julian Place (walls and gates) of Julian Place as either a pedestrian and/or access road
 - Overlooking
 - Loss of light
 - Pollution
 - Social problems associated with Julian Place (crime, littering, privacy impact)
 - Traffic and parking impacts
 - Unsatisfactory provision of rubbish bins
- 2.3 These have been previously considered in the case officer report.
- 2.4 The following additional objections have been raised and are considered below:

- Noise – created by the development in general
(Officer comment: Any noise generated by the scheme is considered to reflect the residential use which is acceptable in this location. It should be noted that no significant adverse noise impact was identified within the Environmental Statement or in the assessment by Council's Environmental Health Team. Further, any unreasonable or excessive noise is covered by the environmental health legislation rather than planning legislation).
- Pollution (unspecified)
(Officer comment: The range of potential impacts was considered in the Environmental Impact Assessment and not found to be significant to warrant refusal).

2.4 The following issues have been raised but are not material to the assessment of the application:

- Query concerning the effectiveness of the future management regime (Glenkerrin) in dealing with issues such as security and policing;
- Seeking assistance for new and old communities in the area to come together for leisure and play; and
- Issue that properties in Julian Place were not consulted by the developer prior to lodging the previous and current applications formerly with the Council.
- An excess of flats in the area and more flats seems completely unnecessary

Supporting

2.5 The following points were made by neighbours in support of the development:

- Affordable housing will address housing need in the area and take many people off waiting lists;
- Good quality affordable housing is proposed in this scheme and should be supported;
- The greenspace proposed as part of the application is welcomed;
- Represents an excellent development for a site that is currently derelict and an eyesore.

3.0 Additional consultation responses

3.1 The following external consultees also provided additional comments.

GLA

3.2 Affordable housing

- On balance and given the circumstances of the two site, the affordable housing provision is considered to be a good offer over both sites providing this is the maximum amount deliverable.

- Any increase in the quantum of affordable housing would result in a higher proportion of affordable housing at City Pride and the unsuitability of the City Pride site for affordable housing has already been established in the discussions around the provision for off-site affordable housing. The provision of more affordable housing would increase the need for amenity space on the constrained City Pride site, as the number of children in the development would be likely to increase. In addition the smaller units in the City Pride development would be unlikely to attract grant funding. In contrast, the Island Point development will provide good quality affordable housing with large family units with access to high quality amenity and children's playspace.

3.3 Housing

- Overall, a good standard of accommodation is provided for families.

3.4 Children's play space

- Whilst it is disappointing the indoor kick about area has been removed from the scheme, given the quantum and quality of the proposed child play space and the proximity and quality of the surrounding play facilities for children over 12 years of age, the proposal will meet the needs of residents.
- The stage 1 report stated that there is an under provision of child playspace of 517sqm. The applicant has confirmed that, with the inclusion of the semi-private gardens to the east of block C of approximately 566sqm, the proposal provides an overprovision of playspace. This alteration is supported.

3.5 Climate change and mitigation

- Whilst the lack of photovoltaic panels is disappointing, the GLA raises no further objections to the proposed energy strategy for Island Point.

(Officer comment: The GLA confirms that additional information has addressed all queries and the scheme is compliant with London Plan Policy in these respects).

CABE

- 3.6 Advise that there are no further comments to make in respect of the Environmental Statement.
(Officer comment: Note that CABE already commented on the design. Refer to section 8 of the case officer report for details)

London Borough of Lewisham

- 3.7 Lewisham have considered the application and raised no objection.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

- 3.8 The Authority considers the proposal to be satisfactory.