

## Addendum report- St George's estate

### Strategic Development Committee 29/05/2008

<b>Agenda Item number:</b>	7.3
<b>Reference number:</b>	PA/05/1866
<b>Location:</b>	St Georges estate
<b>Proposal:</b>	Refurbishment of existing buildings and erection of nine buildings ranging from 6 to 9 storeys in height to provide 193 dwellings (13 x studios, 67 x 1 bed; 79 x 2 bed, 22 x 3 bed, 7 x 4 bed and 5x5 bed). Erection of four townhouses and erection of a community centre of 510 sq.m and landscaping.

#### 1. AMENDMENTS

- 1.1 There are some minor changes to some of the figures reported in the committee report. These include the following:
- 1.2 Paragraph 3.1B should read the following: " total of 32 new affordable units"
- 1.3 Paragraph 3. A should be omitted as the application is not GLA referable.
- 1.4 Paragraph 4.2 should read the following: " It is proposed to refurbish the existing 498 homes and introduce 193 new dwellings in twelve new buildings. These additional units will raise the density of the estate from 419 to 565 habitable rooms per hectare. And the density of estate currently is 415 rising to 561 hab rooms per ha"
- 1.5 The last sentence in paragraph 8.3 should read the following: "The scheme delivers a target level of cross subsidy of £10.155m
- 1.6 In paragraph 8.4 the:
- first bullet point should read: "refurbishment of 498 existing units".
  - second bullet point should read: "provision of an additional 18 affordable housing units
  - third bullet point should read: "introduction of 14 new intermediate units".
- 1.7 There have been some minor changes to the figures to the table in paragraph 8.19. The table should now read the follows):

Total new scheme (including existing and new build = 691 units  
(changed figures are underlined)

Units	Social	Intermediate	Private	Total
Bedsits	11	0	13	24
1 bed	77	1	82	160
2 bed	<u>154</u>	13	151	<u>318</u>
3 bed	55	0	103	158
4 bed	<u>9</u>	0	<u>16</u>	<u>25</u>

5 bed	5	0	1	6
Total	<u>311</u>	14	<u>366</u>	<u>691</u>

- 1.8 The second sentence in paragraph 8.29 should read: 'the proposal does not make provision for family units in the intermediate tenure and 11.2% in the private tenure'
- 1.9 In paragraph 8.30, the latter part of the first sentence should read: "the proposal makes provision for 27% family accommodation (189/691) against the Councils target of 30%".
- 1.10 The first sentence in paragraph 8.36 should read: " The site currently contains 498 residential units".
- 1.11 The second sentence in paragraph 8.40 should read: "the net proposed density is 561 hrph, which is acceptable",
- 1.12 The second and third sentence in paragraph 8.42 : "the proposed density is 572 hrph which exceeds the density matrix guidance. The existing density is 419 hr/hectare"
- 1.13 The last sentence in paragraph 8.44 "the proposal has none of these impacts"
- 1.14 In paragraph 8.52 site 9 should read as 2 storey's (not 1 storey) and site 11 should read as 9 storey's
- 1.15 The second sentence in paragraph 8.61 should read: "the podiums is to be extended to create a further 1, 597m2 of amenity space as hard and soft landscaping".
- 1.16 Paragraph 8.98 should read the following: " According to Policy DEV2 of the UDP, new developments should be designed to ensure that there is sufficient privacy for residents. A distance of about 18 metres (60 feet) between opposite habitable rooms reduces inter-visibility to a degree acceptable to most people. This figure is generally applied as a guideline and is interpreted as a perpendicular projection from the face of the habitable room window. The objections relating to loss of privacy are made by residents from George Leybourne House. However, the six storey development on site 1 will not result in direct overlooking of these properties. At an oblique angle, the distance between site 1 & George Leybourne House is 17.5 metres. At a 45% angle, the distance between the 2 buildings is 22 metres. The closest distance is 15.9 metres. The proposal is therefore not considered to result in undue loss of privacy. Given the urban context of the site, the Council believes that a distance of 15.9 meters is acceptable and broadly complies with the recommended distance of 18 meters.

#### Conditions

- 1.17 In Section 3.4, conditions 3, 5, 9, 10, 15, 18 & 22 are not required and are therefore deleted.
- 1.18 Since the publication of the report, the following conditions are to be included:
- Foul and surface drainage systems
  - Storage facilities for oil, fuels or chemicals

- Surface water source control measures

1.19 In paragraph 3.4 (2): the sentence should read: " Details of the following required: material, CCTV, external landscaping including semi mature trees"

#### Additional Section 106 contribution

1.19 A contribution of 10.155 million to secure the upgrade of existing upgrade units to decent home standards

## **2. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

### Environmental Agency

2.1 EA have no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions

### English Heritage

2.2 According to Councils records, comments from English Heritage were not received. However as the site is located in an area of archaeological importance, the applicant will be required to undertake an Archaeology investigation study.

### Additional objections

2.3 The proposal will result in the loss of 2 trees as a result of the development on site 1.

**(Officers response: The Council has not placed a tree preservation order on the two trees in question. Given that the trees are not protected and the proposal site is not located within a conservation area, the applicant does not require planning permission to remove the trees. Nevertheless, to mitigate against the loss of these trees, the proposal includes extensive improved landscape works to the overall site. There will be additional tree and shrub planting on:**

- **The podium**
- **Noble Court**
- **Swedenborg gardens communal garden square**
- **Brockmer House Communal green and frontage**
- **Betts House**

**The applicant will be required to plant mature and semi mature trees at the above sites and particularly within the vicinity of site 1.**

2.4 The proposal will impact on the setting of the grade II listed St. Paul's school and other grade ii listed buildings in the area.

**Officers comments: The Council does not believe that the proposal will have a negative impact on the setting buildings. On the contrary, the proposal will**

**enhance the character and appearance of the area and will not adversely impact or encroach upon the setting of the nearby listed buildings).**

2.5 The construction and operation of the development expected to increase traffic in the local area.

**(Officers comment: Construction is for a limited period only. As noted in the committee report, there are no new car parking spaces proposed. In addition, there will be a reduction in the number of existing car parking spaces from 207 to 195 spaces.)**

2.6 Loss of light to the meeting room to the strangers rest mission building will be encroached upon.

**(Officers comment: As the meeting room is not a habitable room, it is unnecessary to undertake BRE tests on this room. Given the urban context of the site, a refusal based on the loss of daylight to this window could not be sustained).**

2.7 Little or no space within the development is provided for motor vehicles

**Officers comment: There are no additional car parking spaces proposed which will help alleviate any problems associated with development and its impact on congestion)**

2.8 The construction could severely affect the use of the church buildings during the regular services

**(Officers comment: The construction period will be for a limit time only. Limit hours of power /hammer driven poling/breaking bout to between 10.00 hours to limit 16.00 hours Monday to Friday. In addition, the hours of construction can be limited to between 8.00 hours to 18.00 hours, Monday to Friday to 13.00 hours on Saturdays)**

### **Letter of support**

2.9 One letter of support written 'on behalf of the St Georges Estate Board' was received which stated: " This application represents a once in a lifetime opportunity to completely transform both the estate and the surrounding neighbourhood".

### **3.0: RECOMMENDATION**

3.1: The issues raised in the additional objection as well as some of the issues raised in the consultation responses have been addressed within the scope of the committee report and were found to be acceptable.

2.2 However my recommendation is amended as follows:

**ADD** a condition for implementation of a programme of archaeological work.

**ADD** an informative for detailed proposals in the form of an archaeological project design in accordance with appropriate English Heritage Guidelines.

**ADD** a condition on details of foul and surface drainage systems

**ADD** a condition on details of Storage facilities for oil, fuels or chemicals

**ADD** a condition on details of surface water source control measures

**ADD** a condition on further landscaping details (including planting of mature and semi mature trees)

**AMEND** the S106 agreement to include a contribution of 10.155 million to secure the upgrade of existing upgrade units to decent home standards