



FRAME PROJECTS

Old Kent Road Community Review Panel

Report of Review Meeting: 16-28 Penarth Street

Monday 7 June 2021

Video conference via Zoom

Group

Gurmeet Sian (chair)
Lucy Atkinson
Shelene Byer
Hazel Flynn
Aaron Mo
Saidat Oketunde
Victoria Oluwables
Madison Westwood

Attendees

Tim Cutts	London Borough of Southwark
Troy Davies	London Borough of Southwark
Colin Wilson	London Borough of Southwark
Tom Bolton	Frame Projects
Meghna Patel	Frame Projects
Penny Nakan	Frame Projects

Apologies / copied to

Tyreece Asamoah	Old Kent Road Community Review Panel
Hugh Balfour	Old Kent Road Community Review Panel
Muyi Kazim	Old Kent Road Community Review Panel
Peter Warren	Old Kent Road Community Review Panel
Alicia Chaumard	London Borough of Southwark

Confidentiality

As a public organisation the London Borough of Southwark is subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOI), and in the case of an FOI request may be obliged to release project information submitted for review.

Declarations of interest

Office Sian, a practice owned by Gurmeet Sian, Chair of the Old Kent Road Community Development Panel, is part of a development team employed by Southwark Council on a site within the Old Kent Road Opportunity Area, at the Ledbury Estate. Gurmeet works alongside the practice leading the team, Karakusevic Carson Architects, not directly for Southwark and does not take part in any design review of schemes on the Ledbury Estate or adjoining sites.

Report of Old Kent Road Community Review Panel
07 June 2021
CRDP08_ 16-28 Penarth Street

James Glancy, the developer for 16-28 Penarth Street, is a member of the Old Kent Road Community Development Panel. He therefore did not attend this review meeting, either as a panel member or as member of the development team.

1. Site address

16-28 Penarth Street, Southwark, London, SE15 1TF (including 51 and 33/35 Hatcham Road and 122 Ormside Street

2. Presenting team

James Felstead	Child Graddon Lewis
James Edwards	Caddick Developments Ltd
Steve Fidgett	Union 4
Alan Hannify	Union 4

3. Planning authority's briefing

The site is located to the north of the Old Kent Road and to the south of South Bermondsey Station, within the Hatcham Road Industrial Estate. It is made up of several separate structures dated from the 1940s to the 1980s. The principal two storey structure, dating from the 1940s, is constructed from brick and accommodates the James Glancy Design studio.

The proposal seeks to demolish the existing building and construct a mixed-use scheme of up to 10 storeys (including mezzanine level), with commercial/light industrial units, 49 conventional residential homes and up to 280 co-living units (single occupancy for rent only). The scheme also includes communal amenity spaces, cycle parking, access and servicing arrangements. The design of buildings should reflect its robust, functional industrial character. The site allocation indicates that redevelopment should retain or increase employment and business floorspace, and provide affordable workspace and housing.

Southwark officers asked the panel for its views in particular on:

- The increase in commercial workspace at ground and first floors.
- Whether the commercial space will attract businesses, and help to activate the development at street level.
- The proposed massing and use of materials.
- Whether more can be done to ensure a comfortable relationship to the surrounding townscape.
- Whether the panel feels that the site can accommodate the proposed density of homes in terms of meeting exceptional design standards and in the provision of private balconies, play space and communal amenity space.

4. Community Review Panel's views

Summary

The panel supports the design, massing, and quality of amenity spaces in the proposed development, but questions the decision to include co-living accommodation which it feels is unlikely to meet local housing needs, and risks failing to benefit the wider area. While co-living can succeed on its own terms, the panel is concerned that it will only serve residents from demographics outside the Old Kent Road area, that rents will not be locally affordable, and that residents will be transient and will not integrate with the local community. Further justification is needed for the provision of this accommodation type, and for demand in this location. The panel welcomes the intention to enable wider community use of shared facilities. It is particularly important to provide community access to the development, and the panel asks for further local consultation on how they are managed. The panel raises some concerns over the quality of space around the development at pedestrian level, which could feel confined when all proposed schemes are completed in the area. It suggests that more family units and fewer one-bed units should be included in the affordable housing mix. The ambitious sustainability proposals are very welcome, and the panel encourages the applicant to ensure they are delivered. The panel recommends installing the latest ventilation systems and considering the quality of overall provision needed to attract tenants for the commercial units. These comments are expanded upon below.

Architecture and massing

- The panel supports the overall approach to the height and massing of the development. However, it expresses some concern that, in combination with other consented and forthcoming developments on neighbouring sites, Penarth Street could feel enclosed and confined at pedestrian level. Any further measures that could improve the pedestrian experience should be considered.
- The panel appreciates the proposed architectural approach, including the use of different materials to articulate uses.

Alignment with local needs

- The panel expresses a range of opinions on the appropriateness of co-living for the area, and the extent to which it will provide local benefit. On the one hand, co-living can provide a valuable way for those who are new to the city to meet others and settle in.
- On the other hand, concern was expressed about the likelihood of co-living residents integrating with others living in the building, or in the local area. This concern is partly due to the relatively transient nature of co-living, which is less likely to attract long-term residents. The panel feels it is important that the development enables and encourages integration among all residents, and with the wider community.
- The panel therefore considers it important to demonstrate how a co-living model can meet the needs of the area and provide local benefit. Many local residents live in

overcrowded housing, and many young people have difficulties finding somewhere to live locally. Co-living could provide a valuable option for young people wishing to leave home, but the panel thinks it is unlikely the accommodation provided will be affordable. It is concerned that, unless co-living rents are set at an affordable level, the scheme will accelerate gentrification, rather than helping to address core issues for local residents.

- The panel is also concerned that the co-living accommodation could be marketed specifically to demographics from outside the area, and will not be intended for local people.
- It also questions the level of demand for co-living in an area such as the Old Kent Road, particularly in the light of the pandemic's effect on residential demand in London.
- The panel also asks that the range of people depicted in illustrations of the development should reflect the diversity of the local community.

Residential mix

- The panel is concerned that the proposed mix of one, two and three-bed homes in the affordable housing section does not provide an optimum residential mix for the area. The high demand for family accommodation is recognised in the Old Kent Road Area Action Plan, and the panel asks that further thought is given to whether more larger units can be provided.
- A greater number of larger units would also be preferable from a management perspective. The combination of families with children and people living in one bed flats can be especially difficult to manage within the same building.

Amenity and shared spaces

- The panel comments positively on the quality of the amenity and garden spaces, and the provision of communal growing space on the roof. It appreciates the thought and effort given to this element of the scheme design.
- The panel has concerns about the self-contained nature of the co-living model, with facilities provided in-house, and feels that it is important these spaces are managed in a way that encourages co-living residents to become part of the area.
- The panel asks the design team to ensure that, as well as justifying the choice of a co-living model in this location, it does all it can to make spaces such as gym facilities, co-working facilities, shared dining and gardens accessible to those in the wider area, beyond the development itself. Providing facilities for those who cannot access them elsewhere could provide local benefit and help people connect.

- The proposed community management service to provide access to shared spaces is welcome. The panel encourages consultation with local residents on the management of communal spaces, to ensure they serve local needs.
- The panel notes the potential for rooftop amenity spaces to be noisy, and asks that thought is given to how noise can be reduced for residents' balconies overlooking amenity spaces.

Commercial space

- The panel welcomes the proposal to give local businesses priority to occupy the commercial spaces.
- The panel encourages the design team to consider installing ecology units (an exhaust and air purification system) in the commercial spaces, and to consider any other fit-out measures that could increase their attractiveness to potential occupiers.

Sustainability

- The panel welcomes the ambition of the scheme's energy and sustainability strategy, and encourages its delivery and appropriate management. If delivered as proposed, it will play an important role in the development's success.
- The panel welcomes the proposed energy efficient communal heating, with heat recycled within the building. It asks whether planned savings from the use of more efficient systems can be passed on to residents.

Next steps

The Community Review Panel is available, if required, to provide further advice once designs have developed further.