



**Old Kent Road Community Review Panel**

**Report of Community Review Panel meeting: 72-162 Ilderton Road**

Monday 4 July 2022

Christ Church Peckham, 676-680 Old Kent Road, London SE15 1JF

**Group**

Gurmeet Sian (Chair)  
Hugh Balfour  
Peter Warren  
Saidat Oketunde  
Madison Westwood  
Victoria Oluwables

**Attendees**

Tim Cutts	London Borough of Southwark
Wing Lau	London Borough of Southwark
Zoë Cave	Frame Projects
Deborah Denner	Frame Projects
Abigail Joseph	Frame Projects

**Apologies**

Liz Awoyemi	London Borough of Southwark
Alicia Chaumard	London Borough of Southwark
Colin Wilson	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.

# CONFIDENTIAL

## Declaration 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.

### 1. Site address

72-161 Ilderton Road, London SE16 3JZ

### 2. Presenting team

Alex Springer	Fifth State
Emiliano Acciarito	tp bennett
Nenad Manasijevic	tp bennett
Sam Hine	DP9
Edward Law	DP9
Adam Walsh	Kanada
Caroline Walsh	Churchman Thornhill Finch
Nitharshan Natarajan	chapmanbdsp

### 3. Planning authority's briefing

The proposal is to redevelop the site at 72-162 Ilderton Road to provide 609 co-living units, 118 residential homes, and up to 1,450 sqm of mixed commercial use space. Consent was granted in February 2022 for a development on this site, which included 312 homes with retail and commercial floorspace. The revised proposals make amendments to the design and scale of the approved buildings, and change the use to include co-living units. They also differ from the consented scheme in proposing two buildings accommodating co-living units and two with affordable housing, delivering a total of 40 per cent affordable housing.

The site, previously used as a lorry park, is now vacant. It does not include any listed structures and is not in a conservation area. Southwark Council is currently preparing an Area Action Plan to guide development in the area. The site is part of the OKR 16 allocation, which the council hopes to see transformed into a mixed new neighbourhood with a diverse range of uses. Development should retain or increase business floorspace and provide a minimum of 35 per cent affordable housing.

The council asked for the panel's comments, in particular, on whether co-living space represents an appropriate use; whether dividing the site into two blocks with different uses is the right approach; how the two uses can integrate with one another; whether the proposed heights are justified; and whether the architectural approach succeeds in reflecting the industrial history of the site and surrounding area.



# CONFIDENTIAL

## 4. Community Review Group's views

### *Summary*

The Community Review Group welcomes the opportunity to review this proposal and sees merit in the way the scheme is aiming to meet the demand for homes for a range of people, including young professionals, and new arrivals to the capital. The way the scheme makes use of the site's available space to create a pocket park, podium and rooftop gardens is also welcome. The panel commented on the architecture, recommending that the applicant could develop the design of the facade further to have more references to the Bermondsey industrial vernacular. Some concerns were raised about how the co-living scheme will work in practice. The panel asks for further thought about how quality of life can be maximised for residents. It also feels that providing too many facilities within the scheme may reduce the amount that residents utilise local services outside the scheme. Similarly, allowing local people use facilities in the new development will support integration between new and existing residents. Whilst acknowledging that it is a car-free scheme, the panel asks for careful thought vehicle access, for example for supermarket deliveries and refuse collection.

### *Co-living*

- The panel comments that this scheme has many similarities to the student accommodation schemes they have reviewed previously but recognises that this is aimed at a different market of residents.
- It can see the appeal for some people who may otherwise be living in shared housing, of having their own private studio flat.
- The panel is unsure about exactly what profile of person will live in schemes such as these but does welcome that other completed schemes are well-occupied.
- The panel stresses it is difficult to know if a co-living scheme is the right use of the site without knowing what the rents will be. It would like to be reassured they will be genuinely affordable.
- The panel urges the applicant to develop the scheme so that it is conducive to longer-term residencies which will help foster a better sense of community.

### *Studio flats*

- The panel acknowledges the creative way the studio flats have been configured. Nevertheless, although bigger than the policy recommended 18sqm per person, the panel highlights that 20sqm not big enough for long term living.



## CONFIDENTIAL

- The panel understands that 10% of the studios are accessible for residents with disabilities. However, within the standard studio flats, the minimal space will limit flexibility to adapt to residents' changing needs.
- For example, the panel asked what would happen if a resident became pregnant? The units would not be suitable for family life.
- The panel was told that in this scenario, the resident would have to move out. If this is the case, it is essential that support is in place to help find suitable accommodation elsewhere.

### *Integration with the local area*

- The panel recognises that the proposal has a good provision of on-site facilities, amenities, and social space for residents.
- However, the panel highlights the risk of residents having little need or no need to use the existing local services in the surrounding area. It sees this a potential limitation to new residents integrating with the local community.
- The panel advocates that the scheme could be improved if the applicant gives more thought to how this scheme can avoid becoming isolated from the local area, as a result of all the services available on-site.
- The panel is glad to see there is space on the ground floor designed to be used by local people and not just residents.
- However, as this will be managed as commercial space, the panel asks that plans for how it will work with and benefit the local community should be further developed.

### *Architecture*

- The panel feels the proposed architecture has positive qualities, and offers some suggestion about how it could be further improved.
- The building façades as depicted in the presentation have a notably pink hue. The panel suggests that more neutral tones are used.
- The panel also suggests further thought about how the architecture draws inspiration from the Bermondsey industrial vernacular.
- For example, arched window heads are characteristic of historic brick buildings, and could be introduced to interest to the facades. A nearby example is the Peak Frean biscuit factory.
- The panel worries that the balconies with solid balustrades shown on the visualisations may cut out light for the studio flats.



# CONFIDENTIAL

- Projecting balconies may also reduce light for the units below.
- It suggests that glass or metal railing balustrades would maximise light inside the studio flats.
- Winter gardens rather than balconies may be needed on lower floors because Ilderton Road has a lot of traffic.
- Similarly, balconies overlooking the railway line may be less usable because of noise, and the design team should consider how to mitigate this.

## *Landscape*

- The panel appreciates the way the scheme the way the scheme makes use of the site's available space to create a pocket park, podium and rooftop gardens.
- The panel welcomes the proposed play provisions for different age groups.
- It emphasises that the landscaping and play provisions should allow for ball games, and that such activities can happen in small spaces on the site.

## *Parking and deliveries*

- The panel accepts that this is a car-free scheme and recognises that the proximity to the overground station means it will be accessible.
- It asks the applicant to consider how service providers such as delivery vehicles, will approach and park at the site, and plan for scenarios such as if a number of delivery vehicles at the same time.

## *Next steps*

The Community Review Panel is available to review the plans again if required, at the next stage of design development.

