



## Residents / GLA Meeting

Re. OAPF

24<sup>h</sup> May 2017

Present:

GLA: Shelley Gould, Holly Lang

Residents: Arthur, Glen, Danny, Maureen, Jackie, Eliza, Maggie, Candida (chair), Ahmed, Pam

Advisor: Mike

### 1. GLA Presentation

- a. The GLA needed to look at what could possibly go on each potential site on the IOD, and at 3 options for each site: low, medium or high density, and then predict what infrastructure was likely to be needed to sustain the Island in each density range.
- b. Part of the work is to test different infrastructure packages involving transport, GP's and health services, and education and schools.
- c. They need to make sure any proposals are feasible and then draft their proposals.
- d. The figures that are produced are based on possible eventualities not on any preferred options.
- e. The market and LA planners are what drives any decisions about what is developed.
- f. Any development needs to be sustainable and improves the environment for for people living here.

### 2. Points rising from discussions

- a. Routes and links
- b. The plan looks at developing routes to help link up areas.
- c. This document does not signal any estates should be developed, though those possibilities are included.
- d. Some gated estates are still blocking the river.
- e. Piecemeal development has maintained the old industrial boundaries and contained areas. The plan should link these up.
- f. This infrastructure model will inform the LA where they need to focus their services and develop their services.

### 3. Transport

- a. Getting on and off the Island is still a significant problem.
- b. Getting to hospitals and on Public Transport is an area that should be prioritised.
- c. Coaches Parking by hotels is an issue.
- d. There is always concern that emergency services could be hampered by blocked traffic which seals off access to the Island.
- e. The study will help to influence reductions in pollution by recommending bus types etc. The air quality team will be advising on this.

### 4. Housing and Grants

- a. What if the infrastructure costs are so high, there is no money left for social housing?

- b. CIL (community infrastructure levy) can be used to fund anything except housing.
- c. Section 106 money can fund 30, 40 or 50% of social housing costs.
- d. Central Grant commitments can be taken into account as well.
- e. This study is a tool which enables planners to see how much extra money will be needed.
- f. Developers can provide Affordable Housing but not social housing because of the higher infrastructure costs.
- g. On our estates the lowest level of development has been put at 8% increase (infill) – the study does expect this. This is the same for all London Social Housing Estates.

## 5. OAPF baseline

- a. Starting point for minimum infrastructure is all the development that has been approved or is currently seeking planning approval.
- b. The additional infrastructure will have already been stipulated in the planning application.
- c. There is already a shortfall in infrastructure following developments already in place – shouldn't this be the baseline?
- d. What infrastructure could improve the facilities for local people – not just adding more schools and surgeries for new residents. What about Leisure Centres, parks and play areas as part of the plan.
- e. The London Plan sets a higher expectation but this was not a target.
- f. The previous London Mayor was maximising potential schemes, the current administration has a more balanced view.

Residents Only business.

## 6. Kingsbridge Bid

- a. A letter has been received from John Gregory. This was quite brief and only skimmed over our concerns but agreed to come and meet with us.
- b. If the JV has been challenged by this GLA bid and Argent walk away from the JV it will mean other development options will be opened up, rather than the bigger project Argent would favour.
- c. We are still unclear about where Argent's target limits / grey areas are.
- d. If Argent stay involved they might need to be flexible about the range of options.

## 7. Consultation

We agreed to put the consultation process long list of possible consultants on hold until further notice.

## 8. New CEO

- a. We agreed to send a letter to Anthony Mayer, Chair of the Board of OH Directors, as they are appointing a new CEO to
- b. take the opportunity to build more positive relationships with TH, residents, and the community it serves, and to nurture a new more positive attitude.

## 9. Representation of Residents

A Barkantine resident has been accusing the 4EF of undermining their tenancy agreement with OH by representing him/her. We need to make it very clear in any information we produce that we are not

representing anyone, that we are gathering information and ensuring residents are properly consulted and responsible for any decisions made about their homes, not the 4EF.

#### *10. May Newsletter*

OH is still considering whether they will distribute it. If they do not, Canary Wharf have offered to.

#### *11. Neighbourhood Plan*

We are hoping that oil any of our amendments to the estate regeneration section do not get included in the main policy because they are not directly “land use” issues, they will be included as “expressions of the community”.