As Chair of East Greenwich residents, we believe that a robust case still needs to be made by the applicant and tested by the council to demonstrate that there will be no adverse impact on neighbouring centres or on the wider transport network.

On transport:

* Use of PTAL ratings are not relevant for the IKEA mode of shopping and could be considered to be disingenuous, you can’t buy a kitchen sink and take it home with you on the bus
* A transport assessment has been carried out, but in isolation and only specific to IKEA’s plans

What about the bigger picture?

What about large scale neighbouring developments which will massively increase the densities in the East Greenwich area. These developments will be fed by the same overburdened local networks for the IKEA site (both at construction stage and then by the developments residents)

We are talking about 770 units at Enderbys with 250 room hotel and cruise liner terminal, Alcatel 272 Units Greenwich square 645, Lovells proposed 849 under new plans

10,000 new homes on the Peninsular alongside the 02

The Council cannot claim that because the applicant has presented figures which TfL has reviewed that its job is done in terms of judging the impact on its own local residents and businesses. The Council is the local Highways authority, these local networks are already overstretched, but where is the evidence, the report which tests and proves the applicants figures?

* East Greenwich is not an out of town shopping area akin to Thurrock and the like as classified in the papers.

There is no reference to the impact on Trafalgar road, or Greenwich Town Centre in any of the papers – IKEA users from Surrey Quays, Deptford, anywhere West of the site will not all be accessing the site from the A102. Most likely, they will be coming through the centre of Greenwich and along Trafalgar Road.

Infact, Tfl notes in its consultation response that no wider modelling has been conducted beyond the immediate local junctions – follows references to Bugsbys Way and A102

* Can I just remind you of pollution data taken last year on these local networks

 40 μg/m3, the EU limit.

Woolwich Road Blackwall Lane 70 and the fly over and 50 at two locations on the Peninsular

* Where is the overall Environment Impact Assessment?
* Much still needs clarifying, we have a travel plan which many local groups dispute, but the details of the car park management plan, construction logistics plan, delivery and servicing plan, cycle and pedestrian plan remain to be seen
* I would also add that the change in design, the loss of the eco-friendly Sainsbury’s building and the concreting over of the wildlife area will lead to a deterioration of the site and public realm whilst next door on Woolwich Road the council will be pumping tax payers money into public realm improvements. **Where is the coherence here?**

So I challenge point 2.2 of the Board Papers stating that the principle of providing a major non-food retail outlet out of town centre location is acceptable or sustainable or under 2.7 that these plans would not harm the quality of life for nearby residents – that remains to be seen at this stage.

These plans, as they stand, are not sustainable in terms of traffic, health and environment and there seems something of an indecent haste in recommending the granting of outline permission.

I would suggest that a deferred decision would be the best outcome for residents and businesses with IKEA coming  back with significant revisions to their plans. They need to be pushed harder to prove their development will not adversely affect residents and communities in East Greenwich or bring the Peninsular to a complete standstill before outline permission is granted.