



REPORT FOR:  
**Communiqué,**  
**University House,**  
**11-13 Lower Grosvenor Place,**  
**London, SW1W 0EX.**

Prepared for  
**David McFarlane**  
**5th November 2007**

Prepared by:  
ERS Research  
33 Clarendon Road  
London N8 0NW

Contacts:  
John Hearn  
020 8365 8909  
[john.hearn@electoralreform.co.uk](mailto:john.hearn@electoralreform.co.uk)

JN F679

---



1	Background and summary.....	3
2	Information about yourself .....	5
3	Questionnaire .....	6
	Appendices .....	17

## 1 Background and summary

Communiqué has commissioned ERS Market Research to analyse questionnaires received from members of the public on Greenwich Hospital's proposed scheme for the regeneration of Greenwich Market. A public exhibition was held at at 3-4 Nelson Road in Greenwich on Friday, 5<sup>th</sup> and Saturday, 6<sup>th</sup> of October 2007.

The questionnaire was designed by Communiqué. The questionnaires were handed out to members of the public at the exhibitions. A sealed ballot box was provided by ERS, at the exhibition, for survey participants to put completed questionnaires in. This ballot box was returned to ERS still sealed in order to ensure that no third party had access to participants' responses.

Respondents could also post completed questionnaires directly to ERS. Pre-paid reply envelopes were provided so responses could be posted at no expense to the participants.

A third method of participation was a web version of the questionnaire which ERS set up on their company website. A link to this could be found on the Greenwich Hospital market consultation website ([www.greenwichmarketconsultation.org.uk](http://www.greenwichmarketconsultation.org.uk)) which also showed display material used at the public exhibition.

Although respondents were asked for personal details for validation purposes, ERS Market Research is bound by the Market Research Society Code of Conduct and will not pass on the responses of anyone who has participated back to a client organisation in a way that individuals can be identified. Respondents could, however, indicate that they would like further information on this project. In these instances, contact details alone were passed back to Communiqué.

## Survey response

Public Exhibition	264	79%
Postal Responses	31	9%
Internet Responses	38	11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>333</b>	<b>100%</b>

This report contains the overall response to the pre-coded (closed) question at an overall level, together with additional analysis of the responses given at the open questions.

## 2 Information about yourself

### Postcode

	(N=333)
SE10 8	29%
SE10 9	25%
SE10 0	5%
SE10 Other	1%
SE3	12%
SE7	4%
SE8	4%
SE9	1%
SE12	1%
SE13	2%
SE14	1%
SE16	1%
SE18	2%
SE Other	3%
Other London	6%
Other Non-London	3%
None given	1%

In addition to giving their postcodes, respondents were asked to provide their name, address and signature, purely for internal validation purposes. They were also asked if they would like to receive further information on this project either by post or e-mail. The contact details of respondents who indicated that this was the case (by ticking the appropriate boxes on the questionnaire) were passed back to Communiqué, but all other information on how they responded in the survey was withheld by ERS.

---

### 3 Questionnaire

What is your view of the proposed scheme for the regeneration of Greenwich Market?

---

	(N=333)
I support the proposals	23%
I support the proposals with suggestions	50%
I do not support the proposals	22%
No reply	5%

---

The table above shows that almost three quarters of all respondents indicated that they either support the proposals outright or do so, but have suggestions to make (73%). In contrast, just above one in five stated that they do not support the proposals

## Reasons for making this choice

*Replies to this question have been summarised under the broad headings shown in the table below and on the following page.*

	(N=333)	(N=333)
<b>Maintaining the variety of market stalls</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>33%</b>
Concern that individual stalls/traders will be replaced by run of the mill high street shops/ I would like assurances that independent stores would be protected and chains stores limited.	82	25%
The variety of stalls/shops needs to be retained	37	11%
The variety of stalls/shops is an important feature of the market	11	3%
The number of small independent shops needs to be retained	8	2%
I am concerned about the future of the printmakers	3	1%
<b>Suggestions on or concerns about the proposal/designs</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>29%</b>
The proposal must retain the character of the surrounding area	24	7%
Individual suggestions on aesthetic design, e.g. the windows, types of decorations etc.	12	4%
Designs must be in keeping with local buildings	9	3%
The quality of the proposed construction in paramount	9	3%
Plans must include storage space for traders (during the development)	8	2%
Please ensure market is 'user friendly' e.g. disabled access, toilet facilities, facilities for families with children etc	8	2%
There are currently too many stores catering for tourists, and not enough for local people.	7	2%
I do not want to see more cafes/restaurants/clubs/bars	7	2%
The proposal must include better provision for trader loading & unloading, as well as parking	6	2%
I am concerned about plans for permanent stalls, as they will limit the use of space / they may be vandalised.	6	2%
Please retain the cobbled stone	6	2%
The market is currently too congested; please ensure the proposal remedies this	5	2%
Signage should be improved	5	2%
The market should include a food market (like Borough market)	4	1%
The development should be environmentally sustainable	3	1%
The market space should be utilised in the evenings, e.g. live music	3	1%
The market's isolation should be addressed, since tourists often have difficulty locating it.	3	1%

<b>Criticisms of the current proposal/designs</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>24%</b>
The designs are not in keeping / will destroy the character of the market	34	10%
I do not like the proposed colour of the brickwork	21	6%
The designs are bland/sterile/unappealing	15	5%
The proposal are profit-driven	9	3%
I do not like the proposal / I am concerned about the proposal	8	2%
The designs are too modern in style	7	2%
The layout does not leave enough room for the stalls	6	2%
Prefer alternative options (e.g. 'Option 1)	3	1%
 <b>Concerns over rent paid by market traders</b>	 <b>77</b>	 <b>23%</b>
I am concerned that rent increases as a result of the redevelopment will push out small local shops & stallholders	31	9%
I would like rent assurances given to existing small shops & stallholders	19	6%
I am concerned rents will rise	17	5%
Recent rent increases have pushed out small, local shops & stallholders	12	4%
 <b>Support for the current proposal/designs</b>	 <b>68</b>	 <b>20%</b>
I like the proposal	42	13%
The proposal will generally benefit the surrounding area	15	5%
The designs are in keeping with the individuality/character of the market/Greenwich	11	3%
I like the proposed site layout	8	2%
 <b>Comments and suggestions on the proposed hotel</b>	 <b>41</b>	 <b>12%</b>
The hotel is a bad idea	12	4%
The hotel is a good idea	10	3%
Other comments re the hotel - negative	8	2%
The plans for the hotel are agreeable, but the hotel should be a boutique rather than a chain.	7	2%
Hotel guests will be disturbed by early morning noise from the market	4	1%
Other comments re the hotel - positive	4	1%
 <b>Concerns regarding the development/construction process itself</b>	 <b>41</b>	 <b>12%</b>
I would like the development to be carefully managed so that stalls can continue trading during the disruption	24	7%
I am concerned about revenue lost by stallholders during the development	11	3%
Plans must include storage space for traders (during the development)	8	2%
I am concerned at how long the proposed development is likely to take	6	2%

<b>Comments and suggestions on traffic and pedestrianisation</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>9%</b>
I am concerned about the increased traffic & parking	21	6%
The road crossing is dangerous and needs improvement	9	3%
Certain areas ought to be pedestrianised	6	2%
<b>Comments and suggestions on the market roof</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9%</b>
I dislike the plans for the roof	11	3%
I like the plans for the roof	10	3%
The roof must ensure appropriate ventilation/waterproofing/acoustics/ease of maintenance	6	2%
Instead of replacing the roof, repair the existing roof	3	1%
<b>Comments relating to the market as it is</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>9%</b>
The market is an important part of Greenwich and attracts visitors	14	4%
I like the market as it is	11	3%
The market is currently thriving	4	1%
<b>The market needs renovation, not full redevelopment</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8%</b>
It needs refurbishment and maintenance - not full redevelopment	18	5%
Above all the site needs cleaning and tidying	5	2%
Instead of replacing the roof, repair the existing roof	3	1%
<b>Comments and suggestions on public consultation</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5%</b>
Further consultation is necessary, e.g. a public meeting, seeking the views of all interested parties etc	6	2%
I am not happy with the consultation process	6	2%
I am pleased with the consultation process	3	1%
<b>Comments on Greenwich Hospital</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>
General criticism of Greenwich hospital	5	2%
Greenwich hospital does not have a reputation as a good landlord	4	1%
No reply	38	11%
Other	8	2%

IN THE TABLE ABOVE, COMMENTS HAVE BEEN GROUPED UNDER NET HEADINGS (IN BOLD), AND ANY COMMENT WHICH DID NOT FALL UNDER A NET HEADING AND WAS MADE BY A SINGLE RESPONDENT HAS BEEN CODED UNDER A GENERAL 'OTHER' CODE. AS REPLIES COULD BE SUMMARISED UNDER MORE THAN ONE HEADING, THE SUM OF THE PERCENTAGES WILL INEVITABLY EXCEED 100.

The table on the preceding pages demonstrates that respondents were forthcoming in their comments and observations on the proposed regeneration scheme for the market. A third of respondents made reference to the variety of stalls in the market and the importance of maintaining this, with the most frequently expressed concern being that the current mix of small traders would be replaced by run of the mill high street names to the detriment of the market (25%). 11% stated that the variety needs to be retained without expressing this concern.

A large proportion focussed on particular specific aspects of the redevelopment rather than the plans as a whole (29%). Relatively small proportions made reference to topics as diverse as the aesthetics of the design, the quality of materials used, facilities for the disabled and for families with young children and babies and to sign posting and ensuring that tourists could find their way there.

Almost a quarter were hostile to the proposal (24%). One respondent in 10 overall criticised the designs as not being in keeping with or not true to the character of the market. The designs were also criticised as being bland, too modern or for making use of red brick work.

23% recorded concerns relating to the rent that market traders will be paying whilst one respondent in five re-iterated their support for the scheme. Opinion on the hotel (referred to by 12%) is mixed.

Further analysis reveals that:

- of the 78 respondents who indicated that they support the proposals, 18 supported their view with generally positive statements about the proposals (e.g. 'I like them') whilst 11 voiced the opinion that the development will benefit the area generally;
- of the 166 respondents who indicated that they support the proposals, but with suggestions, 57 expressed concern that individual stalls/traders will be replaced by run of the mill high street shops and/or that they would like assurances that independent stores would be protected and chains stores

limited, whilst 29 stated that the variety of stalls needs to be maintained. 23 expressed concern that rent increases that result from the redevelopment will push out the current small shops and stall holders and the same number indicated that they want things carefully managed so that stall holders can continue to trade during the development process;

- of the 74 respondents who indicated that they do not support the proposals, 29 stated that the designs are not in keeping with or will destroy the character of the market whilst 18 expressed concern that individual stalls/traders will be replaced by run of the mill high street shops and/or that they would like assurances that independent stores would be protected and chains stores limited.

The following quotes are representative of those types of views most frequently recorded;

#### Maintaining the variety of stalls

*"It still needs to be able to attract individual/independent traders selling at reasonable prices. Some markets, e.g. Spittlefields are very clinical - attracts corporate/large designer-mass market stores - these are not needed in Greenwich."*

*"The key issue is how the letting of the shops is managed. If the market is filled with high street 'multiples', I would not support it. Preference must be given to independent shops/traders."*

*"The qualified support is that the market stalls should be retained as they create atmosphere."*

#### Suggestions on or concerns about the proposal/designs

*"Care needs to be taken to ensure that the new buildings are of high quality."*

---

*"It's important to preserve the Georgian historic look of central Greenwich, so I think that, whilst it's not listed, the bricks should be London stock and the design of the building sympathetic to the surroundings."*

*"As it's such a special place, it's essential that it's kept this way - without losing its character."*

#### **Criticisms of the current proposal/designs**

*"The idea of red brick does not blend well with Greenwich as we know it."*

*"This is another ugly modern indoor shopping centre. Yuck! It's not necessary to change it so much and remove all charm and character."*

*"I feel the complete rebuild of the market will destroy the character which is much loved by the Greenwich Community."*

#### **Concerns over rent paid by market traders**

*"Concern re. ability for stall-holders to pay (doubtless) vastly increased rentals upon return to the site."*

*"Excessive rent rises that will follow will make the market soulless and homogenised."*

*"Keep rent at existing levels for 5 years to encourage traders to stay."*

#### **Support for the current proposal/designs**

*"If the market needs to be changed, these plans seem OK."*

*"I like the idea of being able to improve the place without going over the top about it. It does need a change and the outside character of the place will remain intact with the inside seeing the majority of the change."*

*"The proposals look sensible and exciting."*

---

## What is your interest in the market?

---

	(N=333)
I visit the market at least once a month	74%
I visit the market at least once every two months	4%
I visit the market at least once every six months	3%
I visit the market less often than once every six months	2%
I am a retailer in Greenwich Town Centre	11%
No reply	6%

---

Almost three quarters of respondents indicated that they visit the market on at least a monthly basis, whilst 9% do so less often. Above one respondent in 10 is a retailer.

Not less than seven respondents in 10 stated that they either support the proposals or do so with suggestions. Those who visit most frequently are most likely to have stated that they do not support the proposals whilst it is amongst retailers that the highest proportion to have indicated that they support the proposals but with suggestions can be found.

---

	Visit once a month (N=247)	Visit at least every two months (N=12)	Visit at least every six months (N=11)	Visit less often than every six months (N=7)	Retailer (N=36)
I support the proposals	23%	50%	55%	71%	8%
I support the proposals with suggestions	49%	42%	36%	29%	67%
I do not support the proposals	25%	8%	0%	0%	19%
No reply	4%	0%	9%	0%	6%

---

---

## What do you think would benefit the market?

---

	(N=333)
More light	55%
Market trading on more days every week	50%
More space	46%
Safer road crossings	46%
A wider variety of shops and stalls	37%
Buildings of a higher standard	37%
More seating areas	29%
Easier access into the market	28%
More tourists visiting the market	28%
A wider variety of places to eat	19%
No reply	8%

---

AS RESPONDENTS COULD GIVE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER, THE SUM OF THE PERCENTAGES WILL INEVITABLY EXCEED 100.

11 respondents in 20 feel that more light would be better for the market whilst half are keen on increasing the number of trading days in the week. Significant minorities of respondents indicated that they believed all of the other listed alterations would be of benefit, although less than one in five thought that a greater variety of places to eat would be an improvement.

	Support (N=78)	Support with suggestions (N=166)	Do not support (N=74)
More light	71%	69%	14%
Market trading on more days every week	49%	58%	35%
More space	69%	54%	7%
Safer road crossings	56%	49%	28%
A wider variety of shops and stalls	50%	40%	20%
Buildings of a higher standard	65%	37%	8%
More seating areas	40%	31%	14%
Easier access into the market	44%	30%	8%
More tourists visiting the market	38%	30%	16%
A wider variety of places to eat	29%	20%	8%
No reply	0%	4%	24%

AS RESPONDENTS COULD GIVE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER, THE SUM OF THE PERCENTAGES WILL INEVITABLY EXCEED 100.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, those who support the proposed scheme are more enthusiastic about each of the perceived benefits than those who support with suggestions and these in turn are more enthusiastic than those who do not support.

The only exception is the issue of the market being open on a greater number of days which is cited by 58% of those who support with suggestions as against 49% of those who support outright. This proposed change is also the most frequently cited one amongst those who do not support the proposed scheme (35%).

	Visit once a month (N=247)	Visit at least every two months (N=12)	Visit at least every six months (N=11)	Visit less often than every six months (N=7)	Retailer (N=36)
More light	54%	67%	73%	100%	56%
Market trading on more days every week	55%	50%	18%	14%	33%
More space	44%	67%	82%	71%	42%
Safer road crossings	47%	50%	64%	71%	28%
A wider variety of shops and stalls	40%	25%	36%	43%	22%
Buildings of a higher standard	32%	75%	64%	57%	42%
More seating areas	29%	8%	73%	29%	28%
Easier access into the market	22%	33%	64%	57%	50%
More tourists visiting the market	19%	33%	45%	71%	69%
A wider variety of places to eat	20%	17%	27%	43%	6%
No reply	9%	0%	0%	0%	3%

AS RESPONDENTS COULD GIVE MORE THAN ONE ANSWER, THE SUM OF THE PERCENTAGES WILL INEVITABLY EXCEED 100.

A majority of respondents regard more light as being beneficial, no matter what their interest in the market. Trading on more days in the week is cited by 55% of those who visit once a month and half of those who visit at least every couple of months (although this amounts to only six individuals).

Above two thirds of retailers see attracting more tourists to the market as being beneficial - visitors to the market are not so keen, with just 19% of those who visit most regularly regarding this as a benefit.

## Appendices

---

---

## Appendix 1 - The questionnaire

---



# GREENWICH MARKET REGENERATION

We would like to hear your views on the proposals set out in the exhibition of October 2007.

Please answer the questions in Sections 1-2. It will only take a few minutes of your time and will greatly help us to assess community feedback on the proposals.

## SECTION 1 INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF

### Personal details

Post code *(please complete)*

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

### Name and address

Your name and address are requested for validation purposes in order to prevent multiple returns. Unless you indicate that you wish to receive further information about the plans, this is the only purpose for which your name and address details will be used.

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Name:</b>
<hr/>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<hr/>	
<hr/>	
<hr/>	
<b>Signature:</b>	

### Email address

--

### Further information

Greenwich Hospital may wish to contact you in the future with updates on this project. This is the only purpose for which your information will be used. If you wish to receive further information by post or email, please tick the appropriate box and supply your address. If you do not wish to receive further information, please leave the boxes clear.

Post       Email

*Please turn over...*

## SECTION 2 QUESTIONS

### 1 What is your view of the proposed scheme for the regeneration of Greenwich Market?

- I support the proposals
- I support the proposals with suggestions
- I do not support the proposals

My reasons for making this choice and any other comments:

---

---

---

---

---

### 2 What is your interest in the market? *(please tick one)*

- I visit the market at least once a month
- I visit the market at least once every two months
- I visit the market at least once every six months
- I visit the market less often than once every six months
- I am a retailer in Greenwich Town Centre

### 3 What do you think would benefit the market? *(please tick as many as you like)*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> More light                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Easier access into the market          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More space                     | <input type="checkbox"/> A wider variety of shops and stalls    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Safer road crossings           | <input type="checkbox"/> A wider variety of places to eat       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> More seating areas             | <input type="checkbox"/> Market trading on more days every week |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Buildings of a higher standard | <input type="checkbox"/> More tourists visiting the market      |

---

Please put your completed form in the comments box or use one of the prepaid envelopes provided to send it to:

Research Department  
Electoral Reform Services  
Independence House  
33 Clarendon Road  
London N8 0NW

Alternatively, please visit [www.greenwichmarketconsultation.org.uk](http://www.greenwichmarketconsultation.org.uk) and fill in the form online.

To be received by 13th October 2007

Thank you for taking the time to respond

## Appendices 2 - 5

In addition to questionnaires submitted, further comments and suggestions were received by Communiqué and forwarded on to ERS. Although these were not survey submissions, they have been appended here as many of the issues raised reflect those identified in the survey.

References to individuals have been removed from these documents, but those relating to organisations or groups left in.

---

---

Appendix 2 - Comments from the Maritime Greenwich World  
Heritage Site Executive Group

---

Research Department  
Electoral reform Services  
Independence House  
33 Clarendon Road  
London N8 0NW

To whom it may concern

9 October 2007

**GREENWICH MARKET REGENERATION  
MARITIME WORLD HERITAGE SITE EXECUTIVE GROUP**

I am writing to you following the public exhibition of the proposals for the regeneration of Greenwich Market to offer a view from the context of the World Heritage Site Management Plan.

**World Heritage Site Management Plan**

Greenwich Town Centre is one of the main elements of Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site along with the Old Royal Naval College, The National Maritime Museum and Greenwich Park. Within the Town Centre Greenwich Market forms a major attraction, located since the late 1820s in the centre of the island site. The market with its associated activity and colour acts as complement to the grand architecture and formal landscape of the rest of the World Heritage Site. Para 2.4.2 deals with viability issues and notes 'much of the charm of Greenwich Town Centre comes from the markets and small shops dealing with specialist goods. Many of these shops have been lost in recent years with the arrival of bigger concerns including chain stores'. There are also a significant number of historic buildings associated with the market and its island site, which was planned and rebuilt as an integrated whole by Greenwich Hospital (largely to the design of its Surveyor, Joseph Kay) as part of a complete redevelopment of the degraded post-medieval town centre from about 1824 to the early 1830s.

The WHS Management Plan recognizes the historic and commercial role of Greenwich Market in the Town Centre and in the Action Plan para. 2.4.4 supports 'undertaking a strategic review of Greenwich Market to promote its diversification'.

In essence therefore the WHS Management Plan supports the principles behind the proposals, which are stated on the front of the consultation leaflet.

**Traffic**

One of the main issues in Greenwich Town Centre is the effect of heavy traffic. While a number of initiatives including a heavy lorry ban and car-free days have been

successful in reducing the impact of traffic, the isolation of the market site on what is effectively a roundabout detracts from both the activities within and the setting of the historic buildings. The proposals make little reference to this save for a new pedestrian link shown running north-west to a new pedestrian crossing over Greenwich Church Street towards the DLR station.

This wider concern about Town Centre traffic is for the Local Authority transport officers from both LB Greenwich and TFL to address, taking into account implications of the market regeneration scheme. There are a number of options for improving the situation overall including the introduction of a more pedestrian-friendly public realm.

### **Scheme design**

In general the overall design approach is welcomed. The introduction of a small hotel should assist the night-time economy and lengthen visitor stay in Greenwich. As with the rest of the scheme there is concern about the service and parking arrangements which are not made clear in the exhibition or brochure.

The proposals mean the loss of some building fabric although this is not of great significance. The existing steel-frame market canopy was installed in 1908, so next year marks its centenary. It is not however of great architectural value save that it is familiar and still apparently serviceable. The other loss would be the central four houses of the King William Walk frontage. These are 1950s replacements to WWII bomb-damaged Kay frontages which, while they are part of the story of Greenwich in the 20th century, only approximate Kay's flanking designs and are themselves of no great architectural value. Their replacement by a reinstated Kay frontage would mean a resurrection of Kay's overall grand design and a return to an architectural scale befitting the elevation facing the Old Royal Naval College. In this way the King William Walk elevation will also match in scale the frontages of Nelson Road and College Approach. It will be important to see authentic replication of Kay's design style here complete with similar roofs and chimneys.

The bomb damage which led to the destruction of the 'island' frontages and their replacement by 1950s versions is also evident on the Greenwich Church Street side. These face some of the earliest and most interesting domestic buildings in the World Heritage Site on the west side of that street. These buildings are not part of the proposal and not all are within the ownership of Greenwich Hospital. It is hoped that in the future there will be an opportunity to replace these 1950s in-fills with more appropriate ones, either by remodelling their frontages or replacing the buildings. There is also an opportunity to reinstate period shop fronts where these have been removed.

While the retention of the character of the market is welcomed there is concern that the scale of the proposal may threaten some of the small traders. Their businesses are small and therefore fragile, although they are essential to the special nature of the place. It is understood that Greenwich Hospital has recognised this concern and has given assurances that it will strive to create a unique and diverse trading environment which will be attractive and affordable to the market traders and to small independent enterprises.

I hope these comments are helpful and I look forward to further discussion on the details of the scheme.

On behalf of the Maritime Greenwich World Heritage Site Executive Group.

---

Appendix 3 - Comments from the Greenwich Conservation Group

**Greenwich Hospital's proposals for the redevelopment of the Greenwich Market site as seen at the public exhibition held on 5/6 October 2007.**

**Comments, for consideration, by the Greenwich Conservation Group**

In principle, the Greenwich Conservation Group broadly welcomes the proposals which are seen as representing a big improvement on the present situation.

We have no objection to either the removal of the existing utilitarian roof structure or to the demolition of the present blocks on the eastern and western flanks of the covered market.

The replacement buildings here appear to be faced in a bright red coloured material and, if this is to be facing brickwork, it is our view that a London Stock brick would be more appropriate here. However, what would be even more fitting would be the use of a traditional render treatment.

The presentational material indicates two different solutions for the replacement glazed roof. In one version the roof adopts an attractive arched form while elsewhere there is an indication of a stepped profile. (It may well be that we have misunderstood the drawing and that the stepped profile relates to a longitudinal section through the roof) The arched form is preferred but its springing point must be below the sills of the existing and proposed windows at first floor level so that adequate daylight and natural ventilation reaches the upper level rooms. Another benefit would be that, by setting the start of the roof at this level, occupants of the upper level rooms would be protected from the noise of the market activities below.

We note the introduction of a further new block set westwards towards Greenwich Church Street, running parallel with the two blocks surrounding the market. This would appear to be at the expense of some rear outbuildings of shops in Greenwich Church Street and, elsewhere, to a loss of an existing parking and servicing area. We are not entirely convinced that servicing and storage for market stalls is acceptable at first floor level as proposed, despite the provision of a service lift/s. We also have a concern that delivery vehicles will have no option but to reverse out into Greenwich Church Street - part of the town centre's one-way system - and this could present safety issues. We also question what provision, if any, has been made for temporary parking of stall holders' vehicles as they set up and dismantle their market stalls.

We also note a proposal to introduce an additional entry/exit point to the Market at the north-west corner of the plan. We can see that this makes for a direct link with the entrance to the DLR station but we are of the view that the established three-way pedestrian light controlled system at the western end of Creek Road is adequate for purpose. A further crossing would, in our view, be unacceptable.

We note the decision to demolish the four out-of-character infill buildings on King William Walk and to replace them with buildings matching in outward appearance those to the north and south, to the original Joseph Kay design. With this we have no problem, although we would ask whether a contrasting modern infill might be considered. Handled sensitively by an architectural practice of Hopkins' calibre, such a treatment could be an enhancement to the conservation area and the World Heritage

Site setting. It could also act as a reference to the glazed roof treatment inside the market and would be better able to accommodate the entry point into the market, as indicated in the model, than would a group of replica buildings.

If the intention is to position the proposed hotel in the King William Walk range of buildings, we question what thought may have been given to providing an adequate setting down and pick-up space for taxis and other vehicles at a point in the one-way system which is already compromised by the existence of numerous bus stops and stands on the eastern side of King William Walk opposite the site. A solution to the problem might be to sacrifice some of the ground floor space in the infill section to allow for a porte cochere, which could accommodate a pull-in point off the street, a reception area and double up as the already proposed way through into the market.

In conclusion, we support the current proposals yet we would make a plea that, on conclusion of the works, market traders - both stallholders and occupants of the permanent buildings - are offered rents at an economic level in order to maintain the sustainability of the enterprise.

(on behalf of the Greenwich Conservation Group)

12 October 2007

---

## Appendix 4 - Comments from the Greenwich Printmakers

Comments on the Greenwich Market development from the Greenwich printmakers.

The following comments and queries have been made by some of the Greenwich Printmakers. Because of the short notice few could come to the public consultation but I emailed them the newsletter and put a notebook in the gallery so they could record their comments. Many members queried what had happened to Option1 which they wanted to support, they were surprised that there was no alternative to the proposal. They asked "has the simple refurbishment and six new shops definitely been shelved?"

1) Here are my comments. There is such thought in members observations and comments on the plans for development, they come over with genuineness and individual assessment of the situation confronting the printmakers and other traders. It appears that comments on the one development option left is all we are allowed. This is arrogant and autocratic, veiling the fact that there is no room for independent thinking or contribution at this crucial planning stage.

Everyone involved in these planning decisions needs to take a step back so that more than a single option is on the table for this centre of Greenwich site.

Don't foist another DOME but a long term one on GREENWICH !

2) 1. What will happen to existing shops and stalls during the proposed rebuild? Where will they go? What level of rents would there be on a temporary site? Would there be relocation publicity? Who will be allocated the new shops?. From the plan there looks to be larger shops- would there be more small units or or fewer larger ones? How many shops? Have any market loos been planned for? How can the shops be accessed by vehicle for stocking? What sort of time scale are you looking at?

3) I'm concerned that the proposed new development will look like any other ordinary shopping centre, smaller, but with none of the individuality and character that now brings people into the market. Shopping centres are two a penny!

4) I'm sure the rents will be too high for the ordinary local craftsperson. I really think it will be the death of the existing market as it is today. I'm sure they will go ahead and do it anyway- they have the power and the money- what a pity!

5) The artist's impression looks very bland and devoid of the distinctive character of Greenwich, which people come to the market for.

6) In the proposed scheme it's said that permanent stalls would be installed at ground level, later it's stated the market would be larger to make it easier for stallholders to set up- this seems to be a contradiction- temporary stalls as at present or permanent ? both? The character of the market depends on the look of an old-fashioned style market providing varied and unique goods. This may be lost of Option 4 as it is goes ahead. I agree that attention and renovation of the roof is necessary, but wouldn't it be possible to install a new roof without ripping the place to pieces? This would be at minimal cost compared with the elaborate plan proposed and would mean only minor disruption. Two days for the public to view the plans is far too short a time-they should be up for at least a month.

7) I would like to support Option 1.

8) Why not restore the facades of the Market buildings to their original Georgian state pre 1940's bombing, the interiors could be designed to comply with modern requirements, disabled access, lifts etc, then I'm sure the plan would have much more support ?

Red brick as on the artist's impression is a complete no-no and it's impossible to see any details of the architectural design of the buildings of the displayed model. Why not use London stock bricks.? Has there been in-depth investigation into shopping patterns in the Market- Monday to Thursday is very quiet, it's only busy at the weekends, but many people even then come only to browse and not to spend. Rents should reflect 10% of turnover.

Is a "boutique hotel" suitable in an area immediately surrounded by 3 pubs and a club because of late night drinking and accompanying noise? Also there's lots of noise from market stalls being erected and dismantled. The height of attic floor of hotel at C may affect levels of light to rear of houses in King William Walk. How would a new roof as in the proposed plan be cleaned?

9) Any development should be kept simple with a cleaned roof. The market stalls are too numerous and need pruning. People come to the market because of the ambiance created by it's traditional style. Kiosks in diagram would block exits for fire/ ambulance.

10) A new clean roof and better access would be good but my main thoughts are really how it would affect Greenwich Printmakers and other traders. I can only repeat other's fears. Will there be increased rent if G.H. rehouse us or would we exist "virtually"? Will the same traders be able to exist in the proposed new space or be unable to afford the inevitably higher rents? Where is the funding coming from to pay for this proposed development?

11) I was expecting to see more than one plan- there is too much change, however I do think the market needs a new roof. The main worry is the time it will take-3-to 4 years? what happens in the meantime- a temporary village somewhere?

12) I support Option 1. the market definitely need cleaning up- the roof is a disgrace. As for Option 4, do Greenwich residents and retailers really want a hotel in the market increasing traffic and parking problems the town centre already suffers from? Provide decent affordable coffee shops, ( not chains) within the market to attract people to stay and shop.. Having been a member of Greenwich Printmakers for more than 10 years i am deeply concerned that this unique organization will will come to an end all because of money. Inevitably rents will be pushed up and we as an artist-run co-operative will not be able to afford further rent increases. What will happen during this re-building? How will it be managed ? Obviously everyone's trade will be affected.

13) I've had a look at the proposal in the newsletter and am a loss to what comments I could make. The market is suffering and does need a rethink and their ideas may not be so bad. it is a heritage site but feels like a down-at-heel market.

14) It is difficult to judge if the new layout would work for us. E seems to be for stalls, otherwise it will be blocking the view of visitors entering from the main entrance- it depends on how large the gap is between D and E. It would be helpful if the plan indicated the sizes.

---

Appendix 5 - Comments from the Greenwich Society

Comments from representatives of the Greenwich Society.

The Greenwich Society's Executive Committee were very positive in their views on your proposals, as displayed at the recent public exhibition. More broadly, we have been very encouraged by and appreciative of the Greenwich Hospital's openness in respect of its hopes and aspirations for the Market site, both publicly and in the context of the Key Stakeholders' Group. We have particularly welcomed the Hospital's declared intention to maintain the character and eclectic nature of the Market's operations and offer.

To use the words which I seem to recall using at the last meeting of the KSG, the Society considers Option 4 to be exciting and creative and very much welcomes the concept of the scheme. We look forward to seeing the more detailed proposals in a Planning Application in the near future. There are just four points on which we would wish to make some brief comment at this stage:

- 1 Along with other stakeholders, we very much hope that, following the delivery of the scheme, rents remain at an affordable level which will allow small scale specialist traders (both in the shops and on market stalls), to continue to offer the eclectic mix to which I have already referred and to which all concerned undoubtedly aspire.
- 2 As regards the design and operation of the proposed hotel, I'm sure that the nature of the site will test the ingenuity of your various professional advisers when translating the concept into practice! We look forward to seeing more details in due course. Of particular interest will the proposals (a) for a drop-off point for delivering hotel guests to its front door, bearing in mind the ever-present problem of traffic in the town centre; and (b) for the linking of the two wings of the hotel on opposite sides of the market space.
- 3 A crucial component of the delivery of the scheme will be the viability of the arrangements which are offered for existing shop- and stall-holders to continue to trade during reconstruction. We feel that this is a key issue and that an alternative venue should be within the environs of the World Heritage Site.
- 4 The new market space will offer an attractive potential venue for evening activities - such as small scale public performances - and we would urge that the space managers will take that opportunity to create an interesting addition to the evening scene in Greenwich town centre.

I hope that these comments are helpful and constructive and I look forward to seeing you at the next meeting of the Group.

With very best wishes for a successful conclusion,

\*\*\*\*\*

for the Greenwich Society