



**GREENWICH HOSPITAL
COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP**

**Minutes of the First Meeting of the Community Liaison Group held at Greenwich Park
Bar & Grill, 1 King William Walk at 1600 on Tuesday 10 June 2008**

PRESENT:	Andrew Sell	Chairman (NB Real Estate)
	Jane Rowson	Secretary (Greenwich Hospital)
	Martin Sands	Greenwich Hospital
	Edward Dolby	Greenwich Hospital
	Mick Gebbett	Greenwich Town Centre Traders Association
	Rob Toogood	Town Centre Trader
	Sally Brazill-Drewett	Town Centre Trader
	Elaine Marshall	Town Centre Trader
	Ali Paton	Stallholders' Representative
	Frank Dowling	Inc Group
	Clive Lynton	Stonehurst – Greenwich Pier Developer
	Helen Beioley	Greenwich Foundation
	David Molecey	College Approach Resident
IN ATTENDANCE:	Eric Reynolds	Urban Space Management
	John Burton	Urban Space Management
	Chris Smith	Urban Space Management
	Ian Drew	NB Real Estate
	David McFarlane	Communiqué
	Neil Lucas	Drivers Jonas
	Geoff Taylor	Transport Planning Practice
	Neil Surtees	Gleeds
	Oliver Close	Gleeds

COPY TO: Those present and in attendance plus:

Kate Jacanello	Stallholders' Representative
----------------	------------------------------

Richard Upton	Cathedral Group – Devonport House
Joe Szarowicz	King William Walk resident
Vicky Bateman	Rockfield House resident
Richard Doughty	Cutty Sark Trust
Ray Smith	Greenwich Society
Andy Locke	Gypsy Moth Public House
Sarah Hardon	Town Centre Trader
Duncan Wilson	Greenwich Foundation
Cllr Maureen O'Mara	London Borough of Greenwich
Cllr David Grant	London Borough of Greenwich
Cllr Margaret Mythen	London Borough of Greenwich

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Kate Jacanello, Richard Doughty, Ray Smith and Sarah Hardon.

WELCOME AND CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

2. The Chairman welcomed the Group to the first meeting of the Community Liaison Group (CLG) and thanked the members for their attendance.
3. The Chairman explained that the purpose of the CLG was to engage with the attendees to understand their concerns and the matters to have regard to when looking at the option of Cutty Sark Gardens (CSG) for the temporary market relocation. Its role was also to ensure the continuity and success of the market through the temporary relocation.

ITEM 1 – ROLE OF COMMUNITY LIAISON GROUP

4. David McFarlane provided further detail on the role of the CLG. The following key points were made:
 - a. The intention of the CLG was to provide ongoing community consultation in addition to the consultation already undertaken, including the Key Stakeholder Consultative Group, the community newsletters and the public exhibition.
 - b. The CLG would consider issues surrounding a possible temporary relocation of the market to CSG and provide a forum for residents' representatives, stakeholders and community leaders to:
 - (1) Be kept up to date about the Hospital's plans for the regeneration of Greenwich Market and its temporary relocation.
 - (2) Discuss issues about a temporary relocation of the market to CSG.
 - (3) Discuss issues relation to how a temporary market might operate at CSG.
 - c. To date there had not been resident representative volunteers from Coltman House and Greenwich Church Street and therefore these positions would remain open for the next few weeks.
 - d. Written submissions had been received from Vicky Bateman of Rockfield House and Kate Jacanello of the stallholders who were unable to attend the meeting. These points would be raised later in

the meeting.

- e. There would be 2-3 meetings of the CLG before the submission of a planning application in September 2008.

ITEM 2 – INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT FROM GREENWICH HOSPITAL

5. Martin Sands, the Director of Greenwich Hospital introduced himself and outlined the history and role of Greenwich Hospital as a naval charity. He then provided a background on the regeneration project. The following key points were made:
 - a. The Hospital was given Ministerial approval in January 2008 to proceed with a planning application which would likely be submitted in September 2008.
 - b. There was a vital need in everybody's interest to retain retail diversity and continuity of trading together with a thriving market offer throughout the construction period. The CLG would help to determine how this might best be achieved.

ITEM 3 – PLANNING PROCESS AND TIMETABLE

6. Neil Lucas represented Drivers Jonas who had been appointed as the Hospital's planning consultants. He explained the planning process that would follow over the next few months. The following key points were made:
 - a. The planning application both for the main scheme and for the temporary market would be submitted simultaneously and would be considered in parallel by the planning officers.
 - b. CSG was a sensitive location for the temporary market relocation given its planning and heritage designations and the number of parties affected by it. It was therefore important to consult all of these parties.
 - c. The Hospital had met with the Greenwich Society, CABE, English Heritage and the Greenwich Conservation Group to discuss the principles of the main regeneration scheme, as well as the relocation of the market to CSG. All parties were positive towards the proposals.
 - d. The successful relocation of the market was integral to the success of the main scheme as it represented a means of delivering the permanent regeneration of the market whilst ensuring that it could continue to operate successfully during construction. It was therefore important that the planning officers considered both

proposals together.

- e. The approximate timescales, assuming planning permission was granted by January 2009, was to decant the market in April 2009, after which there would be 24 months of construction allowing the market and retailers to move back into the market area in Spring 2011.

ITEM 4 – TEMPORARY RELOCATION OF THE MARKET – OUTLINE DESIGN

- 7. Eric Reynolds presented a proposal for the relocation of the market to CSG and showed plans of the temporary market and its position on CSG. The following key features were identified:
 - a. It was vital to preserve the character of the market and promote and protect the existing offer. Therefore the decant would need to be a seamless exercise. The temporary market would need to be a comfortable sensible place to work that was easily recognisable and similar in size and shape to the existing market.
 - b. The market would be a tented structure to provide a roof covering and covering for all four sides with access points at the front and rear of the structure. A photographic image of the existing market entrances would be transposed on the front side of the tent.
 - c. The plan also indicated that a glazed canopy could be located north of the main tent, by the riverside, that could provide a space for eating and drinking opportunities.
 - d. Areas were indicated on the plan for servicing, toilet facilities and storage.
 - e. The plan included some self contained units to house a small number of retailers alongside the market.

ITEM 5 – GENERAL DISCUSSION (ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD AT FUTURE MEETINGS)

- 8. It was highlighted that there could be a timing issue with the glazed canopy proposed to be located near the river as this area had been licensed to London River Services for its ticketing office from September 2008 till December 2009. It was suggested that the boat operators and the eating offer could be accommodated within the market.
- 9. It was queried what reaction the Cutty Sark Trust had to the temporary market proposal. It was commented that the Trust were aware that the market relocation would span the ship's completion date (Spring 2010) but felt that the market would attract more people to the ship and increase time spent in this area to mutual benefit. There were some

details that would need to be worked out though, such as the potential illumination of the ship.

10. It was commented that for the relocation to be successful a strong marketing and advertising campaign would be crucial so that people knew the market was not closing down. It was confirmed that a full communications plan would be put in place to include display boards, extensive signage and other forms of media to ensure that people know where the market was.
11. There was a concern that the temporary market might create excessive noise which would affect the residents of the Meridian Estate. It was commented that the noise levels would not be dissimilar to the current market which it was thought to be quite low. The noisiest factors in the current market were deliveries to the Coach & Horses pub and the erection of the market stalls. As there was much more limited stall breakdown and set-up and no pub related deliveries it was felt that it would be possible to reassure tenants that the noise would not be that high.
12. There was a query as to what would happen to the small festivals that currently took place on CSG. USM would work closely with the festival operators to ensure that both parties' aspirations for CSG could be accommodated wherever possible.
13. There was a concern that as there would be a large number of people on CSG there may be a risk of people accessing the Meridian Estates from CSG. It was confirmed that the market service area would be located beside the entrance to the Estate and therefore people would be unlikely to be in this area.
14. It was queried as to how secure the temporary market would be. It was confirmed that overnight security was being looked at within the current budget so it would be possible for stallholders to leave their goods on site if required. The tent doors and sides will be secured shut at night. It would actually be a more managed environment than the current arrangement and therefore an improvement on security.
15. There was a concern that the temporary market would create a litter problem on CSG. It was confirmed USM would provide adequate means of controlling rubbish and that a strong management regime would be put in place to ensure that the litter situation wasn't worsened by the market.
16. It was questioned whether the tented structure would be heated or not. It was commented that it was not practical to heat an un-insulated structure aside from the fact that it is against building regulations to heat a temporary structure. The structure would however be weather-proof.
17. It was confirmed that the structure would have flexible sides so that they could be wound up or down depending on the weather. To prevent the tent being a wind tunnel the entrance could be staggered and/or

appropriate windbreaks would be provided.

18. There was a query as what loading and unloading provisions there would be. It was confirmed that the Hospital would need to liaise with all parties concerned to come to a practical agreement for servicing the market. USM were reasonably confident that this could work and that it may even be easier than the current situation.
19. It was confirmed that the temporary market would operate on all of the current trading days (Wednesday to Sunday) and may operate on additional days. This was still to be decided.
20. It was queried what 'Plan B' was should the Council refuse a planning application for the use of CSG for the temporary market. It was commented that it was hoped that the risk of the application being rejected would be known in advance of submission. Other locations had been considered but CSG was a superior option if feasible.
21. It was queried whether Greenwich Council would demand a rent for the use of CSG and what other costs were involved in the relocation. It was confirmed that the Council may receive a rent for the use of CSG, the main tent would be rented and USM would donate the glazed canopy. It was confirmed that the costs of the temporary market would need to be viable for it to happen.
22. It was confirmed that over the two years the tent would require some maintenance such as washing. USM would arrange this as required.
23. There was a concern that a lot of disruption and noise would be generated when the demolition and rebuild of the existing market takes place. It was suggested that the Hospital's project managers (Gleeds) establish a communication regime to inform locals of works taking place. Construction working hours could also be restricted.
24. It was confirmed that the height of the roof on the temporary market structure would be similar to the height of the existing market roof.
25. It was confirmed that the local ward councillors were aware of the CLG. Councillors declined an involvement in the Group due to probity issues as a planning application was involved.
26. It was confirmed that the main regeneration scheme and the temporary market relocation were intrinsically linked, as for the main project to work and be delivered, there would need to be a sensible and viable solution for the temporary market arrangements. As the two proposals were to be submitted simultaneously, it was thought very unlikely that one application would be approved whilst the other refused.
27. It was commented that the temporary market scheme as shown on the plans took up a lot of public space which the planners may dislike. It was suggested that if necessary the glazed canopy could be removed or used for another purpose.
28. USM confirmed that they would continue to conduct baseline counts of

footfall to monitor whether the relocation caused a drop in trade. However, it was felt that the relocation of the market would be an event/opportunity and if promoted properly could attract many people.

29. David McFarlane raised a range of issues on behalf of Vicky Bateman (Rockfield House) and Kate Jacanello (Stallholders). Written responses to these queries will be attached to the Minutes and further discussed at the next meeting.

ITEM 6 – DATE OF NEXT MEETING, ANY OTHER BUSINESS AND SUMMARY

30. The Chairman thanked the Group for the points raised and their useful participation.
31. A second meeting of the CLG would take place on 01 July at the same venue at the later time of 1700.