

Greenwich Builds consultation event - The Brooks

Henwick Primary School, Henwick Road, Eltham, SE9 6NZ

Wednesday 22nd January 2020

(FAQ's information sheet provided to all attendees at the meeting.)

In attendance

Clive Efford MP - Chair

Cllr Chris Kirby

Pippa Hack

Jeremy Smalley

Duncan Broe

Peter Fernandes

Lee Christie

Thanh Le

Shedkm representatives

BCA Landscape representatives

A&E Elkins representatives

Ideal Modular representatives

BlakeneyLeigh representatives

90 residents

Member of Parliament

Cabinet Member for Housing

Director Regeneration, Enterprise and Skills

Assistant Director of Regeneration

Head of Homes Delivery

Senior Project Manager

Engagement and Consultation Manager

Greenwich Builds Support Officer

1. Introductions, were made by the Chair of the meeting - Clive Efford MP

- a. **Cllr Kirby** went on to give context as to the reason these proposals have been developed, namely to deliver the desperately needed homes for people on the RBG Council waiting list. The proposals for the Brook estate form part of the wider Greenwich Builds programme, which commits Royal Borough of Greenwich to delivering high quality social housing at a scale not delivered in over a generation, with 750 planned over the next four years. Details of the programme can be found at www.royalgreenwich.gov.uk/greenwichbuilds.
- b. Cllr Kirby explained that this was the second consultation meeting with residents and that the purpose of the meeting is to share current proposals, explain what has changed since the last meeting and to take any questions.

2. Presentation given by architects, Shedkm and BCA landscape

3. Questions and Answer session:

Flooding:

Q - Concerns were raised about the local flooding risk to Bournbrook Road, corner of Highbrook Road.

A - As part any planning application, if the area is in at risk of flooding we will need to produce a Flood Risk Assessment and alongside it, a mitigation strategy. A technical solution will be provided, which will be explained in detail at a later stage.

Q - Residents raised an issue of potential water pooling at the bottom of Ridgebrook Road.

A - A full drainage survey will be conducted, and a solution designed to manage any local water pooling.

Parking / traffic:

Q - How will the increased demand of parking be met?

A - Parking provision was directly answered in the FAQ sheet, which details generous parking provision being proposed within the boundaries of the respective site. The point was made that the proposal goes above what the Mayor requires and equates to 0.8 spaces per dwelling.

Q – Concern was raised about access in / out of Polebrook road (via Halsbrook Road), traffic views in to a dangerous bend along with Birdbrook / Ridgebrook Road. Residents also queried whether Ridgebrook Road is wide enough to manage the projected increase in vehicle use.

A – Royal borough of Greenwich Highways team will review and comment on the potential impact highlighted above and make recommendations to resolve any issues.

Q – Related to the Ridgebrook Road site, it was expressed that there is already a problem with builders from the Kidbrooke development parking locally and sometimes dangerously along with users of the Stalkway Centre. It was felt that building on Ridgebrook road could exacerbate the current problem.

A – Any construction traffic / parking created by these proposals will be managed through a construction management plan. There is currently a generous 69 parking spaces proposed within the boundaries of the three sites.

Q – Has a parking stress survey been carried out?

A – Yes, the survey was conducted over a three week period and reflected 48% kerbside parking stress across the three sites.

Q – How will refuse vehicles manage?

A – A waste management plan will be developed in conjunction with street services at the planning application stage.

General questions

Q – There is a removal of green space, how can the proposals make up to local residents for this loss of space.

A – there is a budget of £750k to improve the remaining green spaces, and residents' suggestions are welcomed.

Q – What is the PTAL rating?

A – Public Transport Accessibility Level rating – described further in the FAQ's

Q – What can be done to improve local transport?

A – Cllr Kirby explained that the case is being made for improved public transport across the borough. Clive Efford MP added that there will be more bus routes coming to the area soon.

Q – Annesmere gardens residents queried about the impact on privacy / light

A – We will ensure that any final proposals meet planning requirements to assess the impact of light and privacy.

Q – Some residents queried, the style of the proposed new builds and asked that it be kept in line with the local 'style' and not like the Jacks Acre style.

A – Cllr Kirby explained that the style is somewhat subjective and he personally like the style of Jacks Acre, but the designs are not yet finalised.

Q - Residents requested that RBG develop the old Thomas Tallis site, rather than the sites on the Brook estate.

A – Cllr Kirby explained that the site is an old education site, in need of decommissioning, with a covenant on it.

Q – Why was the Kidbrooke site (old Ferrier estate) given to a private developer, rather than developed by RBG.

A – Cllr Kirby explained that the redevelopment of the old Ferrier estate started over ten years ago, when the economic climate was very different. Cllr Kirby added that the Housing crisis was not due to the Ferrier estate redevelopment, but because RBG lost many of its council homes due to their being sold privately under the Right to Buy. The lack of the housing grant also contributed to the crisis.

Q – A resident queried, considering the scale of the Housing crisis if 750 new council homes are anywhere near enough?

A – Cllr Kirby explained that it is not enough and are looking at various other sites around the borough for a potential Greenwich Builds phase two into the future, subject to funding.

Q – Is the development worth the environmental impact. 'once the green space is gone, it is gone'

A – This is explained in the FAQ's, with a projected increase of 180 trees, commitment to invest £750k in the remaining public realm, zero-carbon homes, the proposals aim to improve the local environment.

Q – How will RBG improve the recreational space, that is lost with this development?

A – The Greenwich Builds team will be investing £750k in to improving the remaining green spaces, including £250k on existing play provision. The Greenwich Builds team would love to hear any Ideas from the community on how to enhance the proposed communal spaces.
Email Greenwich.builds@royalgreenwich.gov.uk

Q – Will homes built all be Council homes?

A - Yes

Q – What will the impact from a community safety perspective?

A – Community safety has been incorporated as part of the design (improved lighting, clear lines of sight etc) and with more detail provided at the planning application stage.

Q – Residents queried whether there is space for school provision locally.

A - Cllr Kirby explained that he believes that we do, with Henwick School alone currently 5% under subscribed. (further information to be provided in any planning application)

Q – What will happen to the hedge, bank of trees running between Rochester Way and the Halsbrook site?

A – No trees will on Rochester Way will be removed without replanting elsewhere.

Q – How will RBG feedback from the meeting

A – Via these minutes, FAQ's and updates on the webpage. Residents that provide their email address will be informed when changes are made to the webpage in future.

Q – Clive Efford MP and Cllr Kirby were asked why they were not listening to the residents that signed the petition against these proposals?

A – Clive Efford MP explained that he also has a duty to consider the needs of his constituents that are not at the meeting, but are on the Council waiting list, desperately in need of accommodation.

4. General comments made:

- Many residents were supportive of building more social housing.
- Many residents were opposed to any development on any of the green spaces and did not feel as though they were being listened to.
- Many residents were concerned about the future impact of the proposals, in relation to the environment / local infrastructure.
- One resident explained that there were previously houses on this land.

