

**King Street Regeneration Project**  
**Stakeholder Meeting on 18 July 2007**

**In Attendance:**

Chaired by Councillor Mark Loveday

Officers attending:

Nigel Pallace (Director of Environment)

Lyn Garner (Assistant Director Housing and Community Support)

Rob Mansfield (Principal Communications Officer)

Bill Dyke (Project Manager, Corporate Property Services)

The meeting started at 7.00 p.m. and there were approximately 20 people present comprising representatives of amenity groups, local residents from the Thomas Pocklington Trust, Riverside Gardens and Marryat Court properties and the Society of Friends. The list of people who completed the attendance register is reproduced at Attachment 1.

**Notes:**

Nigel Pallace welcomed those present and gave a short presentation providing an update on the project, etc. to date. He explained that it had been the Council's intention to have met most of the Thomas Pocklington Trust tenants by now but this has not been possible as the Trust had advised that they are unable to release information on their tenants. He emphasised that the Council still wished to meet with residents and hoped that individual meetings could be arranged soon.

Those present were then invited to ask questions and the following is a summary of the questions asked and the responses made:

<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Councillor Loveday – would stakeholders prefer quarterly meetings or were they needed more frequently or less often?	Quarterly at least, but will be driven by events
Gefry Horrabbín – I see from the presentation that you've had a meeting with Thomas Pocklington Trust (TPT), we would like to know what happened?	The meeting was held between TPT and officers on 16 May. Outline details were given of the tenancies, approximately half are shorthold the remainder secure tenancies. There are 12 visually impaired tenants living in 9 x 2 bed flats. Shorthold tenancies are typically of 6, 12 or 18 months duration. TPT did agree to provide a tenancy schedule to enable more consideration of individuals needs, they have since rescinded the offer on

	the basis that it would breach the Data Protection Act
Gefry Horrabin - does that mean they are in favour of the plans?	No, they would like to either retain their building or have it replaced in the new development
Is it an option to re-provide all the existing flats?	This is not specified in the Development Brief. It is possible, but unlikely, that the preferred bidder could include this option in its proposals.
Will the Council place a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) on any parts of the site?	The Council has informed bidders that they will use CPOs if necessary.
Councillor Loveday - because St James's Investments (SJI), who work in partnership with Tesco, own the cinema, could this mean that no one else could develop the site?	It was made clear at the outset and including to SJI, that CPO powers will be used if needed.
How would a CPO be activated?	There is a range of authorities needed to implement a CPO if it becomes necessary i.e. negotiations by the preferred developer fail
Chris Allen - are the 12 visually impaired in secure or short hold tenancies?	TPT has not made this information available so not too sure.
Are the tenants TPT's responsibility and, if so, how far will the Council go beyond it's statutory responsibilities?	The Council is intent on ensuring tenants are dealt with decently and, if possible, generously. The evaluation criteria posted on the website, recognises the importance of minimising disruption to residents.
Councillor Loveday - do people think it would be a good idea for the Council to approach TPT tenants on a 'one to one' basis to ascertain their status and needs?	It was felt that some would welcome the chance to discuss matters, particularly those with shortholds.
Perhaps the proposed meeting with Greg Hands MP will be the best forum to discuss this idea?	Yes.
Denis Smith - suggest that surely it is better to talk rather than shout at each other. Could the developer house tenants in the scheme?	This has not been ruled out but the scheme needs to be viable. It could be possible to explore later if this would be feasible, once the realistic financial limits of the scheme are understood. The Development Brief does not require the developer to re-house tenants.
John Jones - there is a lot to commend the TPT building and its loss would be a great shame. SJI is buying up the Marryat Court flats. Affordable flats should be re-provided on site as per the usual re-development arrangement, particularly if the Council is getting free offices.	Both retail and residential led options will provide substantial proportion of housing to achieve viability. As before nothing is ruled out at a later date for exploring residents returning. The brief calls for bids based on wholly market housing and some affordable housing. The planning application has to be referred to the Mayor of London so is not the Council's sole decision.

	<p>Financial offers have been invited at no cost but there is no guarantee this will be possible.</p> <p>The Council is putting the whole of its land holdings, apart from the Town Hall itself, in to the development, so therefore the offices are not free.</p>
<p>Councillor Loveday – is it the case that the more profit generated by the scheme the more likely it is that the bidder will win?</p>	<p>There is a complex scoring mechanism that gives due score for good financial offers but is capped to deter excessively high bids.</p> <p>It is aimed to retain sufficient flexibility to choose the best overall proposal within constraints of competitive dialogue procurement process regulations.</p> <p>Hammersmith Town Hall Extension (HTHX) would cost circa £18M for a full refurbishment including temporary decant accommodation for about 2 years but this would leave an ugly building at the end of it which would have a value of circa £10M – this would not represent value for money.</p> <p>We are replacing HTHX and 181 King Street floor area plus an additional area to enable rationalisation of other remote properties to reduce costs and improve standards.</p> <p>Efficiencies will be possible from centralising accommodation around HTH, reducing the workforce and improved ways of working.</p>
<p>Gefry Horrabbín – why are the TPT flats to be lost in order to finance the scheme?</p>	<p>The developer will be coming up with overall proposals to derive value, this is more complex than just financing.</p> <p>Other solutions have been explored but would be of a higher cost to the Council which ultimately would impact upon council tax payers, i.e. residents.</p> <p>HTHX’s deteriorating condition cannot be ignored, either work needs to be done on it or it must be demolished. There is no ‘do nothing’ option. The opportunity must be taken to regenerate King Street, incorporate suitable public realm enhancements and minimise impact. The displaced residents will be treated decently and if possible generously.</p>
<p>The previous (TESCO-led) scheme removed Marryat Court, when was the decision taken to retain it?</p>	<p>The scheme initially developed by the Council involved HTHX and the Nigel Playfair Avenue (NPA) car park site which needed the sale of assets in central Hammersmith and prudential borrowing. Values reducing and costs</p>

	<p>increasing eventually made the scheme not viable. SJI came along with a proposed alternative scheme, details leaked and the Council decided to reject SJI's proposal. SJI withdrew their proposal before the Council could formally reject it.</p> <p>The new proposals omit Marryat Court because it is believed the scheme would be viable without Marryat Court and plainly the less disruption to residents the better.</p> <p>Currently competitively tendering opportunity and the long list of bidders includes SJI who qualified on merit</p>
Annabel Clarke – Are the Council able to manage this and the NCP car park development at the same time?	The two schemes are unconnected, they are quite different.
What will the impact of the White City (Westfield) development be?	Capacity re: shops is not considered to be a problem.
If a cinema is provided on the NCP car park site, is one needed on this site?	<p>The local cinema does not seem to be thriving.</p> <p>The King Street area may only be able to sustain one cinema complex.</p> <p>The NCP car park is probably the better location but the proposed cinema complex there would include non-general release screens as well as family and general-release films.</p>
Councillor Loveday – Is the cinema site essential for the viability of the scheme?	<p>Yes. But acknowledge the existing cinema is not very good presently and cannot compete with new local cinemas such as the proposed multiplexes at Westfield shopping centre (Shepherds Bush). The present cinema needs either major refurbishment or a re-build.</p> <p>Councillor Loveday – Probably impossible to achieve everything but will try to do as much as possible including an upgraded subway across to Furnival Gardens.</p>
Comment - The NCP cinema is proposed to be 4 screen, the size is not important but quality of provision is. A cinema is very important as it also benefits the wider community who, incidentally, are not represented here.	
<p>Comment - The development needs to create a sense of destination to be a success, e.g.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It should be a top quality design;</li> <li>2. It should accommodate all the people dislocated from the present site; and</li> <li>3. It needs a draw to create a destination,</li> </ol>	

not just shops and offices.	
Councillor Loveday – What is being suggested in the last comment that is different to what is currently being proposed?	<p>From the Floor - The only difference is that there is no definite proposal to re-house the TPT tenants on the site. If a cinema was included in the scheme then this would create a draw but it is accepted that the area does not need two. Including cafes and restaurants should create a draw.</p> <p>Officers' Response - The site is not an island, the whole town centre is a destination although parts are in need of regeneration, especially this end of King Street. The new town square will transform the area and offer great potential as a draw.</p>
Tom Young – It was said at the last meeting that studies had been commissioned on regeneration, can these be made available?	Not sure that it was said that studies had been done but there is currently lots of work being undertaken on regeneration.
Why not develop Riverside Gardens side?	The NPA car park offers potential for development.
John Marshall – Not sure why the cinema is important. It is a poor facility. King Street is good for restaurants and those on site are very popular. Area already a destination but not sure if a cinema is needed. The quality of King Street is already good and needs enhancement, not replacement.	<p>Councillor Loveday – I live near so have no wish to spoil it. Understand that Ravenscourt Society is already concerned about the state of repair and abuses by tenants of shops and restaurants in terrace opposite. An increased footfall will support investment and good tenants.</p> <p>Local restaurants should not be lost. Want to involve stakeholders in the design of the public square which may include cafés, etc.</p>
Does scheme seek to increase energy efficiency measures?	Yes, the brief states statutory minimum energy efficiency standards but evaluation criteria encourages enhancement beyond these minimum standards.
Development site indicates Friends Meeting House on corner. TESCO needed it for servicing superstore. Why is the Friends Meeting House still in the mix if housing led option approved?	The brief provides for both options to be realised. If not retail then still useful to include in the site.
Would CPO not apply if residential led?	Still the case whilst 2 options feasible.
Councillor Loveday – Is it possible that residential led developer may decide not to need the Meeting House site as it's cheaper than re-siting the Friends?	The possibility could not be ruled out but do not want to raise false hopes as the proposals are not yet known. It could be possible.
Has brief been issued to developers without seeing any buildings they have done?	The number of developers have been brought down from 17, the number originally applying, to 9 as the long list of bidders. Bidders are now introducing

	architects into their team and the quality of design is an evaluation criteria to be scored when proposals are received. A high quality of design will be required as recognised in the assessment criteria.
This proposal is destroying the community in Cromwell Avenue, which integrates with Marryat Court, this is a vital part of Hammersmith. It is all about people.	
Heather Taylor – people with sight problems will need 18 to 24 months to settle into a new area.	Councillor Loveday – We’ve spoken a lot about regeneration, etc. but the community and people give me the greatest interest and pause for thought. I am keen to ensure that all will be treated decently and hopefully generously.
Is the project going forward on this timescale?	Yes and a meeting with TPT residents is needed to understand their issues. Need to understand what treating people decently and generously means to individuals and their particular circumstances.
Could facades of TPT buildings be kept?	It cannot be ruled out that a good developer together with a sensitive architect could create such a scheme. It is not a requirement of the bidders to retain them but it will be up to them as to what is included in their bids.
Comment - Lyric Square is only very successful when the market is there, otherwise it is very sterile.	Lyric Square has potential for further events as well as running the market more frequently.
Comment - The price of the loss to the community is very high.	
Please add the Quakers to the list of things to do on the final slide of your presentation.	This is being progressed and it is understood that you are currently thinking about one property that you have been shown.
When is the next meeting?	Probably November / December but will notify everyone.

The meeting closed at approximately 20.45.

P.S. A little more information has become available on the cinema proposed for the NCP car park site since the meeting and this is included as Attachment 2.

**Attachment 1**

**List of Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation / Status</b>
Diana Douglas	Hammersmith Society
Chris Allen	Brackenbury Residents Association
John Jones	Ravenscourt Society
Tim Harvey	Ravenscourt Society
Roger Warry	Hammersmith & Fulham Historic Buildings Group
Margaret Lind Smith	St Peters Residents Association
Annabel Clarke	Cathnor Park Area Action Group
Gefry Horrabbin	Cromwell Pocklington Tenants Association
Heather Taylor	Resident
Mavis Smith	Resident
Denis Smith	Resident
Tom Young	Resident
Ed Simmons	Resident
S. Sahiti	Casa Mia Restaurant
John Marshall	Hammersmith Friends Meeting
Victoria Timberlake	Hammersmith Friends Meeting
Simon Risley	Hammersmith Friends Meeting
Liz Bridgman	Hammersmith Friends Meeting

**Proposed Cinema on the NCP Car Park Site  
In Hammersmith Grove - Outline Information**

At the stakeholders' meeting one issue raised was whether the preferred bidder should include a cinema as part of the proposed development. Reference was made to the proposed development at Hammersmith Grove NCP Car Park which is to incorporate cinema screens.

Development Securities plc (who are developing the NCP Car Park site) have recently provided details of their proposed scheme. The cinema complex suggested for Hammersmith Grove will be provided under the Everyman brand and will be combined with restaurant, café and community meeting space. According to the property press, Everyman has recently signed a 30 year lease for part of the proposed building.

The proposed cinema will:

- Occupy three floors;
- Have a ground floor reception and ticket area with a food service and creche as additional facilities;
- Provide four screens located in the basement with seating for approximately 430 people together with a small bar; and
- Include a multi-purpose space on the first floor for meetings, seminars and other community meeting uses.

The development will include three restaurants, plus a restaurant linked directly to the cinema.

Everyman currently runs a cinema complex at Hampstead Village (please access their website on [www.everymancinema.com](http://www.everymancinema.com)). They show a mixture of full length 'general release' films similar to those currently being shown at Hammersmith Cineworld. They also show specialist short feature films by contemporary and independent film makers, classic films and children's films.