

## **River Gardens Community Liaison Group (CLG) – Meeting 1**

**Venue:** The Forum, Trafalgar Road, Greenwich

**Date:** 14 March 2017

**Attendees included:** Cllr Chris Lloyd (CL); Cllr Stephen Brain (SB)

Around 40 residents attended (1,000 households around the site received invitation letters)

**Project team attendees:** Matt Browne (MB), SP Broadway – Chairman; Jamie MacArthur (JM), Bellway; Daniel Gray (DG), Bellway; Matthew Loughlin (ML), K2 Group; Dan Bleach, SP Broadway

### **Item 1: Welcome and introductions**

1.1. MB opened the meeting by welcoming attendees to the first CLG, and introducing the project team in attendance.

### **Item 2: Draft Terms of Reference for the Group**

2.1. MB outlined the terms of reference previously distributed to attendees, and asked for any issues with the terms of reference to be raised to him (no issues were raised). MB stated that the purpose of the CLG was to provide updates on the Bellway development at River Gardens, and an opportunity for residents to raise issues regarding it, and stressed that the issues arising from neighbouring developments could not be dealt with at this meeting.

2.2. MB said that a new community website – [www.spbroadway.com/rivergardens](http://www.spbroadway.com/rivergardens) had been set up and would be kept updated with development news and CLG minutes. He said that the website included his contact details, allowing people to raise any issues directly with him.

### **Item 3: Background**

3.1. JM said the River Gardens development was consented in 2013 with the application brought forward by London & Regional. JM explained that a new application was approved in 2015, and that Bellway became involved in the site in 2016.

3.2. JM gave a brief overview of the Bellway portion of the overall River Gardens development. JM said Bellway had recently submitted an application to make small adjustments to the scheme, known as a section 73 application.

3.3. JM said there would be more apartments if the new application was to be consented, but the building would become smaller due to a more efficient use of space. JM added that the number of parking spaces would increase accordingly.

#### **Item 4: Build-out progress and timescales**

4.1. DG explained the phasing of the development, highlighting which blocks would be built when.

#### **Item 5: Questions**

5.1. CL asked why it had taken so long to organise the liaison group, given that discussions with the council, about setting up a resident's forum to discuss development issues locally, had taken place in November 2016. JM said he had only heard about the council's request to Bellway for a liaison group in February 2017, and agreed to look into why he had been informed so long after the initial discussions. MB said that Bellway had been asked to organise a liaison group to discuss their development, and had done so.

5.2. CL asked about the protocols in place to deal with staff misbehaviour, citing examples he was informed about by residents of public urination and littering. DG said that there was no excuse for this, and that all the facilities required by construction workers were on-site. DG stressed that the construction workers for the Bellway scheme had distinct workwear, and asked whether CL was certain that the examples given were from Bellway's workers. DG said he would look into organising a patrol watch to ensure such issues did not occur. ML said that other developers had a 'red card' system to penalise workers behaving anti-socially, and that this is something that he could look into implementing.

5.3. CLG members suggested that it was difficult to differentiate between the construction workers across the neighbouring developments, and asked why the other developers were not present at this meeting. ML said the other developers did not seem interested in engaging.

5.4. CLG members raised the issue of spitting and littering outside the site. DG said spitting was not allowed on or off the site, and said he was unaware of any Bellway involvement in littering. CLG members said workers park outside the gate in the morning before the site opens, eat breakfast outside the site and leave litter. CLG members suggested using more bins, to which DG agreed. CLG members said the spitting was related to dust pollution, and asked whether there was dust monitoring in place. DG said there was dust monitoring.

5.5. CLG members said vehicles from the site had been backing onto Azof Street, and that this would not happen if the entry gate was angled. It was further suggested that this angled gate had been agreed with London & Regional. ML said they were in the process of trying to close off a road to achieve that, but were being held up by the council. ML said they hoped to do this soon.

5.6. CLG members asked about crane movements to and from the site, asking why this takes place at unsocial hours. DG said those large vehicle movements were restricted by TfL and the Met as to when they could occur, and that Bellway had followed those guidelines. CLG members said that the last time there was a crane movement to the site, they only received the newsletter after it took place. ML said that future events would be communicated better to residents. MB said Bellway had asked SP Broadway to assist with that exact kind of issue and to ensure there was good communication with residents.

**5.7.** CLG members asked whether Bellway could work with the adjacent developers to find a better route to and from the site. ML said it had not been possible to get a consent from the other developers to use the privately owned roads in the area. SB said that he attended regular meetings with Barratts and could try and arrange for Bellway to attend. DG said that this would be very welcome.

**5.8.** CLG members asked about the height and size of the development and whether it was consistent with the original consent. JM confirmed that while the number of apartments was to increase, the building itself was actually reducing in size compared to the original consent.

**5.9.** CLG members asked when the river path would open. ML said it was planned to be opened in April 2018.

**5.10.** SB said he had spoken to a construction driver and was sworn at. SB asked whether Bellway had the intention of using the river to transport materials to and from the site. ML said that the majority of the bulk removal had been taken away from the site by the river, and that it was effective for large quantities. ML said use of the river would be limited once the river path was open.

**5.11.** CLG members asked about the phasing of the landscaping, and asked whether certain parts of the landscaped grounds would be open at the same time as the new homes. ML said certain parts of the site that would be landscaped were still needed for construction access.

**5.12.** CLG members asked about construction hours, and said that they had seen work taking place after 6:00pm. DG said the council had informed Bellway that they were entitled to work until 6:30pm, and agreed to seek clarification from the Council. DG said that currently Bellway made every effort to finish before 6 pm.

**5.13.** CLG members asked about controls over 'parking surfing'. CL said stricter parking restrictions were being discussed, and that there would shortly be a second consultation to discuss this, with implementation planned for Autumn 2017. DG said the majority of the workers at the site travel by public transport (60 out of 70 workers), and that the few that drive park on the site.

**5.14.** CLG members asked whether the new landscaped areas would be private and gated. DG said they would be. CLG members asked about the benefits of the development for local residents. JM said these had been set with the original consent, and that financial contributions would be made to the local authority as per that consent.

**5.15.** CLG members asked about the cleaning of the roads, and added that while the sweeper helped it did not clear the dirt from the front of nearby houses. ML said he would ask if it was possible to clean the front of the nearby houses also.

**5.16.** CLG members said one of the road sweepers was very loud, suggesting that it was broken, and asked whether an alternative sweeper could be used that would be quieter. DG agreed to look into this.

**5.17.** CLG members raised an issue with lights being left on near the portacabin and at the entrance to the site. DG said these should be turned off when the site is closed, and agreed to look into implementing stricter protocols.

**5.18.** CLG members asked if it would be possible to provide a simplified version of the amendment application. JM said he understood these applications were lengthy and hard to read, and said he would look to provide a summary document on the new website.

**5.19.** CLG member asked that more information about the development be provided on the website, including plans and 3D images. MB said the website would be updated to include a minute of the meeting and other information relevant to the CLG. JM said the documents and plans discussed at the CLG would be made available to view on the website.

**5.20.** CLG members asked about further cleaning works off the site, including removing dirt from the site out of the drains. DG said he would enquire about the possibility of doing this.

#### **Item 6: Next steps**

**6.1.** CLG members asked about the schedule of future meetings and suggested they occur every three months. The project team in attendance agreed to this, and MB noted that the next CLG would be organised for mid-June.

**6.2.** MB closed the meeting. MB thanked the CLG members for attending, and stressed that contact details were available on the website should CLG members have any questions in the meantime. He urged those present to fill out the contact forms provided, so that they could be sent emails about about the site, and future CLG meetings.