

# Report to Council

27 OCTOBER 2010

## Shepherds Bush Market Area Planning Brief – Market and Theatre led Regeneration

### Addendum

#### Introduction

These late comments have been received outside the statutory consultation process. They exclude the comments made during the drop in sessions held on 15 and 16 October, which are included in the main report, and have been provided to the Council as an addendum detailing occupier and stakeholder concerns. A number of respondees below have already provided responses that have been incorporated into the main Council report.

<p><b>C Roney</b></p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Please reconsider the destruction of the old fabric shops, they are the heart of the fabric world and attract customers from miles away.</p>
<p><b>Rachael Jukes</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Restore, don't destroy.</p>
<p><b>Mary-Jane Gibson</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Market Diversity</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Shocked to hear the proposal to demolish this terrace in order to update the area. These shops ought to be restored not destroyed and should form the architectural centre piece of the proposed works in Shepherds Bush Market.</p> <p>The textile shops are famous for their quality and variety throughout the country and are a huge draw for the fashion industry, the theatre, schools and the general public. Without these shops the volume of visitors would diminish.</p> <p>If the Market is sanitised too much and turned into a paved area with cafes and high rent stalls changing its organic and colourful nature, the volume of visitors will probably fall. It's because of the wonderful ethnic mix</p>

		and colourful feel to the market that visitors are drawn to it particularly if they have just visited Westfield.
<p><b>Karen Peacock</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Dismayed to learn of plans to demolish these shops. Appreciate that the terrace is an eyesore, but there is no reason why it couldn't be restored.</p> <p>The textile shops are an important facility to the theatre, film and television industry. As a freelance costume designer, I depend on those shops for all my productions as they provide affordable and unusual fabrics that can't be found elsewhere. Where will these shops go if the terrace is demolished?</p>
<p><b>Steve Basterfield</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Loss of Pie and Mash Shop Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>General</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Disgusted at the planned demolition of this terrace, which is a part of history.</p> <p>Been going to the pie and mash shop for over 35 years and it's an integral part of going to QPR. Don't want it removed.</p> <p>There is no reason to extend the Market, Westfield is just around the corner.</p>
<p><b>Martin Horsfield</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Modern Market</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>This would be an act of cultural vandalism forced upon the people of London. It is not appropriate to demolish buildings dating from the 19<sup>th</sup> century in order to enhance the historic character of the area. The developers are just after money.</p> <p>Do not want the Market turned into an identikit "shopping experience" similar to all the other modern retail developments in London.</p>
<p><b>Marwinnie Malek</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Do not want this terrace demolished, please consider other options of regenerating the area without destroying its history and community.</p>
<p><b>Pierre Bedenes</b></p> <p>General</p> <p>Lime Grove Hostel</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Happy the way things are on Goldhawk Rd.</p> <p>This hostel should not be opened up again for the homeless. The site has no access road other than through the residential road of Gainsborough Court. Appreciate the homeless have to be housed</p>

		somewhere, but not on a residential street.
<b>Steve Whitehead</b>  Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	This is a fabulous stretch of Victorian Architecture and the money spent on demolition would be far better spent on restoration. Too often it is considered the easy option to knock down and redevelop rather than help and restore. These are marvellous examples of Victorian architecture and nothing can truly replace this architectural character that will be lost.
<b>Matthew Woolf</b>  Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	Please do not demolish this historic terrace of shops.
<b>Shireeka Devlin</b>  Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd  Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	The terrace should be retained and restored.  I'm a fashion design student and shop here nearly every day as it's the cheapest place in London to buy fabrics. If these shops go then there will be nowhere to buy cheap fabric.
<b>Rachel Roberts</b>  Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	The loss of these cheap shops will mean I will have to shop at more expensive shops in central London.
<b>Samina Qadir</b>  Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	These local businesses are vital to local communities and students.
<b>Archana Ravivarma</b>  Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	I'm a fashion student and find these shops very helpful with a big selection of fabrics. The loss of these shops will destroy the history of the area.
<b>Guy Rubin</b>  Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd	<b>Object</b>	This terrace is distinctive and important in that it contrasts with the anonymous identikit nature of high streets in the Borough. It is part of Shepherds Bush heritage, which should be preserved and retained in the development rather than sacrificed.

<p><b>Christing McKay</b></p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Don't get rid of the fabric shops.</p>
<p><b>Ellen Stelter</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>It is a terrace which provides vital facilities to our neighbourhood, and can not be replicated.</p>
<p><b>Keith Gould</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Lime Grove Hostel</p> <p>Public Meeting</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>The proposed demolition is an abomination, these shops should be restored to their former glory.</p> <p>Lime Grove residents will suffer from trouble and noise from the hostel.</p> <p>Would like a public meeting so the community can make their opinion known.</p>
<p><b>Miranda Wilde</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Always take pleasure at looking at this terrace, but is in need of some tender loving care. It would be a great blow to the character of this section of Goldhawk Rd if these buildings are demolished. They are wonderfully quirky and typical of their era. 'Old' London is rapidly disappearing and being replaced by banal ubiquitous glass and concrete boxes. The terrace should be retained and restored. Wesfield is enough shiny new glass for Shepherds Bush.</p>
<p><b>Alistair Whitehead</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>This row of buildings gives the area a lot of character and it would be a shame if they were lost.</p>
<p><b>Joanne Kay</b></p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Concerned about the destruction of fabric shops in the area, it would be a tragedy if they were to be destroyed.</p>
<p><b>David Wilson</b></p> <p>General</p> <p>Consultation</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Object to the regeneration of Shepherds Bush Market, the proposal is ill conceived, and hugely detrimental to the Market Traders, the local community, and the clients of Broadway.</p> <p>This is being pushed through by the Council with complete disrespect to the wishes of the Market</p>

Broadway Hostel and Lime Grove Hostel		<p>Traders, the local community, and the clients of Broadway.</p> <p>Don't want the Broadway Hostel relocated to the Lime Grove Hostel. There are too many families with young children on Lime Grove and relocating the Broadway to Lime Grove serves neither the adjoining residents or the clients of the Broadway.</p>
<p><b>Ainhoa Acosta</b></p> <p>Council Questionnaire</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>New Market</p> <p>Rent</p> <p>Car Parking</p> <p>Toilets</p> <p>Lighting and Security</p> <p>Lime Grove Hostel</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Public Meeting</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>The Council sent out 71 questionnaires and received a response rate of 69% in favour of the regeneration – surely this does not make for a conclusive result and is certainly not representative of the majority of the population of the area.</p> <p>This terrace needs to be restored and retained as valuable heritage, not converted into an impersonal, characterless shopfront.</p> <p>The proposal to upgrade the Market does not take into account the desires and needs of the Market Traders or their customers.</p> <p>The objective is to price Traders and many residents out of the area as well as erasing the real character and ethnic diversity of the area – its real strength.</p> <p>The car parking problem needs to be sorted out.</p> <p>The toilets need to be upgraded.</p> <p>These need to be improved.</p> <p>Lime Grove residents will continue to suffer the effects of the relocation of the services offered by Broadway into the Lime Grove Hostel – a poor site that doesn't serve its occupants.</p> <p>This proposal has deliberately been kept away from those who will be affected by it.</p> <p>Would like to be given the opportunity to express our views in an open meeting.</p>
<p><b>Walter, Suzanna, Natasha and Same Harris</b></p> <p>General</p>	<b>Object</b>	<p>Object to the unnecessarily grandiose plans for the Market and its neighbourhood. Do not want a piazza, cultural area, cafes, restaurants or new shops. The changes should be minimal and responsive only to the needs of those directly involved in trading and their</p>

<p>Access Surfacing</p> <p>Toilets</p> <p>Roof Over Market</p> <p>Market Pricing</p> <p>Loss of Textile Shops Within 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Market Diversity</p>		<p>customers.</p> <p>Proper, safe surfacing is important.</p> <p>New and additional public toilets would be welcome.</p> <p>There should be a roof over the current Market.</p> <p>Our family lives on a low income and we buy food at the Market more cheaply than at supermarkets, the household goods and clothes are cheaper too.</p> <p>No where has such a fabulous range of textiles at affordable prices. Against the demolition of this terrace.</p> <p>Do not want the Market's diversity to be lost.</p>
<p><b>Margaret Hyde</b></p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>Overdevelopment</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>These buildings form part of the traditional and human scale street architecture of Goldhawk Rd and should be cherished. The traditional feel of this part of the Borough should be improved upon rather than destroyed.</p> <p>The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site and does not maintain the existing height levels and street lines of adjoining development.</p>
<p><b>Andy Slaughter, MP for Hammersmith</b></p> <p>General</p> <p>Public Meeting</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>General</p> <p>Section 4 – Development Guidelines and Principals, B The Markets</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>None of my previous questions have been answered and the scheme has not changed, further evidence that this is a done deal between the Council and the preferred developer, who was selected without any competition or transparency.</p> <p>Would like the Council to meet all interested parties at a public meeting to hear their concerns.</p> <p>The consultation has been a sham and serves only to persuade residents and Traders that the Council has a private agenda, which is harmful to their interests.</p> <p>Concern that TfL lack of investment has led to neglect and loss of trade, not the fault of the traders but redevelopment may not reflect Trader's wishes.</p> <p>Additional retail proposed is acceptable if it does not undermine existing Traders or discourage existing shoppers.</p>

<p>Section 2 – Site and Surroundings</p> <p>Section 3 – Site Constraints and Opportunities, and Section 4 – Development Guidelines and Principals</p> <p>Section 4 – Development Guidelines and Principals</p> <p>General</p> <p>Section 4 – Development Guidelines</p>		<p>Council has assembled land without consultation, requires clarity regarding landowners and changes to site uses especially around hostel uses.</p> <p>What protection will be given to Pennard Road residents in terms of overlooking and disturbance as higher buildings are proposed.</p> <p>How many residential units will be provided and how many will be affordable?</p> <p>What assurances will be given to Traders that they can continue to trade from the same type, size, and location of premises at the same rent?</p> <p>There is nothing in the report to address Trader's current concerns about the lack of parking for customers in the vicinity.</p>
<p><b>Rosemary Pettit, Brackenbury Residents Association</b></p> <p>Market Traders</p> <p>Market</p> <p>Demolition of 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</p> <p>General</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Understand that the Market Traders fear for their livelihoods and every effort must be made to mitigate against those fears.</p> <p>The Market needs reviving, not convinced that wholesale demolition and building works are the answer. Unless housed in a beautiful, airy building like the old Covent Garden, Markets tend to work best from the bottom up, in a quirky individual way.</p> <p>Would like this terrace to be retained and restored, in order to retain the Victorian streetscape.</p> <p>Focus on Traders and customers rather than on the developer.</p>
<p><b>Aniza Meghani, Representing Shops From 30-52 Goldhawk Rd</b></p> <p>Public Meeting</p>	<p><b>Object</b></p>	<p>Would like a public meeting.</p>

Consultation		A poor level of consultation has taken place.
<b>Shing Wong</b> Lime Grove Hostel	<b>Object</b>	Do not want the Broadway Hostel moved to the Lime Grove Hostel.
<b>Casper Glyn</b> Lime Grove Hostel  Human Rights Act  Equality Impact Assessment  Consultation  Judicial Review	<b>Object</b>	<p>Do not want the Broadway Hostel moved to the Lime Grove Hostel.</p> <p>Intend to review the way in which the Council has proceeded with its recommendation which is in breach of Schedule 1 of the Human Rights Act, particularly Article 8.</p> <p>No Equality Impact Assessment has taken place in breach of the Council's disability and race equality, duties.</p> <p>The consultation should be undertaken again, because we were presented with the sham of commenting on finalised proposals.</p> <p>Will be drafting a statement of facts and grounds for judicial review on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council has illegally fettered its discretion prior to the end of the consultation period.</li> <li>• The Council has illegally failed to take into account relevant factors in moving the Broadway hostel to Lime Grove.</li> <li>• The proposal is irrational in that it breaches residents Article 8 rights.</li> <li>• The Council is guilty of procedural impropriety by failing to consult properly and to apply for a quashing order.</li> <li>• The Council has not carried out an Equality Impact Assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>Petition (175 signatures)– The Lime Grove, Gaumont Terrace and Gainsborough Court Residents</b>  Lime Grove Hostel	<b>Object</b>	The Lime Grove Hostel is in the wrong place and the proposal to operate the hostel will create nuisance to Lime Grove, Gaumont Terrace and Gainsborough Court residents. The hostel is in a poor location on a flawed site that doesn't work. The hostel is a magnet for criminal and anti-social activity and the current design



<p>Market Lane Hostel Client Group</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Existing Broadway Hostel</p> <p>Broadway Residents and Lime Grove Residents</p> <p>Disability Impact Assessment</p> <p>Design Issues With Existing Lime Grove Hostel</p>		<p>issues of the hostel exacerbates these issues. Access to and from the hostel means that half of the street and at least half of the residents homes have hostel users and visitors walking past. Quite often the hostel's visitors are the greatest perpetrators of anti-social behaviour. Moving the Broadway Hostel on Market Lane to Lime Grove will only exacerbate the negative impacts on Lime Grove, Gaumont Terrace and Gainsborough Court residents. The Brief's statement regarding the use of the Lime Grove hostel is misleading and false. The hostel also attracts drug dealers, who harass local residents.</p> <p>The rights of this group are being ignored and their interests subordinated to profit, in their moving to the bad hostel in Lime Grove. The client group will be in conflict with residents.</p> <p>The views expressed by residents on the Lime Grove Hostel have not been taken into account.</p> <p>The Broadway Hostel on Market Lane is a much better location for a hostel type use, because it is sited close to the Market Lane entrance to Goldhawk Rd and there are no residential properties nearby that can be negatively impacted upon.</p> <p>There has been no assessment of the difference in needs of Broadway residents to Lime Grove residents.</p> <p>The Equality Impact Assessment must take into account the fact that Broadway Hostel residents, a largely disabled cohort, are moved to much worse accommodation which will place them in much greater conflict with others. The views of disabled people in the wider area should also have been taken into account.</p> <p>The following are matters that no modifications or design issues can address, unless the hostel is effectively rebuilt on a different floor plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No external defensible space for clients, save that which places them in conflict with residential amenity;</li> <li>• No place for smokers, save that which places them in conflict with residential amenity;</li> <li>• All the residential windows face towards Lime Grove;</li> <li>• All the social room windows face towards Lime Grove, such as the dining room, the TV room and the games room;</li> <li>• Access in the middle of the residential street;</li> <li>• Problems with access in the middle of a residential street;</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with access either have to be dealt with at the front door of the hostel, creating noise and nuisance for the residents backing onto the hostel. Or on the street, creating nuisance for the whole of Lime Grove;</li> <li>• The entrance to the middle of a community rather than onto a non-residential road.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

Further to a Shepherds Bush Market regeneration briefing session held on 5 October for Andrew Slaughter MP, Councillor Coleman, Councillor Umeh and Councillor Jones (ward councillors), the following key points were made:

- Members expressed concern that only Orion & Development Securities are the interested developers in the regeneration scheme. They enquired regarding the origin of Orion's interest in the Shepherds Bush Market regeneration opportunity. Members requested information about the 2 developers and details of other schemes they are involved in.
- Members enquired if a competitive selection process was undertaken and what other interest was expressed by other developers in the market regeneration. They also enquired about what discussions the Council has had with the owners of the private market.
- Members enquired about the regeneration phasing plan and expressed concern as to whether the market would be able to continue to operate throughout the regeneration period. Members expressed strong desire to protect existing traders and need to ensure that disruption during the works do not make businesses/market unviable.
- Members enquired about likely future rents and security for existing traders. Expressed concern that regeneration proposals will drive up rents and push out existing traders. Members asked for guarantees to protect the market footprint and existing traders.
- Members expressed concern that the consultation process has not been comprehensive enough and that the deadline should be extended. They supported request for a public meeting involving all stakeholders together.
- Members stated that they do not support the market regeneration proposals and that they would oppose it.