

Britannia Village Hall Advisory Group #3 Meeting notes – 4.5.2021

Facilitators: Helen Fernandes (HF), Dan Hill (DH), Alice Hamlin (AH) and Ian Bramwell – Mole Architects, Chris Carthy (CC) – Igloo development managers. 6 residents and 8 stakeholders also attended.

Meeting purpose:

To show how feedback is shaping options, explain financial viability position and get further input into the evolving options.

Summary notes:

- HF thanked everyone for coming and explained that lots of design and financial work had been done since the last meeting. She explained that this meeting would involve showing 2 developed options and asking for the groups' views on these.
- CC gave an update on recent progress and a brief overview of the footprint workshop which the group had been invited to.
- DH shared general feedback we had heard from the April advisory group meeting. These have fed into the revised options:
- AH provided an update to the options work shown below which had taken into account the feedback from the April workshop (in these plans, the community space is blue, nursery yellow and housing light grey) but also sought to respond to viability work.
- The key change in massing was to increase the block on Evelyn Road from 4 storeys to 5 storeys and to remove the block on Wesley avenue.



Option 1 - Central Garden

800m² of community space
24 homes



Option 2 - Community Corner

620m² of community space
30 homes

- CC gave an overview of project viability (separate to West Silvertown Foundation's operational finances) for each of the two options.
- Both of these showed a 'gap' between income and costs. This is because:
 - The costs of re-providing a new state of the art community centre and nursery are likely to be more than £3.5m
 - Most of this would need to be funded through sale of new homes

- In addition planning policy requires that 35% of new homes are affordable which also need some subsidy
- This is not unusual for a project of this nature at this stage and there are several ways in which this gap can be filled including grants from GLA/Royal Docks and elsewhere, higher levels of grant for the affordable housing, s106 from other projects, reducing costs where possible, changing the mix of homes to generate more income, seeking reduced borrowing costs.

There were two breakout groups that provided feedback on the options and made other helpful comments on both options:

Option 1 was preferred amongst the attendees as it:

- Better met the original brief particularly with sufficient space for the community elements with good ground floor provision
- Included more internal space for community and nursery provision
- Had a positive green garden that could provide great space for community, nursery and residential users
- Avoided some of the potential issues associated with the north-south connection
- Although it had a bigger financial deficit, this gap could be filled with external funding
- Relates better to the neighbours, particularly homes along Julia Garfield Mews
- Allows for some additional homes that could be built above the nursery
- Creates a well-lit and generous central garden that would be a great asset for the project

However there were further points made to improve the options:

- How could the single storey nursery building in Option 1 be reused if the nursery moved away? Could some homes be included on its roof? Or perhaps a garden?
- Could we better define the sustainability targets?
- The detailed rights to light and daylight/sunlight assessment would need to be done for homes neighbouring the project, particularly Julia Garfield Mews.
- Could the team better define the contingency amounts set out in the appraisals?
- More detail needed on how the garden space would be split between different users at different times.
- Some concern on the impact of increasing height at Evelyn Road/Audley Drive corner but also some promotion of a higher building in this location.
- Some concerns on how parking would work.

In conclusion:

- HF thanked everyone for coming and emphasised that people's contributions would be taken into account.
- HF explained this was the last of the advisory group meetings but carried out a poll to ask whether people would like to be part of similar meetings in the future. 9/9 people who participated said yes.