

Liberal Democrat Party candidate's response to the Lots Road Neighbourhood Forum Election Questionnaire

1. What do you believe are the key local issues facing the residents and businesses in the Lots Road Neighbourhood Area?

We, Liberal Democrats, would like to see a Consolidated Development Plan for the Lots Road Neighbourhood Area which looks at all current and proposed future development so that the collective impact of these developments can be properly assessed, and taken into account in decision-making. The planning process itself needs to be more transparent, more responsive to the views of local residents, as well as protective of the unique character of the local area. In addition to the Lots Road South plans (see questions below), we are concerned about the following issues:

- Cheyne Nursery: We support plans to redevelop the Cheyne Nursery in Westfield Park. We are opposed to both the 7-storey building that was rejected in the first consultations last year, and the 4-storey building that was presented to residents (without consultation) before it was temporarily pulled before Christmas. Neither option "would contribute positively to the character and appearance" of the Lots Road Conservation Area; both would have a deleterious effect on Westfield Park which is the most significant green space in the area; and both would negatively impact the residents of Thorndike Close, significantly reducing light into their flats. We support residents' wishes for a new nursery, and a second-storey community centre above it.

- Cremorne Wharf: Residents were led to believe that following the completion of the Tideway's Sewer project, the area around the Cremorne Wharf would be used as a new local park and recreation area. We are concerned that the RBKC New Local Plan Review instead states that Cremorne Wharf will be safeguarded " maximising its use for waste management or waterborne freight management " - up to " 23,400 tonnes per year". Local residents recall the the fly-tipping that was a regular part of the old dumpsite, and are worried about the impact of lorries, odours, noise and vibrations a new dump would have on the local area

- Old Ferry Wharf: Residents remain in the dark about future development plans on this site, and their impact on the Embankment, Lots Village, and the houseboats. None of these plans take into account the impact of the Lots Road Power Station/Chelsea Waterfront Residential Development on the local area - neither the years-long building noise and pollution, or the fact that 420 units are coming on stream and how that will affect local services and population density.

2. How do you view new developments in the area, particularly issues such as building heights and the impact of new developments on the employment zone and on local infrastructure and services?

We, Liberal Democrats, are concerned about future development plans in the area, particularly Lots Road South, that would see additional tall, empty glass towers mar the skyline and cast a shadow over local streets and important buildings such as the Heatherley Arts School and the local economic zone. The over-sized plans for Lots Road South provide only for 4000 sq m of economic activity, half of which can be used for commercial purposes, and none of which is protected from a change of use. This is not in keeping with the current vision for the local economic zone, and we would want the Council to seek Article 4D protection for any development here.

We support plans for additional local housing and adult social care places, but note, with concern, that current plans would increase local population density significantly and have a

consequential impact on local services and infrastructure, the effect of which has not been adequately investigated. Further, we question why plans for development in other parts of the borough, on larger sites, are slated for low-density projects in contrast to those proposed for Lots Road and the local area. With all these new developments, a significant increase in local traffic can be anticipated, requiring the Council to produce traffic flow projections and mitigations to neighbouring homes and businesses. We are concerned that, as in the case of 344 Old Brompton Road, existing policies will be over-ruled to the detriment of all. It is essential that waste produced on site is used as part of renewable energy production, and flood protection is addressed on this site.

3. What is your approach to the specific development of the Lots Road South site?

We, Liberal Democrats, are concerned about the sheer size of this project, the lack of detail in the Design Brief, as well as the lack of protection for the economic zone; all issues which need to be addressed. The long-overdue Thamesbrook replacement is most welcomed, but many questions remain unanswered. The Lots Road South Design Brief does not address the question of apportionment of adult spaces between RBKC and Hammersmith and Fulham, so the actual number of adult social care places for local residents is unclear. This question was raised in Council by our Councillor, Linda Wade, and she has yet to receive a response. The delay in replacing Thamesbrook has caused hardship for local residents, a backlog of housing spaces, and seen the cost of rebuilding sky-rocket, as well as the funds earned from the sale of the original site on Dove House Street put to other purposes. The Design Brief is very short on massing details, but from what we can gather the project will now include a 25-30-storey building in order to pay for the otherwise welcomed adult social care, social and 'affordable' homes on the site. And, the proposed 6-10-storey buildings on Lots Road will negatively affect light into the Arts School and neighbouring businesses. Mitigation for these issues must be part of the design. And, all efforts should be made to reduce the height of the high-rise as another empty glass tower is not the solution to local housing needs or in keeping with the local area.

We are concerned about the balance of economic and residential space and the lack of protection for the economic zone. With regard to social and 'affordable' housing, we would like additional clarity on the configuration of floorspace in these units in order to be assured that there is a mix/balance of unit sizes resulting in useable and 'liveable' homes.

The design and planning process must be more transparent, take into account the unique nature of the local area, as well as the concerns of local residents. The end result must preserve the economic zone and provide housing for local residents.

Margo Schwartz