

**MINUTES OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF THE LOTS ROAD
NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ON 29TH NOVEMBER, 2023**

1. The meeting was attended by twenty-four members. As well as individuals, local residents' associations, like Poole's Lane and Lots Village Chelsea, were represented together with members of the Chelsea Reach Boat Owners Association and the Cheyne Walk Trust. Apologies were received from the Ward Councillors because of a full Council Meeting that evening. Particularly, Cllr. G. Hargreaves was hoping to get the Council to implement the whole of the Thames Conservation Plan, which was critical to the whole campaign of what's happening on the river front. Apologies were also received from Kerry Davis-Head, Martyn and Rosy Baker, Steve Rubie and Charles Pelham.

The Agenda was adopted.

2. Richard Jacques, the Chair briefly reviewed the history of the Forum to date, starting with its inception which began as a result of the proposed development of the Cheyne Nursery, and the weight of the local community's opposition, which resulted in the project being cancelled. He said the important thing about being a formally constituted Forum is that it gives us legal standing with the Council particularly concerning planning consultations.

This is the area designated –



with its heart in Lots Village and including the whole waterfront to Battersea Bridge. which we argued was a very cohesive way of looking at the area. That went through a public consultation itself and on 5th July 2022 the Council designated us as a legal Forum. We had an emerging Committee which has been meeting throughout the year,

particularly concerning the Lots Road South Development and the plight of the houseboats.

In parallel with this, the Council has been reviewing its local plan. On the whole, the community were happy with the existing 2019 Plan because it designated the area as an employment zone and set into their planning controls the conservation status. Among the many changes in the new plan the Council gave itself permission to develop Lots Road South as a large residential development. They did away with the concept that the site was an employment led development area. The Forum contested this with detailed, weighty submissions throughout the process and finally with the independent examiners of HM Planning Inspectorate when the Council finally published its plans. On 25th October, 2023, the Forum learned the Inspectorate had listened to the Forum's objections and for many reasons ruled that the Council's plan was unsound. To make the new Local Plan sound the Inspector is now requiring RBKC to make it explicit that any mixed-used development should be employment led, with levels of residential consistent with the employment use of the site. This should fundamentally change the dialogue the Forum will have with the developer and the Council.

The Forum made application for some NCIL money and as a result a first community CCTV camera (as a likely precedent of many) has been installed in Tadema Road for security reasons, and an Acoustic Camera for the Cheyne Walk residents is still waiting installation because of TfL's necessary involvement.

In addition, the Forum has made representations on the planning application of a new illuminated advertising hoarding and on planning applications that breach the conservation area status, such as the construction of a lower ground floor extension and rear roof extension on Lots Road.

In the longer term because of the huge pressure on residents parking because of the developments, the Forum intervened in the proposal of installing dockless Bicycle Parking Bays for the present.

In the interests of local residents safety, and as an absolutely priority, the Forum together with all the local amenity groups got involved in the TfL proposals for the Battersea Bridge Safety Improvement Scheme.

The Forum also considered producing a Neighbourhood Plan, just covering planning issues in the Forum area. To this end they worked with planning consultants Oneill Horner to understand the process. The experience was that it could take months and possibly years to produce a successful Plan, and it was decided not to proceed at the moment in view of prioritising the key issues facing the area, particularly Lots Road South.

3. Lots Road South Development

The developer is Mount Anvil. The Council when they appointed Mount Anvil got a number of community groups together to interview various candidates. Mount Anvil certainly sounded the most appealing, saying all the right things. They certainly seemed to understand that this is a small plot which can only handle a small quantum of development. They are also a small developer. They seemed to be on the right wavelength, but recent experience is that the jury has to be out on this because this is their first idea. It's one whole building taking up the whole site with 15,10 and 9 storey towers.



They say none of this is going to impact on Heatherleys which we know is a really important issue to make sure that whatever is built doesn't impact on the successful work of the school.

Veronica Hicks (Principal of Heatherleys) said the height of the three blocks was to the side, and they had been assured it wouldn't look on them and they wouldn't look on it.

The bottom left hand corner is about the only public amenity which is a plaza of sorts.

Charles Donlan said the operational plant would add the equivalent of an extra storey onto each of the blocks. Richard Jacques continued that they're all going to be passive buildings and would need a lot of heat pumps put onto the roofs to make them passive.

Mount Anvil are proposing a podium garden on the first second floors which would not be available to the community, but exclusively the residents of the development.

There will be some sort of community facility in the development but most of what is planned will be residential property.

The Residential Care unit would be at the Heatherleys end of the development.

The greener public space walkway runs between the back of the development and the railway line and is about four meters wide and a slightly wider pavement on Lots Road. There is no opportunity to see through this megalithic building or to walk through or experience it in any way for the community.

When we come to the employment spaces, essentially on the ground and first floor, they are probably going to be showrooms which won't employ many people.

The white section in these photographs is the model that Mount Anvil brought to the consultation with the Forum on 18th November 2023.



The brief in the RBKC tendering process talked of 65 care home residents, and in the New Local Plan Review the development is described as 100 gross new residential unit and 65 gross affordable extra care unit. Mount Anvil have doubled affordable housing to 130 units, and the overall size of the development to 260 units.

When the Council were putting the documents into the SPG they said the heights should be between 6-10 storeys, and we're now looking at 15, 10 9 and 5 at least on Lots Road itself.

Kush Kanodia pointed out that the care home facility was the only one in the south of the Borough and he believed it was grossly under provisioned and should be double that.

Gillian Best pointed out that Hammersmith and Fulham might claim a portion of the 65.

Richard Jacques continued that this was the problem they were grappling with. RBKC owned the whole site, but the borough boundary roughly cuts off this very tall building and Mount Anvil say RBKC want 165 units and Hammersmith and Fulham also want 65 social rent units on the site. The Lots Village community have to live with this and it's not what the Council sold it on, or said in any of their documents, or said to the planning director, so this was going to mean quite a fight on the community's hands.

He continued, I think we will be played off with the developer saying RBKC want us to produce this and our problem is what Hammersmith and Fulham also want us to produce.

His personal view is that this is an overdevelopment and trying to get too much development onto the small site.

David Lloyd Davis said that Mount Anvil's own model said it all, its just over development. However they went away from the meeting on 18th November saying "it had been well received."

Following the public exhibition at the beginning of November, the developer put together a summary of everyone's views on 7th November saying 70% of people liked some or all of it, and only a couple of people raised any objections to the height. The Forum had a meeting with the developer saying you know that's not true and they have agreed in future as far as the Forum is concerned, clear what they say about our views with us before they say it. It was also clear that they have a lot of ways of getting people to say that they're positive. Mount Anvil are going to have another consultation with the Council on 13th December at St. Johns and I urge everyone to go and make your views clear, mindful that anything said positively about the development might be exaggerated.

In answer to a question about parking facilities, Richard Jacques said there would be no community parking spaces. He pointed out that if you're producing 300 new homes that would create parking issues. He noted that there was going to be one partial basement only as a loading bay for the Auction House, and maybe three or four spaces for mobility use by the Care Home. Mount Anvil don't want to build a basement, partly because it's probably very contaminated, and also because of the cost.

He concluded that it seemed very un-thought through in the real world. Whether this was an opening ploy to set the number really high in the hope that the Forum will come round.

It was noted that the base of the building was really solid going up to the third or fourth floor.

Richard Jacques recommended speaking to RBKC and Hammersmith and Fulham over the scale and volume of what is being proposed. Also speaking to the developer about how the whole thing works – with one building with these sort of heights which casts a very different feel to the whole area.

He said the Forum understood that this isn't what the current landowners – RBKC – wanted. If Mount Anvil manages to get a development through planning, they become the landowner and they take possession of the whole site from RBKC, according to the contract.

Bill Toomey noted that in the recent four storey development on Sloane Avenue – Holbrook House – with Sainsbury's on the ground floor. Originally it was put forward that it had to be 14 storey's high. Part of that was the push back in the area to that height in that particular area. So there must be some similar tactic to be used.

Richard Jacques noted that interestingly that building has no social element. Bill Toomey said he'd asked the question and the planning adviser said, no there are no planning requirements because of the social funds for housing on Lots Road.

Richard Jacques said that Mount Anvil say they know nothing about that deal. But certainly Lots Road shouldn't be paying for the social housing that is being avoided on Sloane Avenue. If the Sloane Avenue development want to make a financial contribution it should be lowering the amount of commercial property that needs to be built on Lots Road South. Many people are in favour of the extra care homes. It's an important piece of community structure that was lost on the Kings Road site and the community needs that and as Kush Kanodia attests we need a lot more than that probably. But we shouldn't be subsidising the Sloane Avenue development.

RBKC own the whole site and can in theory decide what's going to be built, but when it comes to planning control, this corner of it is subject to control of H & F. And H & F are allegedly saying, you can only develop on this corner, even if you own it, if you put up a suitable building and provide us with 50% social housing. As far as the Forum is aware H & F and RBKC are talking to each other.

The Forum hoped this meeting would agree that it was driving in the right direction and that seemed to be the consensus.

He also wanted to alert people to the fact that the Forum's initial experience was that Mount Anvil have a way of interpreting people's opinions, especially viewing silence as consent, so it will be necessary to be very clear and robust about tackling them. He urged people to attend the meeting on 13th December, which is part of the planning process and to make sure their views, especially if they were against the Mount

Anvil's initial plans, were accurately reflected by Mount Anvil. He was anxious that community views came across loud and clear.

David Waddell asked for clarification about the heights. Richard Jacques confirmed that it should be anywhere between six and ten storeys. He pointed out that in the Mount Anvil scheme, the 15 storey tower was on the H & F area, and they take as their reference the heights of the development on the other side of the railway line. But he felt that the Forum might well point out to the RBKC that as the sponsors and owners of this piece of land as a development, how can you sign up to an inspector who says this site should be no more than six and ten storeys and allow your developer to engage with H & F to plan to build up to fifteen? It doesn't seem in any real world an acceptable solution.

He said he and Peter Barratt, were going to see the Council on 30th November. That's just a start. We have to tackle our ward councillors, Cem Kemahli, who is the head of Planning, Emma Will who's head of property, Sof McVeigh who runs the new homes programme and Josh Rendall who looks after employment. The Forum are going to contact Josh Rendall and get him down here. Also Greg Hands the MP. He also said we need to start the engagement with H & F. He noted that the potential Labour Candidate for the area in the next General Election is the deputy leader of H & F.

The meeting showed its strong support for the position of the Forum and the Forum's efforts to date.

4. Houseboats.

Simon Howard said he was the only boat owner moored on Old Ferry Wharf itself and had been moored there for more than 45 years. He said as far as RBKC are concerned, they own Old Ferry Wharf which is where the Chelsea Yacht Company are based. Simon Howard felt that he should have been consulted but wasn't and on 4th July 2022 RBKC signed new rolling 5 year leases. David Waddell said they had submitted a list of points about the extension which were totally ignored.

Simon Howard said there was a clause in the lease that Moffatt who owns the CYC would behave well, but we don't know what that is.

Within four weeks Simon Howard got an eviction notice, because his application to renew his lease was a month late, because of major illness. CYC has subsequently issued evictions elsewhere, and also said RBKC have no influence on planning. CYC is having big double decker boats turning up, which it constructs and owns.

David Waddell said the moorings were reorganised in 1978 and there is a letter to that effect issued by the Town Clerk/Chief Executive of the RBKC, which said as far as Chelsea Reach was concerned there should be no more than 60 boats, and there should be no boats introduced without planning application. Subsequently in 1983 they said there had been some guidance before 1976 which would be very difficult to get hold of. That was codified more precisely in 1983 in the River Thames

Conservation Area statement which set out precisely what was acceptable in terms of size and appearance of boats.

The boat owners were concerned that a coach and horses was being driven through all this. At the same time the owners of CYC bought Cadogan Pier and submitted what he called a certified legal entitlement of use, which is an application because of planning practice over the years was acceptable.

The Chelsea Reach Boat Owners Association objected. Moffatt took advice and was told he would get this through. There is a clear distinction between leisure boats and houseboats. The CRBOA has always been pretty much for houseboats, which incur council tax for the owners and always has been the case.

Pressure started to be exerted on all boat owners. “Winkling” was going on. Together with the Chelsea Society they engaged a Silk to give a clear view on what the Council’s local planning was. The CRBOA Silk agreed with the general line we had advanced.

The Council leader agreed to a meeting of the two Silks, RBKC’s and ours. The meeting was held on 18th August 2023 and two silks essentially agreed on what was broadly the CRBOA’s position.

The ward councillors of the two wards covering the Houseboats – Chelsea Riverside and Royal Hospital – in 2019 had moved that there should be a Chelsea Conservation Area appraisal. This involves great detail. The Council have since done two things – gone to the Port of London Authority, who don’t have a planning per se on all of this, other than navigation and the safety of the River – maritime issues. But they don’t regard planning permission which is attached to the land which then becomes subject to local authority planning. THE CRBOA have said they must have a clear statement on all this. There is a draft through a Thames conservation area plan which has been in existence for about four years. The officers have gone slow on implementing the full document.

CRBOA have in particular pointed out that there needs to be control on the size of boats. They resisted this so the Council has got itself into a complicated position where it is going to put an enforcement case to the Planning Committee. On this occasion the Council itself is going to consider a paper from the officers on whether or not it can enforce and then take a view on what the outcome should be.

The members will then be able to say we do actually enforce in this case, which would be all fine. But it’s not yet determined.

Simon Howard said this is the mixed ecology we currently enjoy and that is what we’ll end up with.



There are two apartments on each boat and they rent for about £100,000 a year.

David Waddell said this was very important because going back to the 1978 the clear indication was that the 58 boats would be essentially be privately owned boats. What seems to be happening is that the owner is ejecting all the privately owned boats to bring in what is essentially a fleet of hired caravans.

Simon Howard said the RBKC had not asserted their rights as the repairing landlord. They own the wharf and they own most of the embankment. They can put whatever conditions they like. A neighbouring site insists that their boats are jet-washed three times a year. You can write whatever you like as the repairing landlord.

Richard Jacques said that things were coming to a head, so the Forum has already written to Councillor Campbell. The Forum has to keep its foot on the pedal of this one.

David Waddell said that the planning meeting supposedly on 19th December doesn't resolve the situation, the CRBOA would have to move into a massive campaign with petitions and signatures.

Richard Jacques said clearly there were local residents who were really suffering from the rapaciousness of CYC, and people would support them. In addition, the community all enjoyed the boats, they are part of the community and part of the way the whole waterfront looks like. How we want to keep it like that, not turn it into a rather expensive caravan park.

The Forum is behind the CRBOA in trying to get the Council to exercise planning control. The other piece is if the Council wants to redevelop Old Ferry Wharf we need to start that meaningful discussion now. The rolling five year lease is already one year old, and what the Council want to do with Old Ferry Wharf and not turn it into a Pencil Tower, but actually turn it into something that brings real benefit to our community. The Forum knows what the community thinks of the advertising hoarding.

Part of it is the planning control and then how the Forum gets into a meaningful forward looking conversation with RBKC.

David Waddell said the interest was in protecting the conservation area, but at the same time the riverside community there who are being decimated in a catastrophic way. The Council should not permit that to happen.

General discussion followed about a possible future campaign.

Richard Jacques said that if matters reached this point he proposed a meeting with all the interested parties to exploit the skills and expertise available to enervate any campaign.

There was some general discussion about the failure of RBKC to listen to the concerns of local residents.

5. Richard Jacques said that the Council were proposing to spend some CIL funds on the development of the area. RBKC total CIL amounts to about £30 million to spend, much of which will go on the redevelopment of Portobello Road, but there may also be some funds to address the deficit our area has endured, of having all the development and always feeling that bit of the Borough that hasn't really been appreciated. These historic issues mean the Council leadership has decided that we will be a place where they wish to invest in.

They have started to think about a whole list of things they might do in this area. Our green spaces will be a priority and we are told there is going to be new park in the area: when Thames Water move off the site, the Council intends to take over the Cremorne Wharf site and put some new infrastructure there. It's not clear exactly what because Thames Water needs access to that site for the sewer. Critically it should include the extension of the Thames Pathway.

The Forum will need to keep the pressure up on the Council to deliver these plans. He asked that if anyone had any creative thoughts about our parks they should come forward. Also traffic which has a whole set of ideas which needs community involvement. Also enhancing security in the area. There will be some deadlines concerning spending the money – for instance monies from the Power Station. If the community doesn't come up with good ideas and help the Council spend it, then the money will just go back to Grenfell and prettifying the Portobello Road.

Richard Jacques said that if we could get a group of people together he would try and bring the council people back to have a brainstorming session with the Forum.

Gillian Best said a member of LVC had sent an e-mail concerning the Council's cavalier attitude of neglecting to inform locals about the felling of trees, specifically in this instance in Cremorne Gardens, information he'd got through a Freedom of

Information application. She asked that if we as a Forum could in future receive information about these plans?

Richard Jacques said that in addition to the Forum receiving weekly all planning applications, he would write to the Parks Department and make sure they include the Forum as a statutory consultee.

Richard Jacques confirmed he'd said to the Council, no road closure plans without up to date traffic studies.

6. Finance

Josh Lee said the Forum had made a successful application for technical support in Neighbourhood Planning. This had resulted in the Forum receiving just under £6,000 with some £2,800 still remaining. He still needed to do some research into what other routes of funding and would appreciate any information from members.

Richard Jacques said that if we could come up with a distinct idea, we could apply for NCIL funds. Anything we would need expertise about.

7. Election of Forum Committee for 2024

Richard Jacques presented a list of people prepared to serve in an honorary capacity and asked for the meeting to endorse it:

Richard Jacques, Chair

Peter Barrett, Vice Chair

Kerry Davis-Head, Vice Chair and LVC Chair

Josh Lee, Treasurer and Pooles Lane Residents Association

Gill Best, Secretary and LVC

Charles Donlan, Website and communications

David Waddell, Cheyne Walk Trust

Jenny Graham, Chelsea Reach Boatowners Association

Kush Kanodia, Disability Rights and Race Equality Champion

Veronica Ricks, Principal, Heatherley School of Fine Art

Giso Van Loon, LVC

Jo Sherrard, LVC

David Lloyd-Davis, Worlds End Studios

It was agreed unanimously.

8. AOB

David Waddell mentioned the assisted care home originally attracted the half million pounds subsidy from the GLA and that seems to have disappeared in the noise. And secondly the sale of the original Thamesbrooke home and the money originally promise to fund the new home.

Richard Jacques said that money had been given to Grenfell issues, but would raise it with the Council.

Richard Jacques confirmed three future dates for meetings of the full Forum in 2024:

21st February

15th May

18th September

The Meeting closed at 19.00.