

## Minutes

Chelsea Barracks Partnership  
Resident's Liaison Group

Date: 12<sup>th</sup> December 2017, 6.30 – 8.00pm  
Location: St Barnabas Church Hall, SW1W 8PD  
Chair: Steve McAdam

	Mary Regnier-Leigh	MRL	Belgravia Society
	Celeste Shirvani	CS	Belgravia Place RA
	Helen Black	HB	Belgravia Residents Association
	Martin Flash	MF	Royal Avenue RA
	Jeff Simpson	JS	Gatliff Close RA
	Jason Gillot	JG	Wellington and Chelsea RA
	Paul O'Grady	PO	Grosvenor
	Janice Selman	JSe	Chelsea Gate Apartments RA
	Ginny Woodrow	GW	St Barnabas Church
	Rashim Arora	RA	Grosvenor Waterside RA
	Georgina Abrahams	GA	St Leonards Terrace RA
	Warwick Hunter	WH	Qatari Diar
	Lee Hallman	LH	Qatari Diar
	Michael Squire	MS	Squire and Partners
	Michael Poots	MP	Squire and Partners
	Donncha O'Shea	DO	Gustafson Porter and Bowman
	Matti Lampila	ML	Piercy & Co
	Louise Overton	LO	DP9
	Chris Beard	CB	DP9
	Steve McAdam	SM	Soundings
	Adrian Alexandrescu	AA	Soundings

### Welcome, introduction and agenda – Steve McAdam, Soundings

SM welcomed everyone to the meeting and ran through the agenda for the evening, setting out that the focus was going to be on Phase 6b.

#### 1. Updates on the project - Warwick Hunter, Qatari Diar

WH provided an overview of the construction and planning progress for the overall site:

- Phase 1, 2 and 3 are on site. Mace is working to complete by February 2019, nine months behind schedule. The right quality of stone is one of the main reasons for the delay. The first three phases are 65% sold with purchases from all over the world, but many from the UK. Three out of the total thirteen townhouses have been sold, and more purchases are expected once work has finished. Once complete, the first 3 phases will open up half the site for use, including the chapel.

- The Chapel has achieved practical completion on the 12th December and the aim is to use the venue for the February 2018 RLG meeting. Curators and partners are being engaged to determine how space will be utilised in the future, honouring the different obligations for the community use. The chapel trust will be looked at in the New Year and it will be discussed during the February meeting.
- Phase 4 is underway with the main contractor commencing work in January after a long tender process.
- Planning application submitted for 5B with consent to be received before Christmas, similar to 6A.
- The overall masterplan will not be breaching the consented number of residential units 448, the affordable and extra care housing numbers will not be diluted, 123 units. As groundwork for Phase 4 is now completed, QD has paid its contribution of £78 million to Westminster. The masterplan will deliver the other agreed community facilities, the public sports centre, swimming pool, medical centre, community use and public space, honouring all the commitments and they will be delivered in the next 10 years, depending on sales.
- The public art strategy has selected Conrad Shawcross to bring forward a bicameral tree design. The progress on the design will be presented by Conrad to the RLG members in February, in the Chapel.
- The restaurant in Garrison Square has now two shortlisted operators, one local and one international, and QD is in the process of finalising terms, with the opening scheduled for September 2018.
- The Chelsea Barracks foundation was involved in sponsoring a gold medal winning Chelsea Flower Show Garden that Jo Thompson designed. The garden has been donated to the British Legion.
- QD is talking to RBKC and Westminster about new pedestrian crossings in connection with their s278 obligations. Further information will be provided pending collaboration between the two councils.
- Phase 6B will deliver its obligation of 60 extra care units (senior living), 63 affordable housing units consisting of intermediate and social rent, the swimming pool, sports centre, primary care trust, and the retail offer which is being explored in the presentation. The original requirement was to provide a single supermarket of 800 m2. The presentation will explore an alternative to the specification, taking into account the new Sainsbury's local that was set up locally.

During the presentation, the two options were explored.

*JG: The corner Ebury Bridge Road and Chelsea Bridge Road, which phase is that?*

*WH: WH explains that the corner is part of 6A. Regarding construction, once phase 4 is complete, there will be a decision made whether to accelerate the northern or southern part of the site in regards to deliver, depending on sales. The corner will be delivered before 6B.*

*RA: So the build will start in January - February on Phase 4, and then it will be south / 6a?*

*WH: In March 2019 after there have been sufficient sales of the other phases, there can be a decision made whether to go with more townhouses or to deliver more apartments first.*

*GW: When did the planning application for 5B go in?*

*WH: 1st August.*

## **2. Introduction to Phase 6B - Michael Squire, Squire and Partners**

MS introduced the developing options for Phase 6B, highlighting that the images provided are there in order to describe the overall concept relating to mass and form and that they should not be interpreted as designs.

- Option 1 illustrates how all the uses agreed upon will fit in the different blocks which were consented as part of the parameter plan originally agreed.

- Certain concerns related to Option 1 are the number of entrances on Ebury Bridge Road, which could be better distributed; and the long massing (60m) of the building which is considered too imposing.
- A second option explores the idea of breaking the massing into two elements, bringing the southern building out, closer onto the road, while creating a gap between the two buildings, creating more comfortable proportions and better permeability.
- Option 2 is not a 'land grab' as the area that is given away between the structures is slightly greater than that which is added to the southern building.
- The new iteration is also an adjustment of internal uses, creating a more cohesive distribution of spaces. The entrances will be better distributed on Ebury Bridge Rd and the PCT will be in its own self-contained building to the north of the walled garden. The new massing does not have a negative impact on the buildings across Ebury Bridge Rd, with 18 meters still separating the two sides.
- The new corridor between the two buildings making up building 21 will be 6 meters wide and the height of the buildings will comply with those agreed in the parameter plan.

*MRL: Has there been a planning application submitted for this option?*

*MS: No. These are just ideas that we are communicating to identify if the changes are appropriate.*

*JSe: What is the height of building 21 and how does that compare to Chelsea Gate apartments? (An exact dimension could not be given at the meeting. Squire and partners subsequently confirmed that Building 21a is 27.75m to the penthouse roof and Chelsea Gate Apartments is 28.995m to the penthouse roof - both 'Above Ordinance Datum'. So, the Chelsea Gate Apartment building is 1.245m higher than Building 21a opposite.)*

*JSe: What is the intention for the space in front of the buildings as what we have been shown in the past is either chairs and tables or lorry drop-off's?*

*WH: The space will be a drop-off zone, with an ambulance drop-off. In option 2 there will be a pull in just as shown in the illustrations (adjacent the northern building) while for option 1 the drop-off/service area would extend the full length of the building.*

*JSe: But it is still a service area?*

*WH: Yes.*

*JSe: So what will be the dimension of it?*

*MS: There be sufficient provision for the proposed spaces which will have to be serviced by this area. Due to the potential change in need in regards to the supermarket, consideration was given to providing smaller retail units, if agreed upon, and the space will have to be used for deliveries at certain times, but with the sports centre, it will be more for facilitating people drop-off rather than servicing.*

*GA: If there are schools coming with coaches which will be parked there, that is not ideal either!*

*WH: The depth of the space in front of the drop-off is about 10-15 meters with shared surfaces which will soften its impact. There will not be any parking space.*

*MS: The landscaping will help prevent any negative impact that those drop-offs might have on neighbouring sites.*

*RA: Can you explain from the plan image, which will be the different entrances in Option 2?*

*MS: MS moves to the perspective image and describes from north to south on the two masses the sequence of entrances.*

*JSe: Which type of retail are you considering if not supermarket?*

*WH: A1 (standard shops) or A3 (restaurant and cafes)*

*CB: When permission was given back in 2010, it was specified that a large supermarket was needed in the Chelsea Barracks development, but we are also considering the requirements for the future.*

Further comments were made about the existing Sainsbury and how it does not provide for local needs. CB explained that nothing changes in terms of the area delivered from one option to another. The only difference is that Option 1 provides the entire 800 m<sup>2</sup> in a single space, required to be a supermarket, while Option 2 splits the floor space into smaller retail units.

*GW: Is there no way of creating a ramp to a lower level to provide drop-off for the facilities in 6B?*

*WH: The site is congested, and the lower levels are working hard to deliver the required spaces which would not allow such a solution.*

Further conversations regarding the provision of supermarket continued. There was a sense that the existing arrangement is not keeping up with the demands.

MS makes everyone aware that regardless of which option goes forward, there will not be provision for a massive supermarket with a large car park as there is no space for that despite the 800 m2 internal space.

GW identifies the break in massing as a good move from the architects.

*JSe: Why can't there be another configuration of the building that keeps the large footprint but still comes out in an L-shape? Bring the building lower in the space between Phase 6A and 6B!*

*WH: I think that if we look at the landscaping and public space, it might help ....*

*JSe: Landscaping will not change any of the buildings.....*

*GW: I think we should let Michael finish and see where he is going on this.*

MS continues describing the spaces between the buildings and changes made in Option 2 by explaining that the area in front of the building is not envisioned as becoming congested by cars.

*JSe: If there is a space, people will use it to park illegally. It happens everywhere around the area, and I don't think that there is a way to prevent that.*

*MS: This will be a managed space, and there will not be that problem for this drop-off space.*

*JSe: They are doing this in front of Sainsbury now.*

*WH: There will be 31 parking spaces designated for residents of this phase of the project available only for the affordable and extra care units.*

*JG: How large is the swimming pool?*

*WH: We are working to a 25m long and six lanes wide swimming pool with an additional, smaller children's swimming pool.*

*JS: Will there be any daylight?*

*MS: We are looking to achieve daylight in different ways, yes. A good question!*

*JS: Might I suggest that this 6m wide lane you are creating can have some provision to allow daylight in the swimming pool area below?!*

*MS: I think that that is an excellent idea.*

*JS: You give me some daylight while I am swimming and I will support the gap between the buildings.*

*The conversation continues on the different spaces on the plans of the buildings in options 1 and 2.*

MS resumes the presentation comparing the two options, reaffirming that whichever option is selected the amenity provision will not change. In option 1 it will be harder to provide daylight into the swimming pool as the space will be under the drop-off zone.

### **3. Introduction to Phase 6B landscape strategy - Donncha O'Shay, Gustafson Porter and Bowman**

DO describes the process which took place to get to this stage of the project and how their work is supporting the vision of the masterplan. Similar to MS, DO emphasised that the elements presented at this stage are ideas which are intended for comparative purposes between the two options.

- The proposal is focusing on pedestrian circulation and green space at ground level as well as how the different zones communicate amongst themselves in order to create a pleasant pedestrian environment

- By respecting the different requirements of the site concerning the amount of green spaces, number of trees, character of those trees, and, where possible, exceeding those expectations the landscape design will provide improved public realm
- Design is looking to open up the landscape through Option 2 as a result of the new uses layout and create a public connection from the northern part of Phase 6B, all the way to the south
- There will be community space to the north incorporating the protected tree
- There is the opportunity to open up the green space to the north through soft landscaping and the re-arrangement of uses in Option 2. The space will become more active as it will be surrounded by public buildings
- At the front of the building the landscaping will help soften the area for drop-off, with the new gap between the structures allowing enough space for tables and chairs
- The drop-off will not be a parking space
- The spaces will deliver an appropriate number of seats in order to assist the different resident groups and create a pleasant living environment with landscaping to facilitate that.

#### 4. Question and answer session

*JSe: Why is the open green space to the north only available in option 2?*

*DO: The garden is not activated in Option 1 due to the residential buildings surrounding. Option 2 has more public uses that would activate the space.*

*MS: In all fairness, you are right, there is no reason why the same landscape would not be available in Option 1.*

*GA: Yes, if that is a better garden we should have it regardless.*

*DO: I do agree, whichever changes are made they will support the architecture and deliver the right solutions.*

*JSe: So does that mean that those who had the private garden will not have a private garden in Option 2?*

*DO: There will not be provision for ground floor accommodation in that case. Therefore there will be no private gardens.*

*JSe: So will there be another area for provision of a garden to residential use or are those stopped completely?*

*WH: The townhouses will not be there anymore as they are provided at upper levels.*

*GA: Are the houses there social or shared ownership?*

*WH: A mixture.*

*GA: So are they not available anymore?*

*WH: We are still providing those 3 or 4-bed apartments with outside space but no private gardens.*

*MS: They were not houses but duplexes.*

*GA: But they will not have the gardens anymore.*

*RA: Which one of the options have the most green space?*

*DO: The second option has more publicly accessible green space.*

WH expresses that it is important to hear those views as work is being conducted with Westminster on providing the right mix and the correct spaces. This process informs the steps which will be taken in the new year and what we consult upon in February, and then take into the exhibition and planning.

*JG: If there is a lift system used for parking in this phase what are the concerns regarding reliability? What happens if it breaks?*

*MS: We have two motors for the lift. There will be times of maintenance, but there is confidence in their reliability.*

*RA: Will there be for each building a concierge system and how will that work?*

*WH: At the right time we will engage with providers, and they will take responsibility for how to manage these buildings as they will own the buildings.*

*JG: What criteria will you use for choosing the providers?*

*WH: It is a generous amount of affordable; therefore that will filter some of the providers, it is also the nature of the mix with the extra care provision which some providers do not cater for. In time, there will be a tender*

process which will facilitate the decision. We are also engaging with some of them at this point to understand if we are delivering the right spaces.

*JS: How many floors is the primary care building?*

*WH: Within Option 1 it will occupy the first floor in building 20 and then it will be ground and first floor of the central building.*

*GA: What will be the security arrangements for the site and will the affordable be charged for it?*

*WH: There will be a service charge to the private residence which will cover the entire site. There might be an element of an estate charge.*

Questions were raised relating to the materiality of the building to which WH and MS responded, reassuring that the quality of the buildings will not change from the rest of the site. The aim is to deliver a high-quality masterplan irrespective of classification. The actual finish on the buildings will be determined by the language of the street and it will only change to create a cohesive urban palate along Ebury Bridge Road.

Further comments were made by two members regarding the provision of a single, larger supermarket that could replace the existing smaller one without creating a clash.

*JG: What is the plan for the parking on the street?*

*CB: There will be no on-street parking.*

*JG: That will be a problem especially for people outside who are coming to visit the area.*

*CB: With the sports centre there will be a demand for parking on Ebury Bridge Rd.*

*WH: I think it comes back to control. The drop-off will be managed. People will be moved on. If they are parking on Ebury Bridge Rd that is a Westminster controlled area, and I assume it will not become a red route but it will become a double yellow line and therefore down to Westminster to enforce restrictions.*

*JG: Regarding community spaces and what is the intention for the area, will it focus on becoming a destination or it is to service the local community?*

*MS: A sports centre of this size will draw a broader community, but it is a matter of moving away from the car.*

*JG: Yes, in the future, but now there are families with 2 or 3 cars.*

*MS: But not if they don't have space to park here.*

*RA: Is there any way of providing underground parking?*

*WH: The underground is densely packed with the existing deliverables, if we allocate any additional parking there will be other elements that will need to be taken out.*

*MS: We do not want to encourage cars.*

There was a question regarding the Grosvenor-owned petrol station site to which PO replied that the space is on a short-term lease, however it is the first time he has seen the project, and further comments will be made at a later stage.

*RA: With the health centre I am sure that there must be some provision for disabled parking.*

*WH: There will be a provision around the health centre.*

*JG: Are there any negotiations with Westminster regarding the surrounding development?*

*WH: I understand that Westminster is now looking at a revised proposal as the original scheme was not viable.*

## **5. Next steps**

SM summarised and clarified what he had heard. He asked if the RLG really wanted a second supermarket. There was a mixed response with some supporting the idea but an equal number being critical or more cautious. The RLG affirmed that the braking of building 21 in two and the massing proposals were supported though JSe would like to see daylight and sunlight studies. In terms of the landscape proposals, these were considered acceptable

SM reminded everyone that there will be further consultation in the New Year, at which point there will be further discussions on the progress of the design and a subsequent public exhibition. He thanked members for attending and drew the meeting to a close.