



PIMLICO NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 2021-2040

Consultation Statement

SUMMARY OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, ISSUES AND OUTCOMES

1. Pimlico Neighbourhood Forum was established following an application sponsored by the Federation of Pimlico Residents Associations (Pimlico FREDA). FREDA is an umbrella body comprising some 18 residents associations covering the Forum area.
2. The proposal was for a body with the following purposes:
 - a. For the promotion and improvement of the social, economic, environmental well-being of Pimlico, its residents and businesses;
 - b. To encourage development to be in keeping with the distinctive and historic character of Pimlico;
 - c. To promote high standards of town planning and architecture in Pimlico;
 - d. To ensure that the administration of local services and amenities are properly and efficiently delivered and are to the advantage and legitimate needs of local residents and businesses;
 - e. To enhance the existing conservation areas within the area and extend the same where appropriate;
 - f. To prepare a Neighbourhood Plan in conformity with Westminster City Council's strategic planning policies so far as they are relevant to Pimlico in furtherance of the purposes as set out in sub-paragraphs a)-e) above.
3. The Forum and the Forum Area were designated by Westminster City Council on 9 October 2015. Membership of the Forum is open to all residents and businesses in the Forum Area and Councillors for the Area.

Stage i: Early discussions with stakeholders to produce Vision

4. The Forum was launched in practice on 26th September 2016 with an initial meeting in St. Saviour's Hall (St. George's Square) attended by some 120 residents. Members had been able to join via a webpage hosted by a Pimlico community group (www.5fields.org) and had also through been invited via the 18 constituent residents associations of FREDA. An initial steering group was elected from members on that occasion with other members being recruited in light of tasks identified. The Constitution of the Forum provides for its work to be done by the steering group.
5. The steering group met with neighbouring Forums (Fitzrovia West, Queen's Park, Churchill Gardens and Knightsbridge) to understand how they had approached their work. In the light of that and discussions among the steering group members conducted an open ended email survey of the 18 FREDA RAs and their

members. We emailed each of the RAs, some other RAs in our area and local clergy asking them to coordinate responses to four basic questions:

- **What do you like about living in Pimlico?**
- **What would make it even better?**
- **Looking to the future, say the next 15-25 years, what changes do you foresee in what you will need in Pimlico?**
- **What are your top 2 or 3 policies/policy areas for the Pimlico Neighbourhood Plan to cover?**

6. Some 27 responses, very largely from residential members well distributed across the FREDAs associations, were summarised as follows:

- *What people like:* The village feel: the quietness compared with the surrounding area, helped by the traffic management in the Grid, while still being close to the centre of London and very easily accessible. The lack of tall buildings, although people were concerned about the effect of development in Victoria and on the other side of the river. The Cubitt development is much appreciated and valued. Green spaces (but we'd like some more). The mix of shops, especially independent business with residential property close by although we'd like a greater range of goods and recognise that business is hard.
- *What would make it better?* Less through traffic and pollution, greater availability of affordable housing so people can stay here, better maintenance: waste collection, street cleaning, sewers and drains, pavement repairs, street repairs. More dynamic market in Tachbrook Street, perhaps reversing the dominance of street food in the week. Maintenance of housing association street stock. More trees!
- *Next 15-20 years?* As well as dealing with the problems: transport changes - move to electric cars and charging points, possible reduction in coach traffic should Victoria Coach Station be moved. Maybe we should have a lift to make Pimlico station "accessible". Avoid high rise/too high developments.
- *Priorities for policies?* Preserving the best of what we have, especially park and green spaces, dealing with the maintenance and waste issues and with small scale enhancements – trees etc. Avoiding harmful effects of traffic Avoiding harmful, especially high rise, developments but having growth which meets the needs of the community and allows for affordable housing. This was taken as avoiding as definitely avoiding massive regeneration schemes and respecting the current streetscape with no big increase in building heights in the historic area.

7. Building on this, our March 2017 AGM was attended by over 60 residents and unanimously endorsed the following vision for our area:

- Continue to maintain the quiet village atmosphere and its largely residential nature;

- Improve the quality of life of current and future residents by bringing about a more vibrant retail and commercial sector and enhancing leisure and cultural facilities;
- Development that respects and enhances the form and setting of the conservation areas;
- Protecting the squares and green spaces and where possible add more of them; and
- Improve the local environmental quality by continuing to limit and if possible reduce the harmful effects of traffic.

Stage ii: Exhibition and Survey Monkey/Mailchimp survey to guide development of priorities for policies

8. Following this vision and reflecting the points made, we decided to organise our questions and thinking along the following broad headings:
 - Spatial priorities; the ideal role of the various shopping/business areas and the role of the riverside frontage;
 - Housing, especially questions about affordable housing as this had been raised in the early 2017 responses
 - Traffic, especially in the shopping streets, environmental issues including green spaces and tree planting and gardens
 - Heights of new buildings and protecting heritage;
 - Waste and sustainability; and
 - Larger sites including ambitions for any new development on the Queen Mother Sports Centre site and the surrounding block.
9. We took a stall at the fete held to celebrate 40 years of Lillington and Longmoore Residents Association on 24 June 2017 to explain the background of the Forum. We also held exhibitions/consultation events based on a leaflet [attachment 1] in N Pimlico 8 November 2017 in the Dryburgh Hall and in S Pimlico on 17 November 2017 in the Pimlico Library.



10. These were advertised by a posting on the www.5fields.org website, email to all forum members and to the FREDAs residents associations and on posters in Tachbrook Estate (courtesy of Peabody) and the notice board in St Saviour's church in St George's Square. The leaflet and survey were available on the 5fields website. At the exhibitions, steering group members were on hand to explain about neighbourhood planning and to take feedback directly and attendees were encouraged to respond via an online survey.

11. Following these events and the feedback received, we identified the following issues for development in the Plan:

- identifying areas where commercial activity might be promoted or prioritised and how commercial activity could be a good neighbour for the surrounding residential areas;
- ensuring that the heritage of the conservation areas (especially the Pimlico Conservation Area), the streetscape and views is protected and enhanced in particular by limiting the heights of new developments or upward extensions;
- the value attached to green spaces, open spaces and the ability to access the riverbank given the shortage of open spaces;

- the shortage of affordable housing, housing of a size to enable downsizing from larger family homes for older people, and favouring owner occupation over private landlord/renting;
- the need to ensure that the QMSC block, if redeveloped maintains a sports centre of a comparable functionality and favouring public space over other public facilities and retention of heritage assets adjacent to the Sports Centre itself.

12. These issues needed to be reconciled with the 2016 Westminster City Plan and the emerging City Plan. They also informed responses of the PNF to consultations by WCC on the emerging City Plan.

Stage iii: Producing the first draft of the Plan

13. Building on the exhibition and survey we gathered a number of locally based architects, surveyors for discussion of the problems of the area that we felt needed addressing and produced a brief discussion document to both clarify out thinking and to help us in our discussions with local residents, Westminster City Council and housing associations as well as locally based professionals such as architects and surveyors, conservation architects etc.

Warwick Way/Wilton Road area

14. We concluded that the growth in parts of Pimlico's population (over 46% growth in private sector tenants between 2001 and 2001 and 38% growth in over 60s) suggested that there is unmet demand for an attractive retail and dining offer, but that demand is choosy and has alternatives within walking distance (Chelsea, Central London).

15. Members reported that the physical environment of the "village high street" was a serious deterrent and needed to improve and have public realm maintenance and investment to address this issue.

16. We identified a number of improvements in public realm, road and utility maintenance and services that were needed in Wilton Road and in Warwick Way between Belgrave Road and Vauxhall Bridge Road. In addition, signage of the business premises and their maintenance needed improving. If the effects of traffic in this section of Warwick Way could be reduced, we believed that the business environment would improve.

Other local shopping parades

17. The local shopping parades in Moreton Street, Churton Street, Sussex Street, Cambridge Street, Alderney Street, Tachbrook Street were much valued and the community was keen to protect the non residential stock which had been gradually lost to residential conversion seems which often had a deadening effect. We thought about protecting retail and preferred alternative uses that would maintain vibrancy of these streets while sitting well with the quiet residential nature that they are in.

Riverfront and open/green spaces

18. Pimlico lacks organised open space and green spaces – parks, squares, market places. So informal community spaces such as the pavements and the expanded junctions/small spaces (mini piazzas) that were provided with the earlier traffic schemes in the Pimlico Conservation Area are of greater importance than they are in, say, suburban areas with plenty of private space in gardens.
19. The open aspect of parts of Pimlico, especially along the riverside, is another way in which the lack of space is alleviated.
20. We proposed:
- Protecting existing open and green space;
 - Improved management of public realm (open and green space, pavements and mini piazzas)
 - Making more of the riverfront as an asset for the quiet enjoyment of Pimlico residents and to enhance the very limited opportunities for enjoyment of open spaces.

Design and heritage protection

21. Design and impact of developments are of concern to residents. They like the heritage of both the historic Cubitt core and the listed social housing estates and want to see that respected. So we want to see the principles set out in the four Conservation Area audits followed.
22. We envisage development happening in a number of ways:
- In the historic area, by additions of mansards, back extensions and potentially reconfiguring and redevelopment of the post 1900 infills, but with essentially the same broad envelope in terms of heights, street frontages as the Cubitt development;
 - The non listed housing estate: Abbots Manor; Tachbrook Estate, Bessborough Gardens may over time become the subject of proposals by their owners and would need to meet strong design and landscape criteria.
23. It is important that development outside the conservation areas should not affect the setting of the conservation areas (this is particularly the case for the effect on Pimlico Conservation area) nor be detrimental to the village feel, which together comprise much of the character of Pimlico. We therefore wanted to emphasise preservation or enhancement of views and streetscapes.
24. One of the biggest concerns had been some recent developments of weak design given their historic context. So any major developments would need quality scrutiny.
25. Except in the central area, we believe that developments should be predominantly residential and otherwise only provide for local needs (and therefore not undermine the role of the central area).

Queen Mother Sports Centre block

26. The QMSC site and the surrounding block are of great interest as the boundaries are historic/listed and mark a change to the lower scale, village feel of Pimlico. So redevelopment of any of this block needs to reflect this boundary and avoid dominating the historic area S of Warwick way or W of Guildhouse Street. The

Sainsbury building and the Park Plaza hotel are examples of what to avoid in terms of height and design.

27. Residents were keen to see a sports centre of at least the same size and scale continue for Pimlico and there may be case for making a bigger, but not a “destination” which could cause traffic problems.
28. We felt that office space would help support local retail, restaurants and cafes and ideally any retail units should be small enough to be able to support independent units rather than the chains. The height and setback of any development were seen as important as the setting of the view down Wilton Road and the feel of Warwick Way are of great importance and we wanted to avoid any sense of being in a canyon.
29. These issues were drawn together in a document for further discussion with Councillors, Westminster City Council and the other stakeholders in Autumn 2018. Based on this we shared a very early draft of our Neighbourhood Plan with WCC in March 2019 and the comments were fed into the Reg 14 draft Plan.

Stage iv: Pre-submission (Regulation 14) consultation July-October 2019

30. In preparation for the Pre submission consultation we established our own website at www.pimlicoforum.org. The consultation on our draft plan was launched on 31 July 2019 ending 10 October 2019 to allow more time over the Summer period.
31. In addition to Forum members and the FREDA residents associations, we consulted
 - Natural England
 - Environment Agency
 - Historic England
 - GLA and TFL
 - NHS
 - Abbots Manor Residents Association
 - Churchill Gardens Neighbourhood Forum
 - WCC and the 9 Councillors for the 3 Wards overlapping with the Forum Area
 - Homes England
 - Highways England
 - Network Rail
 - UK Power Networks
 - National Grid
 - Coal.Gov.UK
 - Thames Water
 - Housing Associations: Sanctuary, London and Quadrant, Peabody and Genesis-Notting Hill
 - Vicars/Priests of all four churches in the Forum Area
 - Other Westminster Neighbourhood Forums
 - Westminster Boating Base
 - Victoria and the Westminster Business Improvement Districts
 - The Crown Estate
 - Westminster Property Owners Association

- The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings, The Victorian Society, The Twentieth Century Society
- Parkchoice
- Wandsworth Council

32. During the consultation period we meet with various RAs; Eccleston Square Residents associations, Abbots Manor Residents Association, Pimlico Grid Residents Association, FREDA, Tachbrook Street Residents Association, Churton and Charlwood Residents Association. [We put up posters in the Tachbrook Estate (courtesy of Peabody) and Lillington Gardens and in shop windows in Pimlico and distributed/home delivered over 8,000 post cards (see Appendix below) to home addresses in the Forum area.

33. We received responses from

- 8 Statutory Bodies
- 9 Amenity Societies/Residents Associations
- 30 Residents/Business owners

Commercial and Mixed Use Centres

34. Several residents and residents associations recognised the problem with vacancies and over provision of charity shops and hairdressers in the central area and agreed that the public realm would need to be improved to assist the provisions of retail that met the needs of Pimlico residents. Over the time of the preparation of the plan, the general economic and retail environment became better appreciated and the adoption of Use Class E necessitated a major rethink. In addition the replacement of City Plan 2016 Policy S10 with other policies on the CAZ in the new City Plan 2020 needed to be taken into account. PIM 1 has thus been substantially revised to clarify the critical issues of residential amenity to be protected in the Local Centres (defined in the City Plan) and in the Pimlico Parades defined in the Neighbourhood Plan, all of which are close to (or indeed underneath) residential units, many of them being heritage assets. PIM 1 is now less prescriptive and generally concentrates on outcomes being sought, although the justification also goes into some detail about the issues that may arise in those cases which require an associated planning permission to fully achieve a change of use in practice.

Design and Heritage

35. Westminster City Council asked us to clarify our thinking on protected views in the Pimlico Conservation Area. Discussion with Historic England helpfully identified what was special about the Pimlico Conservation Area: importantly the features of the townscape (as well as the interest of the views at the end of streets) and the regularity of the heights/rooflines of terraces and their lengths. PIM2 has been adjusted and the supporting text substantially revised.

36. There was broad support among residents for the policies in PIM3 and PIM4 which increases the number of locations (compared with the Conservation Area Audit) where mansard extensions are allowed. The policy is detailed, but in practice it is less elaborate and potentially subjective than the existing City Plan policy. The text justifying PIM3 and PIM4 has been clarified.

37. Policies PIM5 and PIM6 have been revised to address points raised by Westminster City Council so that the language is clearer and more precise about the features of Peabody Avenue and Lillington and Longmoore Gardens that the Plan is seeking to enhance or preserve.
38. PIM7 in relation to Dolphin Square has been revised to be clearer about the features that should be protected or enhanced to address concerns of Westminster City Council.
39. PIM 9 has been revised to recognise the advisory role of Design Review following a query from a local resident. The case for such a panel has become stronger over the period of preparing this plan.
40. PIM 11 has been substantially revised following comments from Historic England and Westminster City Council. In addition we produced a detailed assessment of building heights across our area in Appendix 1.
41. PIM 12 has been revised in title and the policy altered to impose a high standard on any replacement while emphasising the role of style (explained in the supporting text as relating to preserving the memory of bomb sites) to clarify the purpose of this policy in relation to concerns of a resident.
42. The list of unlisted buildings of merit has been slightly revised and retitled to reflect the fact that these buildings are intended to be locally designated heritage assets (there is no local list for Westminster). The entries have been updated.

Housing and Hotels

43. There was broad support for the policies in this section from residents, PIM13-PIM 16 reflecting the shortage of “family” sized market properties compared with 1 or 2 bedroom units and the shortage of market properties suitably for older people to “downsize” from the larger properties (the houses of 4 bedrooms plus). PIM 14 has had its justification strengthened to bring out the evidence for the shortage of lateral flats in the market sector in Pimlico. The justification for the policy PIM 15 has been strengthened and clarified following input from the local clergy. The drafting of PIM16 has been considered in relation to Westminster City Council’s comments.

Open spaces, pedestrian and transport facilities, protecting the environment

44. PIM 17 on local green spaces has been updated to include Dolphin Square Gardens (and removing it from the list of Public Open Spaces, in response to a concern from Dolphin Square residents), Otherwise the policy has been unchanged. We consider it necessary that any built developments on the very limited green space should enhance their functions, as their amenity benefits to residents would otherwise be reduced.
45. PIM 18 has been left unchanged. We do not think it is possible or desirable to avoid through traffic or “outsiders” enjoying the space on estates, where that is legally permitted but in view of limited amount of open space for residents the space needs to be prioritise for their enjoyment.
46. PIM 19-PIM 21 have been reordered. We think comments about a bridge from somewhere other than Nine Elms (which we define as the whole of the S bank of the River between Vauxhall and Chelsea Bridges) are a bit confused. Residents would have preferred a stronger policy preventing a bridge from the south bank,

but we do not think that can be positively phrased. References to the Policies Map are now clearer.

47. PIM 22 is intended to apply mainly to the Core CAZ retail cluster where it intersects with Warwick Way and Wilton Road as these are the areas that need improving in the way suggested (the policy has been revised to address Westminster's comments).

Larger Sites including the Queen Mother Sports Centre Block

48. PIM 24 We have adjusted this policy to reflect the change of use classes and have revised the justification to strengthen the case for preferring commercial over residential use. The City Plan requires no net loss of office floorspace and the Sports Centre. heritage and public realm requirements of major development on the QMSC block would limit the floorspace that could be dedicated to residential use without an excessively tall building. We have also changed the title to "Major Developments" to make clear that this is not a site allocation policy.

Stage v: Finalising the Plan

Strategic Environmental Assessment screening report

49. On 15 December 2020, the Forum submitted a screening report to WCC and the statutory bodies (the Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England) to assist in the determination of whether or not the Pimlico Neighbourhood Plan would have significant environmental effects in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The Forum's draft SEA Screening Report concluded that the Plan would not be likely to have any significant environmental effects arising either individually or cumulatively.

The Environment Agency by letter dated 2 February 2021, Natural England by letter dated 3 February 2021 and WCC by letter dated 13 January 2021 all agreed that the Plan was not likely to have significant environmental effects. In a letter dated 2 February 2021, Historic England raised concerns in respect of the wording of Policy PIM 3 (Upward Extensions in the Pimlico Conservation Area) as it was unclear whether the related City Plan policies had been screened for SEA and the title of PIM 24 on Major Development Sites.

50. As a result, the Forum amended the title of Policy PIM 24 to Major Developments to clarify that it was not allocating sites. Following clarification by WCC, Historic England confirmed by letter of 28 April 2021 that it did not consider that the Neighbourhood Plan would lead to additional significant environmental effects meriting SEA. The final SEA Screening Report including the responses from the statutory bodies has been submitted to WCC at Regulation 15 stage as part of the evidence base for the Plan.

Habitats Regulation Assessment screening assessment:

51. The Forum prepared an updated draft HRA Screening Report and consulted the statutory bodies on 15 December 2020. The draft HRA Screening Report

concluded that the amended Plan is not likely to have significant impacts on European protected species or sites. Natural England by letter dated 3 February 2021 and WCC by letter dated 13 January 2021 agreed that the Plan is not likely to have significant impacts on European protected species. The final Screening Report including the responses from the statutory bodies has been submitted to WCC at Regulation 15 stage as part of the evidence base for the Plan.

22 May 2021

Appendix





Please visit: www.pimlicoforum.org

Have your say on the future of Pimlico!

Pimlico Neighbourhood Forum needs your
comments on its Plan for future development in
Pimlico. Find out more at www.pimlicoforum.org.
Send your comments to email@pimlicoforum.org
by 5pm on 10 October 2015.