

TTIS Response to Tachbrook Street Draft Development Opportunity Framework

November 2016

We agree that the site has problems, but not that it should become part of the Victoria BID.

It is vitally important that the sports centre should not be reduced in size, and should be out of commission for as short a time as possible for rebuilding.

The plan is clearly steering development in the direction of one massive redevelopment, which is much more likely to deliver commercial and residential accommodation with city-wide attraction rather than geared to local use as is the case now. This would be detrimental to local people.

Our response to particular clauses:

2.16 There is ambivalence over the retention of Gillingham Row and even Gillingham Street, the negative implication being that their retention would restrict the scale of development. Whereas the fact is that they should be restricting the scale of the development, which should be considered a part of Pimlico, not Victoria.

3.4 This clause describes the useful small businesses on the site – much more valuable to locals than more Pret a Mangers. But these small businesses would be lost if an expensive commercial scheme replaced the existing mix.

3.6 ‘This residential character is not particularly mirrored at this site which exhibits a more Core CAZ commercial character.’ – we disagree with this assessment. Despite the QMSC this block relates in scale and land use to Pimlico – the blocks on the other side of Tachbrook St and Longmoore St should set the bar for scale, and the northern boundary, Gillingham Row has listed buildings. The Warwick Way and Tachbrook Street ‘CAZ frontage’ is dominated by useful local shops and services – it does not feel part of the CAZ. Wilton Road has some quite tall buildings at the Victoria end, but because of the presence of the large Sainsbury’s it feels like a local shopping street (in contrast to Victoria Street).