



Decision Maker:	Cabinet Member for Built Environment
Date:	20 May 2016
Classification:	For General Release
Title:	Naming of five new access roadways within the site of the former Chelsea Barracks, Chelsea Bridge Road, SW1
Wards Affected:	Churchill
Policy Context:	
Key Decision:	No
Financial Summary:	Not Applicable
Report of:	Director of Planning

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1 Notices of intention to name five new access roadways on the former Chelsea Barracks site, Chelsea Bridge Road, SW1 have been received from DP9 Ltd on behalf of the applicant Project Blue Limited.
- 1.2 The applicant has formally applied to the City Council to name the new access roadways as Five Fields Square, Garrison Square, Grenadier Gardens, Mulberry Square and Whistler Square.
- 1.3 Consultations have been undertaken with the Emergency Services, ward councillors and the local amenity society.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 That the naming of five new roadways at the former Chelsea Barracks site on Chelsea Bridge Road, SW1 be approved, namely:
- Five Fields Square
 - Garrison Square
 - Grenadier Gardens
 - Mulberry Square
 - Whistler Square

3. Reasons for Decision

- 3.1. The PDA Section of London Fire (the Emergency Services) has objected to the use of three of the five names proposed by the developers, Project Blue Ltd. Their objections are based on the names being in duplication with other streets and roads and other buildings, not only within the surrounding area but also within the adjoining boroughs of Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and the London Borough of Wandsworth.
- 3.2 No further discussions have taken place with the Emergency Services in seeking any possible reconsideration and withdrawal of their objections on three of the proposed names. Based on a recent similar case following objection to a name on the grounds of duplication, the Emergency Services had previously stated that they are only acting in an advisory capacity to the Council, and it is the Council who are the street naming authority and it is therefore the Council who is the final arbiter and decision maker.

In view of the above, the proposed naming of all five proposed new street names at the former Chelsea Barracks site are put forward for the Cabinet Member's decision.

- 3.3 The City Council's Street Naming and Numbering guidelines that were formally adopted by the former Environment and Planning Committee on 31 March 1998 (a copy of which is attached at Appendix 1 to this report) broadly require that street names are not duplicated, are easy to pronounce and have some local historical connection with the area. It is considered that the proposed names generally fit this criteria albeit that there is some duplication for three of the names.
- 3.4 The relevant legal considerations for the Cabinet Member to consider in reaching a decision are set out in Sections 6 and 8 of this report. If the Cabinet Member agrees to the naming of the five new roadways, the Director of Planning will assign the names by statutory order. If, however, the Cabinet Member does not

approve a particular name, then the developer will be informed that the application is refused.

4. Background and Consideration, including any Policy Context

- 4.1 Discussions took place as early as August 2014 with regard to a proposed naming strategy for new roads to be constructed on the former Chelsea Barracks site, which is being redeveloped for a largely residential and mixed use scheme. Initially, seven new street names were put forward by the developers, who used a specialist branding company to provide relevant local and historical justifications for each of the proposed names. These were based on military association, royal connection, botanical relationship and heritage and history of the location. Officers advised that some names would most likely be objected to by the Emergency Services on the grounds of duplication with some street names already used in the borough. This was the case and the Emergency Services raised objection on five out of the seven names. Following further discussions, the developers provided alternative names in substitution for two of the original names, as well as two of the original names being dropped completely. The developers also indicated an intention to proceed with two of the names that the Emergency Services had previously objected to. The developers were subsequently advised that the two alternative names proposed did not meet the City Council's criteria for naming new streets in the borough and these were subsequently dropped from the naming strategy.
- 4.2 In May 2015, the Council received five street naming applications. These are set out below with the developer's justification and officer's comments. Consultations have been carried out by the Council on each application, including a public notice being erected on the site in accordance with the statutory procedure. The agents acting for the developer, DP9, have confirmed that prior to formal submission of the applications meetings were held with the Chelsea Barracks Residents Liaison Group and they had been encouraged and supportive with the names linked with the past history of the site.

1. FIVE FIELDS SQUARE

This is the largest square in the development and 'Five Fields' represents the original name for the neighbouring Pimlico and this name falls within the heritage themed association. No objections have been raised to this proposed name.

2. GARRISON SQUARE

This proposal is to name the square adjacent to the former listed Chapel as Garrison Square. Although a military association, the reference to the former Garrison adjacent to the Chapel makes a single clear connection to the site's heritage. No objections have been raised to this proposed name.

3. GRENADIER GARDENS

The proposal is to name the gardens off Ebury Bridge Road as Grenadier Gardens. The Grenadier Guards are the original Royal Guards who were housed at Chelsea Barracks and thus the name falls within the heritage and military themed associations. The Emergency Services have objected to the prefix 'Grenadier' on grounds of duplication in the surrounding area which could lead to confusion. Evidently, the duplication is from a Home Office building in Horseferry Road which was named 'Grenadier House' and is 0.7 miles away. It is felt questionable that this would cause any confusion with a roadway within the former Chelsea Barracks development. DP9 were informed of this objection but they wished to proceed with the proposed name.

4. MULBERRY SQUARE

The proposal is to name the main entrance square into the site from Chelsea Bridge Road as Mulberry Square. The name falls into the botanical, royal and heritage categories recognising that the original site of Buckingham Palace consisted of a mulberry garden planted by James I and pays homage to the design of the new public space created as part of the development. The Emergency Services objected to the prefix 'Mulberry' on the grounds of duplication in the surrounding area which could lead to confusion. There is a Mulberry House at 19B Douglas Street, SW1 which is 0.8 miles away. Again, it is questionable if any such confusion could arise with a new building located at the former Chelsea Barracks site. DP9 were notified of this objection but wished to proceed with the proposed name.

5. WHISTLER SQUARE

The proposal is to name the new square created as part of the first phase of development as Whistler Square, which is in honour of James A N Whistler, who famously painted the nearby Thames from Westminster Bridge. The name falls into the heritage category paying tribute to the rich history of the location, its geography and in recognition of the influential history in the era in which the original Chelsea Barracks on the site was established. The Emergency Services have objected to the prefix 'Whistler' on the grounds of duplication in the surrounding area. Officers sought clarification on where this duplication is to be found. In response, the Emergency Services said the duplication is with Whistler Walk, SW10 and Whistler Tower, SW10 in the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. Both are deemed to be located about one mile away from the site of the former Chelsea Barracks. They have also said that there is a Whistlers Avenue, SW11 in the London Borough of Wandsworth which is just over one mile away from the development site.

In a later conversation with DP9, it appears that they were never informed that the Emergency Services had objected to Whistler Square. They said that this was of concern particularly as the blocks here will be in the first phase of

completion and the developer has invested large sums in marketing this part of the development.

- 4.3 In addition to the consultations carried out with the Emergency Services, a public notice was erected on site for the statutory period of 28 days from 19 August to 16 September 2015. There were no responses received as a result of this consultation.
- 4.4 Ward Councillors from Churchill Ward were consulted but no responses were received.
- 4.5 The Belgravia Residents Association were consulted as the local recognised amenity society and they confirmed that committee members have all given their consent and have no objection to the proposed names. DP9 had also confirmed that meetings had been held with the Residents Liaison Group and they have been encouraged and supportive of the names because of their links with the local history.

This report is for the Cabinet Member to decide whether there is sufficient reason to depart from the Council's normal Street Naming and Numbering guidelines and to agree the proposed names as set out in this report, having taken into account the representations received.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 There are no financial considerations relating to this report.

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1 Under **Section 6 of the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act, 1939**, the Council may by order assign "any name which they think fit to any street, way, place, row of houses or block of buildings whether or not in substitution for a name already given or assigned". The use of these words gives the Council a wide discretion. However, Section 6(3) requires the Council to consider any objections it receives, before making such an order.

Under **Section 5 of the London Building Acts (Amendment) Act, 1939**, one months' notice must be given to the Council of the intended name of any street, way, place, row of houses or block of buildings. The Council may object to any proposed name.

- 6.2 The City Council's guidelines on street and building naming and numbering, state that new street names should not duplicate any similar name already in use in the borough or neighbouring boroughs. A variation in the terminal word, i.e. 'street', 'road', 'avenue', etc will not be accepted as sufficient reason to duplicate a name.
- 6.3 The Department of Transport's Circular Roads 3/93 provides advice on street naming and renaming insofar as it is important to both the Royal Mail and the Emergency Services to avoid giving streets similar names within the same locality. The close juxtaposition of similar names such as Park Road, Park Avenue, and Park Gate Drive in the same area has proved to be a particular source of difficulty. A great number of calls to the Emergency Services are received each day and some callers can be vague in the details they provide. Where names are duplicated it can be extremely difficult to pinpoint an exact location to enable an ambulance or fire engine to attend in the time allowed.

As mentioned above, the PDA Section at London Fire (Emergency Services) has raised objection to three of the proposed street names.

In exercising the Council's discretion, the Cabinet Member must take into account the advice set out in this report, along with the outcome of the consultations which have been carried out, and the Council's own guidelines on street naming and renaming.

7. Staffing Implications

- 7.1 There are no staffing implications involved.

8. Consultation

- 8.1 Councillor Gassanly - no response received

Councillor Talukder - no response received.

Councillor Williams - no response received.

Emergency Services (PDA Section London Fire) – as reported above

The Belgravia Residents Association has responded by stating that the proposed names were discussed at a BRA meeting and all gave consent and therefore have no objection to the names.

A public notice was posted on site on 19 August 2015 allowing the statutory period of 28 days for any written support or objections to the proposed names to be made to the City Council. There were no responses received.

**If you have any queries about this report or wish to inspect any of the
Background Papers please contact:**

**RICHARD CLIFTON, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, 12th FLOOR,
WESTMINSTER CITY HALL, 64 VICTORIA STREET, LONDON SW1E 6QP**

By email to rclifton2@westminster.gov.uk or 020 7641 2520

BACKGROUND PAPERS:

None

Appendix 1

Copy of Guidelines on Street and Building Naming and Numbering in the City of Westminster.

Appendix 2

Location plan showing the proposed site, proposed names and road layouts.

For completion by the **Cabinet Member for Built Environment**

Declaration of Interest

I have <no interest to declare / to declare an interest> in respect of this report

Signed: _____ Date: _____

NAME: **Councillor Robert Davis, MBE, DL,**

State nature of interest if any

.....

(N.B: If you have an interest you should seek advice as to whether it is appropriate to make a decision in relation to this matter)

For the reasons set out above, I agree the recommendation in the report entitled naming of new access roadways within the site of the former Chelsea Barracks, Chelsea Bridge Road, SW1.

Signed

Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Built Environment

Date

If you have any additional comment which you would want actioned in connection with your decision you should discuss this with the report author and then set out your comment below before the report and this pro-forma is returned to the Secretariat for processing.

Additional comment:
.....

.....

If you do not wish to approve the recommendations, or wish to make an alternative decision, it is important that you consult the report author, the Director of Law, City Treasurer and, if there are resources implications, the Director of Human Resources (or their representatives) so that (1) you can be made aware of any further relevant considerations that you should take into account before making the decision and (2) your reasons for the decision can be properly identified and recorded, as required by law.

Note to Cabinet Member: Your decision will now be published and copied to the Members of the relevant Policy & Scrutiny Committee. If the decision falls within the criteria for call-in, it will not be implemented until five working days have elapsed from publication to allow the Policy & Scrutiny Committee to decide whether it wishes to call the matter in.