

## Community Liaison Group Meeting 4 Masterplan Overview

**Date:** 04.07.2017

**Time:** 19:00 – 21:00

**Venue:** Stag Brewery Sports Club, Lower Richmond Road, London, SW14 7ET

### Attendees:

Francine Bates  
Helen Edwards  
Avril Daghish  
Jackson Fiorini  
Dan Harrington  
Andrew Howard-Smith  
Graham Kench  
Ben Knight  
Shaun Lamplough  
Ashley Lawrence  
Tim Lennon  
Jen Loudon  
Peter Makower  
Ben Macworth-Praed  
Max Millington  
John Repsch  
Anna Sadler  
Kate Woodhouse  
Margaret Woolmore

**Mortlake Brewery Community Group**  
**Thomson House Parents Voices Group**, Representative  
**West London River Group**, Chair  
**The Tapestry**  
**Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace**, Representative  
**Thames Bank**, Representative  
**Lower Richmond Road**, Resident  
**Local Resident**  
**Mortlake with East Sheen**, Chair  
**Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace**, Representative  
**Richmond Cycling Campaign**, Chair  
**Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace**, Representative  
**Local Resident**, Chiswick  
**Barnes Community Association**, Representative  
**Williams Lane**, Representative  
**Chertsey Court Action Group**, Representative  
**LBRuT**, Community Links Officer  
**Mortlake Community Association**, Chair  
**Chertsey Court Action Group**, Representative

### Project Team:

Guy Duckworth  
Barnaby Johnson  
Murray Levinson  
Wendelin Theole  
Neil Henderson  
Rob Parker  
Ros Boalch  
Steve McAdam  
Rowan Cole  
Janet Hall

**Dartmouth Capital**, Development Manager  
**Squire and Partners**, Architect  
**Squire and Partners**, Architect  
**Gillespies**, Landscape Architect  
**Gerald Eve**, Planning Consultant  
**Peter Brett Associates**, Transport Consultant  
**Waterman Group**, Environmental Consultant  
**Soundings**, Community Consultant  
**Soundings**, Community Consultant  
**Soundings**, Community Consultant

### Agenda:

#### **1 Introductions**

- 1.0 SM apology for the postponement of the original meeting planned
- 1.1 Reminds attendees of the public exhibition dates, CLG preview (2pm, 13 July 2017)

#### **2 Review from previous CLG**

- 2.0 GD briefly outlines some of the previously discussed issues which progress has been made on; Lower Richmond Road crossing, and Chalkers corner.
- 2.1 GD provides assurance that an option without the loss of trees has been progressed, it will also improve the position of the Green Link.
- 2.2 BP, WT elaborate on the changes; less road widening on LRR, and improved planting at this location
- 2.3 SM, any further comments on the minutes may be issued by COP tomorrow to Soundings

#### **3 Open Questions**

- 3.0 Has the Thames Strategy and the Wooded Towpath audit been referred in the background studies and design response.

WT confirms that they have been referred to, and that this will be included within the planning statement

- 3.1 Has the view of the development from the north bank and the river itself been illustrated and consider, along with potential issues of lighting spillage to the river.

BJ, these views have been shown to planning officers and will be made public at the exhibition next week. A further range of distant views onto the site will also be included in the planning application.  
 WT, lighting will be managed along the towpath, using controlled light preventing its spillage  
 RB, an assessment on shadowing will be included within the EIA

- 3.2 One local group makes a statement regarding the school; to keep it to 800 pupils only, creating a manageable sized school. This proposal has been made to the Council Leader. No response was received.

Another comment is made regarding the appointment of Paul Hodgins as the Council Leader, and possibility of the school being a landmark school for Richmond.

BJ, reminds all that the school decisions are made by the EFA, and that the development cannot affect these matters.

- 3.3 New guidance was issued last week to planning officers advising that planning permissions be denied or reduced for schools, where pollution exceeds acceptable levels.

RB, air quality testing has been carried out in the area, it was deemed as acceptable. Final test results will be issued through the EIA.

WT, air quality in the area will also be improved by the planting of 4,000 trees in the area.

- 3.4 New trees are lovely, but old trees are better.

WT agrees

GD, there is a blanket Tree Protection Order (TPO) on the site. Three trees have died and been removed from the site. A strategy working within the boundaries of the TPO is being developed.

GD and SM, re-emphasise that the trees on the corner of Mortlake Green are not going to be pulled down.

- 3.5 Is the school still located on the Watney playing field?

BJ, it is still positioned partially on the Watney playing field, and has been moved further off than in the version we previously showed you.

- 3.6 What is the need of a museum? A swimming pool would be a lot more useful.

No museum is proposed for the site; just facilities for community use. A local community tenant and management of that space is required.

- 3.7 Is a cinema still required? A swimming pool would be preferable to that for health, and elderly provision.

SM, we need to go back to the planning brief, which at no stage made reference to a pool

NH, any public pool would have to be local authority led for inclusion

- 3.8 Density and traffic are still outstanding fundamental issues to the development. There needs to be reduction in the density, and traffic implication. We want development, but what is the traffic mitigation strategy for those who are living here currently?

Why are more radical solutions like car clubs implemented through the development.

- 3.9 The danger of the level crossing in its present state, what conversation has been had with Network Rail?

RP, we have got a bit more information from Network Rail and Southwestern Trains, we are aware that they are planning to increase capacity through longer trains, not train frequency. The capacity they have stated to achieve by 2025 will be an improvement upon today's experience, even with the increase in the local population.

Those numbers will be made available through the transport assessment report in the planning application.

- 3.10 Has an under-pass at Chalkers Corner or the level crossing been discussed? Could Sheen Lane be pedestrianised, improving the level crossing and traffic entry onto Chalkers Corner.

RP, it is not something that a development of this scale can viably deliver.

Attendees break out into disorganised conversation and argument on the effects of pedestrians

3.11 Statement reinstating concerns regarding density, impact upon traffic, parking, aesthetic of the development, and its scale overall.

GD confirms that those points have been made well, and heard by the project team. We are trying, and are in some sense fighting the same battle as you to see what can be achieved with the council regarding parking and traffic. For example, the council would like to see double the car parking provision proposed on-site.

The traffic numbers presented at the last exhibition stated that the current traffic situation could be improved, many local residents did not believe this, and we have since organised a peer review by another transport consultant of this modelling.

The revised scheme will also provide a second exit on Mortlake High Street, which means that they will not have to add further traffic to the Lower Richmond Lane, or Sheen Lane, unless by choice they which to do so.

3.12 If you were just to shave a little of the heights of all buildings, including the school, it would be more acceptable.

3.13 Warns that there will be thousands of people opposing the planning application on the grounds of traffic and transport, a more radical and cohesive approach – working with TfL and network rail incorporating roads, bus routes and trains needs to be taken.

A second attendee states that no peer review of the numbers will make people believe them. The only way to tackle this issue is to take a more radical approach in reducing the car-parking, or numbers of houses, or school capacity.

SM, is a commitment from the project team that the traffic will not be any worse as a result of the development good enough to satisfy you concerns?

Attendees again breakout into disorder, several state that this proposal is not possible

RP, re-emphasises the process and scrutiny that all the data, modelling, and decision made regarding transport must go through in the peer review, with TfL, and the council. So far, all are satisfied that these numbers are sound, there tends to be a lot of double-counting involved in trip generation, the numbers will be higher than reality.

3.14 If the school has no playing fields, children will have to be taken by bus to them, creating more traffic.

RP, highlights that there will be some trip-saving due to local school location, currently some children are being bussed further distances to other schools.

3.15 Reduce everything by 25% to reduce the traffic impact, this would make it acceptable to the local community. It doesn't seem a big ask to produce it by 'a little bit', I hope the decision isn't driven by profit.

NH, explains that the traffic generation and proposal, at the current magnitude, is deemed acceptable.

3.16 The 2011 planning brief is where we stand, based upon the consultation of 550-600 units.

3.17 How will the crossing at the Lower Richmond Road affect traffic movement across?

3.18 Previously a variation in heights was proposed, what feedback was received on this?

GD confirms that there will be variation across the site, these align to the SPD except for perhaps one building.

3.19 GD The new commercial heart of Mortlake; reason for cinema is to promote life and activity in the early evening, will also support the retail in the area.

There are two cinemas in Richmond, one in Barnes, people drive to them. We don't want people using the area in the evening, it's a village not a town; some people disagreed with this view.

3.20 Is Mortlake a town or a village. Chalkers Corner is in Surrey. Everything show has an urban feel about it, we are on the edge of London. Why have references been made to other developments in the city, but not from the west to here. LBRuT consider the borough as a series of villages, they produce village plans.

GD, reminds the CLG of the first diagrams shared with them which were used to calculate density based upon the surrounding street plan densities.

Attendee, forget the commercial mix, what if housing and streets just like those in the area were built; people would probably welcome it. (Laughter and some agreement amongst attendees)

WT, this would encourage further car use, and support wider suburban sprawl in the area. It's not part of modern planning policy, it's not sustainable.

ML, 6 and 7 storey buildings were featured in the planning brief, what could this have been other than apartments? The planning brief intention was urban.

Attendees, point to the fact that heights were provided as ranges within the planning brief; and ask why the upper limit has always been taken. Seven storeys is not in-keeping with the area.

- 3.21 GD, there will be a sharing agreement with the school providing local access to indoor and outdoor sports facilities. This agreement will actually provide more access to sports facilities to more people in the area than the current sports pitches do.

An attendee suggests that the developer donates the field to the local community who could set up a community amenity trust. Another asks what happens if local people want to play sport during the day; and how much outdoor space does the school need?

BJ, the school could have more space than is allocated; we have tried to maintain the outdoor space so that the public park may be provided.

WT, there are 3ha of public space distributed through the site, with plenty of spaces for sport and team games.

BJ, the current pitch could be used a little more frequently, but not to the extent that a 3G pitch can.

SM, highlights that the land is actually privately owned.

- 3.22 What is the status on the potential school siting? Four options have been reviewed, we think the best option is to build the school on the northern side, leaving the most public space open to the road end.

BJ, points out that the traffic is not to be directed through Williams Lane but the new road running parallel to Ship Lane. We still expect that most children will arrive to school by bike or on foot.

Attendees, half the school population will walk through Chalkers Corner and half across the Lower Richmond Road. Has the speed at which teenagers walk considered in your transport strategy?

BJ/RP/WT, highlight other routes that will be taken by students; along the Towpath from Kew, and across Chiswick Bridge, plus the bus stop.

- 3.23 Would it not make sense to extend the 209 bus stop toward the Kew Retail Park?

RP, we will present our numbers demonstrating the expected increase of use on the route, LBRuT are supportive of extending the route, so far TfL have not given their position on this, and it will ultimately be their decision. One advantage of the current terminus is that it will not have to go through Chalkers Corner, TfL will be looking at two things; demand and journey time.

Another attendee brings forward a previous suggestion made for a non-stop, or infrequent stop service to Hammersmith. They also highlight the potential effects due to the closure of Hammersmith Bridge; it will have a huge effect on the area.

RP, these options have been discussed.

- 3.24 Chertsey court, were not expecting hundreds of teenagers to be walking through our grounds. Will the development affect the value of my leasehold?

WT, the infrastructure cannot be moved from this location, but there a quality piece of landscape will be delivered, and trees planted will mitigate pollution and noise. The aesthetic and amenity will be improved.

This is on the opposite side of the road, it won't help. Another attendee highlights that there is a difference between a tree and a mature tree in terms of quality and reduction of pollution.

How is the development able to interfere with the outlook and spaces associated with apartments that are not adjacent to the site?

NH/WT, a maintenance plan for planting and ensuring growth around the site will be in place.

3.25 Attendee expresses a concern that social tenants of Chertsey court are being put at risk by the transport interventions planned there, they request thoughtfulness of the project team regarding the value ensured for those who live there.

3.26 SM, asks if there are any questions on public realm?

Some of the businesses are very close together, has that changed at all?

BJ, confirms that the space between some buildings will have increased.

3.27 When do you expect TfL to respond to the traffic proposal?

RP, we receive informal response from them until the planning application in which they will formally comment on the transport strategy. That will be made available to the public on the LBRuT planning website.

3.28 What happens between now and determination on the planning application?

SM, the statutory consultation will take place.

3.29 Has the demolition and removal of the existing brewery been planned? Do you know where it will be taken to?

RP, there will be an outline construction management plan submitted as part of the planning application. When a contract is appointed a detailed plan will be formed.

3.30 When will the internal asset stripping be completed? Is it the end of the year?

GD, it is supposed to be at the end of October. The demolition process and groundworks are likely to take one year to eighteen months.

3.31 What about the use of a barge for construction?

GD, we considered muck-away, delivery of materials, and the public transport potential of the river from the site. This presented two problems, it would require closure of the tow-path, and the rowers wouldn't be happy.

3.32 It is very important that construction periods are communicated well to people, the current removal of assets has not done so. How widely were people informed about the exhibition?

RM, 5,500 leaflets were delivered, an advert was placed in the Richmond and Twickenham Times, the banner outside, email and advertisement on the website. We have also spoken to your local councilors.

An attendee offers to distribute 300 leaflets

3.33 It was very cramped at the last exhibition. A suggestion for a marquee was made also. Will access to feedback forms be improved? How is the data from the feedback analysed?

RM, we will be using a different approach for displaying the exhibition boards, and will be bringing air conditioning units in, which should improve the comfort level. We would like to reduce the number of printed feedback forms used, and will be offering more online and digital access to give feedback. People will be free to send extended comments, if possible, we would prefer to receive these by email. All the data is anonymised and analysed in-house, it will be submitted as part of the planning application in the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

3.34 What is the proposed timing for the planning submission?

Project team answer September.

3.35 Are there plans to have an archaeological dig on site?



RB, some investigations have taken place already, they are consulting with GLAS, LBRuT's archaeological adviser. Post planning application, prior to any earthworks, further investigations will take place.

3.36 The only existing legislation applicable to the site is the 2011 planning brief, how will planning be able to through before the new local plan is issued?

NH, the SPD and the emerging local plan are material planning considerations, we will submit, the planning application will be some way through by the time the local plan is issued.

ML, we expect that it will go before a committee in January/February.

#### **4 AOB**

4.0 SM reminds attendees of the CLG exhibition preview on 2pm, 13 July 2017

**Close**