



Minutes

Stag Brewery Community Liaison Group

Meeting 03: Transport, traffic and environmental impact

Date: 06.06.2017

Time: 19:00 – 21:00

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

Chair: Steve McAdam, Soundings

Attendees:

Linda Andrew	Barnes & Mortlake History Society
Francine Bates	Mortlake Brewery Community Group
Una O'Brien	Mortlake Brewery Community Group
Avril Daglish	West London River Group, Chair
Dan Harrington	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace, Representative
Ann Hewitt	Towpath Group, Chair
Andrew Howard-Smith	Thames Bank, Representative
Graham Kench	Lower Richmond Road, Resident
Ben Knight	Local Resident
Shaun Lamplough	Mortlake with East Sheen, Chair
Ashley Lawrence	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace, Representative
Lynette Lawson	LBRuT, Community Links Officer
Tim Lennon	Richmond Cycling Campaign, Chair
Amanda Letch	Thomson House School, Principal
Jen Loudon	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace, Representative
Peter Makower	Local Resident, Chiswick
Ben Macworth-Praed	Barnes Community Association, Representative
Howard Potter	Mortlake Brewery Community Group
Danny Masting	Local Resident
Max Millington	Williams Lane, Representative
John Repsch	Chertsey Court Action Group, Representative
Diana Roth	Towpath Group, Chair
Kate Woodhouse	Mortlake Community Association, Chair
Margaret Woolmore	Chertsey Court Action Group, Representative

Project Team:

Guy Duckworth	GD	Dartmouth Capital, Development Manager
Greg Callaghan	GC	Peter Brett Associates, Transport Consultant
Rob Parker	RP	Peter Brett Associates, Transport Consultant
Hannah Fiszpan	HF	Waterman Group, Environmental Consultant
Ros Boalch	RB	Waterman Group, Environmental Consultant
Robert Copeland	RC	Gillespies LLP, Landscape Architect
Murray Levinson	ML	Squire and Partners, Architect
Kevin Watson	KW	Gerald Eve, Planning Consultant
Steve McAdam	SM	Soundings, Community Consultant
Rowan Cole	RCole	Soundings, Community Consultant
Janet Hall	JH	Soundings, Community Consultant
Leonora Grcheva	LG	Soundings, Community Consultant

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

1.1 SM introduces the agenda for the evening.

2.0 Transport and Traffic presentation by PBA and Gillespies

2.1 RP/GC/RC present

- Overall transport problems on site and surrounding area
- Overview of surveys, modelling and research undertaken by PBA
- Mitigation of future increase in traffic
- Access and parking on site
- Discussions with TfL on public transport
- Trip generation
- Cycling and pedestrian strategy
- Travel plans etc.

3.0 Open discussion

3.1 *Are you taking into consideration other developments taking place that would have local traffic impact? For example, there is a 2000 unit development in Kew Bridge that should be finalised around the same time.*

RP/GC: The TfL HAM strategic model that we are using includes entire South London in detail, and takes into consideration all future development up to 2031, including as well planned infrastructure improvements.

3.2 *I'm glad you acknowledge that the Chalkers Corner improvements can lead to increased traffic flow. I am a resident in Chertsey Court, and the people living there will be left with no tree buffer and exposed to air pollution and noise. It is irresponsible to intervene there for short-term improvements that will have long-term impact on residents. The trees on that corner are 70 years old, 70 feet high.*

RP: The improvement impact will not be very short-term, calculations take developments until 2031 into consideration, and so it would probably be revised around 2031.

RC: We have surveyed the size of each tree on Chalkers Corner, and are putting effort in compensating by planting new semi-advanced trees 6-7 meters high.

An attendee asked if the team have figures on the benefits of fully matured trees, as compared with semi-advanced trees; and reminded that the Mortlake Green corner is designated as Open Land of Townscape Importance.

KW: We are aware of the protected designations, and we are re-providing the same quantum of space, according to policy we don't need to do that in the same space.

3.3 *Not all of the land is being re-provided; the sport fields are not being re-provided, the benefits won't be the same.*

Another attendee commented that adding new trees is not the same as adding new land.

KW: The main site strategy has been to re-provide quality open space throughout the site, not only in the same spot where it now is, we consider a series of spaces to be the best approach, even if it is not as large.

An attendee asked where would football be played.

KW answered that there would still be a full-sized astro-turf football pitch.

3.4 *Why does a riverside development transport plan make no reference to river transport? And not only public transport, but for muck away. It is possible and it needs to be given further thought.*

RP: We did look at the river from a public transport viewpoint, but there are constraints; for instance due to tides, the pier would have to be extended up to the middle of the river.

GD: You would also have to close the towpath or parts of it to make material transport possible.

GC: We have been speaking to TfL and GLA about using the river and we will continue to talk in this direction.

3.5 *I have few points to make.*

We are still talking about the same density, you have not moved forward on making any changes on this, and I urge you to do so for the public exhibition.

I think you are not being straight with us on the movement of traffic in and out of the site, and you don't understand the realities and traffic problems of the 3000-4000 people living nearby.

You continue to ignore the level crossing, and I cannot accept that you cannot reach Network Rail.

I cannot believe that you would cut out a part of the Mortlake Green greenery.

You need to talk to TfL. Chiswick Bridge is in serious disrepair, and a non-stop bus connection to Hammersmith should be considered.

I am most interested to see the changes that you will make by the exhibition to show that you have heard us.

Another attendee adds that a new development is an opportunity to address the level crossing.

An attendee agrees and adds that air pollution will worsen due to traffic, and that it should be taken into consideration that there would be residents, staff, visitors and delivery vehicles in and out of the site.

The attendee is also horrified by the additional lane at Chalkers Corner, which may end up attracting traffic.

There is also the issue of shared cyclists and pedestrians that are stuck on narrow shared paths, which are dangerous for pedestrians.

Another attendee asks whether there has been a consideration to reduce the lanes?

GC: We are not hiding the trip generation data, we have already started sharing it with Howard Potter, and are happy to share our comprehensive surveys with you.

Regarding the level crossings – TfL are responsible for the wider infrastructure plans; we have tried talking to Network Rail, and this hasn't been very successful. Their main concern is making the line work. I promise we'll try again to speak with them, but we do have our hands tied by higher authorities on this matter.

On Mortlake Green – the proposals shown respect the green link and it's location as in the policy brief, this has led to the removal of some greenery because of the need to enable visibility for drivers and safety for pedestrians.

On bringing more traffic – we also have to look at speed limits and attractiveness of the area to drive through, for example we will slow cars down by multiple crossings.

On Chalkers Corner – we can do other things that could increase cycling provision. But these will mean losing the parking spots along Lower Richmond Road.

3.6 *You talk about cycling, yet have 850 parking spots. You accepted the 0.8 parking provision of Richmond, why not be radical and go with 0.4 per unit? We need more radical thinking.*

GC: We surveyed surrounding sites to get the parking numbers.

Would you consider talking to council about reducing the cars on site? It's not too late.

Another attendee commented that the same goes for the school, reducing a bit from the school, from the residents, from the parking, it could all come down to reasonable numbers.

Howard (MBCG transport representative): I did have the discussion with PBA, and some things have been moving, but there is still more to go. For example, for a 'sustainable scheme' some mitigation should be done on Lower Richmond Road. If we open up this road to more capacity, this will bring more traffic, and this is not being mitigated. My own forecast for traffic is higher than PBA's. The sites used for comparison have been fed by Richmond, but they are different than Mortlake. Monitoring the barrier closing impact, whenever there is a 5-minute closure, there is a queue in every street in the area. So this may mean that focus is needed on sustainable transport rather than opening up capacity. We also have suggestions for better level crossing solutions that can be offered to Network Rail.

GD: Do share with us any suggestions that you may have regarding the crossing.

GC: We will probably have more chance to improve around the station, rather than the level crossing itself.

- 3.7 *The cycling plans are encouraging, but there are no extensions to connect wider area cycleways to get people in and out of the development, I would like to hear Tim's (Richmond Cycling Campaign) opinion.*

Tim: It's wonderful how permeable the site is, but there are many worrying aspects. 7% of all journeys in the borough are bicycles and this is not taken into consideration in the modelling. There is nothing to encourage people to cycle to and from the site, which would be a waste of a massive opportunity. For instance, from the site you can cycle to Richmond station in 10 minutes, but you have to pass via Chalkers Corner which is now appalling. The shared paths for pedestrians and bicycles are also appalling, and they do not work.

Another attendee commented that it is not clear whether there are dedicated cycle lanes.

An attendee commented that if the team was passionate about cycling, they could have made an exemplary scheme, with 1000 bicycle parking spaces, 200 at Mortlake Station, reducing car parking as well, make this a green development applauded by Londoners.

An attendee noted that there have been requests before for improvements on Mortlake High Street and that they have been informed that the problem is Central reservation.

Also, about the buses – were TfL looking at increasing the 419 frequencies, or extending the 209? Also, Hammersmith Bridge will be shut down for 2 years, I don't know if you are aware of this.

- 3.8 *There are still the bigger issues that are most relevant – the protection of the playing field, the number of units, the position and size of the school.*

SM notes that time should be given for Waterman Group to present.

4.0 Environmental Impact Assessment presentation by Waterman Group

4.1 HF/RB present

- What Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is and what its purpose is
- The key stages of EIA and where the project currently is in relation to these stages
- The environmental topic areas to be considered in the EIA
- Specific commentary was provided on the topic areas considered to be of most importance to the audience at the present time, i.e.:
 - Noise and vibration.
 - Air quality.
 - Surface water drainage and flood risk.
 - Archaeology (buried heritage).

5.0 Open discussion

5.1 *What do you mean when you say socio-economic assessment?*

HF: The assessment of the projects upon socio-economic factors including:

- Employment generated by the demolition and construction works.
- Employment generated by the completed and operational project.
- The likely significant impacts of the new populations of the development in relation to social infrastructure such as healthcare facilities, educational facilities and open space facilities.

- 5.2 *Who of the team speaks to the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group), informally they have said to us that there is no money to add to the local GP services, what are we doing about this.*

KW: We've met with NHS and with Richmond regarding this, and have said that we are willing and able to provide facilities. They were, at that point, not able to give information on the type of space they would need, so they asked to have space reserved (around 10,000 sq. feet). We have included that space in the masterplan. We

are meeting this week with CCG, NHS and Richmond and hope to discuss needs, funding and delivery.

- 5.3 *I would like a clarification on the process – is the expectation that the borough consults with the community or do you? In which stage do consultations with the wider community regarding environmental impact take place?*

HF: The council have the responsibility to consult, and they have. It is not a statutory obligation for us to consult with the community; it is best practice that we can consider.

I'm making a plea for you to reach out to us and consult us on issues such as health and archaeology.

Another attendee asked a confirmation whether the best practice to consult is really going to be considered.

HF: We first need to go through to scoping opinion and finalise that stage which should be in the next two weeks, we can then assess whether consultation is appropriate and let you know.

An attendee said that the team should be talking to people if they want community's views to be reflected.

SM: If additional consultation is to take place, we can try to help with this.

RCole: We can come back to discussing this on the next CLG.

- 5.4 *I am very concerned about air quality. The council only monitors some parameters, and were not even aware of the proposals on Chalkers Corner. PM10, PM 2.5, nanoparticles, nitrogen dioxide – these cause health problems.*

HF: We fully understand and are aware of the growing issues concerning air quality in major cities and in the UK as a whole. Our lead air quality specialist is currently working with many leading QCs in relation to the matter. Air quality will be a key consideration with the EIA. We intend to make use of a very complex and advance air quality dispersion modelling in order to undertake an assessment of how the completed and operational project will impact upon local air quality. The model is called 'ADMS' and even goes so far as to scientifically model a future 'with-project' and 'without-project' situation, accounting for how traffic emissions, building plant emissions, meteorological conditions and all sorts of other factors influences air quality. The 'with-project' and 'without-project' situations will be compared to enable us to quantify the likely impact. Depending on the results, appropriate mitigation will be recommended.

- 5.5 *Can we have a copy of the arboriculture survey?*

It was responded that it should be possible.

- 5.6 *What is happening on site, there seems to be demolition?*

GD: there is no demolition yet, it is only removal of brewery equipment and machines, and the buildings remain.

An attendee commented that since there is noise, it would be good practice to keep the neighbourhood informed.

RCole: If it is helpful, we can add additional information about this on the website.

6.0 **Other business**

- 6.1 R Cole asked whether everybody is all right with the CLG 2 minute draft that has been circulated.

Attendees asked until the end of the week to finish reviewing and comment. This was agreed.

- 6.2 An attendee asked what is going to be the topic of the next CLG?

SM: We would like your opinion on what to discuss at the next meeting.

Topics suggested include density, ground floor uses, health and other services useful for the local community, as



well as a general update on the development.

6.3 If the public exhibition is at the end of July, that is not really public.

RCole: We are doing it by 15 July, and are fully conscious that it needs to be done before school closure dates.

7.0 **SM closes the CLG meeting.**