

RICHMOND-UPON-THAMES COLLEGE
REDEVELOPMENT

**DESIGN & ACCESS
STATEMENT**



REV. A 2015.11.27

REVISION NOTES

Prepared for Outline Planning Application submission.

Issued 2015.11.27.

- References to accessible & adaptable and wheelchair housing updated to reflect optional Building Regulations Requirements M4(2) and M4(3) that came into effect in October 2015, and which have been adopted in updated GLA & LBRuT planning guidance - see section 6.2.27, 6.2.29 and 7.11.3.
- Section 5.2.11 corrected to replace northeast with northwest.
- Section 6.2.27 corrected to read '...1-,2-,3-bedroom ...' for improved clarity.
- Section 6.3 updated to reflect revised parameter plans.
- Diagrams and keyplans in section 7 updated to reflect revised parameter plan PL-17 A.
- Illustrative views in section 7.10 updated to reflect revised illustrative scheme (primarily reduced building heights).
- Additional views across College Playing Fields added to Section 7.10.
- Glossary updated to reflect changes to accessible & adaptable and wheelchair housing, clarify the definitions of active frontages and rooftop plant, provide a definition of inactive frontages, and correct typographic errors.

NOTE ON FORMATTING

Specialist terminology and defined terms are highlighted in *red italics* when they first appear in this document. Definitions of these terms can be found in the Glossary at the end of this document.

FOREWORD

0.0 FOREWORD

This Foreword has been prepared to explain the various documents submitted with the *Outline Planning Application* being made by Richmond-upon-Thames College (*RuTC*) for the redevelopment of the existing College site at Egerton Road, Twickenham.

The Outline Planning Application includes a number of documents that are submitted for approval ('the *Primary Control Documents*'), whilst others will provide background, illustrative and supporting information ('the *Secondary Control Documents*'). These are submitted to assist the London Borough of Richmond (*LBRuT*) and Greater London Authority (*GLA*) to reach a decision on whether to grant consent for the proposed development.

This Foreword explains the relationship between the application documents and is included to help the planning authority, consultees, stakeholders and other interested parties navigate the planning application.

0.1 THE PRIMARY CONTROL DOCUMENTS

The Primary Control Documents comprise the following:

- (i) *Site Location Plan*, (PL-01) which identifies the extent of the Application Site (within which development is proposed) and the extent of land within the ownership of the Applicant.
- (ii) The *Development Specification*. This essentially sets out what is proposed in the Outline Planning Application. It describes the principal components of the proposed development and defines the form and content of the Outline Planning Application. This will then inform the assessment of effects of the proposed development - during the various phases of its construction and when operating when the development is complete. It will also provide the framework within which applications for the approval of reserved matters for each element of the scheme will need to be sought.

- (iii) The *Parameter Plans* and the *Detailed Access Plans* show how the proposed development can be accommodated on the site. Collectively they define:
 - the extent of the proposed uses (the *Development Zones*);
 - the extent and scale of the proposed buildings within these zones against allowable deviations/tolerances (the *Building Zones*);
 - access arrangements to/from the site, and between the development and building zones; and
 - the potential treatment of the spaces between these zones, buildings and accesses.
- (iv) The *Design Code* sets out what the proposed development is expected to look like. It sets out the general design principles for the proposed development. It provides a set of illustrated *design requirements*, which will inform the detail design and appearance of the both the buildings and landscape of the individual development zones and the site as a whole. Although the Code is not meant to be prescriptive, it establishes a 'benchmark' for the future design of all aspects of the proposed development and against which applications for approval of reserved matters involving appearance will be assessed.

0.2 THE SECONDARY CONTROL DOCUMENTS

The following documents are also submitted in support the Primary Control Documents to provide information to help the planning authority determine the Outline Planning Application. These Secondary Control Documents comprise:

- (i) *Planning Statement* prepared by CgMs Consulting which explains the relationship between the proposed development and the policies of the development plan. It also sets out why the proposed development is being promoted and what benefits are expected to flow from it.
- (ii) *Design & Access Statement* (this document) prepared by HOK explains the design evolution of the proposed development and is organised in three parts. The first part explains the context for the application, identifying constraints and opportunities that have informed the proposals. The following parts explain how the proposals have responded to and evolved from that contextual analysis to define the development parameters for which planning permission is sought. The final part of the Design & Access Statement explores one way (but, importantly, not the only way) in which the scheme might be delivered and includes an Illustrative Masterplan for the development.

- (iii) This *Illustrative Masterplan* (PL-17) is also submitted to demonstrate how a scheme of the scale proposed might fit within the parameters for which permission is being sought. It is not submitted for approval, but shows one way in which development of the type and scale proposed could comply with the Primary Control Documents referred to in paragraph (iii) above;
- (iv) *Environmental Statement* and *Non-Technical Summary* prepared by Cascade Consulting, which presents the findings of the technical environmental assessments that have been undertaken to understand the likely significant environmental effects of the Proposed Development. These assessments are based on the Primary Control Documents referred to above, and, where appropriate, also test the Illustrative Masterplan. The ES takes account of the proposed variation in layout, scale and appearance of future development, and access arrangements as allowed for in the control documents and is based on the 'worst case scenarios' (which may vary from topic to topic).
- (v) *Transport Assessment* prepared by Transport Planning Practice (TPP);
- (vi) *Energy Statement* prepared by NDY;
- (vii) *Sustainability Statement* - prepared by Cascade;
- (viii) *Flood Risk Assessment* - prepared by ESI;
- (ix) Draft Heads of Terms for the Proposed Legal Agreement(s) prepared by the applicant; and
- (x) *Statement of Community Involvement* prepared by RuTC.

The information contained in these Secondary Control Documents does not form part of the development for which approval is sought, but has been submitted with the aim of assisting in the evaluation or the proposals. Where these documents make commitments and recommendations in order to make the proposed development acceptable and/or mitigate any unacceptable effects, it is clearly stated, along with the mechanism for securing the commitment (e.g. through a planning condition).

0.3 THE DESIGN & ACCESS STATEMENT

This Design & Access Statement has been prepared by HOK International on behalf of Richmond-upon-Thames College.

It explains the thinking that has gone into assessing the context and developing the proposals, and serves as evidence of the design and access proposals evolution in response to best practice, environmental & traffic assessments and in particular to feedback received from community engagement.

Accordingly, the Design & Access Statement sets out to:

- present an analysis of the context of the proposed redevelopment, including surrounding area, the site itself, and the planning policy context;
- summarise the lengthy history and evolution of proposals to redevelop the site, with particular regards to community engagement;
- explain the current masterplan proposals;
- present the illustrative masterplan.

This organisation is reflected in the structure of the statement.

As issues of access have been central to the evolution of the design thinking for the site, issues relating to site access are presented alongside other design issues (eg relating to layout, use, scale, etc.) throughout this document.

Readers of the Design & Access Statement should bear in mind that this document forms part of an Outline Planning Application for which all matters, except access, are reserved. Consequently, while the statement sets out the principles for the whole design, many of the details will only be resolved through future design development and consultation.

Reflecting this outline nature of this application, the Design & Access Statement sets out to clearly explain and justify the decisions taken so far while explaining the principles that should be followed in subsequent Reserved Matters Applications. Nevertheless, in order to assist with the assessment of the application, this statement includes an Illustrative Masterplan that reflects one way that the proposals may be delivered. While Reserved Matters Applications may differ from the Illustrative Scheme, they will be required to keep within the parameters set out in the Outline Application, as set out in section 0.1 and explained in this statement, unless there is a good and justified reason to do otherwise.

CONTENTS

SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION.....1	SECTION 5	CONSULTATION & SCHEME EVOLUTION..... 37
1.1	Vision for the Site2	5.1	Overview of Consultations 38
1.2	About the Partners.....3	5.2	Evolution of the Proposals 39
1.3	The Consultant Team6		
SECTION 2	CONTEXT9	SECTION 6	DESIGN RESPONSE.....47
2.1	Site Location10	6.1	The Masterplan Proposals 48
2.2	Wider Context 12	6.2	Principles of Redevelopment51
2.3	Site Context13	6.3	Parameter Plans.....57
2.4	History of Site Development.....15	6.4	Detailed Access Plans.....59
2.5	Visual Character17	6.5	Design Code 60
SECTION 3	EXISTING SITE..... 21	SECTION 7	THE ILLUSTRATIVE MASTERPLAN 63
3.1	Access 22	7.1	Overview of Illustrative Scheme 64
3.2	Organisation.....24	7.2	Vehicular Access 65
3.3	Easements & Rights-of-Way.....25	7.3	Pedestrian & Cycle Routes 66
3.4	Playing Field Site26	7.4	Public Realm.....67
3.5	Visual Character27	7.5	Landscape & Habitat Areas..... 68
SECTION 4	PLANNING CONTEXT 29	7.6	Private Spaces69
4.1	London Plan..... 30	7.7	Sports Facilities.....70
4.2	Local Plan31	7.8	Building Massing.....71
4.3	Development Management Plan 32	7.9	Residential Design.....72
4.4	Crane Valley SPG..... 33	7.10	Townscape & Views.....73
4.5	RuTC Planning Brief SPG 34	7.11	SPG Compliance 77
4.6	Housing Guidance..... 36	APPENDIX A	GLOSSARYA-1

DRAWING KEY

NOTE ON DRAWING KEY

The Design & Access Statement includes a large number of drawings many of which are historical. As a result consistent colour coding of every drawing and diagram in this report is not possible. Nevertheless, wherever possible this report uses the following standard drawing key, unless specifically indicated otherwise.

Additionally, in order to focus attention on specific details, some drawings have been lightened: as a result the colour coding may be subtly different where this technique has been used.

STANDARD DRAWING KEY

	APPLICATION SITE BOUNDARY OR COLLEGE PROPERTY BOUNDARY - REFER TO NOTE ON RED LINES (AT RIGHT)
	EXISTING BUILDINGS; AND/OR PROPOSED BUILDINGS
	ROADWAYS
	PREDOMINANTLY HARD LANDSCAPE
	PREDOMINANTLY SOFT LANDSCAPE
	PREDOMINANTLY GRASS SPORTS
	PREDOMINANTLY ALL-WEATHER SPORTS
	PREDOMINANTLY PRIVATE GARDENS
	PREDOMINANTLY SOFT LANDSCAPE WITH PODIUM PARKING UNDERNEATH
	REEC SITE (COLLEGE, SCHOOLS & TECH HUB)
	COLLEGE PLAYING FIELDS SITE
	RESIDENTIAL SITE
	TECH HUB
	PEDESTRIAN ACCESS
	PEDESTRIAN ROUTE
	VEHICULAR ACCESS
	VEHICULAR ROUTE

NOTE ON 'RED LINES'

As the College Site has been subject to a number of different proposals over a long period of time, in order to explain this evolution it is necessary to make reference to a number of published drawings and diagrams that contain subtle variations, for example because of changes to surrounding properties and in proposed site boundaries. A discerning reader may therefore notice unavoidable variations between red lines in different diagrams used within this report.

In order to minimise the number of conflicts, this report uses a red line drawn around the College's property in diagrams in sections 1 - 4, unless noted otherwise, as this is the most common line used in historic documentation on the site. In section 5, the red line shown varies as per the evolving proposals. In sections 6 & 7, or where an extract of a primary or secondary control document is used, the Red Line corresponds to the Application Site Boundary.