

Summary

Twickenham Riverside – 01/2584/FUL

Land use

Leisure activities for the community include the cinema, health and fitness club and piazza – fulfil this requirement of the plan. However what are the terms that make the facilities available to meet the needs of the community directly.

WC's are provided, brief states they should be convenient to both the shopping centre and embankment, current location achieves this. Proposed locations seem reasonable.

Landing stage seen as an important as linking the site to the River and is not included?

Significant element of A1/A3 which is not specific to the brief, however they will help in achieving overall regeneration objectives.

Affordable housing

+ ea.

Trees

Two groups of trees to consider:

1. Row of semi-mature and mature horse chestnut trees on The Embankment
2. Row of five mature Hornbeam trees inside the northern boundary of the swimming baths.

All other trees on site are not worthy of protection.

Group 1: Horse chestnut trees on The Embankment

Potential life expectancy of up to 100 years and therefore should be retained and protected accordingly. PBA Consulting also recommends retention of these trees, however there are some anomalies in their figures in their tree measurements. These need to be accurate in order to implement Table 1 in BS5837 'Trees in relation to construction'. The amended protection zones are:

Tree 1 -	4.5m
Tree 2	8 m
Tree 3&4	4.5m
Tree 5	8m
Tree 6 to 10	4.5m

Existing planters are also to be replaced. Current raised planters range in size 2.5m –4.5m. It is evident that they are inadequate for the trees and consequently they are in a state of disrepair. Proposed new planters should be make bigger to a minimum of 5m to allow for future growth.

Disabled parking bays and toilets under trees 6 to 10, could be affected by falling conkers, leaves and birds??

Group 2 – Hornbeam trees inside northern boundary

There are 4 maturing hornbeams growing within the development site boundary. They are healthy specimens that have indefinite life expectancies that provide screening from the rear of King Street and development site and therefore should be retained if possible.

Measurements in PBA's report are again inaccurate with regard to tree No 2840 which would require a 6m protection zone to conform to BS5837. A realistic amount of working space would also be required between the protective fencing and the north elevation of the proposed building.

Due to differing ground levels along the service road, the proposal shows these four trees being retained in tailored planters of various heights. It is important that the planters are constructed in a manner that contains the majority of the root structure of each tree and maintains existing ground levels around each tree otherwise it is unlikely that the trees will survive. Planter size would also need to be increased to a min of 4m internal diameter and incorporate some form of irrigation system to account for the changes in the surrounding ground level.

Proximity of the hornbeams to the proposed structure also raises another potential problem. The nature of these trees is such that they form a very dense tightly branched crown that does not allow light to percolate through. The crowns of several of these trees would be touching the proposed buildings where residential dwellings are proposed, thereby depriving natural light entering these properties. This would lead to pressure to repeatedly prune the trees, consequently spoiling their shape and appearance. This conflict is covered in BS 5837: section 6.3 'Proximity of trees to structures'

Retention of the 5 hornbeam trees will present immediate and long term management problem. However significant redesign could allow the retention of these trees:

- Moving the footprint of the building to the south
- Removal and replacement of the trees with suitable alternatives (preferably would see the retention of two hornbeams on junction of service road and Wharf Lane.

Environmental Health

The design report acknowledges that there is potential for noise problems generated by the cinema and retail units. Can we assume that details of how this will be achieved will be sent in due course?

Hours of use of cinema, A3 etc

Note that best practical means must be employed during the demolition of the site to minimise noise and dust complaints from local residents and businesses.

English Heritage – Archaeology

Recommends that demolition works should be subject to archaeological consideration to enable control of demolition. In addition it is considered that development of this site is likely to damage archaeological remains. The applicant should therefore submit detailed proposals in the form of an archaeological project design. The design should be in accordance with appropriate English Heritage guidelines.

Port of London Authority

No objection in principle to the proposed redevelopment of the Twickenham Baths site and is supportive of the environmental improvements to the river embankment.

The PLA would like to see further investigation into the possibility of transporting materials to and from the site by water, in the interest of sustainability.

It is noted that the applicant intends to commission feasibility studies with regard to a new river pontoon. This will clearly have implications from a navigational perspective and will need to be discussed with the PLA in greater detail before a separated planning application is submitted.

English Heritage (Conservation Area reference)

Opposed to the scheme-see letter

Environment Agency

Nature conservation issues

Flooding

Highway matters

Subject of correspondence between respective consultants. May need a separate meeting.

Design etc.

Deputive issue