



# **Stag Brewery, Mortlake**

## **Community Uses and Cultural Strategy**

For Reselton Properties

February 2018

# Contents Page

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>Purpose of Assessment</b>	<b>1</b>
-----------	------------------------------	----------

---

<b>2.</b>	<b>Baseline Assessment</b>	<b>4</b>
	Education	4
	Health & Social Care	10
	Leisure & Recreation	16
	Community & Emergency Services	26

---

<b>3.</b>	<b>Demand Assessment</b>	<b>35</b>
	Proposed Development	35
	Effect on Existing Provision	37
	Summary of Impacts	46

---

**Appendix A - List of Primary Schools within 2 miles of the Site**

---

**Appendix B - List of Secondary Schools within 3 miles of the Site**

# 1. Purpose of Assessment

- 1.1 This *Community & Cultural Assessment* has been prepared by *Regeneris Consulting* on behalf of Reselton Properties Limited ('the Applicant') in support of three linked planning applications for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake ('the Site') within the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames ('LBRuT').
- 1.2 The former Stag Brewery Site is bounded by Lower Richmond Road to the south, the river Thames and the Thames Bank to the north, Williams Lane to the east and Bulls Alley (off Mortlake High Street) to the west. The Site is bisected by Ship Lane. The Site currently comprises a mixture of large scale industrial brewing structures, large areas of hardstanding and playing fields.
- 1.3 The redevelopment will provide homes (including affordable homes), accommodation for an older population, complementary commercial uses, community facilities, a new secondary school alongside new open and green spaces throughout. Associated highway improvements are also proposed, which include works at Chalkers Corner junction.
- 1.4 The three planning applications are as follows:
  - Application A – hybrid planning application for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery site consisting of:
    - i. Land to the east of Ship Lane applied for in detail (referred to as 'Development Area 1' throughout); and
    - ii. Land to the west of Ship Lane (excluding the school) applied for in outline detail (referred to as 'Development Area 2' throughout).
  - Application B – detailed planning application for the school (on land to the west of Ship Lane).
  - Application C – detailed planning application for highways and landscape works at Chalkers Corner.
- 1.5 Full details and scope of all three planning applications are described in the submitted Planning Statement, prepared by Gerald Eve LLP. The purpose of the document is to assess the impact which the development will have on community and cultural infrastructure locally. There are two elements to this work which are as follows:

- firstly, an analysis of the existing provision of Community & Cultural facilities within close proximity to the Proposed Development and across the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).
- secondly, an assessment of the impact which the Proposed Development would have on Community & Cultural facilities, once fully operational.

1.6 As part of the assessment, Community & Cultural facilities have been broken down into the following categories;

- **Education & Learning:** nursery education & childcare, primary schools, secondary schools & 6<sup>th</sup> form and further, higher and adult education
- **Health & Social Care:** primary care, intermediate care facilities, acute care
- **Leisure & Recreation:** libraries, indoor sports and recreation, open space and arts & culture
- **Community & Emergency Services:** civic council & community services, community centres, youth centres, police force, fire service, ambulance service and places of worship

1.7 To help assess impact, recognised standards or benchmarks have been used (including maximum walking distances, journey times, quantity per capita), however in the absence of recognised standards, professional judgement has been used. To help understand the current and future needs of social community infrastructure a number of policy documents have been referred to, including the following: (amongst others)

- LBRuT Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2017
- LBRuT Draft School Place Planning Strategy, 2017
- LBRuT Indoor Sports Facilities Needs Assessment, 2015
- LBRuT Open Space Assessment, 2015
- LBRuT Playing Pitch Assessment, 2016
- LBRuT School Census, 2016

1.8 To support the planning applications an Environmental Statement (ES) has been completed. As part of this a Socio-Economic Environmental Statement Chapter has been prepared, which assesses the provision of specific social and community infrastructure (SCI) such as; **education, primary health care and open space.**

## Policy Context

- 1.9 The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) advocates for development to create *“strong, vibrant and healthy communities”* which provide high quality environments with adequate housing supply and accessible local services that reflect community need (paras 7 and 12).
- 1.10 The London Plan (2016) also places a strong emphasis on delivering additional and enhanced social infrastructure to meet the needs of London, with Policy 3.16 supporting proposals which provide high quality social infrastructure in light of strategic and local need. Supporting para 3.86 sets out that social infrastructure includes health, educational, community, cultural, play and sport, spiritual and community safety facilities. The Policy recognises that social infrastructure delivered alongside housing developments can help to make *“residential areas more attractive”* and create *“sustainable neighbourhoods and communities”*, in line with London Plan Policy 7.1. Where new social and community uses are provided, these should be accessible for all and in locations that are easily accessed by public transport. Where possible, the extension of new social uses to serve the wider community will be encouraged.
- 1.11 Local policy also sets out that new social and community infrastructure will be supported (Core Strategy (2009) Policy CP16) with detailed policies going on to state that this support will be where it responds to local need, is of a high-quality design and accessible for all, is in a sustainable location and considers impact on transport and local character and amenity (Development Management Plan (2011) Policy DM SI 1 and emerging Local Plan (2017) Policy LP 28). In line with the London Plan, the provision of services which can be extended to other areas of the community, through the provision of multi-use, flexible and adaptable buildings or co-located services will be encouraged.
- 1.12 Both the Stag Brewery Planning Brief (2011) and the emerging Site Allocation (Policy SA 24) identify that the redevelopment of the Site should provide a mix of vibrant uses, which includes social infrastructure and community uses, including leisure and sport and health uses.

## 2. Baseline Assessment

- 2.1 The baseline assessment has been carried out to measure the current levels of provision local to the Site (definitions are set out in the relevant sections) and across LBRuT.
- 2.2 This section includes an overview of existing infrastructure, including its location, use, quality and accessibility (where this information is available).
- 2.3 Establishing the baseline will allow the extent of the impact of the Proposed Development to be measured and quantified, where possible.

### Education

- 2.4 There is a range of educational facilities within LBRuT, however the standards and benchmarks differ dependent on the level of education. The table below sets out the different benchmarks used to assess the existing provision locally.
- 2.5 The Site is located in the Eastern half of LBRuT, therefore any education facilities that are located on the Western half of the Borough or outside of LBRuT have been omitted from the baseline, as agreed through consultation with LBRuT education officers.

**Table 2.1 Existing Provision Benchmarks/Standards/Impact Areas**

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Early Years	2 miles	Based on Department for Education (DfE) recommendations <sup>1</sup> and LBRuT guidance.
Primary	2 miles	Based on DfE <sup>2</sup> recommendations and LBRuT guidance.
Secondary	3 miles	Based on DfE recommendations <sup>3</sup> and LBRuT guidance.
Further/Higher/Adult Education	LBRuT	No set standards.

<sup>1</sup> Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. This is used as the upper bound for determining eligibility for free school transport. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to assess nursery provision. Facilities that are located on the Western side of the Thames river or outside LBRuT have been excluded from the assessment, as per consultation with the local education authority.

<sup>2</sup> See Footnote 1

<sup>3</sup> See Footnote 2

- 2.6 The current provision of education, at the various levels is explored in more detail below.

## Early Years

### Early Years: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.7 Pre-school education facilities for children under 5 years are provided through a range of resources including local authority children centres and private run nurseries.
- 2.8 The draft LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy Autumn 2017 suggests that demand for Early Years places across the Borough as a whole are very high. According to the Strategy, 20 of the 40 infant and primary schools in the Borough have attached maintained nurseries, and there is one stand-alone nursery school.
- 2.9 A review of data from the LBRuT website indicates there are 8 maintained nurseries within 2 miles. These provide services ranging from full-day care from the age of zero to pre-school and from 3-5 years old. The total capacity is around 420 places.
- 2.10 There are also 51 private, voluntary and independent (PVI) nurseries within 2 miles of the site, however capacity and demand is difficult to measure for these facilities.

### Early Years: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.11 As stated in the draft LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy, it is difficult to estimate the amount of unmet demand for maintained nursery places within the borough. Evidence shows that parents are challenged to find places which are entirely free of charge. No information is available on future supply and demand of places.
- 2.12 The LBRuT Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2017 states that whilst future demand is likely to remain high for pre-school and nursery places, providers are responding to need and there is no obvious indication of a gap in provision. Despite this, it appears there could be a lack of maintained early years places, as is currently the case.

## Primary Education

### Primary Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.13 Summary information on primary school provision is set out in Table 7.13. There are a total of 14 primary schools within 2 miles of the Site. The latest admissions data<sup>4</sup> and

<sup>4</sup> LBRuT Autumn School Census, 2016

consultation with LBRuT suggests there is a +31 place surplus across these within a 2 mile radius. This is based on the number of the new reception admissions and capacity across all primary schools within the specified distance.

- 2.14 The closest primary school to the Site is Thompson House School where there was no capacity in Autumn 2016.
- 2.15 Two of the 14 schools within the 2-mile radius have capacity deficits. Further detail is provided in Appendix A.

Table 2.2 Reception Class Enrolment within 2 miles				
Type of school	No. of schools	Number on roll	Admissions Capacity	Surplus / Deficit
Primary Schools	14	801	832	+31

*Source: LBRuT Richmond School Census 2016 (Autumn)*

### Primary Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.16 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy sets out the Council’s strategy for meeting current and future demand for school places at primary and secondary level up to 2024, based on population projections.
- 2.17 The local impact area falls within the LBRuT’s Area 9 for school places planning which comprises the wards of Mortlake and Barnes Common and Barnes. The Strategy, LBRuT IDP and consultation with LBRuT education authority has highlighted that there is a need for at least one more form of entry (30 pupils) in Area 9. It has been recommended that it is essential to expand Barnes Primary School to meet future demand, the expansion is currently scheduled for 2019.
- 2.18 The neighbouring school planning Area 8, which comprises East Sheen, is noted to overlap with demand from Area 9. The Strategy and further consultation with LBRuT states the expansions of Sheen Mount and East Sheen Primary have met the previously forecast need for places within this area and therefore no action is needed at present, or in the foreseeable future.

## Secondary Education

### Secondary Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.19 Summary information on secondary school provision is set out in Appendix B. There are a total of three secondary schools within three miles of the Site. In Autumn 2016



these admitted 554 Year 7 pupils, with a capacity of 540. This suggests a deficit of -14 places. One secondary school is oversubscribed within the three-mile catchment area of the Site. Richmond Park Academy is the school closest to the Site which had a surplus capacity of +14 places in Autumn 2016.

Name of school	Numbers on roll	Admissions Capacity	Surplus / Deficit
Richmond Park Academy	180	166	14
Christ's Church of England School	150	148	2
Grey Court School	210	240	-30
<b>Total</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>-14</b>

*Source: LBRuT Richmond School Census 2016 (Autumn)*

### Secondary Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.20 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy Autumn 2017, states there were 2,002 places available in Year 7 across the Borough. However, these places were not diversely spread out.
- 2.21 According to the Strategy, it is envisaged that the opening of Turing House in 2015 and the imminent opening of The Richmond upon Thames School in September 2017 will mean that there will be sufficient places in the western half of the borough for the period covered by this strategy.
- 2.22 However, a need for additional secondary places has grown within the eastern half of the borough (where the site is located) at a faster rate than was previously forecast. The main reason for this is due to the fact that the Year 7 spare capacity which traditionally existed at Richmond Park Academy (RPA) and its predecessor school, Sheen, has sharply and unexpectedly reduced.
- 2.23 The numbers for the other two secondary schools within the eastern half of the borough, Christ's and Grey Court – have also grown, particularly at Ofsted-rated 'outstanding' Grey Court.
- 2.24 The Strategy states that in the last two years, there were a significant number of children in the eastern half of the borough, mostly in Barnes and Kew, for whom offers couldn't be made at any of the three local schools at the initial allocations stage.
- 2.25 Based on recent forecasts the Council would be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide places for those children unless a new school were provided.

- 2.26 It is forecast that the children who are at most risk of not being admitted to any of the three schools in the eastern half of the borough live in Kew, and east and north Barnes. As stated in the LBRuT IDP, the Stag Brewery site in Mortlake has been identified as the only suitable site for a new school in the east of the borough.
- 2.27 In addition, and as noted above, there are on-going discussions with the Education & Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and LBRuT planning department regarding the provision of a Secondary school on the Stag Brewery Site.

## Further Education

- 2.28 There is a wide range of facilities that offer further education to residents of LBRuT. There is no set benchmark for measuring maximum distance for further education institutions. Unlike primary and secondary education people are willing to travel further distances to access further education. The assessment therefore considers supply across the whole of LBRuT.

### Further Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.29 There are seven Sixth Form colleges across LBRuT with the closest provision to the Site being Richmond Park Academy and Christ's School. Consultations with LBRuT has established that there is currently capacity within most Sixth Forms across LBRuT.

Name	Distance (miles)
Richmond Park Academy (Sixth Form)	1.0
Christ's Church of England School (Sixth Form)	1.5
Richmond University	2.2
Orleans Park (Sixth Form)	3.0
Grey Court School (Sixth Form)	3.5
Hawk Training	3.8
St Mary's University College	4.5
West Thames College	4.6
Waldegrave School (Sixth Form)	4.6
Teddington School (Sixth Form)	5.0
Kingston College	6.0
Richmond upon Thames College	6.0
Kingston University	6.3
Hampton High (Sixth Form)	6.4
Esher College	10.0
Brooklands College	13.6

Childcare Company	16.5
-------------------	------

- 2.30 Sixth form and further education is fluid and there is currently capacity amongst providers within LBRuT and neighbouring areas. It should also be noted that there are also a number of further education providers across Greater London which are highly accessible to residents within LBRuT.
- 2.31 With a large number of Further Education providers within LBRuT and in surrounding areas, there does not appear to be any shortage or gaps in provision. The IDP states there is a wide range of courses on offer locally catering for all types of learning. Accounting for this the existing provision is deemed sufficient.

### Further Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.32 There are currently no plans to increase capacity or the overall provision, except at the three schools which have opened in the last five years (St Richard Reynolds, Turing House and The Richmond upon Thames School). These sixth forms will open in 2018, 2020 and 2022 respectively. There will also be capacity provided as part of the school built as part of the Proposed Development.
- 2.33 As stated in the LBRuT IDP; St. Mary's University and LBRuT are working together to develop a masterplan in partnership to address the growing demand for university places in the area.
- 2.34 Table 2.5 provides a summary of all existing education provision local to the Site.

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Early Years</i>	LBRuT IDP recognises there are no current gaps in provision and providers are responding to increasing demand. However, there appears to be pressures on maintained early year places now and in the foreseeable future.	Insufficient
<i>Primary Education</i>	Consultation with LBRuT, School Place Planning Strategy 2017 and IDP all suggest that there has been pressure on existing supply however, expansion at East Sheen and Sheen Mount and Barnes Primary (future) mean demand is met for the foreseeable future.	Sufficient
<i>Secondary Education</i>	LBRuT state there is a current shortage in places in the Eastern half of the Borough, with an extra secondary school needed to meet future demand.	Insufficient
<i>Further Education</i>	Consultation and the LBRuT IDP states there is a diverse range of further education provision in the area, catering for all needs. Plans to expand the offer further at St. Mary's University will also enhance the offer further.	Sufficient

## Health & Social Care

- 2.35 There are a range of health care facilities within LBRuT, however the standards and benchmarks differ depending on the type of facility. The table below sets out the different benchmarks used to assess the existing provision locally.

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
GPs	1 mile	Based on consultation within London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT) NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and NHS London Health Urban Development Unit (HUDU)
Dentists	LBRuT	No recognised standards
Intermediate Care	2 miles	Reasonable walking distance based on DfE minimum walking distances and consultation with LBRuT CCG
Pharmacies	20-minute walk	Walking distance based on British Medical Journal research.
Acute Care	15 mins drive time	London average as per DfT Journey Time Statistics, 2014 and consultation with LBRuT CCG

### Primary Health Care

#### GPs: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.36 Summary information on GP provision is set out in the table below. Based on data from the Health and Social Care Information Centre (HSCIC), NHS Choices and consultation with LBRuT NHS CCG there are currently six GP centres based within 1 mile of the Site providing a total of 39 GPs (31 FTEs) and with a total of 51,600 registered patients.

	Within 1 miles of Site	LBRuT CCG average
No of GPs (FTEs <sup>5</sup> )	39 (31)	-
Registered patients	51,600	-
Patients per GP	1,323	1,498
Patients per FTE GP	1,654	1,972

Source: NHS Choices. Date Accessed: August 2017.

<sup>5</sup> Multiplier of 0.8 used to reflect GP FTEs for all GP surgeries based on average hours worked per week for Medical Practitioners; ONS ASHE, 2017

- 2.37 According to the NHS, there is no recommended number of patients per FTE GP per practice – this recognises the differing needs of the registered patients of GP practices however, NHS London HUDU use a benchmark of 1,800 patients per GP FTE.
- 2.38 The average number of patients per FTE GP is 1,654 within 1 mile of the Site and 1,972 across the wider NHS LBRuT CCG area. Therefore, patient numbers at the local level are lower than the HUDU benchmark whilst at the wider Borough level they are slightly higher.
- 2.39 The two surgeries that are in closest proximity to the Site (Jeziarski & Partners and Johnson & Partners) both fall below the HUDU benchmark.
- 2.40 All six surgeries within 1 mile of the Site are accepting new patients indicating there may be some spare capacity and that they could accommodate the needs of future residents of the Development.
- 2.41 Consultation with LBRuT did suggest there are pressures on existing care in the community<sup>6</sup> provision, this is based on anecdotal information however, the latest Care Quality Commission assessment<sup>7</sup> recognised there were pressures on existing services and staffing levels were an issue.

#### **GPs: Future Supply & Demand**

- 2.42 Based on consultation with LBRuT NHS CCG there are no plans to expand any existing surgeries in the immediate future.
- 2.43 The LBRuT CCG Strategy states the CCG are working towards increasing the number of community based health services, rather than hospitals, closer to where people live. LBRuT CCG are working with Hounslow & Richmond Community Health NHS Trust to establish multi-disciplinary hub teams which will work in the community to address future health care demands.
- 2.44 The LBRuT IDP identifies three surgeries that are earmarked as priorities, one of which is North Road Surgery, which is close to the Site.

<sup>6</sup> Community care services are intended to help people who need care and support to live with dignity and independence in the community and to avoid social isolation. The services are aimed at the elderly and those who have mental illness, learning disability and physical disability.

<sup>7</sup> CQC Inspection; Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare NHS Trust: Community Health Services for Adults; August 2017

## Dentists: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.45 According to NHS choices data, there are three dentist surgeries within 1.5 km of the Site. There is no information on the number of dentists within each surgery or the number of registered patients, however all three surgeries are accepting new patients. Data from the Health and Social Care Information Centre (HSCIC) indicates that the total number of dentists within LBRuT is around 109 and that the population per dentist is 1,776. This is lower than the national average (2,255) and suggests the Borough is well provided for.

Table 2.8 Dental Provision in LBRuT	
	LBRuT
Total No. of Dentist	109
Population per dentist	1,776
Dentists seen per 100,000 population	56

Source: HSCIC

## Dentists: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.46 Based on consultation with LBRuT NHS CCG there are no plans to expand any existing surgeries.

## Intermediate Health Care

### Health Centres: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.47 There are seven health care centres within LBRuT, all providing a range of inpatient and outpatient services, a list of the existing health centres is listed below.

Table 2.9 Health Care Centres		
Facility	Services	Distance (mile)
Centre House	Community Health Care Centre	0.5
Richmond Rehab Unit	Physical Rehabilitation Facility	1.7
Ham Clinic	Community Health Care Centre	3.7
Whitton Corner Health and Social Care Centre	Community Health Care Centre	4.8
Teddington Health and Social Care Centre	Community Health Care Centre	5.3
Teddington Memorial Hospital	Diagnostics dept. & in-patient rehabilitation	5.3
Walk-in Centre at Teddington Memorial Hospital	Walk-in Centre	5.3

- 2.48 Centre House is the closest centre to the Site and is within 0.5 miles, the services provided by this facility are; immunisations, ante-natal, family planning, minor surgery, phlebotomy and children's health & development.
- 2.49 Richmond Rehab Unit is located within 1.7 miles of the site which also provides a range of specialist therapies, such as; neuro-physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy and neuro-psychology.
- 2.50 LBRuT consultation suggests that realistically, new residents resulting from the Proposed Development would only access Centre House, Richmond Rehab Unit and Ham Clinic.
- 2.51 Whilst there are no set standards for health centres, it would appear there are a sufficient range of services within proximity to the Site.

#### **Health Centres: Future Supply & Demand**

- 2.52 Based on consultation with LBRuT NHS CCG there are no plans to expand any existing centres.

#### **Acute Care**

- 2.53 Acute care is often referred to as secondary care, such as; serious illness, intensive care, childbirth, medical imaging to name a few. This type of care is often provided in a hospital rather than a health centre or GPs.
- 2.54 Whilst there are no official standards for accepted distances to hospitals, the Department for Transport (DfT) average journey times to hospitals is approximately 15 mins drivetime.

#### **Hospitals: Existing Supply & Demand**

- 2.55 There are seven hospitals within 15 minutes' drive-time of the Site, these are listed below.

Table 2.10 Hospitals within 15 minutes drivetime of Site			
Organisation Name	Services	Distance (miles)	Drivetime (mins)
Barnes Hospital	Mental Health Services	0.5	6
Priory Hospital Roehampton	Mental Health & Counselling Services	0.8	8
Richmond Royal Hospital	Mental Health Services	1.5	10
Queen Mary - St George's University Hospital	Wide range of Outpatient & Inpatient Services	1.5	12
The Huntercombe Hospital - Roehampton	Mental Health Services	1.9	14

Source: NHS Choices. Drive times are based on Google Maps during normal traffic.

- 2.56 The closest hospital to the Site is Barnes Hospital which is located 0.5 miles away however this is a specialist hospital which focuses on mental health services, this is also true of the Priory Hospital Roehampton and Richmond Royal Hospital.
- 2.57 Queen Mary – St George’s University Hospital is the closest hospital which provides a comprehensive range of secondary care, the hospital is rated as ‘Good’ by the Care Quality Commission.
- 2.58 The largest hospitals within the closest distance to the site is Charing Cross, this is approximately 16 minutes drive-time away from the Site. This particular hospital is a large regional hospital and provides a significant number of services. Following consultation with LBRuT; it was suggested that Imperial College and Kingston Hospitals would also be used by residents from the Proposed Development.
- 2.59 The Site is considered well served by a number of hospitals within a 15 minute-drive time, West Middlesex University Hospital is only 17 minutes’ drive-time away and a range of specialist hospitals are located within Central London.

### Hospitals: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.60 Naturally, as the population grows and continues to age, it is anticipated that demand for acute care, as with other elements of health care, will also increase.
- 2.61 There are no plans to build any new hospitals local to the Site, however there are medium term investment plans to improve Charing Cross Hospital Estate, which will improve quality and capacity.



## Pharmacies

- 2.62 There is no set threshold for pharmacy provision for local residents however, a study by the British Medical Journey<sup>8</sup> suggests that 89% of the population have access to a community pharmacy within a 20-minute walk.

Pharmacy	Distance (miles)	Walking Time
Spatetree Pharmacy	0.3	7 mins
Superdrug Pharmacy	0.4	8 mins
Boots	0.4	9 mins
Round the Clock Pharmacy	0.5	10 mins
Dumler's Pharmacy	0.6	13 mins
Barnes Pharmacy	0.9	18 mins

- 2.63 There are six pharmacies within a 20-minute walk of the Site which provide a range of services catering for both NHS and non-NHS patients. Based on the existing number of providers in the local area, the current supply is deemed sufficient.
- 2.64 Table 2.12 provides a summary of all existing health care provision local to the Site.

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Primary Healthcare</i>	Patient to GP ratios in the local area are lower than the NHS HUDU benchmark. Consultation has suggested there is some pressure on existing surgeries. There is good provision of public and private dentists across LBRuT.	Sufficient
<i>Intermediate Healthcare</i>	There are a number of health centres across LBRuT, offering a range of services. Consultation suggested there was some pressures on care in the community.	Sufficient
<i>Acute Care</i>	Based on relative drive-times and consultation with LBRuT CCG, it was deemed that the Site is well served by hospitals and acute care centres.	Sufficient
<i>Pharmacies</i>	There are six pharmacies within 1 mile of the Site, suggesting local supply is good.	Sufficient

<sup>8</sup> British Medical Journey; The Positive Primary Care Law; an area-level analysis of the relationship between community pharmacy distribution, urbanity and social deprivation in England

## Leisure & Recreation

- 2.65 Leisure and Recreation has a broad scope however for the purpose of this assessment we have looked at the following; Libraries, Indoor Sports & Recreation, Open Space and Arts & Culture.
- 2.66 There are few or no set standards for the provision of leisure and recreation, therefore most have been assessed at the Borough level, however open space has been benchmarked with regional standards, as explained later in this section.

**Table 2.13 Leisure & Recreation Benchmarks/Impact Areas**

Provision	Benchmark/Impact Area	Justification
Libraries	LBRuT	No set standards
Indoor Sports & Recreation	LBRuT	No set standards
Open Space	Various	As per regional benchmarks
Arts & Culture	LBRuT	No set standards

### Libraries

- 2.67 There are numerous libraries throughout LBRuT, all of which are operated by the local authority. LBRuT is also home to the National Archives, which is of national significance and is located 1.4 miles away in Kew.

#### Libraries: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.68 There are currently 13 libraries within the LBRuT, as listed in the table below.

**Table 2.14 Libraries within LBRuT**

Name of Library	Distance (miles)
East Sheen Library	0.3
Kew Library	1.2
Castelnau Library	1.6
Richmond Lending Library	1.8
Richmond Local Studies Library & Archive	2.1
Twickenham Library	3.4
Ham Library	3.6
Whitton Library	4.5
Heathfield Library Access Point	4.6
Teddington Library	4.8
Hampton Hill Library	5.4
Hampton Wick Library	5.5

Hampton Library	6.7
-----------------	-----

Source: LBRuT. [www.richmond.gov.uk](http://www.richmond.gov.uk)

- 2.69 Consultation<sup>9</sup> with LBRuT has suggested that all libraries are well used with a large number of members. However, the current provision of libraries across LBRuT is sufficient for the number of residents within LBRuT.
- 2.70 The closest library to the sight is East Sheen (0.3 miles), which is a well-used library, with a user-base of mainly families and adults using the ICT facilities.
- 2.71 There are currently no mobile libraries in operation in LBRuT however there is a housebound delivery service.

### **Libraries: Future Supply & Demand**

- 2.72 The LBRUT IDP states that the Council anticipate libraries to continue to be well used. There are plans to move some libraries to more prominent high street locations whilst modernising the existing provision at Richmond Lending Library and the Old Town Hall. It appears there are no plans to close any of the existing libraries.

## **Indoor Sports and Recreation**

- 2.73 There are a range of indoor sports and recreation facilities available throughout LBRuT, with facilities being managed by a mix of both the private and public operators.
- 2.74 The LBRuT Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment<sup>10</sup> (ISFNA) found that LBRuT has high levels of physical activity amongst residents along with low levels of inactivity. The Borough also has good overall provision of sports and recreation facilities within LBRuT and in neighbouring areas.

### **Indoor Sports & Recreation: Existing Supply & Demand**

- 2.75 There are six indoor fitness centres within LBRuT; offering a diverse range of activities for its residents. The table below details all publicly accessible indoor sports centres within the Borough.

<sup>9</sup> Based on consultation with LBRuT Library Service Manager.

<sup>10</sup> LBRuT; Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment, Knight Kavanagh and Page, 2015

Name of Facility	Distance (miles)	Facilities
Shene Sports and Fitness Centre	0.6	Fitness Suite, All Weather Pitch, Dance Studio, Spin Studio, Sports Hall
Pools on the Park	1.8	Swimming Pools (indoor and outdoor),
Teddington Pools and Fitness Centre	4.8	Swimming Pool, Fitness Suite
Whitton Sports and Fitness Centre	4.8	Sports Hall, MUGA, Dance Studio, Football Pitch (Flood lit)
Teddington Sports Centre	5.0	Netball (outdoor), MUGA, Volleyball Courts, All Weather Sports Pitches, Sports Hall, Squash Courts, Tennis Courts, Dance Studios
Hampton Sports & Fitness Centre	6.4	Football Pitch (floodlit), 5-a-side Football, Fitness Suite, Gymnasium, MUGA, Netball (indoor & outdoor), Sports Hall, Tennis Court (floodlit), Volleyball Court

Source: LBRuT. [www.richmond.gov.uk](http://www.richmond.gov.uk)

- 2.76 The LBRuT ISNFA acknowledges the indoor sports and recreation facilities across the Borough to be sufficient in quantity and of good quality. However, the ISNFA highlights that there are some quantity and quality issues in relation to public swimming pools, with a number of residents stating they visit facilities in neighbouring boroughs.
- 2.77 The IISFNA shows LBRuT benefits from a significant number of private leisure facilities across LBRuT, of which, a large number of LBRuT residents are members, which helps meet demand for facilities across the Borough.
- 2.78 Other private sector providers include Virgin Active (Twickenham), Twickenham Fitness and Wellbeing Centre, Cedars Health Club, Lensbury Health Centre, David Lloyd (Hampton Hill) and St. Mary's University College.
- 2.79 In terms of outdoor playing pitches, the LBRuT Playing Pitch Assessment (2015) suggests that provision across the Borough is good however there are some potential shortfalls in the Richmond analysis area (which includes Barnes and Mortlake). The LBRuT IDP recognises that the level of satisfied demand across the Borough is high with 90% of residents having their needs satisfied, which is the second highest in London.
- 2.80 However, this means there is still a slight shortfall in provision, which is mainly down to lack of day time access to indoor sports. It has been suggested this shortfall could

be assessed by working with education partners to open their sports hall for longer, especially at peak times.

### Indoor Sports & Recreation: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.81 The most significant changes to sports and recreation provision within LBRuT is the development of Richmond upon Thames College and associated sports centre. There are no plans to expand any of the sports centres locally however the Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment recommends that investment is made at Shene Sports Centre, which is the facility located closest to the Site.
- 2.82 The assessment also highlighted the need to upgrade and expand existing swimming pool provision with LBRuT, which is currently limited and outdated.
- 2.83 In addition, the Borough's Playing Pitch Assessment Report, undertaken in May 2015 includes an assessment of playing pitches linked to education provision. This concluded that there is a shortfall in football provision, capacity for cricket, a potential shortfall in rugby provision, only one tennis court, one full sized hockey all weather pitch and a need for three full sized 3G (synthetic) pitches.

### Open Space

- 2.84 LBRuT is well renowned for its green spaces and large parks such as Richmond Park, Old Deer Park, Kew Gardens and its highly accessible green space alongside the Thames.
- 2.85 The benchmarks used for open space are those that are set by the Greater London Assembly (GLA) in the London Plan.

Open Space categorisation	Size Guideline	Distances from homes
Regional Parks	400 ha	3.2 to 8 km
Metropolitan Parks	60 ha	3.2 km
District Parks	20 ha	1.2 km
Local Parks / Open Spaces / Small Open Spaces / Pocket Parks	2 ha	<=400 metres

Source: GLA, 2011

## Open Space: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.86 There are several open spaces within close proximity to the Site, including those that have play areas and other community uses such as sports fields. The table below summarises the open space provision within 1.2km of the Site.

**Table 2.17 Open Space Provision near the Application Site**

Type	Typology	Additional Amenities
Mortlake Green	Open space	Play for 7-14 and under 7's, basketball court
Barnes Common	Open Space	Football pitch
Barnes Green	Open space	Play for under 7's
Jubilee Gardens	Open space	Boat race viewing point
Tapestry Court	Open Space	Boat race viewing point
Thames Bank	Open Space	Boat race viewing point
Vine Road recreation ground	Local park	Children's play areas, paddling pool and informal space

*Source: London Borough of Richmond*

- 2.87 The LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report (April 2015) identifies around 200 open space sites in the Borough equating to a total provision of 527ha. The assessment divides the Borough into three areas for the purposes of analysis and Mortlake and Barnes Common is located within the Richmond assessment area. The area performs well above the Borough average on all typologies of space in terms of provision per 1,000 population.
- 2.88 Based on consultation with LBRuT<sup>11</sup> the closest space for children and young people is Mortlake Green Play Area, which is of sufficient size and within 400m of the site. However, the site does require reinvestment in some of the play equipment which is now old and of poor quality. The site also provides limited play space for people aged 15+ years.
- 2.89 Mullins Path is also less than 0.5 miles from the site. The Open Space Assessment Report suggests that the site is of sufficient quality, however is very small in size and would only serve the population within its immediate vicinity.

<sup>11</sup> LBRuT/Wild Futures, Open Space

Play Area Name	Size (ha)	Distance (miles)	Facilities
Mortlake Green	1.54	0.1	Play area, Natural play, Fitness, Half basketball
Mullins Path Open Space	0.05	0.2	Play area
North Sheen Recreation Ground	3.30	1.0	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Palewell Common	15.38	1.0	Play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Vine Road Recreation Ground	2.32	1.1	Play area, Natural play, Paddling pool
Old Deer Park	28.62	2.1	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness,

- 2.90 The Borough contains a high proportion of LEAP and NEAP sized play areas, many of which score high for quality and value.
- 2.91 Richmond Analysis Areas has the highest amount of play space provision per 1,000 population and has the greatest number of play sites in the Borough.
- 2.92 The majority of play sites (95%) across the Borough are assessed as being above the threshold for quality.

Typology	Number	Total Provision (ha)	Provision per 1,000 Pop	LBRuT Provision per 1,000 Pop
Parks and gardens (urban parks & formal)	4	47.25	0.61	0.39
Natural & semi-natural green space	19	237.78	3.08	1.44
Amenity space	31	57.62	0.75	0.52
Provision for children and young people	17	3.49	0.05	0.03
Amenity space	31	57.62	0.75	0.52
Allotments	13	12.48	0.16	0.15

Source: LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report, April 2015, Knight Kavanagh Page

- 2.93 The Site is also situated along the River Thames, which provides a significant amount of usable open space. The Thames river path also links together open space sites, which would otherwise be isolated from one another.
- 2.94 The development is located between a number of larger parks with more facilities for weekend or occasional visits. The Thames towpath gives access to nature and links to smaller passive parks such as Thames Bank and Jubilee Gardens, but only Mortlake Green provides access to open space facilities such as playground and informal recreation within 400m.

- 2.95 The other sites within 400m are Thames Bank (small grassy area, two benches), Tapestry Court (a narrow cut through between the towpath and Mortlake High Street) and Mullins Path (a small site with 1 bench and 4-5 pieces of play equipment); these are very small, low on features and unlikely to attract visitors away from Mortlake Green.
- 2.96 The Site is deemed to be well served by open space of all forms, however consultation has suggested that local play space could be improved in terms of its quality and provision for older children (i.e. 15+).

### Open Space: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.97 There are continuous improvements being made to existing spaces, however providing additional supply of open space is difficult, based on less and less space being available.
- 2.98 However, with an increasing population, demand is growing therefore it is anticipated that new open spaces will be designed into new developments, to meet additional demand.

### Arts & Culture

- 2.99 There are no maximum walking distances identified for arts and cultural attractions therefore, provision has been looked at across the LBRuT. To provide some context minimum walking distances set by the DfE for primary schools have been used as proxy.

Table 2.20 Existing Provision Benchmarks/Standards/Impact Areas		
Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Arts & Culture	2 miles	Based on Department for Education recommendations <sup>12</sup> .

### Arts & Culture: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.100 LBRuT has a range of arts and cultural attractions with major national attractions including Kew Gardens and Twickenham Rugby Stadium Museum.

<sup>12</sup> Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to as a proxy to assess access to arts and culture.



2.101 There are 12 arts and cultural facilities within LBRuT which include; five arts galleries & centres, three museums, two theatres, one cinema and one botanical garden.

2.102 Based on DfE statutory walking distances, there are six arts and culture facilities within 2 miles of the Site. There is also a significant number of arts and culture attractions located 7.4 miles away in London.

**Table 2.21 Arts & Culture**

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Distance (miles)
OSO Community Arts Centre	Arts Centre	1.0
Longfield Art & Pottery Studio	Arts Centre	1.1
Olympic Cinema Studios	Cinema	1.3
Orange Tree Theatre	Theatre	1.6
Kew Gardens	Botanical Garden	1.7
Richmond Theatre	Theatre	1.8
Museum of Richmond	Museum	2.1
Riverside Gallery	Art Gallery	2.1
Odeon Cinema Richmond	Cinema	2.3
The Twickenham Museum	Museum	3.4
Orleans House Gallery	Art Gallery	3.4
Stables Gallery	Art Gallery	3.4
World Rugby Museum	Museum	3.6

2.103 The baseline assessment along with the LBRuT IDP suggest that there is a diverse range of arts and cultural attractions close to the Site, with even greater provision located nearby in Central London.

### **Arts & Culture: Future Supply & Demand**

2.104 There are no plans to develop any new attractions within LBRuT however the Cultural Strategy<sup>13</sup> states that existing cultural facilities will be retained. There are also plans to expand and refurbish a number of attractions such as;

- a new children’s educational and play garden at Kew Gardens, and;
- extension of the Orleans House Gallery in Twickenham.

2.105 It is anticipated that the demand for arts and culture will continue to increase based on the increasing population. However, there are a large number of attractions within LBRuT as well as internationally recognised arts and culture amenities close by in Central London, which should satisfy future demand.

<sup>13</sup> LBRuT, Cultural Partnership Strategy 2015 – 2019 (2016)

### Public Houses: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.106 Public Houses provide an important resource and meeting place within a local community. Whilst Public Houses play a part in supporting the local community they also have an important economic role.
- 2.107 There are no set metrics to measure the provision of public houses within a local area however, a study by GVA Humberts Leisure<sup>14</sup> found that the average number of working age adults (16-64) per Public House in London was 1,197.
- 2.108 As the table below shows there are 10 Public Houses within the Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward, taking into account the working age population within the ward of 7,448 this would equate to 744 adults per pub.

Table 2.22 Public Houses	
Public House	Distance (miles)
The Jolly Gardener	0.1
The Tapestry	0.1
Ship	0.2
White Hart	0.5
Tree House	0.7
Bulls Head	0.8
The Bear Kick	0.8
The Brown Dog	0.8
Stags Head	0.9
The Sun Inn	0.9

- 2.109 Taking account of the number of public houses per working age population in the Barnes and Mortlake Common ward, which is below the London average, the supply of public houses is sufficient.

### Public Houses: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.110 There are no indications of new public houses being developed in the area. The two existing public houses located next the Site are not part of the Proposed Development and will therefore not be lost as a result of the proposals.

<sup>14</sup> GVA Humberts Leisure, 2012; Cambridge Public House Study

## Heritage

2.111 The Stag Brewery forms a major part of the river frontage in the centre of Mortlake, having served as a productive brewery site for many hundreds of years, and the site of the original Mortlake Manor house, the centre of the large estate, originally including thousands of acres, extending to Richmond Park. A brewery has existed on this site since 1493 when brewer John Williams was granted half an acre by King John, with the Stag Brewery finally closing in 2015.

### Heritage: Existing Supply & Demand

2.112 Heritage elements on the existing site include; the Former Hotel Building, Bottling Plant Building, Maltings Building and the existing boundary brick wall. These are important heritage assets and Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM), that need to be partially retained as part of the Proposed Development to ensure the historical character of the area is preserved. Along with the historical assets that form part of the existing sites are plaques commemorating Brewery workers who died during World War I and II.

2.113 The Site also has strong historical links to the University Boat Race, with the finish line to the race located within close proximity to the Site. Preserving the Site's historical ties to the boat race are important and need to be considered as part of the Proposed Development.

2.114 LBRuT is rich in heritage and has a large number of historical assets, of which the existing Site is one, therefore it is important this is well preserved as part of the Proposed Development.

### Heritage: Future Supply & Demand

2.115 The LBRuT IDP stresses the importance of preserving the Borough's heritage assets and the high priority will be given to the retention of original structures, features, materials and plan form or features that contribute to the significance of the asset. The flexible-use space proposed on the Site could include a new boat house, further strengthening the Site's links to the University Boat Race and boat racing on the River Thames. The Proposed Development will also enable better links and access to the River, which is another significant heritage asset.

2.116 Table 2.23 provides a summary of all existing leisure and recreation provision local to the Site.

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Libraries</i>	Consultation with LBRuT suggested existing supply was sufficient with East Sheen being the closest to the Site. IDP reinforces this and suggest all services will be retained in the future.	Sufficient
<i>Indoor Sports &amp; Recreation</i>	The ISFNA suggests the supply of fitness centres is good. However, the report identifies a small deficiency in indoor sports and sports pitches.	Insufficient
<i>Open Space</i>	Consultation with LBRuT suggested that open space within the local area is of good quality and of sufficient supply.	Sufficient
<i>Arts &amp; Culture</i>	LBRuT has a strong arts and culture offer, which is also supported in the IDP. There are no plans for any of the existing facilities to be closed or lost	Sufficient
<i>Public Houses</i>	The number of public houses close to the Site is good and the number people per pub is lower than the London average, which would indicate provision is high.	Sufficient
<i>Heritage</i>	The existing site has a strong historical identity and heritage links. The Site is of historical importance which needs to be preserved.	Sufficient

## Community & Emergency Services

- 2.117 To help establish existing emergency service provision close to the Site, the various response times set by Fire, Ambulance and Police services have been used.
- 2.118 The table below shows the different response times used by the three emergency services. There are no recognised standards for community services and places of worship therefore these have been assessed at the district level. Community services have been assessed based on the DfE minimum walking distances for primary school children.

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Fire Service	6 mins drive time	London Fire Brigade Response Time Targets 2015/16
Ambulance Service	8 mins drive time	London Ambulance Service target response time
Police Service	15 mins drive time	Home Office; The use of targets in policing
Civic Council	LBRuT	No recognised standards

Community Services	2 miles	Based on Department for Education recommendations <sup>15</sup>
Place of Worship	LBRuT	No recognised standards

## Emergency Services

### Police: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.119 There are three police stations located within the LBRuT, of which all are within 5.5 miles of the Site.
- 2.120 Based on police response times, there are two police stations within 15 minutes' drive-time<sup>16</sup> of the Site with the nearest Police Station located at Sovereign Gate, which is less than 1.6 miles away (within 7 minutes' drive-time).

Name of Station	Distance (miles)	Drive Time (mins)
Sovereign Gate	1.6	7
Twickenham Police Station	3.7	15
Teddington Police Station	5.5	19

Source: Metropolitan Police, 2017

- 2.121 The baseline assessment suggests that the Site is located within close proximity of a number of police stations and within the recognised response times set by the police.
- 2.122 Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) crime rate data shows that in 2016/17, there were 50 crimes per 1,000 of the population, which is lower than the London average (73 per 1,000 of population). There has been a -20% reduction in the number of recorded incidents per 1,000 population within Richmond between 2012, which is closely in line with London as a whole (-21%).
- 2.123 The latest statistics<sup>17</sup> at the ward level show that the crime rate in Mortlake & Barnes (64 per 1,000 population) is higher than the LBRuT average (56). Crime rates relating to violence against a person, burglary and theft & handling are higher at the ward level compared to the borough.

<sup>15</sup> Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to as a proxy to assess access to arts and culture.

<sup>16</sup> Based on Google Maps average drive time.

<sup>17</sup> Metropolitan Police, 2015, Crime Rates in Metropolitan Police area by ward, Crimes per 1,000 population

### Police: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.124 Whilst there are no quantitative estimates on future demand for police over the coming years; based on historic trends and the changing nature of crime, it is anticipated there will be increased demand for policing in the future.
- 2.125 Whilst there are no plans to build new police stations locally or within LBRuT, the MPS have announced that they will be closing 50% of police stations across London. MPS have yet to stipulate where these closures are likely to occur however this could have an impact on existing provision across London.
- 2.126 The LBRuT IDP does not recognise any deficiencies in police provision within the LBRuT area.

### Fire & Rescue: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.127 There are three fire stations located close to the Site, of which all are within 5.4 miles of the Site.
- 2.128 Based on London Fire Brigade (LFB) response time targets, there is one fire station within the LFB six minutes' drive-time<sup>18</sup> target, which is located in Richmond, less than 1.0 miles away (within 4 minutes' drive-time).
- 2.129 LFB response data shows that the average number of incidents per London borough during 2017<sup>19</sup> was 2,065. LBRuT had a lower number of incidents (1,171) compared to the London average and is the Borough with the fourth lowest number of incidents across London so far, this year.

Name of Station	Distance (miles)	Drive Time (mins)
Richmond Fire Station	0.9	4
Chiswick Fire Station*	2.4	10
Twickenham Fire Station	5.4	19

Source: London Fire Brigade, 2017. \* Outside of LBRuT

<sup>18</sup> Based on Google Maps average road speed not blue light response, therefore actual response may be quicker.

<sup>19</sup> London Fire Brigade, 2017; LFB Incident Data (January to August)

2.130 Consultation with LFB<sup>20</sup>, stated that the Proposed Development was not a concern for the fire service as it was easily accessible and within a short drive time of the nearest station.

2.131 Providing that sufficient access to the Site is given and the relevant fire regulations are adhered to the Proposed Development is not deemed to be an issue by LFB.

#### **Fire & Rescue: Future Supply & Demand**

2.132 The Review of Resourcing of the London Fire Brigade<sup>21</sup> states that the number of attendances made by the LFB in 2015/16 had decreased by 16,000 since 2011/12, which would indicate a reduction in demand. However, LFB are piloting a co-response project with LAS, which would mean LFB would be responsible for attending certain types of health-emergencies.

2.133 There are no indications of additional facilities being provided in the local area or within LBRuT. The LBRuT IDP identifies Twickenham Station is in need of replacing which is currently being considered, whilst it has been acknowledged that Richmond Fire Station will require some renovation.

#### **Ambulance Service: Existing Supply & Demand**

2.134 There are two ambulance stations located close to the Site, of which both are within 3.1 miles of the Site.

2.135 Based on London Ambulance Service (LAS) response time targets, none of the ambulance stations are within an eight minutes' drive-time<sup>22</sup> of the Site. The nearest ambulance station is located in Richmond, which is 1.7 miles away (within 9 minutes' drive-time).

2.136 However, it should be noted that ambulances and rapid response vehicles are not always situated at ambulance stations and can be positioned at various locations at any point throughout the day, therefore drive times may be less.

Name of Station	Distance (miles)	Drive Time (mins)
Richmond Ambulance Station	1.7	9

<sup>20</sup> Consultation carried out with Richmond Borough Commander

<sup>21</sup> London Fire Brigade, 2017; Review of Resourcing of the London Fire Brigade 2017 – 2020.

<sup>22</sup> Based on Google Maps average drive time.

Chiswick Ambulance Station*	3.1	11
-----------------------------	-----	----

Source: London Ambulance Service, 2017. \* Outside of LBRuT

2.137 The 2017 average LAS response time statistics<sup>23</sup> suggest that the 74% of all Category A calls were responded to within 8 minutes, which is marginally lower than the target of 75% but higher than the London average (71%) over the same period.

### Ambulance Service: Future Supply & Demand

2.138 The London Ambulance Service 5 Year Strategy 2014/15 – 2019/20<sup>24</sup> shows that demand for ambulance services is increasing, with 999 calls increasing by 10% between 2011-13. There are no plans to increase the number of ambulance stations locally, however LAS state within the Strategy that there will be investment in updating and growing the fleet of vehicles.

## Civic Council & Community Services

2.139 There are no set benchmarks for access to council services and community, however the benchmarks and impact areas used are set out at the beginning of this section.

### Civic Council: Existing Supply & Demand

2.140 There are currently ten LBRuT civic council offices that are accessible to the general public which are detailed in the table below.

Name of Facility	Distance (miles)
Accessible Transport Unit	1.4
Civic Centre & Tourist Information	3.3
Electoral Services	3.3
Elmfield House	3.3
Registration Services	3.3
Social Services	3.3
Strathmore Centre	3.6
The Croft Centre	4.9
Twickenham Training centre	5.1
York House	5.3

<sup>23</sup> NHS London Ambulance Service, Response Times; January – July 2017, Category A response times: target 75% within eight minutes

<sup>24</sup> Latest statistics available.



- 2.141 Based on the most recent residents survey<sup>25</sup> over 80% of residents stated they are satisfied with the way in which the Council operates. This was higher than the national average (67%) reported by the Local Government Association (LGA). The overall satisfaction results are lower for Mortlake with 65% of residents stating they are satisfied, which is the lowest of all villages in LBRuT.
- 2.142 The survey indicates that residents contacted the council in relation to the following issues (over a 12-month period); Environment (24%), Waste & Recycling (21%) and Parking (20%).

### **Civic Council: Future Supply & Demand**

- 2.143 Based on a number of planned developments in LBRuT, it is anticipated there will be increased pressure on civic services in the future. There is no evidence that suggests current services will be expanded. However, LBRuT, as part of the Corporate Strategy<sup>26</sup> aims to improve resident satisfaction with the Borough and improve local engagement.

### **Community Services: Existing Supply & Demand**

- 2.144 Our assessment has shown that there are 19 community and children's centres across LBRuT, of which nine are within a 2-mile walking distance of the Site with Mortlake Children's and Family being the closest.
- 2.145 There are also a number of community centres within close proximity, such as Kew and The Avenue Club community centres. The nearest youth centre (Powerstation) is located 0.5 miles away in Barnes.

Table 2.29 Community Services		
Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Distance (miles)
Mortlake Children and Family Centre	Family & Children's Centre	0.2
Barnes Children's Centre	Family & Children's Centre	0.3
Powerstation	Youth Centre	0.5
Windham Croft Centre for Children	Family & Children's Centre	1.1
Kew Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	1.5
The Avenue Club	Community Centre/Social Club	1.5
Lowther Primary School	Family & Children's Centre	1.9
Castelnau Youth Club	Youth Centre	1.9

<sup>25</sup> LBRuT Residents Survey 2015 (2016); Overall Satisfaction.

<sup>26</sup> LBRuT Corporate Plan 2016-2019 (2016)

Cambrian Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	2.0
Vineyard Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	2.3
Heatham House	Youth Centre	3.5
Ham Youth Centre	Youth Centre	3.7
Ham Children's Centre	Family & Children's Centre	3.8
Whitton Youth Zone	Youth Centre	4.4
Stanley Children and Family Centre	Family & Children's Centre	4.9
Heathfield Children's Centre	Family & Children's Centre	5.1
Norman Jackson Children's Centre	Family & Children's Centre	5.8
Hampton Youth Project	Youth Centre	6.7
Tangley Park Children and Family Centre	Family & Children's Centre	6.8

- 2.146 The baseline assessment and LBRuT IDP would indicate that there are a range of community services located within the LBRuT, with almost half of them within 2 miles of the site.
- 2.147 Quality assessments of each of the facilities is not available, however five of the children's centres have been assessed by Ofsted. Three of the five centres achieved a rating of 'Good' (Ham Children's Centre, Norman Jackson Children's Centre and Heathfield/Whitton Children Centre) whilst the remaining two received ratings of 'Satisfactory/Requires Improvement' (Barnes Children's Centre and Stanley Children's Centre).

### Community Services: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.148 Desk-based research suggests there are no plans to expand or provide additional community facilities locally however, the LBRuT IDP suggest capital expenditure is needed to improve existing facilities, however none of these facilities are within close proximity to the Site.
- 2.149 There are also aspirations to change the way in which community centres are run, with LBRuT encouraging local community groups to take ownership of public assets such as Community Halls, through asset transfer programmes.
- 2.150 It is expected that there will be an element of community space planned as part of the flexible-use floorspace within the Proposed Development.

### Places of Worship

- 2.151 LBRuT is predominantly Christian, with 55% of residents stating they were of Christian faith during the Census 2011, this is higher than the London average (48%) yet lower than the levels for England (59%).

Table 2.30 Population by religion - Census 2011

Religion	Richmond upon Thames	London	England
Christian	55.30%	48.40%	59.40%
Buddhist	0.80%	1.00%	0.50%
Hindu	1.60%	5.00%	1.50%
Jewish	0.80%	1.80%	0.50%
Muslim	3.30%	12.40%	5.00%
Sikh	0.80%	1.50%	0.80%
Other religion	0.50%	0.60%	0.40%
No religion	28.40%	20.70%	24.70%
Religion not stated	8.50%	8.50%	7.20%

2.152 As would be expected, this is reflected in the types of places of worship that are located within LBRuT with the vast majority linked to Christian denominations and in particular, Church of England.

#### Places of Worship: Existing Supply & Demand

2.153 There are 74 Places of Worship within LBRuT, of this total, nearly all are churches. The closest Place of Worship to the Site is St. Mary's, which is approximately 0.3 miles away.

Table 2.31 Places of Worship in LBRuT

Place of Worship	Count
Church of England	34
Roman Catholic Church	13
Baptist Church	8
Methodist Church	5
United Reform	4
Christian Fellowship Church	2
Christian Spiritualists Church	1
Congregational Church	1
Free Church of England	1
H.M. Forces Church	1
Independent Evangelical Church	1
Spiritualist Church	1
Synagogues	1
Unsectarian	1

2.154 Whilst there are a number of places of worship across LBRuT, these are mostly connected to the Christian faith. Therefore, residents of other religions may have to travel to neighbouring boroughs to access a place of worship.

2.155 Notwithstanding this, London is an extremely diverse city and therefore residents will not have to travel significant distances to access a place of worship.

2.156 Taking this into account it would appear that LBRuT has a vast number of places of worship however, the diversity of these places of worship is limited.

### Places of Worship: Future Supply & Demand

2.157 There is limited information available indicating future supply and demand for religion. Based on the number of churches in LBRuT it would appear there is sufficient supply to satisfy future demand from Christian residents however, this is more difficult to judge for residents of other religious denominations. Provision in neighbouring locations and at the wider London level will though help satisfy any increased demand.

2.158 Table 2.32 provides a summary of all existing community and emergency service provision local to the Site.

Table 2.32 Community & Emergency Services: Summary of Supply		
Service	Summary	Supply
<i>Emergency Services</i>	Following consultation with some emergency services and taking into account emergency drive time targets, the Site appears to be well served.	Sufficient
<i>Civic Council &amp; Community Services</i>	The LBRuT IDP highlights that there is a range of community services local to the Site, of which all are to be retained in the foreseeable future.	Sufficient
<i>Places of Worship</i>	Whilst it is difficult to gauge the supply and demand for places of worship, supply does not seem to be an issue.	Sufficient

## 3. Demand Assessment

3.1 This section will look at the demand for community and cultural facilities generated by the Proposed Development.

### Proposed Development

---

3.2 The Proposed Development will be mixed use consisting of; residential, flexible assisted living, a care home, leisure uses (D2), offices (B1), a school and a hotel. The Proposed Development will also comprise flexible floorspace including retail (A1-A4), community uses (D1), sui generis uses along with the delivery of a significant amount of new public open space. The Proposed Development is being brought forward via three applications, Application A; for the masterplan proposes;

- 443 dwellings within Development Area 1 (submitted in detail), and;
- up to 224 units and up to 150 flexible assisted living units proposed within Development Area 2 (submitted in outline).

3.3 Due to the flexible use living accommodation for either assisted living or residential use within the Proposed Development, and given that affordable housing provision has not yet been determined, for the purposes of this assessment, two housing scenarios have been considered, as follows:

- **Scenario 1:** Up to 667 use class C3 residential units, up to 150 flexible assisted living units and an 80-bed nursing home.
- **Scenario 2:** Up to 817 use class C3 residential units and an 80-bed nursing home.

3.4 The table below sets out the schedule for the residential element of the development.

3.5 There will be an element of affordable housing delivered as part of the Development however, the total amount, which will be policy compliant, has yet to be agreed.

**Table 3.1 Indicative Dwelling Mix for Scenario 1 & 2**

Scenario 1							
	Flats				House		Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	3 bed	4 bed	
Residential Units	97	319	212	15	12	12	667
Assisted Living							150
Care Home							80
Scenario 2							
	Flats				House		Total
	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	3 bed	4 bed	
Residential Units	120	395	263	15	12	12	817
Nursing Home							80

3.6 As part of the Proposed Development a range of other uses are proposed which will consist of the following;

- Secondary School (Application B) – 9,319 m<sup>2</sup>
- Cinema & Gym (Application A) – 2,860 m<sup>2</sup>
- Hotel / pub with rooms (Application A) – 1,668 m<sup>2</sup>
- Flexible Uses (Application A) – 4,664 m<sup>2</sup>

3.7 Part of Development Area 1 (ground floor/first floor) is proposed as flexible use floorspace and could consist of A1-A4, B1, D1 and Sui Generis uses.

3.8 The flexible floor space will enable the Proposed Development to respond to market demand in future. However, a cap on the amount of floor space has been suggested for each land use to be secured via condition. The indicative quantum of flexible floor space is shown in the table below.

**Table 3.2 Flexible Floor Space (Maximum)**

Use Class	Floor Area (m2)
A1	2,500
A2	200
A3	2,200
A4	1,600
B1	2,000
D1	1,148
Boathouse/Sui Generis	351

## Effect on Existing Provision

---

- 3.9 This section provides an overall assessment of effects as a result of the Proposed Development, taking into account any on site provision of social and community infrastructure. This assessment has been based on the maximum housing scenario, as this will generate the largest outputs in terms of population and child yield, which for the purposes of this assessment is the worst-case scenario.
- 3.10 The potential effects have been quantified however, where this is not possible a qualitative approach has been taken.

### Education

- 3.11 The estimated child yield (ages 0-5, 5-11 and 12+) resulting from the Proposed Development is based on the GLA Play and Informal Recreation SPG<sup>27</sup>. This estimated the potential child yield generated by a development based on the proposed scheme and tenure mix.

#### Early Years

- 3.12 According to the GLA guidance the Proposed Development could generate a maximum of +183 children aged 0-5. This represents a +15% increase in 0-5 years olds in the local area and a +1% increase across LBRuT.
- 3.13 Whilst it is not possible to gauge the exact number of early years places (maintained and private) across the Borough, the draft LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy<sup>i</sup> and consultation with LBRuT suggests that demand for Early Years places across the District is high. However, consultation with LBRuT suggests there is a healthy supply of private nursery places, yet the number of free of charge places is limited.
- 3.14 Whilst some of the additional population will take place within private nurseries, there will be few places for residents looking to enrol their child within state funded nurseries, unless existing provision is expanded.
- 3.15 The LBRuT IDP suggests that existing providers should be able to meet additional demand and that there are no obvious gaps in provision. However, based on pressures

<sup>27</sup>GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Play & Informal Recreation SPG Calculator

relating to maintained nursery places and the population scenario above, it is unlikely there would be enough maintained places to accommodate the additional children.

- 3.16 Taking into account, mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development, the effect of the additional child yield would be insignificant.

Table 3.3 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Early Years	Insufficient	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development	Insignificant

### Primary Education

- 3.17 The Proposed Development is estimated to generate a maximum of +157 children of primary school age. The latest data from LBRuT states that there was a surplus of +32 places at the schools within the relevant catchment area. This surplus could help absorb some of the additional demand generated by the Proposed Development.
- 3.18 The latest draft LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy<sup>28</sup> states that the expansion of Sheen Mount and Sheen Primary schools have met the previously forecast need for places, however the expansion of Barnes Primary School will help meet the future demand and as such there are no anticipated gaps in provision. This view was also supported during consultation with LBRuT. Therefore, taking this into consideration and acknowledging that mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing schools in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development, the effect of the Proposed Development is deemed to be insignificant.

<sup>28</sup> LBRuT Draft School Place Planning Strategy, Autumn 2017



Table 3.4 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Primary Education	Sufficient	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing schools in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development.	Insignificant

### Secondary Education

- 3.19 GLA forecasts suggest there will be a maximum of +100 children of secondary school age yielded from the Proposed Development. Latest school roll data states there was a deficit of -14 places within a 2-mile catchment of the Site.
- 3.20 Therefore, the additional children of secondary school age generated by the Proposed Development will put additional strain on existing resources. However, the six-form entry (FE) secondary school that is being provided as part of the Proposed Development will create a number of places and help address the deficit.
- 3.21 Therefore, it is deemed there will be sufficient capacity within the local secondary schools and the effect of the Proposed Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.5 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Secondary Education	Insufficient	Secondary school built as part of the development	Insignificant

### Further Education

- 3.22 It is also anticipated there will be increased demand for further education, with the Proposed Development yielding a total of +34 young people aged between 16 to 18. There is no information on the exact number of further education places available across LBRuT, however it is acknowledged there are a number of providers within LBRuT and neighbouring areas, as well as further afield within Central London.
- 3.23 Consultation with LBRuT has suggested that the number of sixth form places within the Borough is fluid and there is currently capacity amongst local providers. There are

sixth form centres opening at three schools with LBRuT over the next 5 years which will increase capacity further. The sixth form provision proposed as part of the new secondary school included as part of the Proposed Development will also further add to capacity.

- 3.24 Taking this into consideration it is assumed that the existing capacity at this level will be sufficient and the effect is insignificant.

Table 3.6 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Further Education	Sufficient	Provided as part of the onsite school.	Insignificant

## Health & Social Care

- 3.25 The Proposed Development is estimated to generate a maximum of 1,850 new residents. Taking this into account, the effect the additional population could have on local health care provision has been considered.

### Primary Healthcare

- 3.26 Data provided by NHS Choices states that the current number of patients per GP (FTE) within 1 mile of the Site is 1,654, which is lower than the 1,800 patients per GP (FTE) benchmark used by NHS London HUDU and the LBRuT average.
- 3.27 As a worst-case scenario, it has been assumed that all residents yielded from the Proposed Development will register with a local GP. Based on this assumption the number of patients per GP (FTE) would increase to 1,713 patients per GP.
- 3.28 All surgeries within the local area are accepting new patients which would indicate that there is some capacity within local surgeries.
- 3.29 There are some concerns around pressure on care in the community, especially with the development of the nursing home and potential assisted living units as part of the Proposed Development.
- 3.30 Primary health care also includes dentist provision and the number of patients per dentist with LBRuT is 1,776, which is 27% lower than the national average (2,555 patients per dentist) which suggests the LBRuT is well provided
- 3.31 Accounting for this acknowledging that mitigation in the form Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the

potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development, it is assumed that the provision of primary health care local to the site will be sufficient and the impact will be insignificant.

Table 3.7 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Primary Healthcare	Sufficient	Mitigation in the form Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced	Insignificant

### Intermediate Care Facilities

- 3.32 Unlike primary healthcare there are no benchmarks for intermediate care facilities, therefore quantifying the potential effects is not possible. However, the baseline assessment has suggested there is Centre House Health Centre within 0.5 miles of the Site which provides a comprehensive range of services and there are a number of other intermediate care facilities within the LBRuT.
- 3.33 This would suggest there are a sufficient number of intermediate care facilities to accommodate the additional demand generated by the Proposed Development. Based on current supply and acknowledging that mitigation in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development the effect of the Proposed Development would be insignificant

Table 3.8 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Intermediate Health Care	Sufficient	Mitigation in the form Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development	Insignificant

### Acute Care

3.34 There are no benchmarks to assess the effect on acute care, namely hospitals. However, the baseline assessment showed there were a number of hospitals within 15 minutes' drive time, Charing Cross and West Middlesex within 17 minutes and a range of specialist hospitals nearby in Central London. Therefore, the provision of hospitals near to the Site has been deemed sufficient and the effect of the Proposed Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.9 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Acute Care	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

### Pharmacies

3.35 Whilst there are no official benchmarks set to assess the effects, British Medical Journal research suggests that 89% of the population in Britain lives within a 20-minute walk of a pharmacy. Using this benchmark shows there are six pharmacies within a 20-minute walk of the Site. The Proposed Development will generate a number of additional residents who will be using the local pharmacies, it is assumed that the existing capacity will absorb the additional demand. Taking this into account, it is deemed that the effect of the Proposed Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.10 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Pharmacies	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

### Leisure & Recreation

3.36 It is envisaged that the residents yielded as a result of the Proposed Development will access the local leisure and recreation facilities, the effect of the additional population has been assessed as follows.

## Libraries

- 3.37 Consultation with library services suggest that there is sufficient provision within the area close to the Site. This is also true at the Borough level; therefore, the effect of the Proposed Development is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.11 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Libraries	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

## Indoor Sports & Recreation

- 3.38 The provision of sports and recreation across LBRuT good, however consultation suggested that there were shortfalls in some sports pitch provision. These deficiencies would be addressed through the provision of a sports pitch linked to the secondary school.
- 3.39 There will also be a Community Use Agreement which will enable local groups, teams, clubs, organisations and bodies the opportunity to use the external play pitch, indoor sports hall and MUGA of provided by the proposed school.
- 3.40 Relevant financial contributions to improve the quality of existing provision will also help address these deficiencies.
- 3.41 Taking this into account it is deemed that the potential effect of the Proposed Development on leisure and recreation will be insignificant.

Table 3.12 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Indoor Sports & Recreation	Insufficient	Sports pitch as part of the school and public access to school sports facilities.	Insignificant

## Open Space

- 3.42 LBRuT has a number of significant, high profile open spaces, with a large proportion of the Thames riverbank accessible to the public. The Borough has a good supply of open space, which would come under increased pressure from the Proposed Development however, it is deemed LBRuT would still have a sufficient supply.
- 3.43 The Proposed Development will provide the following;

- 1,830 sqm of dedicated play space for the detailed element (Development Area 1) and;
- a maximum requirement of 2,254 sqm for the outline element (Development Area 2).

3.44 It is also proposed that the new sports pitch included as part of the school will be accessible to the local community outside of school hours (via a community use agreement). In addition, the Proposed Development will improve access and open space along the Thames River. Taking this into account, the effect would be insignificant.

Table 3.13 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Open Space	Sufficient	Open space and play space designed into the Proposed Development.	Insignificant

### Arts & Culture

3.45 The baseline assessment has shown that LBRuT hosts a number of arts and cultural facilities including, theatres, cinemas and galleries. The Site is also within 1 hour of Central London, which offers internationally renowned attractions.

3.46 The Proposed Development also includes the provision of a cinema onsite, which will further improve local provision. Therefore, taking the aforementioned into account it is deemed the effect will be insignificant.

Table 3.14 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Arts & Culture	Sufficient	A cinema will be included onsite	Insignificant

### Heritage

3.47 The design of the Site will preserve partial elements of the heritage assets and listed buildings such as; the former Hotel Building, Bottling Plant Building, Maltings Building and existing boundary brick wall and gates to the site.

3.48 The Proposed Development is anticipated to support the Site's links to University Boat Race by providing a new boat house (which may come forward as part of the flexible

use floorspace). Taking into account, the preservation of the existing heritage onsite and the potential provision of a new boat house, the strong historical links of the Site will be maintained. The effect of the Proposed Development is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.15 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Heritage	Sufficient	Preservation of all current heritage assets onsite.	Insignificant

### Public Houses

- 3.49 There are a number of Public Houses within the local area, with supply being higher than the London average. There are two pubs (The Jolly Gardener and Ship) that are located next to the Site (not within the red line boundary) which will remain operational following completion of the Proposed Development. Taking this into account the effect is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.16 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Public Houses	Sufficient	Retention of both the Jolly Gardener and Ship Public Houses	Insignificant

### Community & Emergency Services

- 3.50 The assessment is also required to look at both emergency and community services local to the Site. Considering the baseline assessment and the scale of the Proposed Development the following effects have been considered.

#### Emergency Services

- 3.51 Based on the location of the Site and existing emergency service provision, the Proposed Development is expected to have minimal effect. According to the Design & Access Statement the design of the Proposed Development will ensure the Site is accessible to emergency services. Access will be via a proposed route along Thames Street which will service the east of the Site and a new route on the west of the Site which will service the school and Development Area 2.. The project design team has carried out consultation out with the Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Team. This

is to ensure crime and safety considerations are addressed through the design of the Proposed Development.

Table 3.17 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Emergency Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

### Civic Council & Community Services

- 3.52 There are a number of community services within two miles of the Site, including; family centres, youth centres and community/social clubs. Whilst there is no indication of current usage, the baseline assessment suggests that existing provision is adequate despite the Proposed Development increasing demand locally.
- 3.53 There could also be an element of community floorspace designed into the Proposed Development. If this is brought forward it will increase capacity locally and also provide community space for the resident population.

Table 3.18 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Civil & Community Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

### Places of Worship

- 3.54 The baseline suggests there are a significant number of places of worship within the local area however, the places of worship are heavily focussed around Christian denominations.

Table 3.19 Summary			
Places of Worship	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Civil & Community Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

## Summary of Impacts

- 3.55 The table below provides a summary of the impacts of the Proposed Development on the various elements of Social & Community Infrastructure assessed in the report.
- 3.56 Based on the assessment of various elements of social and community infrastructure and the suggested mitigation, it has been judged that there would be no significant effects resulting from the Proposed Development.



Table 3.20 Proposed Development: Summary of Impacts		
Service	Mitigation	Effect
<b>Education</b>		
<i>Early Years</i>	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development	Insignificant
<i>Primary Education</i>	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement or Community Infrastructure Levy may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing schools in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development.	Insignificant
<i>Secondary Education</i>	New secondary school onsite	Insignificant
<i>Further Education</i>	Provided as part of the secondary school onsite	Insignificant
<b>Health &amp; Social Care</b>		
<i>Primary Healthcare</i>	Mitigation in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures	Insignificant
<i>Intermediate Healthcare</i>	Mitigation in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures	Insignificant
<i>Acute Care</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Pharmacies</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<b>Leisure &amp; Recreation</b>		
<i>Libraries</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Indoor Sports &amp; Recreation</i>	Sports pitch as part of the school and public access to school sports facilities.	Insignificant
<i>Open Space</i>	Open space and play space designed into the Proposed Development.	Insignificant
<i>Arts &amp; Culture</i>	New cinema onsite	Insignificant
<i>Heritage</i>	Preservation of heritage assets and provision of a new boat house	Insignificant
<i>Public Houses</i>	Retention of existing public houses onsite.	Insignificant
<b>Community &amp; Emergency Services</b>		
<i>Emergency Services</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Civic Council &amp; Community Services</i>	Community space being provided onsite.	Insignificant
<i>Places of Worship</i>	None Required	Insignificant

## Appendix A - List of Primary Schools within 2 miles of the Site

A.1 Table A.1 provides a list of Primary Schools within a 2-mile catchment of the Site excluding schools that are located outside of within the western half of LBRuT.

Table A1 Primary Schools within 2-mile catchment – Reception Enrolment Autumn 2016						
Name	Postcode	Type	Enrolment	Capacity	Surplus	
Thomson House School	SW14 8HY	Academy	52	52	0	
St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary School	SW14 8HE	Maintained	30	30	0	
Kew Riverside Primary School	TW9 4ES	Maintained	30	29	1	
East Sheen Primary School	SW14 8ED	Maintained	60	90	-30	
Barnes Primary School	SW13 0QQ	Maintained	60	60	0	
Sheen Mount Primary School	SW14 7RT	Maintained	90	91	-1	
Darell Primary and Nursery School	TW9 4LH	Maintained	60	43	17	
Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School	TW10 5AA	Maintained	60	59	1	
St Osmund's Catholic Primary School	SW13 9HQ	Maintained	30	28	2	
The Queen's Church of England Primary School	TW9 3HJ	Maintained	60	60	0	
Marshgate Primary School	TW10 6HY	Maintained	90	59	31	
St Elizabeth's Catholic Primary School	TW10 6HN	Maintained	60	57	3	
Lowther Primary School	SW13 9AE	Maintained	60	53	7	
The Vineyard School	TW10 6NE	Maintained	90	90	0	
		Total	832	801	+31	

## Appendix B - List of Secondary Schools within 3 miles of the Site

B.1 Table B1 provides a list of Secondary schools within a 3-mile catchment of the Site, excluding schools that are located outside of within the western half of LBRuT.

Table B1 Secondary Schools Within 3-mile Catchment – Year 7 Enrolment						
Name	Postcode	Type	Enrolment	Capacity	Surplus	
Richmond Park Academy	SW148RG	Academy	180	166	14	
Christ's Church of England Comprehensive Secondary School	TW10 6HW	Maintained	150	148	2	
Grey Court School	TW10 7HN	Academy	210	240	-30	
		<b>Total</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>-14</b>	



**REGENERIS**

---

[www.regeneris.co.uk](http://www.regeneris.co.uk)

London: 0207 336 6188

Manchester: 0161 234 9910