

2 July 2019

James Garside
London Borough Richmond Upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham
TW1 3BZ

Dear James

Planning application for full planning permission – Homebase Manor Road, North Sheen, Richmond, TW9 1YB (reference 19/0510/FUL)

We write with reference to the Planning Committee Report for application reference 19/0510/FUL. The application is due to be heard at Planning Committee on 3rd July 2019.

Following a review of the Committee Report, we have noted some minor factual errors and would be grateful if you could clarify the following corrections in a Committee Report Addendum:

- The summary of the application (page 3) should refer to 134 affordable homes, not 135.
- The summary of the application (page 3) and paragraph 4 state that the Bus Terminus is to the north of the site. The Terminus is within the site.
- Paragraph 48 – the Affordable Housing Scheme confirms that grant funding does not improve the viability of the scheme to support more affordable housing. This has not been disputed through the Daniel Watney / Turleys responses received to date. Further discussions are ongoing with Turleys regarding the impact of grant funding, and we hope to resolve this outstanding point prior to Planning Committee.
- The Applicant has requested further information from LRBUT regarding the nature of the proposed S106 obligations to review grant funding via a pre-commencement review. No clarification on this obligation has been received from LBRUT to date.
- Paragraph 54 - the Affordable Housing Scheme also sets out engagement with RPs, including an appended letter from Clarion. This should be reflected in the report.
- Paragraph 126 – there is a suggestion that the Council's independent daylight advisor did not have sufficient information in which to review the internal daylight for the scheme itself. Confirmation on the internal daylight assessment and ADF parameters were provided to LBRUT in Point 2's letter dated 10th

June. This was as a result of the direct request made by the Council's independent advisor – their letter dated 31st May – received by Point 2 on the 3rd June.

- Paragraph 127 – the report says “it is clear that, even when based on the applicant's daylight assessment, a significant number of habitable rooms will be affected by poor levels of natural light”. This is a disconnect from the committee report which confirms that the daylight results equate to a compliance rate of 93% - Paragraph 126 (a).
- Paragraph 132 – the child yield is 86, not 68.
- Paragraph 167 – the report says “The review has indicated that the proposal was largely assessed correctly in accordance with the BRE guidelines”. This is incorrect as all assessments undertaken by Point 2 have been undertaken in accordance with BRE and their methodology.
- Paragraph 173 – the report suggests that an additional contextual assessment be undertaken to establish whether the daylight levels are comparable with other residential typologies within the area. This was not something which the local authority raised during the initial discussions and/or the scope of the various assessments. The conclusions reached by Point 2 confirm that the retained daylight values are good to very good. This point was covered in the Point 2 letter dated 10th June.
- Paragraph 233 – drawing P11559-00-001-400-01 (Typical Tree Pit Details) was revised and sent to the LPA on 17th June 2019. The detail ‘Tree pit over slab’ allows for 1200mm soil depth for the tree pit. That is adequate for healthy tree growth and is in line with the best practice. 600mm soil depth is allowed for shrub and herbaceous planting therefore the void is used under them to maintain consistent levels between tree pit and surrounding planting.
- Paragraph 249 – there are 972 cycle parking spaces, not 948. The difference between these numbers seems to be the 24 spaces in the public realm visitors. There are 764 basement cycle parking spaces, 120 at ground floor level in Block C, 64 at ground floor level in Block D and 24 spaces in the public realm for visitors.
- Paragraph 254 – a detailed assessment has been undertaken in relation to potential mode share and we firmly believe that using census data leads to exaggerated public transport levels. We do not consider the use of “Census Travel to Work Data” to be representative of the proposed development and that the TRICS data which relates to all journey purposes is more appropriate.
- Paragraph 255 – further information regarding this was provided in the TA Addendum and should be referred to here.
- Paragraphs 276 and 281 – the crossing referred to in these paragraphs is not 0.8m wide. From our calculations and observations, the crossing is approximately 1.5m wide with a refuge of 1.8m long (i.e. between the islands). This meets the design standards in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.
- Paragraph 286 and 301 – TfL has reviewed the Manor Circus contribution and is now requesting a revised amount of £330,000 (reduced from £420,000). TfL previously requested £420,000 on the basis that this equated to 15% of the total scheme cost. As the cost of the scheme has reduced, 15% of the total scheme cost now equates to £330,000. On this basis, and subject to evidence provided that the scheme is not already funded, the Applicant agrees to a contribution that is 15% of the total scheme cost or £330,000 (whichever is the lesser amount).
- Paragraph 330 and summary – the applicant has agreed to early and late stage review mechanisms, subject to agreement in the final wording.

We would be grateful if you could clarify these changes in a Committee Report Addendum.

As you are aware, we have sent separate responses to the GLA Energy comments (26th June) and Turley's comments on viability (24th June) by separate cover which should also be reflected in the Committee Report Addendum. These are re-attached to this letter for further information.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rachel Crick". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Rachel Crick
Associate
0207 911 2443
rachel.crick@avisonyoung.com
For and on behalf of GVA Grimley Limited t/a Avison Young