

**To:** London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBRuT), Planning Department

**By email to:** [stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk)

**Copy to:** Zac Goldsmith, MP  
Council Leader Gareth Roberts  
Councillors for Mortlake and East Sheen  
and selected others, including statutory consultees.

**Date:** 24 July 2019

**RE:** Response to the following linked planning applications (each, an **Application**) – revised documents June 2019:

1. **18/0547/FUL (Main site – detailed and outline)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0547/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0547/FUL)

2. **18/0548/FUL (Secondary school)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0548/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0548/FUL)

3. **18/0549/FUL (Chalker's Corner works)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0549/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0549/FUL)

Please refer to the glossary at the end of this document for defined terms.

1. **Background**

I am a resident of Williams Lane, Mortlake (SW14) and live immediately adjacent to the Site. I am responding as the 'Community Liaison Group' (CLG) attendee advocating (on an ad hoc basis) the views of a group of Williams Lane & Wadham Mews residents (the **Group**), having previously attended the Applicant's five CLG sessions held in 2017 and 2018 to put forward the general consensus of the Group's views on the emerging plans and submitted representations on behalf of the Group in relation to the original planning applications referenced above.

As far as I am aware, this statement represents the general consensus of the Group's views on the Applications. However, this response is strictly supplemental to any individual responses (including my own) that members of the Group may wish to make and should be read accordingly. This response is made in relation to all relevant aspects of each Application.

The Group moved into the 2011 Development upon construction in December 2011, following adoption by LBRuT of the APB, which itself followed a site-specific consultation. The 2011 Development is shown in the APB Scale and Uses Plan as the 'Approved residential development'. The 2011 Development comprises some 17 houses and 64 flats, approximately 170 residents.

The Group requests that appropriate weight be given to the responses set out below as residents directly affected by the proposed development. **We relied heavily upon LBRuT's then freshly-adopted APB in making an investment and life decision** to move here just 7 years ago. The proposed development, if insensitively pursued in line with the applicant's present proposals, in particular the secondary school, could blight the lives of the residents both during the construction phase and for many years to come, whilst depriving the existing community and future generations of key assets that make Mortlake a green, natural, predominantly sub-urban, site.

2. **Continued opposition to all Applications in light of revised documents submitted and evolving planning and legislative landscape**

- 2.1 The revised plans submitted demonstrate contempt on the part of the applicant for legitimately held views of the severely impacted local community. **No substantive changes** have been made, notwithstanding the Group's concerns which are based, in large part, on sound planning considerations, such as over-density and scale in excess of the APB requirements, significant loss of daylight and sunlight and loss of (OOLITI-protected) green space.
- 2.2 The GLA reasserted the importance of the developer and LBRuT responding to widely held community concerns around a secondary school – 90 per cent of respondents opposed application – yet this remains unaddressed (see further below). Of particular importance, the local primary school, Thomson House, would now appear to have material concerns itself about the need for secondary places based on emerging data. At the same time, the developer has made no provision for primary places required as a result of the present application even though this is a clear requirement of the NPPF – we continue to await a response from LBRuT as to how this is consistent with planning law. Moving Thomson House from its current perilous position beside the level crossing, in a known pollution hotspot, to the Site would respond to numerous groups' concerns.
- 2.3 Further, it is now clear that the demand case for a new secondary school is highly questionable in the longer term: more cost-efficient options are available to meet short-to-medium term (potential) need and, after the initial budge, numbers drop off materially. LBRuT simply must scrutinise this in a view of a number of bodies all questioning the evidence base.
- 2.4 Moreover, the applicant's revised plans fail entirely to respond to LBRuT's legal obligation to reduce emissions in the AQMA: there is simply no basis on which the present proposals could withstand judicial scrutiny. The evidence base – questionable as it was to begin with – must be updated now given lapse of time and material change of circumstance following Hammersmith Bridge closure.
- 2.5 Finally, it is clear on a policy front that social housing must<sup>1</sup>, in future, be blended into and across development sites. The present proposals to allocate all social housing, ghetto-style, to Blocks 18 and 19, in an already sensitive part of the site, is clearly in contravention of that, as indeed it is existing GLA policy. Such housing must be reallocated.
- 2.6 Notwithstanding the foregoing comments in opposition to the applications as presently formed, the Group reasserts its original submissions *mutatis mutandis* as if stated in full in the present response. The Group also endorses comments submitted on behalf of the MBCG.

3. **Opposition to all Applications**

- 3.1 The Group is generally supportive of the Plans in a number of respects – see further paragraph 3.4 below. However, it has a number of key concerns. Accordingly, on the assumption that these issues will not be satisfactorily resolved at this stage, we must **oppose** the Plans in their present form and accordingly **oppose all three Applications**.
- 3.2 Our key concerns and reasons for objection are as follows:

- (a) primarily as a function of its particular physical characteristics, the Site cannot sustain both a large school and high-density residential occupation. Key factors in reaching this conclusion are:
- (i) already-excessive and poorly functioning traffic flow;

<sup>1</sup> <https://news.co.uk/news/political/government-pledges-to-ban-developers-from-making-social-housing-residents-use-different-doors-to-private-owners/>

- (ii) consequent emissions of noxious gases exceeding legal levels in an AQMA, and
- (iii) a strain on local infrastructure and key services that in some cases are already creaking or inadequate – notably public transport, health care, and primary and nursery educational provision,

which will be exacerbated by the cumulative effect of what is proposed and which have not been adequately mitigated by the measures set out in the Plans;

- (b) in relation to overall density, the APB was founded on the basis of community support for a lower-density development: what is proposed, at 897 units, in addition to the large secondary school, is anything but lower density, being:
  - (i) more than double the range proposed in the community-preferred APB Consultation Materials (390 units);
  - (ii) more than double the level of a comparable, recent and local development (Queen Mary's, Roehampton)<sup>2</sup> – despite that site having better transport connectivity (equivalent per-hectare yield of 440 units);
  - (iii) (acknowledging the short-comings of a purely matrix-based approach), approximately triple the level that the GLA matrix would provide as appropriate for a site which is 'predominantly suburban'<sup>3</sup> (296 units) and an average PTAL of 2 and even almost double that applicable to an urban site of that PTAL (493 units)<sup>4</sup>; and
  - (iv) more than triple the level of provision the Borough identified as appropriate in its Monitoring Report on Housing effective at the time of acquisition of the Site by the Applicant (200 to 300 units), and still 80 per cent. in excess of the revised total proposed by LBRuT in July last year following LBRuT's discussion with the developer (500 to 600 units).

Accordingly, residential density (in whatever form it may take) at the proposed levels is grossly excessive and simply must be reduced to be sustainable in this particular locale, especially if sitting alongside the Proposed Secondary School.

- (c) however, given the demonstrable (and increasing, per the Draft London Plan) need for new homes (including affordable supply) in the Borough, the concerns expressed below and independently supported around long term demand for the secondary school and the clear need for a primary school to serve existing pupils (as identified in the 2015 Cabinet Papers, the EIA and from my own personal experience), not to mention the many new pupils who will be resident on the Site, a two-form entry primary school (as per the APB) should be constructed rather than the Proposed Secondary School. The Group is alarmed at the process (or lack thereof) pursued by LBRuT in taking the decision, without consultation, to reverse a key element of the APB and considers that material factors in the evaluation of alternative sites, and in the matching of LBRuT demand and supply, have not been properly considered – including accessibility, the impact on traffic, the environment, the local community and existing residents, the impact on greenfield land and subsidising attendance by out-of-Borough pupils.

<sup>2</sup> <http://wehearthat.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Housing-density-study-05t.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Cited from LBRuT commissioned paper on density, full reference below.

<sup>4</sup> Based on current London Plan matrix mid-points and 3.1-3.7 h/units.

- (d) in any event, the Proposed Secondary School is not supportable in its present form: it appears a case of quantity over quality<sup>5</sup> and cramming an excessive number of pupils into a known pollution hotspot – LBRuT owes a duty of care to pupils and its staff – with a single plastic playing field and no due regard for what the Group's parents wish to see (a key factor in LBRuT's duty under s.14A Education Act). Being situated as it is at the edge of the Borough, at this size LBRuT would be powerless to prevent out-of-Borough pupils attending from Hounslow and Hammersmith, to the detriment of LBRuT demand and the LBRuT taxpayer<sup>6</sup>. In contrast, a high-quality, three-form entry secondary school, serving the local communities of Mortlake, Sheen, Barnes and Kew that will need to co-exist alongside the school, would in principle be acceptable to the majority of the Group as an alternative to a primary school – in no case is the Proposed Secondary School supported in its present form.
- (e) before adoption of any proposed school – primary or secondary – there needs to be a much more detailed, publicly-available, independent assessment of:
- (i) the projected local supply and demand, based on appropriate and reasonable assumptions (e.g. local demographics, impact of Brexit, percentage of pupils leaving state education in LBRuT) to ensure there is minimal risk of empty classrooms here or elsewhere in LBRuT as a result of such decision. For instance, we understand the Richmond Park Academy sixth form currently only takes 35 pupils – with a large, new sixth form that may fall further still, despite currently having capacity; and
  - (ii) (only if that reveals a projected shortfall at primary or secondary level) of all the available options for extension of existing sites or use of new sites to satisfy such projected shortfall – including Barn Elms for a secondary school – based on all material factors, to include:
    - (A) accessibility – not artificially limited to 'east of the Borough and 'west of the Borough', which disregards the realities described above;
    - (B) financial viability and availability of ESFA-funding;
    - (C) anticipated catchments (including post-development of the Site);
    - (D) anticipated use of LBRuT facilities by out-of-Borough pupils;
    - (E) a proper legal assessment of s.14/s.14A duties and the NPPF specific requirement for primary place provision in particular;
    - (F) planning protections (especially to identify land which does not carry protection for a suitable size);
    - (G) complementary proximate facilities, such as running tracks, sports grounds;
    - (H) impact on the local area – in particular, on traffic, noxious gas emissions<sup>7</sup> (especially in the context of LBRuT being an AQMA and specific areas identified as requiring emissions to be tackled to meet

<sup>5</sup> The Proposed Secondary School would have approximately 35 per cent. more pupils, in approximately 35 per cent. less space, than the LBRuT average.

<sup>6</sup> The PBA Report assumes 30 per cent. of pupils will travel in from these areas.

<sup>7</sup> The clear direction of travel is to mitigate the impact of emissions on pupils, let alone siting a new school in a known pollution hotspot. See, for example: <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/mayors-air-quality-audits-to-protect-london-kids>

legal obligations), public transport, loss of green space, existing catchment areas to minimise displacement (cf. s.14A duty), wider infrastructure, residents and opportunity cost for development of the relevant site for use in other ways; and

- (l) any other material relevant factors, such as statutory consultee opposition (e.g. Network Rail in view of level-crossing).

followed by a specific consultation exercise. Based on the scant evidence base offered to date by LBRuT, this exercise has not been done properly; the decision-making process so far – after the initial consultation process which resulted in the adoption of the APB requiring a primary school on-site – has been incredibly opaque and any future process must be more transparent;

- (f) the North-Western Residential Zone:

- (i) is far too dense, with long, wide blocks (in particular the WL Residential Block);
- (ii) is of too great a scale relative to the scale of the existing site in that area and the clear requirements of the APB and the APB Consultation Materials (40-50 units per hectare, as annexed, cf. an estimated 130 to 170 units per hectare here – over triple the density); and
- (iii) (in outline form at least) frankly resembles an over-bearing 1960's ghetto – the opposite of what the APB sought to achieve. It is not permeable and has no evident design features to make it any less imposing, such as a set-back roof. It would benefit from being punctuated by the occasional A1 (shops and retail outlets) and/or A3 (food and drink) uses.

- (g) the WL Residential Blocks must not be four-storey high blocks of flats; they should:

- (i) include houses (where houses are currently found opposite to reflect the existing urban grain, the APB and the APB Consultation Materials), as well as flats – the APB does not require these all to be located behind Thames Bank, they should be dispersed to reflect the existing local area. Indeed, the Applicant's own CLG presentation 2, which showed its interpretation of the APB, shows houses beside Williams Lane; and
- (ii) be of two and three storeys in height for compliance with the APB (both the APB Scales and Uses Plan and the text, which includes a requirement for the height to diminish towards the perimeter), the Village Plan, and the Local Plan, as well as the NPPF to the extent the units will fall on a part of the site where no buildings are currently sited.

which the Applicant and its advisers acknowledge but assert LBRuT has required them to include in the Plans.

- (h) as a function of (i) increasing scale of the WL Residential Blocks to between 4 and 6 levels and (ii) the WL Residential Blocks encroaching on the 2011 Development, instead of being set back from Williams Lane by approximately 2.5 metres as the existing buildings are at present, the Plans pose material issues of:

- (i) significant loss of daylight and sunlight, as evidenced by the Waterman EIA annex<sup>6</sup>;
- (ii) overshadowing; and
- (iii) loss of privacy;

in each case relative to the footprint of existing non-residential buildings on the Site, and that are inadequately addressed by the Plans and the EIA. A 'buffer' and additional amenity space, proposed by the Applicant to mitigate the impact of these factors, and included in the March Exhibition plans, do not feature in the submitted Plans. Obtrusive light pollution from floodlighting (see below) also remains a concern notwithstanding the EIA concluding obtrusive light will not reach neighbouring houses:

- (i) affordable housing must not be concentrated in any one area, in particular the North-Western Residential Zone adjacent to which can already be found an existing high concentration of affordable housing at Reid Court, Combe House and part of the 2011 Development. Failure to ensure, in accordance with the NPPF and the London Plan, that it is sensitively incorporated into and across the Site will result in the creation of a ghetto that may ultimately contribute to greater deprivation, a lack of social mobility and greater long-term cost to LBRuT and the taxpayer. It would also disproportionately affect residents of the 2011 Development and neighbouring roads. Further, the affordable housing should include 20 per cent. 'affordable rented' – aimed primarily at key-workers – in lieu of 20 per cent. of the 'social rented' allocation and in addition to the 20 per cent. intermediate allocation, to ensure the Development is able to attract key workers and to improve the financial viability analysis (allowing fewer units overall);
- (j) the quasi-total loss of grass, and the loss of one entire playing field, on the existing playing fields is strongly opposed and should be resisted by LBRuT on the basis that:
  - (i) the APB expressly provides for the retention and enhancement of the playing fields for football and/or cricket (noting that only recently were the bowling greens removed to allow construction of the 2011 Development);
  - (ii) the land in question is designated OOLTI, and the criteria for 're-provisioning' (i.e. quantum, quality and openness) of the land removed have very clearly not been satisfied – for instance, a bus park is not OOLTI;
  - (iii) 3G and MUGA are not satisfactory replacements for grass for a whole host of reasons: what it offers to the natural habitat and the ecosystems it supports (which interact closely with those at the nearby river-side, something not adequately addressed by the Waterman EIA), the flood prevention characteristics in a Level 2 flood risk zone and what it contributes to the 'green' character of the area – this is different to the analysis where concrete land is being built on, we already have grass here;
  - (iv) the London Plan, Draft London Plan, Development Masterplan, Draft Local Plan, and the NPPF all place significant value on provision of sporting facilities; the loss of 50 per cent. of the simultaneous playing capacity in Mortlake at peak times simply cannot be supported by LBRuT. Sport Richmond would welcome an alternative of retaining pitches of reinforced grass;

<sup>6</sup> At 18.138: "As would be expected with a Development of this scale, there are isolated significant effects to the neighbouring residential properties." The detailed data included at Appendix 18.2 reveal a 40 per cent reduction in VSC and a 62 per cent reduction in NSC to ground floor habitable rooms at 2 - 6 Williams Lane. This is well beyond what is acceptable.

- (v) retaining two reinforced grass playing fields would offer a similar (and acceptable) use capacity case as one floodlit 3G pitch, and lower on-going financial expense to maintain;
  - (vi) playing fields (and green spaces generally) provide a focal point for a community and the positive effects that such spaces can have on health and well-being are well-researched and well-documented (see, for example, the very recent 'Fields In Trust' survey). Enhancement of green spaces for educational facilities marks a clear direction of travel in policy terms<sup>9</sup>;
  - (vii) the playing fields have archaeological and historical value, being situated as they are to the south of the site of Cromwell House (which site will fall beneath Building 18) and the pitches reportedly having been used by the successful England 1966 World Cup team to train; and
  - (viii) the 'pocket park' is of questionable value, being situated as it is beside a main road, in the middle of a known pollution hotspot and next to a large school where pupils may congregate and encourage anti-social behaviour. Do we really want to encourage children to play informal ball games immediately beside a main road?;
  - (k) parking in the vicinity of the North-Western Residential Zone and on Williams Lane has not been adequately addressed. As a minimum we would expect to see the introduction of a CPZ (with passes and visitor passes made available to existing Group residents) to mitigate the impact that car usage by new residents will have on neighbouring residences. In a sub-urban setting such as this with extremely low PTAL (being 1 beside the North Western Residential Development), levels of car ownership by necessity exceed those proposed of 0.7 cars per unit. Provision should be one car per unit (per the APB), and significantly more than 15 parking spaces should be provided for school staff, sixth-form pupils and visiting sports teams; and
  - (l) (albeit of secondary concern) the use of the red brick is frankly not especially attractive or in-keeping with London brick from the Village Plan – the two local Berkeley Homes developments at Chiswick Gate and Brewery Gate, Twickenham are good examples of what would be more palatable.
- 3.3 The Group would also comment that, unless and until a viable, sustainable, fully-financed and integrated transport plan has been devised for the Site and the surrounding area, it is hard to see how the Borough can contemplate approving any material development? The Applicant's advisers have continually laid the responsibility for transport at the feet of the Borough, TfL, South Western Railways and Network Rail. That may or may not be correct. But irrespective of that, until transport connectivity (critical to site capacity under both the London Plan and the Draft London Plan) – and the consequent impact on vehicular emissions - are addressed, the Plans cannot properly be approved in their current form. For instance, due consideration should be given to extending the 22 and 219 bus services through Mortlake to Kew and/or Richmond, as well as whether river transport can be introduced. Consideration should also be given to introducing a 'fast' or 'semi-fast' service from Mortlake to Vauxhall and London Waterloo (as we understand used to be the case) in view of the significant increase in user-base over the last ten years and anticipated through the Plans.
- 3.4 For the record, the Group is particularly supportive of the following aspects of the Plans:

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.bes.com/news/10m-pot-aside-nature-friendly-schools>

- (a) the location of the Proposed Secondary School (if not the school itself, and provided all efforts should be made to incorporate mitigants that avoid a congregation of pupils around the school);
  - (b) limiting the Proposed Secondary School to three storeys in height (albeit the APB proposed a school of two storeys), but the roof top use should be opposed on the basis of loss of privacy to neighbouring residences;
  - (c) retention of the mature trees (which benefit from TPOs) to the north of the playing fields;
  - (d) making the main entrance to the Proposed Secondary School to the east and making the road to the north of the Proposed Secondary School a 'service road' with emergency-vehicle only access, with raisable bollards, in each case to reduce the impact on existing residences;
  - (e) the provision of at least some green and amenity space on the Site (including the 'Green Link' and the garden courtyards) and the retention of as large an open surface area of the playing fields as possible as grass (albeit not sufficient to override the OOLTI protection);
  - (f) heights of buildings diminishing towards the perimeter of the Site in line with the APB (albeit not sufficiently to be compliant as regards the WL Residential Blocks);
  - (g) improvements to Williams Lane and the introduction of a new, wide pavement on the east of Williams Lane beside the playing fields;
  - (h) widening Williams Lane to the north of the playing fields in places (though this must not encroach on the playing fields nor cause disruption to those residences that border this area);
  - (i) basement parking provision;
  - (j) the mix of uses incorporated and the locations for those uses;
  - (k) incorporating a square/open space on the central / eastern part of the site large enough to accommodate periodical and seasonal attractions such as a farmer's market, an ice-rink or low-key entertainment events;
  - (l) giving community access to the Maltings Building, though this should be two floors including on the second floor a cafe/restaurant/bar that can take advantage of riverside views and be available for community hire – see further the MBCG's comments; and
  - (m) opening up the riverside to the public and introducing new elevated pathways less liable to becoming submerged at high tides.
- 3.5 Applicant section 106 contributions and CIL should be made publicly available and be rigorously pursued by LBRuT planning. However, and this is important, this revenue MUST NOT be used as a means for LBRuT to satisfy itself as to adequate future supply of key facilities and services, such as nursery and primary education and healthcare provision – as LBRuT itself has acknowledged, there are not the available sites in the vicinity to provide these, so on-site provision is essential. If this means a reduction in density, so be it.
- 3.6 Planning conditions should include a restriction on transfer of all or part of the Site by the Applicant for a period of at least 10 years.



- 3.7 Planning conditions should require the Applicant (and the Applicant shall be required to procure that its employees, sub-contractors any other people acting under or for it) to:
- (a) limit the working hours on the site to 9am to 4.30pm, weekdays only;
  - (b) use only constructors registered with the 'Considerate Constructors' scheme;
  - (c) keep noise to a minimum, including through the use of all reasonable mitigation techniques – a number of people living here work from home or have young children who sleep during the day;
  - (d) keep dust and other particle dispersion from the site to a minimum, again including through the use of all reasonable mitigation techniques – a number of people living here suffer from respiratory problems;
  - (e) offer each local resident the option of twice annual cleaning of all external affected by the site development during construction and a 'deep-clean' of all affected residences at the end of construction;
  - (f) ensure access to the Site is almost exclusively via the Lower Richmond Road (or the river) and not via Williams Lane, which is too narrow and runs too close to existing residences / protected trees and green space to accommodate large or heavy vehicles, and
  - (g) give local residents at least one week's notice of the time of any works that might reasonably be expected to be particularly disturbing or exceptional, demolition works being the prime example.
- 3.8 Judgement is reserved on the detailed elements of matters for which approval is presently sought only in outline. In particular, in relation to the design, layout and appearance of the North-Western Residential Zone.
- 3.9 In relation to community consultation, as noted to the Applicant's advisors on a number of occasions throughout the CLG process, comments submitted on behalf of the Group in the CLG sessions, and more generally, have not been given proper consideration. There was very much a feeling of 'form over substance' to some of the sessions. In some cases, positive aspects of the scheme supported by the Group, or which the development team undertook to include, have even been reversed. For instance, the WL Residential Units were reduced to three storeys – as they should be at a maximum – for the July exhibition, but following that, without any community feedback we're aware of requesting this, they were then increased to four storeys. Another example is the removal of amenity space beside Williams Lane proposed at the March exhibition. We have also consistently commented in the need to allocate affordable housing across the site. Notwithstanding this, the Group does note that, after many requests from across the community, the Proposed Secondary School was moved to the location shown in the Plans, which was welcomed.
- 3.10 LBRuT (with expert assistance, where required) should scrutinise the viability data and site management proposals in order to be confident that the development will be self-financing, with high servicing standards, even in a stress-tested scenario such as Brexit. We cannot have a situation where the development falls into disrepair with inadequate provision for maintenance and key services such as pavements, lighting and security. Contingency funds and credit support from the Applicant should be sought.

#### 4. Final comment

There remains a fantastic opportunity to develop the Site in accordance with the terms and objectives of the APB which the Group (literally) bought into and in so doing to create a new

village heart for Mortlake. These will deliver sustainable development for Mortlake and the wider Richmond Borough. Residents entirely recognise that the Borough faces competing demands requiring an analysis of complex facts and difficult decisions. However, that does not mean we should collectively accept what is quite clearly at present a sub-optimal solution.

5. **Heads of objections**

The Group's responses contain objections and observations in respect of the Applications under the following heads:

- (a) Overshadowing
- (b) Loss of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms
- (c) Overlooking / loss of privacy
- (d) Inadequate parking
- (e) Overbearing nature of proposal
- (f) Loss of trees and loss of ecological habitats
- (g) Design and appearance
- (h) Layout and density of buildings
- (i) Effect on listed buildings and conservation areas
- (j) Access
- (k) Traffic generation
- (l) Noise and disturbance from the proposed development
- (m) Public visual amenity
- (n) Flood risk

\*\*\*

### Glossary

Term	Description
2011 Development	The residential development completed in 2011 comprising 17 houses and some 64 apartments at Williams Lane and Wadham Mews, SW14
2015 Cabinet Papers	The minutes relating to and other documents (including the Richmond Council Revised School Place Planning Strategy 2015-2024) prepared for the LBRuT Cabinet meeting on 15th October 2015
3G Pitch	The proposed '3G' artificial full-sized playing field shown in the Plans occupying part of the two grass playing fields
APB	The adopted planning brief for the Site from 2011, a supplementary planning document
APB Materials Consultation	The consultation papers (including the questionnaire and indicative land-use options) relating to the "Barefoot Consultation - Future of Stag Brewery and related areas 2010" carried out by LBRuT as a prelude to the APB. A copy of the preferred 'lower density' residential option referred to in the final APB is annexed.
APB Scale and Uses Plan	The proposed design for the Site, including maximum acceptable scale of buildings, set out at Appendix 1 to the APB
Applicant	Reselton Properties Limited
Application	Has the meaning given to that term at the start of this letter.
AQMA	An 'Air Quality Management Area', designated pursuant to Part IV of the Environment Act 1995
Borough, or LBRuT	The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Development Masterplan	LBRuT's current 'Adopted Development Master Plan'
Education Act	Unless otherwise stated, the Education Act 1995
EIA	The Environmental Impact Assessment relating to the Applications (including its annexures), required pursuant to The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011
Local Plan	The local plan, in its current form on the Borough website pending adoption, further revision and replacement, which will supersede the Development Masterplan
MBCG	The Mortlake Brewery Community Group
MUGA	The proposed 'Multi-Use Games Area' shown in the Plans occupying part of the two grass playing fields

North-Western Residential Zone	The area of the Site occupied in the Plans by Buildings 18, 19 and 20
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework, a material consideration in relation to planning applications pursuant to Sections 19(2)(a) and 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
OOLTI	'Other Land of Outstanding Townscape Importance', a designation afforded by the Development Masterplan and the draft Local Plan
Plans	The detailed proposals for the Site set out in the Applications to which these comments relate.
Proposed Secondary School	The secondary school the subject of Application 18/0548/FUL
Site	The Stag Brewery development site, identified as SA24 in the Local Plan
WL Residential Blocks	That part of the North-Western Residential Zone identified in the Plans as Building 18.

Schedule

Developer's analysis of building heights relative to APB







**Thatcher, Lucy**

---

**From:** Max Millington [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 July 2019 23:45  
**To:** StagBreweryRedevelopment  
**Subject:** Consultation on revised Stag Brewery plans - Williams Lane / Wadham Mews ad hoc group  
**Attachments:** WL WM response to planning applications - July 2019 addendum.DOCX

Good evening

Please find responses attached, which contain objections from the local residents referenced to all three revised applications.

Please let me know soonest should you have any issues reading this or should anything require clarification. As a materially and detrimentally impacted group, we hope to have the opportunity to participate in any forthcoming planning committee hearing.

Regards

Mr Millington.



**To:** London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBRuT), Planning Department

**By email to:** [stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk](mailto:stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk)

**Copy to:** Zac Goldsmith, MP  
Council Leader Gareth Roberts  
Councillors for Mortlake and East Sheen  
and selected others, including statutory consultees.

**Date:** 24 July 2019

**RE:** Response to the following linked planning applications (each, an **Application**) – revised documents June 2019:

1. **18/0547/FUL (Main site – detailed and outline)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0547/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0547/FUL)

2. **18/0548/FUL (Secondary school)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0548/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0548/FUL)

3. **18/0549/FUL (Chalker's Corner works)**

[http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning\\_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0549/FUL](http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/0549/FUL)

Please refer to the glossary at the end of this document for defined terms.

1. **Background**

I am a resident of Williams Lane, Mortlake (SW14) and live immediately adjacent to the Site. I am responding as the 'Community Liaison Group' (CLG) attendee advocating (on an ad hoc basis) the views of a group of Williams Lane & Wadham Mews residents (the **Group**), having previously attended the Applicant's five CLG sessions held in 2017 and 2018 to put forward the general consensus of the Group's views on the emerging plans and submitted representations on behalf of the Group in relation to the original planning applications referenced above.

As far as I am aware, this statement represents the general consensus of the Group's views on the Applications. However, this response is strictly supplemental to any individual responses (including my own) that members of the Group may wish to make and should be read accordingly. This response is made in relation to all relevant aspects of each Application.

The Group moved into the 2011 Development upon construction in December 2011, following adoption by LBRuT of the APB, which itself followed a site-specific consultation. The 2011 Development is shown in the APB Scale and Uses Plan as the 'Approved residential development'. The 2011 Development comprises some 17 houses and 64 flats, approximately 170 residents.

The Group requests that appropriate weight be given to the responses set out below as residents directly affected by the proposed development. **We relied heavily upon LBRuT's then freshly-adopted APB in making an investment and life decision to move here just 7 years ago.** The proposed development, if insensitively pursued in line with the applicant's present proposals, in particular the secondary school, could blight the lives of the residents both during the construction phase and for many years to come, whilst depriving the existing community and future generations of key assets that make Mortlake a green, natural, predominantly sub-urban, site.

2. **Continued opposition to all Applications in light of revised documents submitted and evolving planning and legislative landscape**

- 2.1 The revised plans submitted demonstrate contempt on the part of the applicant for legitimately held views of the severely impacted local community. **No substantive changes** have been made, notwithstanding the Group's concerns which are based, in large part, on sound planning considerations, such as over-density and scale in excess of the APB requirements, significant loss of daylight and sunlight and loss of (OOLITI-protected) green space.
- 2.2 The GLA reasserted the importance of the developer and LBRuT responding to widely held community concerns around a secondary school – 90 per cent of respondents opposed application – yet this remains unaddressed (see further below). Of particular importance, the local primary school, Thomson House, would now appear to have material concerns itself about the need for secondary places based on emerging data. At the same time, the developer has made no provision for primary places required as a result of the present application even though this is a clear requirement of the NPPF – we continue to await a response from LBRuT as to how this is consistent with planning law. Moving Thomson House from its current perilous position beside the level crossing, in a known pollution hotspot, to the Site would respond to numerous groups' concerns.
- 2.3 Further, it is now clear that the demand case for a new secondary school is highly questionable in the longer term: more cost-efficient options are available to meet short-to-medium term (potential) need and, after the initial budge, numbers drop off materially. LBRuT simply must scrutinise this in a view of a number of bodies all questioning the evidence base.
- 2.4 Moreover, the applicant's revised plans fail entirely to respond to LBRuT's legal obligation to reduce emissions in the AQMA: there is simply no basis on which the present proposals could withstand judicial scrutiny. The evidence base – questionable as it was to begin with – must be updated now given lapse of time and material change of circumstance following Hammersmith Bridge closure.
- 2.5 Finally, it is clear on a policy front that social housing must<sup>1</sup>, in future, be blended into and across development sites. The present proposals to allocate all social housing, ghetto-style, to Blocks 18 and 19, in an already sensitive part of the site, is clearly in contravention of that, as indeed it is existing GLA policy. Such housing must be reallocated.
- 2.6 Notwithstanding the foregoing comments in opposition to the applications as presently formed, the Group reasserts its original submissions *mutatis mutandis* as if stated in full in the present response. The Group also endorses comments submitted on behalf of the MBCG.

3. **Opposition to all Applications**

- 3.1 The Group is generally supportive of the Plans in a number of respects – see further paragraph 3.4 below. However, it has a number of key concerns. Accordingly, on the assumption that these issues will not be satisfactorily resolved at this stage, we must **oppose** the Plans in their present form and accordingly **oppose all three Applications**.
- 3.2 Our key concerns and reasons for objection are as follows:

- (a) primarily as a function of its particular physical characteristics, the Site cannot sustain both a large school and high-density residential occupation. Key factors in reaching this conclusion are:
- (i) already-excessive and poorly functioning traffic flow;

<sup>1</sup> <https://news.co.uk/news/political/government-pledges-to-ban-developers-from-making-social-housing-residents-use-different-doors-to-private-owners/>

- (ii) consequent emissions of noxious gases exceeding legal levels in an AQMA, and
- (iii) a strain on local infrastructure and key services that in some cases are already creaking or inadequate – notably public transport, health care, and primary and nursery educational provision,

which will be exacerbated by the cumulative effect of what is proposed and which have not been adequately mitigated by the measures set out in the Plans;

- (b) in relation to overall density, the APB was founded on the basis of community support for a lower-density development: what is proposed, at 897 units, in addition to the large secondary school, is anything but lower density, being:
  - (i) more than double the range proposed in the community-preferred APB Consultation Materials (390 units);
  - (ii) more than double the level of a comparable, recent and local development (Queen Mary's, Roehampton)<sup>2</sup> – despite that site having better transport connectivity (equivalent per-hectare yield of 440 units);
  - (iii) (acknowledging the short-comings of a purely matrix-based approach), approximately triple the level that the GLA matrix would provide as appropriate for a site which is 'predominantly suburban'<sup>3</sup> (296 units) and an average PTAL of 2 and even almost double that applicable to an urban site of that PTAL (493 units)<sup>4</sup>; and
  - (iv) more than triple the level of provision the Borough identified as appropriate in its Monitoring Report on Housing effective at the time of acquisition of the Site by the Applicant (200 to 300 units), and still 80 per cent. in excess of the revised total proposed by LBRuT in July last year following LBRuT's discussion with the developer (500 to 600 units).

Accordingly, residential density (in whatever form it may take) at the proposed levels is grossly excessive and simply must be reduced to be sustainable in this particular locale, especially if sitting alongside the Proposed Secondary School.

- (c) however, given the demonstrable (and increasing, per the Draft London Plan) need for new homes (including affordable supply) in the Borough, the concerns expressed below and independently supported around long term demand for the secondary school and the clear need for a primary school to serve existing pupils (as identified in the 2015 Cabinet Papers, the EIA and from my own personal experience), not to mention the many new pupils who will be resident on the Site, a two-form entry primary school (as per the APB) should be constructed rather than the Proposed Secondary School. The Group is alarmed at the process (or lack thereof) pursued by LBRuT in taking the decision, without consultation, to reverse a key element of the APB and considers that material factors in the evaluation of alternative sites, and in the matching of LBRuT demand and supply, have not been properly considered – including accessibility, the impact on traffic, the environment, the local community and existing residents, the impact on greenfield land and subsidising attendance by out-of-Borough pupils.

<sup>2</sup> <http://wshearthat.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Housing-density-study-051.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Cited from LBRuT commissioned paper on density, full reference below.

<sup>4</sup> Based on current London Plan matrix mid-points and 3.1-3.7 h/units.

- (d) in any event, the Proposed Secondary School is not supportable in its present form: it appears a case of quantity over quality<sup>5</sup> and cramming an excessive number of pupils into a known pollution hotspot – LBRuT owes a duty of care to pupils and its staff – with a single plastic playing field and no due regard for what the Group's parents wish to see (a key factor in LBRuT's duty under s.14A Education Act). Being situated as it is at the edge of the Borough, at this size LBRuT would be powerless to prevent out-of-Borough pupils attending from Hounslow and Hammersmith, to the detriment of LBRuT demand and the LBRuT taxpayer<sup>6</sup>. In contrast, a high-quality, three-form entry secondary school, serving the local communities of Mortlake, Sheen, Barnes and Kew that will need to co-exist alongside the school, would in principle be acceptable to the majority of the Group as an alternative to a primary school – in no case is the Proposed Secondary School supported in its present form.
- (e) before adoption of any proposed school – primary or secondary – there needs to be a much more detailed, publicly-available, independent assessment of:
- (i) the projected local supply and demand, based on appropriate and reasonable assumptions (e.g. local demographics, impact of Brexit, percentage of pupils leaving state education in LBRuT) to ensure there is minimal risk of empty classrooms here or elsewhere in LBRuT as a result of such decision. For instance, we understand the Richmond Park Academy sixth form currently only takes 35 pupils – with a large, new sixth form that may fall further still, despite currently having capacity; and
  - (ii) (only if that reveals a projected shortfall at primary or secondary level) of all the available options for extension of existing sites or use of new sites to satisfy such projected shortfall – including Barn Elms for a secondary school – based on all material factors, to include:
    - (A) accessibility – not artificially limited to 'east of the Borough and 'west of the Borough', which disregards the realities described above;
    - (B) financial viability and availability of ESFA-funding;
    - (C) anticipated catchments (including post-development of the Site);
    - (D) anticipated use of LBRuT facilities by out-of-Borough pupils;
    - (E) a proper legal assessment of s.14/s.14A duties and the NPPF specific requirement for primary place provision in particular;
    - (F) planning protections (especially to identify land which does not carry protection for a suitable size);
    - (G) complementary proximate facilities, such as running tracks, sports grounds;
    - (H) impact on the local area – in particular, on traffic, noxious gas emissions<sup>7</sup> (especially in the context of LBRuT being an AQMA and specific areas identified as requiring emissions to be tackled to meet

<sup>5</sup> The Proposed Secondary School would have approximately 35 per cent. more pupils, in approximately 35 per cent. less space, than the LBRuT average.

<sup>6</sup> The PBA Report assumes 30 per cent. of pupils will travel in from these areas.

<sup>7</sup> The clear direction of travel is to mitigate the impact of emissions on pupils, let alone siting a new school in a known pollution hotspot. See, for example: <https://www.london.gov.uk/press-releases/mayoral/mayors-air-quality-audits-to-protect-london-kids>

legal obligations), public transport, loss of green space, existing catchment areas to minimise displacement (cf. s.14A duty), wider infrastructure, residents and opportunity cost for development of the relevant site for use in other ways; and

- (l) any other material relevant factors, such as statutory consultee opposition (e.g. Network Rail in view of level-crossing).

followed by a specific consultation exercise. Based on the scant evidence base offered to date by LBRuT, this exercise has not been done properly; the decision-making process so far – after the initial consultation process which resulted in the adoption of the APB requiring a primary school on-site – has been incredibly opaque and any future process must be more transparent;

- (f) the North-Western Residential Zone:

- (i) is far too dense, with long, wide blocks (in particular the WL Residential Block);
- (ii) is of too great a scale relative to the scale of the existing site in that area and the clear requirements of the APB and the APB Consultation Materials (40-50 units per hectare, as annexed, cf. an estimated 130 to 170 units per hectare here – over triple the density); and
- (iii) (in outline form at least) frankly resembles an over-bearing 1960's ghetto – the opposite of what the APB sought to achieve. It is not permeable and has no evident design features to make it any less imposing, such as a set-back roof. It would benefit from being punctuated by the occasional A1 (shops and retail outlets) and/or A3 (food and drink) uses.

- (g) the WL Residential Blocks must not be four-storey high blocks of flats; they should:

- (i) include houses (where houses are currently found opposite to reflect the existing urban grain, the APB and the APB Consultation Materials), as well as flats – the APB does not require these all to be located behind Thames Bank, they should be dispersed to reflect the existing local area. Indeed, the Applicant's own CLG presentation 2, which showed its interpretation of the APB, shows houses beside Williams Lane; and
- (ii) be of two and three storeys in height for compliance with the APB (both the APB Scales and Uses Plan and the text, which includes a requirement for the height to diminish towards the perimeter), the Village Plan, and the Local Plan, as well as the NPPF to the extent the units will fall on a part of the site where no buildings are currently sited.

which the Applicant and its advisers acknowledge but assert LBRuT has required them to include in the Plans.

- (h) as a function of (i) increasing scale of the WL Residential Blocks to between 4 and 6 levels and (ii) the WL Residential Blocks encroaching on the 2011 Development, instead of being set back from Williams Lane by approximately 2.5 metres as the existing buildings are at present, the Plans pose material issues of:

- (i) significant loss of daylight and sunlight, as evidenced by the Waterman EIA annex<sup>6</sup>;
- (ii) overshadowing; and
- (iii) loss of privacy;

in each case relative to the footprint of existing non-residential buildings on the Site, and that are inadequately addressed by the Plans and the EIA. A 'buffer' and additional amenity space, proposed by the Applicant to mitigate the impact of these factors, and included in the March Exhibition plans, do not feature in the submitted Plans. Obtrusive light pollution from floodlighting (see below) also remains a concern notwithstanding the EIA concluding obtrusive light will not reach neighbouring houses:

- (i) affordable housing must not be concentrated in any one area, in particular the North-Western Residential Zone adjacent to which can already be found an existing high concentration of affordable housing at Reid Court, Combe House and part of the 2011 Development. Failure to ensure, in accordance with the NPPF and the London Plan, that it is sensitively incorporated into and across the Site will result in the creation of a ghetto that may ultimately contribute to greater deprivation, a lack of social mobility and greater long-term cost to LBRuT and the taxpayer. It would also disproportionately affect residents of the 2011 Development and neighbouring roads. Further, the affordable housing should include 20 per cent. 'affordable rented' – aimed primarily at key-workers – in lieu of 20 per cent. of the 'social rented' allocation and in addition to the 20 per cent. intermediate allocation, to ensure the Development is able to attract key workers and to improve the financial viability analysis (allowing fewer units overall);
- (j) the quasi-total loss of grass, and the loss of one entire playing field, on the existing playing fields is strongly opposed and should be resisted by LBRuT on the basis that:
  - (i) the APB expressly provides for the retention and enhancement of the playing fields for football and/or cricket (noting that only recently were the bowling greens removed to allow construction of the 2011 Development);
  - (ii) the land in question is designated OOLTI, and the criteria for 're-provisioning' (i.e. quantum, quality and openness) of the land removed have very clearly not been satisfied – for instance, a bus park is not OOLTI;
  - (iii) 3G and MUGA are not satisfactory replacements for grass for a whole host of reasons: what it offers to the natural habitat and the ecosystems it supports (which interact closely with those at the nearby river-side, something not adequately addressed by the Waterman EIA), the flood prevention characteristics in a Level 2 flood risk zone and what it contributes to the 'green' character of the area – this is different to the analysis where concrete land is being built on, we already have grass here;
  - (iv) the London Plan, Draft London Plan, Development Masterplan, Draft Local Plan, and the NPPF all place significant value on provision of sporting facilities; the loss of 50 per cent. of the simultaneous playing capacity in Mortlake at peak times simply cannot be supported by LBRuT. Sport Richmond would welcome an alternative of retaining pitches of reinforced grass;

<sup>6</sup> At 18.138: "As would be expected with a Development of this scale, there are isolated significant effects to the neighbouring residential properties." The detailed data included at Appendix 18.2 reveal a 40 per cent reduction in VSC and a 62 per cent reduction in NSC to ground floor habitable rooms at 2 - 6 Williams Lane. This is well beyond what is acceptable.

- (v) retaining two reinforced grass playing fields would offer a similar (and acceptable) use capacity case as one floodlit 3G pitch, and lower on-going financial expense to maintain;
  - (vi) playing fields (and green spaces generally) provide a focal point for a community and the positive effects that such spaces can have on health and well-being are well-researched and well-documented (see, for example, the very recent 'Fields In Trust' survey). Enhancement of green spaces for educational facilities marks a clear direction of travel in policy terms<sup>9</sup>;
  - (vii) the playing fields have archaeological and historical value, being situated as they are to the south of the site of Cromwell House (which site will fall beneath Building 18) and the pitches reportedly having been used by the successful England 1966 World Cup team to train; and
  - (viii) the 'pocket park' is of questionable value, being situated as it is beside a main road, in the middle of a known pollution hotspot and next to a large school where pupils may congregate and encourage anti-social behaviour. Do we really want to encourage children to play informal ball games immediately beside a main road?;
- (k) parking in the vicinity of the North-Western Residential Zone and on Williams Lane has not been adequately addressed. As a minimum we would expect to see the introduction of a CPZ (with passes and visitor passes made available to existing Group residents) to mitigate the impact that car usage by new residents will have on neighbouring residences. In a sub-urban setting such as this with extremely low PTAL (being 1 beside the North Western Residential Development), levels of car ownership by necessity exceed those proposed of 0.7 cars per unit. Provision should be one car per unit (per the APB), and significantly more than 15 parking spaces should be provided for school staff, sixth-form pupils and visiting sports teams; and
- (l) (albeit of secondary concern) the use of the red brick is frankly not especially attractive or in-keeping with London brick from the Village Plan – the two local Berkeley Homes developments at Chiswick Gate and Brewery Gate, Twickenham are good examples of what would be more palatable.
- 3.3 The Group would also comment that, unless and until a viable, sustainable, fully-financed and integrated transport plan has been devised for the Site and the surrounding area, it is hard to see how the Borough can contemplate approving any material development? The Applicant's advisers have continually laid the responsibility for transport at the feet of the Borough, TfL, South Western Railways and Network Rail. That may or may not be correct. But irrespective of that, until transport connectivity (critical to site capacity under both the London Plan and the Draft London Plan) – and the consequent impact on vehicular emissions - are addressed, the Plans cannot properly be approved in their current form. For instance, due consideration should be given to extending the 22 and 219 bus services through Mortlake to Kew and/or Richmond, as well as whether river transport can be introduced. Consideration should also be given to introducing a 'fast' or 'semi-fast' service from Mortlake to Vauxhall and London Waterloo (as we understand used to be the case) in view of the significant increase in user-base over the last ten years and anticipated through the Plans.
- 3.4 For the record, the Group is particularly supportive of the following aspects of the Plans:

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.bes.com/news/10m-pot-aside-nature-friendly-schools>

- (a) the location of the Proposed Secondary School (if not the school itself, and provided all efforts should be made to incorporate mitigants that avoid a congregation of pupils around the school);
  - (b) limiting the Proposed Secondary School to three storeys in height (albeit the APB proposed a school of two storeys), but the roof top use should be opposed on the basis of loss of privacy to neighbouring residences;
  - (c) retention of the mature trees (which benefit from TPOs) to the north of the playing fields;
  - (d) making the main entrance to the Proposed Secondary School to the east and making the road to the north of the Proposed Secondary School a 'service road' with emergency-vehicle only access, with raisable bollards, in each case to reduce the impact on existing residences;
  - (e) the provision of at least some green and amenity space on the Site (including the 'Green Link' and the garden courtyards) and the retention of as large an open surface area of the playing fields as possible as grass (albeit not sufficient to override the OOLTI protection);
  - (f) heights of buildings diminishing towards the perimeter of the Site in line with the APB (albeit not sufficiently to be compliant as regards the WL Residential Blocks);
  - (g) improvements to Williams Lane and the introduction of a new, wide pavement on the east of Williams Lane beside the playing fields;
  - (h) widening Williams Lane to the north of the playing fields in places (though this must not encroach on the playing fields nor cause disruption to those residences that border this area);
  - (i) basement parking provision;
  - (j) the mix of uses incorporated and the locations for those uses;
  - (k) incorporating a square/open space on the central / eastern part of the site large enough to accommodate periodical and seasonal attractions such as a farmer's market, an ice-rink or low-key entertainment events;
  - (l) giving community access to the Maltings Building, though this should be two floors including on the second floor a cafe/restaurant/bar that can take advantage of riverside views and be available for community hire – see further the MBCG's comments; and
  - (m) opening up the riverside to the public and introducing new elevated pathways less liable to becoming submerged at high tides.
- 3.5 Applicant section 106 contributions and CIL should be made publicly available and be rigorously pursued by LBRuT planning. However, and this is important, this revenue MUST NOT be used as a means for LBRuT to satisfy itself as to adequate future supply of key facilities and services, such as nursery and primary education and healthcare provision – as LBRuT itself has acknowledged, there are not the available sites in the vicinity to provide these, so on-site provision is essential. If this means a reduction in density, so be it.
- 3.6 Planning conditions should include a restriction on transfer of all or part of the Site by the Applicant for a period of at least 10 years.



- 3.7 Planning conditions should require the Applicant (and the Applicant shall be required to procure that its employees, sub-contractors any other people acting under or for it) to:
- (a) limit the working hours on the site to 9am to 4.30pm, weekdays only;
  - (b) use only constructors registered with the 'Considerate Constructors' scheme;
  - (c) keep noise to a minimum, including through the use of all reasonable mitigation techniques – a number of people living here work from home or have young children who sleep during the day;
  - (d) keep dust and other particle dispersion from the site to a minimum, again including through the use of all reasonable mitigation techniques – a number of people living here suffer from respiratory problems;
  - (e) offer each local resident the option of twice annual cleaning of all external affected by the site development during construction and a 'deep-clean' of all affected residences at the end of construction;
  - (f) ensure access to the Site is almost exclusively via the Lower Richmond Road (or the river) and not via Williams Lane, which is too narrow and runs too close to existing residences / protected trees and green space to accommodate large or heavy vehicles, and
  - (g) give local residents at least one week's notice of the time of any works that might reasonably be expected to be particularly disturbing or exceptional, demolition works being the prime example.
- 3.8 Judgement is reserved on the detailed elements of matters for which approval is presently sought only in outline. In particular, in relation to the design, layout and appearance of the North-Western Residential Zone.
- 3.9 In relation to community consultation, as noted to the Applicant's advisors on a number of occasions throughout the CLG process, comments submitted on behalf of the Group in the CLG sessions, and more generally, have not been given proper consideration. There was very much a feeling of 'form over substance' to some of the sessions. In some cases, positive aspects of the scheme supported by the Group, or which the development team undertook to include, have even been reversed. For instance, the WL Residential Units were reduced to three storeys – as they should be at a maximum – for the July exhibition, but following that, without any community feedback we're aware of requesting this, they were then increased to four storeys. Another example is the removal of amenity space beside Williams Lane proposed at the March exhibition. We have also consistently commented in the need to allocate affordable housing across the site. Notwithstanding this, the Group does note that, after many requests from across the community, the Proposed Secondary School was moved to the location shown in the Plans, which was welcomed.
- 3.10 LBRuT (with expert assistance, where required) should scrutinise the viability data and site management proposals in order to be confident that the development will be self-financing, with high servicing standards, even in a stress-tested scenario such as Brexit. We cannot have a situation where the development falls into disrepair with inadequate provision for maintenance and key services such as pavements, lighting and security. Contingency funds and credit support from the Applicant should be sought.

#### 4. Final comment

There remains a fantastic opportunity to develop the Site in accordance with the terms and objectives of the APB which the Group (literally) bought into and in so doing to create a new

village heart for Mortlake. These will deliver sustainable development for Mortlake and the wider Richmond Borough. Residents entirely recognise that the Borough faces competing demands requiring an analysis of complex facts and difficult decisions. However, that does not mean we should collectively accept what is quite clearly at present a sub-optimal solution.

5. **Heads of objections**

The Group's responses contain objections and observations in respect of the Applications under the following heads:

- (a) Overshadowing
- (b) Loss of daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms
- (c) Overlooking / loss of privacy
- (d) Inadequate parking
- (e) Overbearing nature of proposal
- (f) Loss of trees and loss of ecological habitats
- (g) Design and appearance
- (h) Layout and density of buildings
- (i) Effect on listed buildings and conservation areas
- (j) Access
- (k) Traffic generation
- (l) Noise and disturbance from the proposed development
- (m) Public visual amenity
- (n) Flood risk

\*\*\*

### Glossary

Term	Description
2011 Development	The residential development completed in 2011 comprising 17 houses and some 64 apartments at Williams Lane and Wadham Mews, SW14
2015 Cabinet Papers	The minutes relating to and other documents (including the Richmond Council Revised School Place Planning Strategy 2015-2024) prepared for the LBRuT Cabinet meeting on 15th October 2015
3G Pitch	The proposed '3G' artificial full-sized playing field shown in the Plans occupying part of the two grass playing fields
APB	The adopted planning brief for the Site from 2011, a supplementary planning document
APB Materials Consultation	The consultation papers (including the questionnaire and indicative land-use options) relating to the "Barefoot Consultation - Future of Stag Brewery and related areas 2010" carried out by LBRuT as a prelude to the APB. A copy of the preferred 'lower density' residential option referred to in the final APB is annexed.
APB Scale and Uses Plan	The proposed design for the Site, including maximum acceptable scale of buildings, set out at Appendix 1 to the APB
Applicant	Reselton Properties Limited
Application	Has the meaning given to that term at the start of this letter.
AQMA	An 'Air Quality Management Area', designated pursuant to Part IV of the Environment Act 1995
Borough, or LBRuT	The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
Development Masterplan	LBRuT's current 'Adopted Development Master Plan'
Education Act	Unless otherwise stated, the Education Act 1995
EIA	The Environmental Impact Assessment relating to the Applications (including its annexures), required pursuant to The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011
Local Plan	The local plan, in its current form on the Borough website pending adoption, further revision and replacement, which will supersede the Development Masterplan
MBCG	The Mortlake Brewery Community Group
MUGA	The proposed 'Multi-Use Games Area' shown in the Plans occupying part of the two grass playing fields

North-Western Residential Zone	The area of the Site occupied in the Plans by Buildings 18, 19 and 20
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework, a material consideration in relation to planning applications pursuant to Sections 19(2)(a) and 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
OOLTI	'Other Land of Outstanding Townscape Importance', a designation afforded by the Development Masterplan and the draft Local Plan
Plans	The detailed proposals for the Site set out in the Applications to which these comments relate.
Proposed Secondary School	The secondary school the subject of Application 18/0548/FUL
Site	The Stag Brewery development site, identified as SA24 in the Local Plan
WL Residential Blocks	That part of the North-Western Residential Zone identified in the Plans as Building 18.

Schedule

Developer's analysis of building heights relative to APB







**Thatcher, Lucy**

---

**From:** Max Millington [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 July 2019 23:45  
**To:** StagBreweryRedevelopment  
**Subject:** Consultation on revised Stag Brewery plans - Williams Lane / Wadham Mews ad hoc group  
**Attachments:** WL WM response to planning applications - July 2019 addendum.DOCX

Good evening

Please find responses attached, which contain objections from the local residents referenced to all three revised applications.

Please let me know soonest should you have any issues reading this or should anything require clarification. As a materially and detrimentally impacted group, we hope to have the opportunity to participate in any forthcoming planning committee hearing.

Regards

Mr Millington.