

Thatcher, Lucy

From: Chris Rowland
Sent: 24 July 2019 11:41
To: StagBreweryRedevelopment
Subject: Fwd: Stag Brewery Re-Development - NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION (Ref: 18/0547/FUL)

Att: Mr Robert Angus

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames

Dear Sir

Re: NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION

Three linked planning applications associated to the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake

Application: A

Ref number: 18/0547/FUL

I am writing in response to your letter dated 24th June, 2019. Firstly, I refer to my letter of objection dated 7th May 2018 (copied below) which I resubmit in full terms. As iterated in said letter and I would point out again, the sheer scale of the proposed redevelopment and the vast number of associated documents creates an insurmountable problem for "neighbours". How is a working lay person meant to be able to find the time and resource to be able to review, study and understand the overwhelming volume of plans, documents and data? Without a substantial investment of time and expensive financial investment for professional advice this project is too big for a "neighbour" to simply review the documents and understand exactly what is being proposed. I find it somewhat bizarre that the (corporate) developers have taken approximately 14 months to address the concerns of neighbours, albeit to seemingly have taken barely any of it into consideration and neighbours now have just 30 days to respond to the revised plans which, as pointed out above, is an insurmountable task to an individual.

I resubmit all of the points of my letter of 7th May 2018, annexed hereto, and highlight a number of points below.

I once again raise particular concern of the proposed height and density of the development. Mortlake is a village environment of low level buildings, in fact I believe other development(s) in the area were rejected on height and lower level plans approved. Mortlake is now threatened to be consumed by overly tall, overly dense, overly urban buildings not in keeping with the area. The plans merely appear to maximise the amount of accommodation that can fit into the available area to maximise return to investors, without proper consideration to existing residents.

As an owner/resident of Mortlake High Street I am also extremely concerned with the frontage of Building 10 onto Mortlake High Street which proposes a car park entrance and a sub-station. These features do nothing to enhance the high street and do not comply with the spirit of the 2011 Planning Brief which encourages active uses of the High Street. The "frontage" of Building 10 feels like the back side of a building and its unappealing façade is being subjected to the existing residents of Mortlake High Street rather than being placed less intrusive place and/or internalised into the new development. The car park entrance and the sub-station could easily be internalised into the new development or designed to utilise the current Brewery entrance/exit on Bull's Alley. The proposed car park entrance/exit is opposite an already busy turning which will create an overly busy junction and affect accessibility. I further contend that the positioning of the car park entrance creates loss of privacy and intrusion on the residents of Butler House.

I note that plans still do not reflect the current structure/positioning of Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, and appear to reflect the previous structure/positioning which was a public house set further back from the road. Has consideration been given to the positioning of Butler House and the fact that it is now a residential property and not a commercial public house?

Of course, mention needs to be made to the ever-growing traffic issues which have been exacerbated by the closure of Hammersmith Bridge. This is a clear example of how the area cannot manage increased traffic levels. Mortlake High Street is frequently at a standstill with traffic trying to reach Clifford Avenue, with the traffic not clearing at all some days. Hopefully the bridge will re-open but it does not appear that this will happen any time soon. Increased density of population will just create similar traffic issues. To try and commence development whilst the bridge is closed should be unthinkable.

Mortlake needs to retain its village environment and new buildings on the High Street need to be in keeping with existing low level structures. The High Street needs to be regenerated and new and old should embrace each other and feel as one. Current plans for the High Street do not do this and it feels like it is being used as a dumping ground for the not so attractive aspects of the development, i.e. car park entrance and sub-station. This does not embrace and tie in old and new. I really hope that Richmond Council listens to residents of Mortlake and the surrounding areas. It is a beautiful part of London and Mortlake should be allowed to retain its character and not become centred on and lost to a new concrete, urban development. New developments are needed and can work well but they should be made to work with the existing areas, not try to create something isolated and new.

Yours faithfully

Flat 5, Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, London SW14 8HR

(PLEASE RESPOND BY EMAIL AND POST)

BY EMAIL (stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk) AND RECORDED DELIVERY

7 May 2018

Robert Angus
Head of Development Management
Environment Directorate/Development Management
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham
TW1 3BZ

Dear Sir

Re: **NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION**

Three linked planning applications associated to the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake

Application: A

Ref number: 18/0547/FUL

Thank you for your letter of 9 April 2018 to which I write in response. As the owner of Flat 5, Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, I have numerous comments and objections to raise with regard to the above stated planning application for the former Stag Brewery site in Mortlake.

Firstly, it needs to be said that the sheer scale of the proposed redevelopment and the vast number of associated documents creates an insurmountable problem for "neighbours" of said development. How is a working lay person meant to be able to find the time and resource to be able to review, study and understand the overwhelming volume of plans, documents and data? Without a substantial investment of time and expensive financial investment for professional advice this project is too big for a "neighbour" to simply review the documents and understand exactly what is being proposed. The "neighbours" are therefore somewhat at the mercy/peril of the Council to do the right thing.

I will structure my letter in two parts. Firstly, my objections as an owner of Butler House. Secondly, comments in general and effects on Mortlake.

1. Comments/objections as owner of Butler House

- 1.1 From all of the documents/drawings I have been able to review it is apparent that the footprint of Butler House is not in the correct position. Perhaps the footprint relates to the previous commercial public house that was located on the site? The current Butler House stands much closer to Mortlake High Street than shown on the drawings and is now a residential building not a public house. I seek affirmation that Butler House will be repositioned on plans and acknowledged as a residential block of flats and not a public house and all consequent and relevant consideration be given to its correct use and location.
- 1.2 The proposed Building 10 which faces directly onto Mortlake High Street directly opposite Butler House includes a substation, "flexible use" and the entrance/exit to the basement car park for 400+ cars.

1-

7

- (c) noise and disturbance created generally by size and density of proposed development, being located immediately opposite Butler House
- (b) due to noise from security openings on proposed entrance/exit to basement car park
- (a) due to traffic generation per above
- 1.16 Noise and disturbance resulting from use:
- (a) increase in traffic in vicinity due to density of proposed development
- (b) increase in traffic immediately opposite/adjacent to Butler House due to entrance/exit to proposed basement car park for 400+ cars being opposite Butler House
- (c) increase in traffic in immediate vicinity to Butler House due to entrance/exit for deliveries to said development being almost opposite Butler House
- 1.9 Traffic generation:
- (a) increased traffic on already busy roads
- (b) new road layout causing loss of adequate vision
- (c) narrowing of road due to addition of turning lane for proposed basement car park
- (d) loss of adequate traffic island for pedestrians
- 1.8 Highway Safety comprised due to:
- (a) loss of already maintained and limited street parking spaces
- (b) further loss of street parking due to increased number of residents in area
- (c) loss of accessibility to Vineyard Path due to proposed narrowing of opening
- (d) loss of ease of exit from Vineyard Path due to new turning lane into proposed basement car park entrance
- 1.7 Adequacy of parking/loading/unloading
- 1.6 Diminished visual amenity of direct outlook of Flat 5 of Butler House into the entrance/exit way of basement car park and substitution of proposed development
- 1.5 Loss of privacy caused by entrance/exit to 400+ space car park and waiting/turn lane to said car park being directly in front of and opposite Flat 5 of Butler House including intrusion of headlights from exiting cars directly along into Flat 5 of Butler House – especially given the fact the car park will be located underground and will require a ramp from street level to enter and exit.
- 1.4 Overloading/loss of privacy from the 5 storey building (Building 10) proposed directly opposite Butler House.
- 1.3 Loss of light/overshadowing from the proposed 5 storey building (Building 10) proposed directly opposite Butler House and the proposed 7 storey building (Building 17?) immediately behind it.
- (a) I contend that planners did not consider Butler House as a residential property when proposing such visibility and privacy intrusive features in this location.
- (b) Further, these features do nothing to enhance the high street and do not comply with the spirit of the 2011 Planning Act which encourages active uses of High Street. The "fringe" of building 10 feels like the back side of a building and its unimposing facade being subjected to the existing residents of Mortlake High Street rather than being placed in a less intrusive place and/or internalised into the new development.

- 1.11 Increase in hazardous materials/smells due to inordinate increase in traffic due to size and density of proposed redevelopment.
- 1.12 Loss of trees in immediate vicinity of Butler House due to narrowing of traffic island to accommodate new turning lane into entrance/exit way for proposed basement car park for 400+ cars.
- 1.13 Loss of iconic brewery boundary wall along Mortlake High Street.
2. General opposition to development:
- 2.1 Height and density of buildings:
- Cumulative density of the development is overwhelming to the surrounding area.
 - Plans illustrate around 211 units/hectare east of Ship Lane, whilst the existing average density for Mortlake is circa 70 units/hectare, [exceeding London Plan guidelines on development density].
 - Proposals exceed the height constraints in the Council's Planning Brief for the site published in 2011.
 - Proposals increase the Mortlake population by approximately 40% with insufficient solutions to improve infrastructure of transport, roads etc. to support such rapid growth in population in the area.
 - The height, density and proximity of new buildings sited so close together creates issues of overlooking and significant overshadowing and loss of light between buildings. Proposed green spaces between buildings are cursory only. They cannot hope to be enjoyed and utilised as open spaces as they are too enclosed by tall, close buildings.
- 2.2 Traffic, access and parking:
- Inordinate increase in traffic on already congested roads, also reducing air quality.
 - Further demand on street parking spaces already at capacity.
 - Limited access points to the site east of Ship Lane and related basement car park.
 - Access to car park and roadway on Mortlake High Street is badly placed for existing residents and for accessibility.
- 2.3 There appears to have been no consideration given to enhancing Mortlake High Street, rather the opposite.
- 2.4 Focus on green areas centres on the "Green Link". There does not seem to be much consideration to green areas and open space to the eastern side of the development or assurance that all green areas are and remain suitable, usable communal spaces. Unfortunately, with the exception of the Green Link, green areas appear cursory. The height and density of the proposed surrounding buildings does not permit them to be enjoyable, usable spaces.

The arguments against density, traffic and transport go on and on.

In summary, the essence of Mortlake stands to be lost. Mortlake is a village environment of low level buildings. It is now threatened to be consumed by overly tall, overly dense, overly urban buildings not in keeping with the area. As plans currently stand they merely appear to maximise the amount of accommodation that can fit into the available area to maximise return to investors, without proper consideration to existing residents. Please, please don't sell the soul of Mortlake.

I would like to add that I have not at any point reviewed the proposed flood defences of the new development as this is something I do not feel qualified to comment on. I entrust the Council to ensure flood protection is more than adequately addressed and compromises not made.

Finally, I would like to remind you of the Council's Vision on page 15 of the Council's Planning Brief of July 2011.

Council's Vision

4.2 The overall vision is based on the desire to provide a new village heart for Mortlake based on buildings and public realm of the highest quality that will radically transform Mortlake whilst respecting the character and history of the area. The site should provide a new recreational and living quarter with a mix of uses aimed at creating vibrant links between the River and the town and enlivening the Riverside frontage and Mortlake High Street, fully realising this unique opportunity for the Mortlake community.

4.3 One of the most important aspect of the vision is that there should be a new green space linking to the Riverside, to enable the community to freely access and enjoy the areas main asset, the River Thames. The green space should be bordered by high quality buildings of a traditional style sensitive to the local vernacular, and creating a 'sense of place' similar to other areas such as at Richmond Green or Barnes Green. Buildings addressing this new open public realm must contain a mix of uses and create animated active frontages.

4.4 The Council will require a mix of uses throughout the area and particularly to the east of Ship Lane to create a new Mortlake Village, to generate vibrancy, local employment community and leisure opportunities. These should include restaurants and cafes and small retail spaces, community leisure uses, a museum, boat houses and other river-related uses/activities. They should also include lower cost units suitable for small businesses, creative industries and scientific and technical businesses including green technology, together with mixed tenure high quality housing. The new green space will be the core of the new community and it should provide the centre piece of a new community hub as well as high quality open public realm and landscape with open access to the river as well as maximising the considerable assets and history of the area. The opportunity should be taken to enhance biodiversity throughout the site and particularly along the river.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or follow up in relation to this matter.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs J Rowland

cc (by email): Zac Goldsmith, MP
Councillor Paul Hodgins
Leader of the Council
Paul Avon
Ward Councillor
Gemma Curran
Ward Councillor
Alice Bridges-Westcott
Ward Councillor

zac@goldsmith.com, charloste@zoffice.co.uk
Clr.PHodgins@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.PAvon@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.GCurran@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.ABridges-Westcott@richmond.gov.uk

All services are supplied on the basis of the firm's standard Terms of Engagement which can be found [here](#). We take the protection of personal data very seriously. Full details of how we will process your personal data can be found in our [Privacy Statement](#).

WALKERS' DISCLAIMER: The information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable laws. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information in any way. If you receive this email in error, please inform us immediately and then delete it from your system. Due to the nature of email communication, Walkers and its affiliated entities accept no responsibility for any viruses or for the reliability, security, inaccuracy, incompleteness, interception, corruption, loss or delay of information exchanged.

Thatcher, Lucy

From: Chris Rowland
Sent: 24 July 2019 11:41
To: StagBreweryRedevelopment
Subject: Fwd: Stag Brewery Re-Development - NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION (Ref: 18/0547/FUL)

Att: Mr Robert Angus

Head of Development Management

London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames

Dear Sir

Re: NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION

Three linked planning applications associated to the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake

Application: A

Ref number: 18/0547/FUL

I am writing in response to your letter dated 24th June, 2019. Firstly, I refer to my letter of objection dated 7th May 2018 (copied below) which I resubmit in full terms. As iterated in said letter and I would point out again, the sheer scale of the proposed redevelopment and the vast number of associated documents creates an insurmountable problem for "neighbours". How is a working lay person meant to be able to find the time and resource to be able to review, study and understand the overwhelming volume of plans, documents and data? Without a substantial investment of time and expensive financial investment for professional advice this project is too big for a "neighbour" to simply review the documents and understand exactly what is being proposed. I find it somewhat bizarre that the (corporate) developers have taken approximately 14 months to address the concerns of neighbours, albeit to seemingly have taken barely any of it into consideration and neighbours now have just 30 days to respond to the revised plans which, as pointed out above, is an insurmountable task to an individual.

I resubmit all of the points of my letter of 7th May 2018, annexed hereto, and highlight a number of points below.

I once again raise particular concern of the proposed height and density of the development. Mortlake is a village environment of low level buildings, in fact I believe other development(s) in the area were rejected on height and lower level plans approved. Mortlake is now threatened to be consumed by overly tall, overly dense, overly urban buildings not in keeping with the area. The plans merely appear to maximise the amount of accommodation that can fit into the available area to maximise return to investors, without proper consideration to existing residents.

As an owner/resident of Mortlake High Street I am also extremely concerned with the frontage of Building 10 onto Mortlake High Street which proposes a car park entrance and a sub-station. These features do nothing to enhance the high street and do not comply with the spirit of the 2011 Planning Brief which encourages active uses of the High Street. The "frontage" of Building 10 feels like the back side of a building and its unappealing façade is being subjected to the existing residents of Mortlake High Street rather than being placed less intrusive place and/or internalised into the new development. The car park entrance and the sub-station could easily be internalised into the new development or designed to utilise the current Brewery entrance/exit on Bull's Alley. The proposed car park entrance/exit is opposite an already busy turning which will create an overly busy junction and affect accessibility. I further contend that the positioning of the car park entrance creates loss of privacy and intrusion on the residents of Butler House.

I note that plans still do not reflect the current structure/positioning of Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, and appear to reflect the previous structure/positioning which was a public house set further back from the road. Has consideration been given to the positioning of Butler House and the fact that it is now a residential property and not a commercial public house?

Of course, mention needs to be made to the ever-growing traffic issues which have been exacerbated by the closure of Hammersmith Bridge. This is a clear example of how the area cannot manage increased traffic levels. Mortlake High Street is frequently at a standstill with traffic trying to reach Clifford Avenue, with the traffic not clearing at all some days. Hopefully the bridge will re-open but it does not appear that this will happen any time soon. Increased density of population will just create similar traffic issues. To try and commence development whilst the bridge is closed should be unthinkable.

Mortlake needs to retain its village environment and new buildings on the High Street need to be in keeping with existing low level structures. The High Street needs to be regenerated and new and old should embrace each other and feel as one. Current plans for the High Street do not do this and it feels like it is being used as a dumping ground for the not so attractive aspects of the development, i.e. car park entrance and sub-station. This does not embrace and tie in old and new. I really hope that Richmond Council listens to residents of Mortlake and the surrounding areas. It is a beautiful part of London and Mortlake should be allowed to retain its character and not become centred on and lost to a new concrete, urban development. New developments are needed and can work well but they should be made to work with the existing areas, not try to create something isolated and new.

Yours faithfully

Flat 5, Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, London SW14 8HR

(PLEASE RESPOND BY EMAIL AND POST)

BY EMAIL (stagbreweryredevelopment@richmond.gov.uk) AND RECORDED DELIVERY

7 May 2018

Robert Angus
Head of Development Management
Environment Directorate/Development Management
London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham
TW1 3BZ

Dear Sir

Re: **NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION**

Three linked planning applications associated to the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake

Application: A

Ref number: 18/0547/FUL

Thank you for your letter of 9 April 2018 to which I write in response. As the owner of Flat 5, Butler House, 40 Mortlake High Street, I have numerous comments and objections to raise with regard to the above stated planning application for the former Stag Brewery site in Mortlake.

Firstly, it needs to be said that the sheer scale of the proposed redevelopment and the vast number of associated documents creates an insurmountable problem for "neighbours" of said development. How is a working lay person meant to be able to find the time and resource to be able to review, study and understand the overwhelming volume of plans, documents and data? Without a substantial investment of time and expensive financial investment for professional advice this project is too big for a "neighbour" to simply review the documents and understand exactly what is being proposed. The "neighbours" are therefore somewhat at the mercy/peril of the Council to do the right thing.

I will structure my letter in two parts. Firstly, my objections as an owner of Butler House. Secondly, comments in general and effects on Mortlake.

1. Comments/objections as owner of Butler House

- 1.1 From all of the documents/drawings I have been able to review it is apparent that the footprint of Butler House is not in the correct position. Perhaps the footprint relates to the previous commercial public house that was located on the site? The current Butler House stands much closer to Mortlake High Street than shown on the drawings and is now a residential building not a public house. I seek affirmation that Butler House will be repositioned on plans and acknowledged as a residential block of flats and not a public house and all consequent and relevant consideration be given to its correct use and location.
- 1.2 The proposed Building 10 which faces directly onto Mortlake High Street directly opposite Butler House includes a substation, "flexible use" and the entrance/exit to the basement car park for 400+ cars.

1-

7

- (c) noise and disturbance created generally by size and density of proposed development, being located immediately opposite Butler House
- (b) due to noise from security openings on proposed entrance/exit to basement car park
- (a) due to traffic generation per above
- 1.16 Noise and disturbance resulting from use:
- (a) increase in traffic generally due to density of proposed development
- (b) increase in traffic immediately opposite/adjacent to Butler House due to entrance/exit to proposed basement car park for 400+ cars being opposite Butler House
- (c) increase in traffic in immediate vicinity to Butler House due to entrance/exit for deliveries to said development being almost opposite Butler House
- 1.9 Traffic generation:
- (a) increased traffic on already busy roads
- (b) new road layout causing loss of adequate vision
- (c) narrowing of road due to addition of turning lane for proposed basement car park
- (d) loss of adequate traffic island for pedestrians
- 1.8 Highway safety comprised due to:
- (a) loss of already maintained and limited street parking spaces
- (b) further loss of street parking due to proposed narrowing of opening
- (c) loss of accessibility to Vineyard Path due to new turning lane into proposed basement car park entrance
- (d) loss of ease of exit from Vineyard Path due to new turning lane into proposed basement car park entrance
- 1.7 Adequacy of parking/loading/unloading
- 1.6 Diminished visual amenity of direct outlook of Flat 5 of Butler House into the entrance/exit way of basement car park and substitution of proposed development
- 1.5 Loss of privacy caused by entrance/exit to 400+ space car park and waiting/turn lane to said car park being directly in front of and opposite Flat 5 of Butler House including intrusion of headlights from exiting cars directly along into Flat 5 of Butler House – especially given the fact the car park will be located underground and will require a ramp from street level to enter and exit.
- 1.4 Overloading/loss of privacy from the 5 storey building (Building 10) proposed directly opposite Butler House.
- 1.3 Loss of light/overshadowing from the proposed 5 storey building (Building 10) proposed directly opposite Butler House and the proposed 7 storey building (Building 17?) immediately behind it.
- (a) I contend that planners did not consider Butler House as a residential property when proposing such visually and privacy intrusive features in this location.
- (b) Further, these features do nothing to enhance the high street and do not comply with the spirit of the 2011 Planning Act which encourages active uses of High Street. The "fringe" of Building 10 feels like the back side of a building and its unimposing facade being subjected to the existing residents of Mortlake High Street rather than being placed in a less intrusive place and/or internalised into the new development.

- 1.11 Increase in hazardous materials/smells due to inordinate increase in traffic due to size and density of proposed redevelopment.
- 1.12 Loss of trees in immediate vicinity of Butler House due to narrowing of traffic island to accommodate new turning lane into entrance/exit way for proposed basement car park for 400+ cars.
- 1.13 Loss of iconic brewery boundary wall along Mortlake High Street.
2. General opposition to development:
- 2.1 Height and density of buildings:
- Cumulative density of the development is overwhelming to the surrounding area.
 - Plans illustrate around 211 units/hectare east of Ship Lane, whilst the existing average density for Mortlake is circa 70 units/hectare, [exceeding London Plan guidelines on development density].
 - Proposals exceed the height constraints in the Council's Planning Brief for the site published in 2011.
 - Proposals increase the Mortlake population by approximately 40% with insufficient solutions to improve infrastructure of transport, roads etc. to support such rapid growth in population in the area.
 - The height, density and proximity of new buildings sited so close together creates issues of overlooking and significant overshadowing and loss of light between buildings. Proposed green spaces between buildings are cursory only. They cannot hope to be enjoyed and utilised as open spaces as they are too enclosed by tall, close buildings.
- 2.2 Traffic, access and parking:
- Inordinate increase in traffic on already congested roads, also reducing air quality.
 - Further demand on street parking spaces already at capacity.
 - Limited access points to the site east of Ship Lane and related basement car park.
 - Access to car park and roadway on Mortlake High Street is badly placed for existing residents and for accessibility.
- 2.3 There appears to have been no consideration given to enhancing Mortlake High Street, rather the opposite.
- 2.4 Focus on green areas centres on the "Green Link". There does not seem to be much consideration to green areas and open space to the eastern side of the development or assurance that all green areas are and remain suitable, usable communal spaces. Unfortunately, with the exception of the Green Link, green areas appear cursory. The height and density of the proposed surrounding buildings does not permit them to be enjoyable, usable spaces.

The arguments against density, traffic and transport go on and on.

In summary, the essence of Mortlake stands to be lost. Mortlake is a village environment of low level buildings. It is now threatened to be consumed by overly tall, overly dense, overly urban buildings not in keeping with the area. As plans currently stand they merely appear to maximise the amount of accommodation that can fit into the available area to maximise return to investors, without proper consideration to existing residents. Please, please don't sell the soul of Mortlake.

I would like to add that I have not at any point reviewed the proposed flood defences of the new development as this is something I do not feel qualified to comment on. I entrust the Council to ensure flood protection is more than adequately addressed and compromises not made.

Finally, I would like to remind you of the Council's Vision on page 15 of the Council's Planning Brief of July 2011.

Council's Vision

4.2 The overall vision is based on the desire to provide a new village heart for Mortlake based on buildings and public realm of the highest quality that will radically transform Mortlake whilst respecting the character and history of the area. The site should provide a new recreational and living quarter with a mix of uses aimed at creating vibrant links between the River and the town and enlivening the Riverside frontage and Mortlake High Street, fully realising this unique opportunity for the Mortlake community.

4.3 One of the most important aspect of the vision is that there should be a new green space linking to the Riverside, to enable the community to freely access and enjoy the areas main asset, the River Thames. The green space should be bordered by high quality buildings of a traditional style sensitive to the local vernacular, and creating a 'sense of place' similar to other areas such as at Richmond Green or Barnes Green. Buildings addressing this new open public realm must contain a mix of uses and create animated active frontages.

4.4 The Council will require a mix of uses throughout the area and particularly to the east of Ship Lane to create a new Mortlake Village, to generate vibrancy, local employment community and leisure opportunities. These should include restaurants and cafes and small retail spaces, community leisure uses, a museum, boat houses and other river-related uses/activities. They should also include lower cost units suitable for small businesses, creative industries and scientific and technical businesses including green technology, together with mixed tenure high quality housing. The new green space will be the core of the new community and it should provide the centre piece of a new community hub as well as high quality open public realm and landscape with open access to the river as well as maximising the considerable assets and history of the area. The opportunity should be taken to enhance biodiversity throughout the site and particularly along the river.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or follow up in relation to this matter.

Yours faithfully,



Mrs J Rowland

cc (by email): Zac Goldsmith, MP
Councillor Paul Hodgins
Leader of the Council
Paul Avon
Ward Councillor
Gemma Curran
Ward Councillor
Alice Bridges-Westcott
Ward Councillor

zac@goldsmith.com, charloste@zoffice.co.uk
Clr.PHodgins@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.PAvon@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.GCurran@richmond.gov.uk
Clr.ABridges-Westcott@richmond.gov.uk

All services are supplied on the basis of the firm's standard Terms of Engagement which can be found [here](#). We take the protection of personal data very seriously. Full details of how we will process your personal data can be found in our [Privacy Statement](#).

WALKERS' DISCLAIMER: The information in this email may be confidential, legally privileged and exempt from disclosure under applicable laws. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use or disseminate the information in any way. If you receive this email in error, please inform us immediately and then delete it from your system. Due to the nature of email communication, Walkers and its affiliated entities accept no responsibility for any viruses or for the reliability, security, inaccuracy, incompleteness, interception, corruption, loss or delay of information exchanged.
