

RECEIVED  
19 JUL 2019

10 Vineyard Heights  
30 Mortlake High Street  
London SW14 8HX

The Planning Department  
London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames  
Civic Centre  
York Street  
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

17 July 2019

Dear Sirs

**Former Stag Brewery Site – Neighbour Consultation**  
**18/0547/FUL, 18/0548FUL and 18/549FUL**

I live on the fifth floor of an apartment block overlooking the former Stag Brewery Site. I am therefore very concerned by the proposals for the redevelopment of this site so intensively. I object to these proposals on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development represents a significant over-development in what is recognised as an essentially low-scale, low density sub-urban setting.
2. In many respects the proposals do not comply with the Adopted Planning Brief for the sale in terms of height, scale and massing. This is particularly so in the north-west area of the site where the blocks are very high and over-dominating. In the eastern sections of the site several of the blocks overwhelm the riverside, towpath and High Street. Clearly new housing is required, but this scheme is far too dense, to the detriment of both current and new residents.
3. The loss of the existing sports fields is in direct contravention of the Planning Brief and is wholly unacceptable. The hard all-weather multi-use games area with fencing and floodlighting which is proposed as their replacement is a highly unsuitable substitute. The protected sports fields are designated as "Other Open Land of Townscape Importance" and should be retained as such for community use.
4. The area of genuine open amenity space provided in the proposals (c.25%) is lower than the base provision in the Planning Brief (c.28% for sports fields and green link).
5. The site is uniquely and significantly constrained by the River Thames to the north and the level crossings on the Richmond/Waterloo line. This places huge pressure on Sheen Lane, Mortlake High Street and Lower Richmond Road, which are at certain times blocked with traffic even in normal circumstances. The proposed cumulative scale of the development and high parking provision combined with access traffic will create unbearable congestion on both the roads and local infrastructure. The rise in the level of pollution from the increased traffic will be intolerable, and possibly illegal.
6. The introduction of a 1200-pupil secondary school will increase the pressure on access roads and other infrastructure and will exacerbate the risks at the Mortlake station level crossing – already recognised as dangerous. The congestion caused by the arrival of 1200 pupils as well as teaching and administrative staff between 8am and 9am every day would be intolerable.
7. I understand that there is no evidence or documented justification for a new secondary school with a sixth form. This issue is highlighted in the Mayor's Stage 1 Report and the community have had no detail presented to support this aspect of the scheme. Expansion of existing secondary schools on their own sites should be investigated and I believe that funding mechanisms are available to the Council via the developer as outlined in April 2017 guidance from the Department of Education.

8. The Viability Assessment appears unrealistic, only supporting a very low affordable housing allocation. Affordable provision should be spread over the whole site and not concentrated in one area or block.
9. The proposals for Chalker's Corner, which appear to be an attempt to justify the scale of the new development, are totally unacceptable, involving as they do the loss of mature trees (a valuable counter to pollution) and moving the road so that it abuts Chertsey Court. The residents will suffer visual intrusion, noise, pollution and the loss of protected land. The necessary works will be expensive (I have been given a figure of £8m.) and hugely disruptive for all local residents.

In summary, the latest changes and information submitted by the applicant make no substantive response to major concerns about the proposed development in the three planning applications. The proposals should be scaled down considerably and the density of the buildings reduced. Alternatives to the secondary school should be examined.

Finally, no substantive work on the site should be permitted until Hammersmith Bridge has been reopened. The addition of works traffic to the current congestion would be intolerable.

Yours faithfully



DJR Wells

RECEIVED  
19 JUL 2019

10 Vineyard Heights  
30 Mortlake High Street  
London SW14 8HX

The Planning Department  
London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames  
Civic Centre  
York Street  
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

17 July 2019

Dear Sirs

**Former Stag Brewery Site – Neighbour Consultation**  
**18/0547/FUL, 18/0548FUL and 18/549FUL**

I live on the fifth floor of an apartment block overlooking the former Stag Brewery Site. I am therefore very concerned by the proposals for the redevelopment of this site so intensively. I object to these proposals on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development represents a significant over-development in what is recognised as an essentially low-scale, low density sub-urban setting.
2. In many respects the proposals do not comply with the Adopted Planning Brief for the sale in terms of height, scale and massing. This is particularly so in the north-west area of the site where the blocks are very high and over-dominating. In the eastern sections of the site several of the blocks overwhelm the riverside, towpath and High Street. Clearly new housing is required, but this scheme is far too dense, to the detriment of both current and new residents.
3. The loss of the existing sports fields is in direct contravention of the Planning Brief and is wholly unacceptable. The hard all-weather multi-use games area with fencing and floodlighting which is proposed as their replacement is a highly unsuitable substitute. The protected sports fields are designated as "Other Open Land of Townscape Importance" and should be retained as such for community use.
4. The area of genuine open amenity space provided in the proposals (c.25%) is lower than the base provision in the Planning Brief (c.28% for sports fields and green link).
5. The site is uniquely and significantly constrained by the River Thames to the north and the level crossings on the Richmond/Waterloo line. This places huge pressure on Sheen Lane, Mortlake High Street and Lower Richmond Road, which are at certain times blocked with traffic even in normal circumstances. The proposed cumulative scale of the development and high parking provision combined with access traffic will create unbearable congestion on both the roads and local infrastructure. The rise in the level of pollution from the increased traffic will be intolerable, and possibly illegal.
6. The introduction of a 1200-pupil secondary school will increase the pressure on access roads and other infrastructure and will exacerbate the risks at the Mortlake station level crossing – already recognised as dangerous. The congestion caused by the arrival of 1200 pupils as well as teaching and administrative staff between 8am and 9am every day would be intolerable.
7. I understand that there is no evidence or documented justification for a new secondary school with a sixth form. This issue is highlighted in the Mayor's Stage 1 Report and the community have had no detail presented to support this aspect of the scheme. Expansion of existing secondary schools on their own sites should be investigated and I believe that funding mechanisms are available to the Council via the developer as outlined in April 2017 guidance from the Department of Education.

8. The Viability Assessment appears unrealistic, only supporting a very low affordable housing allocation. Affordable provision should be spread over the whole site and not concentrated in one area or block.
9. The proposals for Chalker's Corner, which appear to be an attempt to justify the scale of the new development, are totally unacceptable, involving as they do the loss of mature trees (a valuable counter to pollution) and moving the road so that it abuts Chertsey Court. The residents will suffer visual intrusion, noise, pollution and the loss of protected land. The necessary works will be expensive (I have been given a figure of £8m.) and hugely disruptive for all local residents.

In summary, the latest changes and information submitted by the applicant make no substantive response to major concerns about the proposed development in the three planning applications. The proposals should be scaled down considerably and the density of the buildings reduced. Alternatives to the secondary school should be examined.

Finally, no substantive work on the site should be permitted until Hammersmith Bridge has been reopened. The addition of works traffic to the current congestion would be intolerable.

Yours faithfully



DJR Wells