



Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Sports Pitch Lighting Assessment

For Reselton Properties

March 2022

Former Stag Brewery, Mortlake.

Sports Pitch Lighting Assessment Summary

Document: 547-(010)-RP-EX-LA-A

Introduction

1.1 This Lighting Strategy has been prepared by Michael Grubb Studio on behalf of Reselton Properties Limited (“the Applicant”) in support of two linked planning applications (“the Applications”) for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake (“the Site”) within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).

Proposals

1.2 The Applications seek planning permission for:

Application A:

“Hybrid application to include the demolition of existing buildings to allow for comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:

Planning permission is sought in detail for works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:

- a) **Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks**
- b) **Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one to two storeys below ground**
- c) **Residential apartments**
- d) **Flexible use floorspace for:**
 - i. **Retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses**
 - ii. **Offices**
 - iii. **Non-residential institutions and community use**

iv. Boathouse

- e) Hotel / public house with accommodation**
- f) Cinema**
- g) Offices**
- h) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works**
- i) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level**
- j) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping**
- k) Flood defence and towpath works**
- l) Installation of plant and energy equipment**

Planning permission is also sought in outline with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:

- a) The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeys**
- b) Residential development**
- c) Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking**
- d) Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping**
- e) New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works”**

Application B:

“Detailed planning permission for the erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and other associated works”

1.3 Together, Applications A and B described above comprise the ‘Proposed Development’.

Background to Submission

- 1.4 The Applications follow earlier planning applications which were refused by the Greater London Authority. The refused applications were for:
- a) Application A – hybrid planning application for comprehensive mixed use redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery site consisting of:
 - i. Land to the east of Ship Lane applied for in detail (referred to as ‘Development Area 1’ throughout); and
 - ii. Land to the west of Ship Lane (excluding the school) applied for in outline (referred to as ‘Development Area 2’ throughout).
 - b) Application B – detailed planning application for the school (on land to the west of Ship Lane).
 - c) Application C – detailed planning application for highways and landscape works at Chalkers Corner.
- 1.5 The LBRuT (the Council) originally resolved to grant planning permission for Applications A and B but refuse Application C.
- 1.6 Following the LBRuT’s resolution to approve the applications A and B, the Mayor called-in the applications and became the determining authority. The Mayor’s reasons for calling in the applications were set out in his Stage II letter (dated 4 May 2020) but specifically related to concerns regarding what he considered was a low percentage of affordable housing being proposed for the Site and the need to secure a highways solution for the scheme following the LBRuT’s refusal of Application C.
- 1.7 Working with the Mayor’s team, the Applicant sought to meaningfully respond to the Mayor’s concerns on the applications. A summary of the revisions to the scheme made and submitted to the GLA in July 2020 is as follows:
- i. Increase in residential unit provision from up to 813 units to up to 1,250 units;
 - ii. Increase in affordable housing provision from (up to) 17%, to 30%;
 - iii. Increase in height for some buildings of up to three storeys;

- iv. Change to the layout of Blocks 18 and 19, conversion of Block 20 from a terrace row of housing to two four storey buildings;
 - v. Reduction in the size of the western basement, resulting in an overall car parking spaces reduction of 186 spaces and introduction of an additional basement storey under Block 1;
 - vi. Internal layout changes and removal of the nursing home and assisted living in Development Area 2;
 - vii. Landscaping amendments, including canopy removal of four trees on the north west corner of the Site; and
 - viii. Alternative options to Chalkers Corner in order to mitigate traffic impacts through works to highway land only and allow the withdrawal of Application C.
- 1.8 Application A was amended to reflect these changes.
- 1.9 Notwithstanding this, and despite GLA officers recommending approval, the Mayor refused the applications in August 2021.
- 1.10 The Mayor's reasons for refusal in respect of Application A were:
- (i) height, bulk and mass, which would result in an unduly obtrusive and discordant form of development in this 'arcadian' setting which would be harmful to the townscape, character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - (ii) heritage impact. The proposals, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and massing would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of several listed buildings and conservation areas in the vicinity. The Mayor considered that the less than substantial harm was not clearly and convincingly outweighed by the public benefits, including Affordable Housing, that the proposals would deliver;
 - (iii) neighbouring amenity issues. The proposal, by reason of the excessive bulk, scale and siting of Building 20 and 21 in close proximity to the rear of neighbouring residential properties in Parliament Mews and the rear gardens of properties on Thames Bank, would result in an unacceptable overbearing and unneighbourly impact, including direct overlooking of private amenity spaces. The measures in the Design Code would not sufficiently mitigate these impacts; and

(iv) no section 106 agreement in place.

1.11 Application B was also refused because it is intrinsically linked with Application A and therefore could not be bought forward in isolation.

The Proposed New Scheme

1.12 This 3rd iteration of the scheme seeks to respond directly to the Mayors' reasons for refusal and in doing so also addresses a number of the concerns raised by the LBRuT.

1.13 The amendments can be summarised as follows:

- i. A revised energy strategy is proposed in order to address the London Plan (2021) requirements;
- ii. Several residential blocks have been reduced in height to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront and to respect the setting of the Maltings building, identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) by the LBRuT;
- iii. Reconfiguration of layout of Buildings 20 and 21 has been undertaken to provide lower rise buildings to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront; and
- iv. Chalkers Corner light highways mitigation works.

1.14 The school proposals (submitted under 'Application B') are unchanged. The Applicant acknowledges LBRuT's identified need for a secondary school at the Site and the Applications continue to support the delivery of a school. It is expected that the principles to be agreed under the draft Community Use Agreement (CUA) will be the same as those associated with the refused school application (LBRuT ref: 18/0548/FUL, GLA ref: GLA/4172a/07).

1.15 Overall, it is considered that together, the Applications respond successfully to the concerns raised by the GLA which also reflect some of the concerns raised by stakeholders in respect of the previous schemes and during pre-application discussions on the revised Proposed Development. As a result, it is considered that the scheme now represents a balanced development that delivers the principle LBRuT objectives from the Site.

Overview & Planning Policy

Michael Grubb Studio (the Lighting Consultant) has considered various lighting options for the Sports Pitch. The challenge being to provide appropriate levels of illumination and uniformity for Sport England / FA without over-lighting and creating excessive glare or light spill into adjacent properties.

Lighting designs for both Class II and FA Class III have been developed, with both complying to the relevant ILP guidelines. These lighting designs are detailed in the appended documents. Whilst both schemes are considered acceptable, the preference is for the FA Class III scheme as this is deemed to be most appropriate when considering use and location.

The planning policy context for the Proposed Development is as follows:

- i London Plan (2021); and
- ii The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018) (as amended in 2020).

Regard has been had to these documents, in particular LBRuT Local Plan Policy LP 9 which states that floodlighting of sports pitches, courts and historic or other architectural features will be permitted unless there is demonstrable harm to character biodiversity or amenity and living conditions. The Stag Brewery Planning Brief was also considered when developing the design of the lighting at the site.

Design & Specification

Both lighting schemes have been designed to Sport England Outdoor Football Pitch Class guidelines, which are:

- Class III FA Standard = 120 lux ave, 0.6 Uo 60 Ra.
- Class II = 200 lux ave, 0.6 Uo 60 Ra

Both schemes are based on 8 No 15m columns with 2 No luminaires on each column. 16 No fittings in total. Luminaires for the Class II scheme would be higher output.

The proposed luminaire (floodlight) from Phillips Lighting contains an internal louvre, which limits spill in all directions as well as reducing light intensity and glare. An additional external louvre is also proposed to ensure that all efforts are made to reduce glare and light spill.

Compliance

Lighting calculations are contained within the appended assessments and are based on Sport England Document and ILP Guidance Notes for Obtrusive Light 2021.

Lighting calculations also include 3 No. 'Observer' locations for each row of houses at 1.5m height (as this represents a person looking out the window). The Maximum Lighting Intensity Obtrusive Light towards each observer is considered acceptable and within ILP Guidelines.

Finally, it should be noted that a 'worst case' scenario approach has been taken in order to ensure a robust assessment – in reality, soft landscaping proposals around the perimeter of the school site (Application B) , especially on the western site boundary, will further protect residents from any impact relating to artificial light.