

## 7. Socio-Economics

### Introduction

- 7.1 This Chapter, prepared by Hatch, presents an assessment of the likely socio-economic effects of the proposed Development on the existing socio-economic conditions within the local and wider area relevant to the Site.
- 7.2 The Chapter provides a description of the methods used in the socio-economic assessment, a description of the relevant baseline conditions of the Site and surrounding area, and an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Development during demolition, alteration, refurbishment and construction (the 'Works') and once the Development is completed and operational.
- 7.3 Mitigation measures are identified where appropriate to avoid, reduce or offset any likely significant adverse effects and enhance any likely significant beneficial effects. The Chapter concludes by examining the nature and significance of likely residual effects.
- 7.4 This Chapter is accompanied by the following appendices:
- **Appendix 7.1:** List of Primary Schools within 2 miles of the Site;
  - **Appendix 7.2:** List of Secondary Schools within 3 miles of the Site;
  - **Appendix 7.3:** List of Early Years provision within the local impact area;
- 7.5 The following separate standalone reports have also been submitted with the planning application:
- **Retail Impact Assessment** - considers the impact of the Development on neighbouring centres and shopping parades of local importance and establish whether the Development might draw trade away from centres and thus have potentially negative effects;
  - **Health Impact Assessment** - considers the impact on well-being and health as a result of the loss of or provision of open space, children's play space, playing fields, soft landscaping and trees as part of the Development;
  - **Employment Assessment** - provides details in relation to employment floorspace and the demand for both office and industrial space; and
  - **Culture and Communities Assessment** – presents an assessment of the community facilities provided by the Development.

### Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

#### Assessment Methodology

##### Overview

- 7.6 There are no published standards or technical guidelines that set out a preferred methodology for assessing the likely socio-economic effects of a development. However, there are a series of commonly used methodologies for quantifying economic effects both during the construction of a development and following its completion. Other established qualitative techniques are frequently adopted to assess the social effects of a development. The following section outlines the approach used to conduct this assessment. Where possible, the likely significant socio-economic effects are quantified, but where this is not feasible, a qualitative assessment is provided using professional judgement and experience.

### Establishing the Baseline Conditions

- 7.7 An updated baseline of existing socio-economic characteristics of the Site and its surrounds was established, drawing on the following sources:
- The Business Register and Employment Survey<sup>1</sup> (Office for National Statistics (ONS));
  - The 2011 Census of population and Annual Population Survey (APS)<sup>2</sup> (ONS);
  - ONS Family Expenditure Survey<sup>3</sup>;
  - London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT) Revised Planning Obligations<sup>4</sup> (2020);
  - National Health Service (NHS) Choices<sup>5</sup> (location of health facilities);
  - NHS South West London Clinical Care Commissioning Group (CCG);
  - Department for Education (DfE) (school locations and capacity information)<sup>6</sup>;
  - Achieving for Children, Community Interest Company delivering children’s services on behalf of LBRuT;
  - Greater London Authority (GLA) Child Yield and Open Space Calculator; Play and Informal Recreation Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)<sup>7</sup>;
  - GLA Population Yield Calculator Update v3.1<sup>8</sup>; and
  - The GLA’s London Data Store<sup>9</sup>.
- 7.8 The relevant baseline conditions are typically described according to the following areas:
- the Local Impact Area (LIA) – the ‘Local’ level primarily defined as Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward. In addition, community infrastructure facilities are also assessed in relation to a number of local ‘catchment’ spatial scales as summarised in **Table 7.1**.
  - the District Area - covering the LBRuT as the local administrative area; and
  - the London Area - where appropriate and for ‘benchmarking’ purposes to set the relevant baseline data in the context of London as a whole.
- 7.9 The geographical and spatial scales are shown on **Figure 7.1**.

Table 7.1: Community Infrastructure Baseline Spatial Areas

Baseline Parameter	Spatial Area <sup>A</sup>	Rationale for Spatial Area
Primary health care facilities.	Within one kilometre <sup>1</sup> for GPs not including facilities outside of LBRuT CCG.	Based on LBRUT (2020), Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
Early years facilities.	District and Local (within two miles of the Site) not including facilities in the western half or outside of the LBRuT.	Based on LBRuT’s Childcare Sufficiency Assessment and School Place Planning Strategy.
Primary schools.	Local (within two miles of the Site) not including schools in the western half of or outside of LBRuT.	Based on the Department for Education recommendations <sup>C</sup> as per the consultation received from LBRuT in respect of the assessment.
Secondary schools.	Local (within three miles of the Site). Not including schools in the western half of or outside of LBRuT.	Based on DfE recommendations <sup>D</sup> as per the consultation received from

<sup>1</sup> 1 km has been applied as a proxy catchment area for GP surgeries based on guidance set out. In practice each surgery will operate its own catchment distance depending on the size of the local population.

Baseline Parameter	Spatial Area <sup>A</sup>	Rationale for Spatial Area
		LBRuT in respect of the assessment.
Open spaces.	Local (within 1.2km radius of the Site) and LBRuT.	GLA Open Space Strategies <sup>10</sup> , LBRuT Open Space Assessment <sup>11</sup> .
Play spaces.	Local (within 800m radius of the Site).	GLA London Plan 2011, GLA Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2012 (Shaping Neighbourhoods. Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation); LBRuT Open Space Assessment.
Other community resources services.	Local (within 1km of the Site).	Facilities located within a reasonable walking distance of the Site.

Notes:

- A. Distances are measured from the approximate centre of the Site as this is where the housing associated with the Development would be situated.
- B. Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. This is used as the upper bound for determining eligibility for free school transport. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to assess primary provision.
- C. Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 3 miles (4.8 km) for a child older than eight years of age. This forms the basis of assessing secondary school provision.

## Employment Generation and Expenditure During the Works

- 7.10 To estimate employment during the Works, Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) Labour Coefficients<sup>12</sup> (workers per £1m spend per annum) were applied to the forecast costs associated with the Works. Workers are divided by the expected timescale of the Works, as set out in **ES Chapter 6: Development Programme, Demolition, Alteration, Refurbishment and Construction**, to provide the average annual number of jobs.
- 7.11 It is acknowledged that whilst some construction workers paid as a result of the construction activity may live locally and their expenditure on household goods and services would also support employment in local businesses, the construction workforce could be drawn from all over London depending on the construction role they can provide. On this basis, an estimate of the induced (local expenditure) effects of this construction expenditure cannot be quantified with accuracy.

## Local Expenditure of the Completed and Operational Development

- 7.12 Once completed and operational, the expenditure effects of future employees of the Development are captured via the induced effects of direct employment (see paragraph 7.16). In addition, the likely household expenditure levels from residents are reported herein, the effect of which would be to help support employment in the retail and services sectors both within the Development and within the surrounding area (see paragraph 7.17). This expenditure is based on average household spend on convenience, comparison and retails services goods from the Family Expenditure Survey for London<sup>13</sup>.

## Employment Generation of the Completed and Operational Development

- 7.13 The assessment of the completed and operational employment effects of the Development was based on the schedule of commercial floorspace uses as set out in **Chapter 5: The Proposed Development**. Where flexible commercial floorspace uses are proposed, a 'worst-case' scenario

of flexible floorspace provision was defined (in this case, the floorspace totals for each commercial or community use that would likely generate the lowest density of employment whilst meeting the maximum Gross Internal Area (GIA) requirements). Assumptions regarding the worst-case scenario for the flexible floorspace uses are set out in **Table 7.2**.

**Table 7.2: Flexible Floorspace Assumptions**

Use	Maximum GIA/NIA	Minimum GIA /NIA	Worst case scenario (GIA/NIA)
Retail	2,200	n/a	1,189
Financial and Professional Services	220	n/a	0
Restaurant	2,400	n/a	0
Bar	1,800	n/a	0
Office	2,200	2,000	2,000
Community	1,300	n/a	1,296
Boathouse	380	n/a	380
<b>Overall Maximum Flexible</b>	<b>4,839</b>	<b>4,839</b>	<b>4,839</b>
High Street Zone (within overall max flexible):			2,354
No < than 50% within high street zone to be flexible retail			1,177

- 7.14 The HCA Employment Densities Guide<sup>14</sup> was used to calculate the likely number of full time equivalent (FTE) jobs that would be supported by each type of floor space proposed. Where necessary conversions are made from GIA to Net Internal Area (NIA) based on ratios set out within the Employment Densities Guide. In the absence of applicable floorspace densities in the Employment Densities Guide, assumptions on employment generation have been informed by industry standards and guidance have been made. As such, the floorspace densities and assumptions used to estimate employment generation are as follows:
- Flexible Retail / Café / Restaurant: all uses 15 m<sup>2</sup> (NIA) per FTE job;
  - Finance and Professional Services: 16m<sup>2</sup> (NIA) per FTE job;
  - Bar: 20 m<sup>2</sup> (NIA) per FTE job;
  - Hotel: 2 rooms per 1 FTE job (total of 15 rooms)
  - Office / Small business / flexible space / management: 30 m<sup>2</sup> (NIA) per FTE job;
  - Cinema: 200 m<sup>2</sup> (GIA) per FTE job;
  - Secondary school: two FTEs per class (maximum class size of 30 pupils) based on School Workforce Statistics together with an allowance for administrative and support functions<sup>15</sup>;
  - Community uses: the density for 'visitor and cultural' attractions using the lowest density of the scale set out within the Guidance. This equates to 300 m<sup>2</sup> (GIA) per FTE.
- 7.15 Indirect and induced multipliers were used to measure the indirect and induced effects on employment of the Development. A multiplier of 1.1 was used at the District level as per HCA guidance. The indirect employment effects generated by the Development include employment growth as a result of the purchase of goods and services by residents and businesses located in the Development.
- 7.16 Leakage and displacement have also been accounted for. Leakage is assumed to be 0% as the estimated direct jobs are generated by on-Site elements of the Development and would therefore be contained within the LIA and District. Displacement assumptions have been made in line with

HCA Guidance and range from 0% for community uses to 25% to commercial office and retail uses.

### Housing Supply Effects resulting from the Completed Development

- 7.17 The Development will include up to 1,085 residential units including up to 22% affordable housing on a habitable room basis, subject to viability discussions. A qualitative assessment of the provision of new homes (considering number, type and tenure proposed) and the contribution to local housing targets was undertaken using professional judgement taking into consideration existing housing quality and housing requirements identified by LBRuT.

### Population and Labour Market Effects of the Completed and Operational Development

- 7.18 An estimate of the population yield of the Development has been derived using the GLA's population calculator V3.2 October 2019. Labour market effects have been based on the age structure derived from the population calculator of the new population of the Development.

### Demand for Community Infrastructure of the Completed and Operational Development

- 7.19 Completed Development child yield (for education purposes) was calculated using the GLA's population calculator (v3.2) combined with the housing and tenure mix for the Development. Schools Capacity data from LBRuT and Achieving for Children<sup>2</sup>, LBRuT School Place Strategy and the Department for Education School Capacity data were used to estimate existing and future school place demand.
- 7.20 For the purposes of assessing the effect of the Development on capacity of primary healthcare facilities, the population yield as described in paragraph 7.19 was compared with the capacity of GP surgeries in the local area of the Site to determine the magnitude of effect on the capacity of local GP surgeries.
- 7.21 Open space requirements arising from the completed Development were calculated using the assessment methodology in LBRuT aforementioned Planning Obligations SPD and consultation with LBRuT.
- 7.22 Children's play space requirements were calculated using the GLA's population yield calculator v3.2 (2019).

### Community Safety and Wellbeing

- 7.23 The assessment of community safety and wellbeing is qualitative and based on professional judgement of the potential effects of the Development upon public safety.

### Significance Criteria

- 7.24 Since there are no formalised technical guidance or criteria available to assess the significance of socio-economic effects, likely effects are assessed by considering the following factors, using professional judgement:
- the sensitivity of each receptor affected; and

<sup>2</sup> Community Interest Company who deliver children's services for Kingston and Richmond Councils.

- the magnitude of change to the receptor brought about by the Development.
- 7.25 The sensitivity of each receptor was evaluated as being high, medium, low or negligible based on a review of the baseline position of each receptor and its performance against benchmark areas, together with consideration of the importance of the receptor in policy terms. This can be summarised as follows:
- **High:** Evidence of direct and significant socio-economic challenges relating to receptor. May be given a high priority in local, regional or national economic and regeneration policy;
  - **Medium:** Some evidence of socio-economic challenges linked to receptor, which may be indirect. Change relating to receptor has medium priority in local, regional and national economic and regeneration policy;
  - **Low:** Little evidence of socio-economic challenges relating to receptor. Receptor is given a low priority in local, regional and national economic and regeneration policy; and
  - **Negligible:** Very low importance and rarity with little or no priority even at local scale.
- 7.26 The magnitude of change to a receptor has been determined by considering the estimated deviation from baseline conditions, both before and, if required, after mitigation. The criteria used for the assessment of the magnitude of socio-economic effects (both beneficial and adverse) are shown in **Table 7.3**.

Table 7.3: Definition of Magnitude of Change

Magnitude	Criteria
High	Loss of resource and / or quality and integrity of resource; severe damage to key characteristics, features or elements (adverse).
	Large scale or major improvement of resource quality; extensive restoration or enhancement; major improvement of attribute quality (beneficial).
Medium	Loss of resource, but not adversely affecting the integrity; partial loss of / damage to key characteristics, features or elements (adverse).
	Benefit to, or addition of, key characteristics, features or elements; improvement of attribute quality (beneficial).
Low	Some measurable change in attributes, quality or vulnerability; minor loss of, or alteration to, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements (adverse).
	Minor benefit to, or addition of, one (maybe more) key characteristics, features or elements; some beneficial impact on attribute or a reduced risk of negative impact occurring (beneficial).
Negligible	Very minor loss or detrimental alteration to one or more characteristics, features or elements (adverse).
	Very minor benefit to or positive addition of one or more characteristics, features or elements (beneficial).

- 7.27 In reporting the likely significance of the effects of the Development, in respect of the Works and once completed and operational, the assessment contextualises both the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the change relevant to the receptor as a result of the Development. The matrix used to determine significance of socio-economic effects is presented in **Table 7.4**.

Table 7.4: Matrix Used to Determine the Significance of Socio-economic Effects

Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Change			
	Negligible	Low	Medium	High

Sensitivity of Receptor	Magnitude of Change			
	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major
<b>Negligible</b>	Insignificant	Insignificant	Minor	Minor
<b>Low</b>	Insignificant	Minor	Minor	Moderate
<b>Medium</b>	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major
<b>High</b>	Insignificant or minor	Minor or moderate	Moderate or major	Major

## Baseline Conditions

### Population and Demographic Characteristics

- 7.28 There is no existing resident population on the Site. Headline demographic and population data for the impact area is set out in **Table 7.5**. There are currently around 11,600 people living in the Mortlake and Barnes Common ward with growth since 2011 of around 7%. LBRuT as a whole has also experienced population growth over the same period, albeit to a slightly lesser extent with 6%. The overall growth rate for London was 10% between 2011 and 2020.
- 7.29 The profile of the population in Mortlake and Barnes Common ward (the LIA) is similar to that of LBRuT as a whole as well as London. Around 62% of the population in the ward are of working age, which is similar to that of LBRuT (63%) but lower than London as a whole (67%).

Table 7.5: Demographics

	Dataset	Mortlake & Barnes Common	LBRuT	London
Overall Population	2020	11,661	198,100	9,002,500
	Change 2011-2020	7%	6%	10%
Age	% Working Age (16-64)	62%	63%	67%
	% 0-15	23%	21%	21%
	% 65+	15%	16%	12%

Source: ONS 2020 Mid-Year Population Estimates and Census 2011

### Labour Market

- 7.30 Headline labour market information is set out in **Table 7.6**. The data indicates that LBRuT performs above the London average on a number of key labour market indicators, including economic activity rates as well as qualification levels.



Table 7.6: Labour Market Profile

	Dataset	LBRuT	London
Economic Activity	Economic Activity Rates	80%	79%
	Unemployment Rates	4.8%	6.6%
Occupations (% employed)	Managerial, professional and associate professionals	76.1%	62.2%
	Administrative, skilled trades	11.9%	15.6%
	Care, leisure, sales	9.3%	12.3%
	Process, elementary	2.7%	9.5%
Qualifications (2020)	% Level 4+	66.2%	58.7%
	% No qualifications	1.3%	5.2%

Source: Annual Population Survey (APS), 2020-2021 (data is not available below local authority level)

- 7.31 According to the data, in 2021 economic activity rates for LBRuT stood at 80% compared to 79% for London. The unemployment rate measured by the APS data was 4.8%, lower than the London average of 6.6%.
- 7.32 Skills levels on LBRuT are well above the London average with 66% of the working age population qualified to Level 4+ compared to around 59% for London as a whole. Furthermore, just under 76% of the population are employed in managerial and professional occupations compared to just under 62% for London as a whole.
- 7.33 Up to date labour market information is not available for the LIA as the APS does not provide data at a sub-District level. The last available data is from the Census 2011 which suggests the LIA performs slightly above the LBRuT average with higher skills levels and economic activity levels.

## Employment

- 7.34 The Stag Brewery ceased brewing operations in late 2015 and decommissioning of brewery infrastructure was undertaken following cessation of brewery activities. Works on-Site have been undertaken in 2018 in respect of removal of brewery fixtures and fittings. Most recently, the Site has been used for film production operations (B1 use) and ancillary activities under a temporary planning consent for a period of two years from June 2020. As stated in **Chapter 2: EIA Methodology**, for the purposes of the EIA, the short-term temporary uses currently on the Site have not been assessed on the basis that the Site will be vacated by June 2022. As such, this Chapter assumes that there is no existing economic activity present on the Site.
- 7.35 Headline data for the economic conditions are set out in **Table 7.7**. According to the most recently available data (2020) the number of jobs in the LIA was around 2,250. Between the latest dataset and 2015 the number of jobs in the LIA has declined by 18% (-500). LBRuT has experienced a decline in overall jobs over the same period of 4.8% (-4,000) whereas London as a whole has seen an increase of 3.65 (+83,500).



Table 7.7: Jobs

Dataset	Mortlake & Barnes Common Ward	LBRuT	London
Number of Jobs (2020)	2,250	80,000	5,264,000
Absolute Change 2015-2020	-500	-4,000	+1,183,500
% Change 2015-2020	-18.2%	-4.8%	-3.6%

Source: Business Register and Employment Survey, 2018, 2020

- 7.36 The largest employment sectors in the LIA and District include professional, scientific and technical, retail and Information and Communications Technology (ICT) as well as health and education at the District level. The latest BRES data shows that the construction industry accounts for 90 jobs or 4% of total employment within the LIA, in line with proportions in LBRuT (2,250 jobs or 2.9%) and London (177,500 jobs or 3.4%).

## Housing Supply

- 7.37 Headline information on key housing characteristics is set out in **Table 7.8**. In terms of housing stock, the LIA has around 5,230 dwellings accounting for around 6.1% of the total stock of dwellings in LBRuT. In terms of tenure, LBRuT has higher levels of home ownership compared to the rest of London (as did Mortlake & Barnes Common Ward in 2011) and a lower proportion of social rented housing.

Table 7.8: Housing Characteristics

		Mortlake & Barnes Common Ward	LBRuT	London
Total Housing Stock (2021)		5,230**	85,170**	3,711,310**
Home Ownership	Owned	58%	65%*	51%*
	Private Rented	24%	24%*	27%*
	Social Rented	16%	12%*	22%*
Household Occupancy (rooms)	of +2 or more (surplus)	38%	45%	30%
	of +1	28%	23%	21%
	of 0	23%	21%	27%
	of -1	8%	8%	14%
	of -2 or less (deficit)	2%	2%	7%
Median House Prices	Median (2021)	£880,000	£693,725	£507,000
	% Change 2018-2021	10.7%	7.1%	8.6%

Source: Census 2011, \*ONS 2019 'Subnational estimates of dwellings by tenure', CLG House Price Data 2021, \*\* 'VOA 2021 'Properties by Council Tax band, local authority and lower and middle super output area'.

Notes: Compound Annual Growth Rate (CAGR). For the Total Housing Stock in 2021, a best-fit of 7 LSOAs for the Mortlake & Barnes Common ward was used.

- 7.38 Household occupancy ratings in the local impact area are similar to that of LBRuT with 67% reporting a surplus of rooms compared to 69% for LBRuT. This is well above the London average

of 51%. Both the LIA and LBRuT as a whole have a lower incidence of deficits compared to the London average.

- 7.39 Median house prices in the LIA (£880,000) are above the average for LBRuT (£693,725) and well above the London average (£507,000). Prices have increased by an average of +3.4% per annum over the last decade, which is above the rate of increase experienced by the LBRuT (2.3%) and London (2.8%). The adopted LBRuT Local Plan<sup>16</sup> notes that the borough has one of the highest average house prices in the UK and a continuing need for affordable housing. Local Plan Policy LP 36 states the affordable housing target is 50% with a tenure mix of 40% rented and 10% intermediate.
- 7.40 The adopted Local Plan sets out the overall housing target for LBRuT as 315 dwellings per annum for the period 2015-2025 (3,150 in total). However, the London Plan (2021)<sup>17</sup> presents a revised ten-year housing target for LBRuT of 4,110 for the period 2019/20-2028/29 or 411 per annum. Local Plan Policy LP 35 on Housing Mix and Standards indicates developments should provide family size housing except in areas of mixed use, where a higher proportion of smaller units is acceptable.

## Educational Facilities

### Early Years Provision

- 7.41 Pre-school education facilities for children under 5 years are provided through a range of facilities including local authority children centres and private run nurseries.
- 7.42 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy<sup>18</sup> suggests that demand for Early Years places across the District is generally high. According to the Strategy, 20 of the 40 infant and primary schools in LBRuT have attached maintained nurseries, and there is one stand-alone nursery school. Between them, there is total of 1,083 places and each of the maintained nurseries is resorting to oversubscription criteria in order to allocate places.
- 7.43 Almost three quarters of the nursery places (3,694) within the District are within the private, voluntary and independent sector and are therefore not free of charge.
- 7.44 A review of data from the LBRuT website indicates there are seven maintained nurseries within the LIA providing services ranging from full-day care from age 0 to pre-school (from 3 - 5 years old). The total capacity is around 390.
- 7.45 There are also 46 private, voluntary and independent (PVI) nurseries within the LIA. However, capacity and demand data are not readily available for these facilities.
- 7.46 The latest available Child Care Sufficiency Assessment (February 2020)<sup>19</sup> sets out there is a total of 356 childcare providers in LBRuT with 9,083 places. These include child minders, nursery school places, private, voluntary and independent nurseries, pre-school and out of school providers. According to the Assessment at the time of writing, *'there is broadly sufficient childcare availability in Richmond with continual changes of models available within the childcare market so that most families can access a suitable model that meets their needs'*. Primary School Provision
- 7.47 Summary information on primary school provision is set out in **Table 7.9**. There is a total of 14 primary schools within two miles<sup>3</sup> of the Site. The latest available school capacity data on LBRuT

<sup>3</sup> Facilities that are located on the Western side of the Thames or outside LBRuT have been excluded from the assessment, as per consultation with the local education authority.

suggests there is an +883 place surplus in capacity across all primary schools within a two-mile radius. This is across all year groups (Year Reception to Year 6).

- 7.48 The closest primary school to the Site is Thompson House School where there was +82 capacity in 2018/2019. None of the 14 schools within the 2-mile radius have a capacity deficit. Further detail is provided in **Appendix 7.2**.

Table 7.9: Primary School Provision

Primary School Enrolment within 2 miles of the Site				
Type of school	No. of schools	School Places	Pupils on roll	Surplus / Deficit
Primary Schools	14	5,910	5,027	+883

Source: Education Funding Agency; School Capacity Tables 2018-19

- 7.49 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy 2019 sets out LBRuT's strategy for meeting current and future demand for school places at primary level up to 2022 and secondary level up to 2024, based on population projections.
- 7.50 The LIA falls within the LBRuT's Area 9 for school places planning which comprises the wards of Mortlake and Barnes Common and Barnes. The Strategy highlights that there is a need for at least one more form of entry (30 pupils) in Area 9. Despite a declining birth trend, there has been a 3.5% increase in applications in the Eastern half of LBRuT for 2019 entry, alongside 30 fewer places available in this part of LBRuT due to the cessation of the 'shared form of entry' between St Elizabeth's, St Mary Magdalen's and St Osmund's. The Strategy estimates a current capacity of 236 Reception Year places and anticipated demand by 2023 of 240 places. The Strategy states that the expansion of Barnes Primary School is necessary to meet this expected demand. Alternatively, the shared-form system of entry between St Elizabeth's (in Area 6), St Mary Magdalen's and St Osmund's could be re-established as a cost-efficient way of adding a form of entry.
- 7.51 The neighbouring school planning Area 8, which comprises East Sheen, is noted to overlap with demand from Area 9. The Strategy states the expansions of Sheen Mount and East Sheen Primary have met the previously forecast need for places within this area and therefore no action is needed at present, or in the foreseeable future. The recent Planning Committee report (January 2020)<sup>20</sup> for the 2018 Application also noted that planning Area 7 has spare capacity which could absorb additional demand generated by the proposed Development.

### Secondary School Provision

- 7.52 Summary information on secondary school provision is set out in **Table 7.10** (with further detail provided in **Appendix 7.3**). There are a total of three secondary schools within three miles<sup>4</sup> of the Site and a total of 11 state funded schools within the entire borough. In Autumn 2018 these schools admitted 3,146 pupils, with a capacity of 3,438 places, which suggests a surplus of 292 places across all year groups.

<sup>4</sup> As per Primary School catchment areas; Facilities that are located on the Western side of the Thames or outside LBRuT have been excluded from the assessment, as per consultation with the local education authority.

Table 7.10: Secondary School Provision

Type of school	Secondary School Enrolment within 3 miles of the Site		
	Pupils on roll	School Places	Surplus / Deficit
Grey Court School	1,393	1,398	5
Christ's Church School of England	888	930	42
Richmond Park Academy	865	1110	245
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,146</b>	<b>3,438</b>	<b>292</b>

Source: Education Funding Agency; School Capacity Tables 2018-19

- 7.53 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy 2019 states there were 2,027 places in Year 7 across the District. However, this is a significant decrease in vacancy rates as a proportion of total places – from 8.8% in 2018 to 1.9% in 2019. This has taken place alongside a 26% increase in applicants for Year 7 places over the past 5 years. Take-up increased in all three schools between 2011 and 2019, and spare capacity at Richmond Park Academy has reduced to nil (for Year 7 starters).
- 7.54 The Strategy notes that the catchments for Richmond Park Academy and Grey Court School have shrunk since 2018, and the Christ's catchment only increased by 200 metres. Primary expansions over the last decade – which are now feeding into the secondary phase – are contributing to the need for smaller catchments. Additionally, the Thames acts as a physical and perceived barrier in terms of long travel times across the bridges which limits the choice of secondary schools for parents further afield.
- 7.55 The methodology for forecasting Year 7 places has recently changed, with a focus on east/west halves instead of a whole-borough approach. According to the latest estimates, there is a large and increasing forecast shortfall of places in the eastern half of the borough, requiring substantial additional permanent provision. The Strategy states that only the provision of a new secondary school – Livingstone Academy – as part of the redeveloped Stag Brewery site will meet that shortfall. This reiterates the 2018 Strategy, which stated that the Stag Brewery Site was the only suitable location for a new school in the east of LBRuT. The LBRuT Local Plan Site Allocation (SA24) has allocated the land for a new secondary school.
- 7.56 The Strategy states that in the last two years, there were a significant number of children in the eastern half of the LBRuT, mostly in Barnes and Kew, for whom offers could not be made at any of the three local schools at the initial allocations stage. In 2019, 106 children were unplaced in the eastern half of LBRuT and 6 children were unplaced in the western half.
- 7.57 Based on recent forecasts, LBRuT would be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide places for those children unless a new school was provided. It is forecast that the children who are at most risk of not being admitted to any of the three schools in the eastern half of the LBRuT live in Kew, north Richmond and east and north Barnes.

## Primary Health Care

### GPs: Current Provision

- 7.58 Summary information on GP provision is set out in **Table 7.11**. Based on data from NHS Choices there are currently 2 GP centres based within 1 km<sup>5</sup> of the Site providing 18.9 GPs (FTEs) and with a total of 29,372 registered patients.
- 7.59 According to the NHS, there is no recommended number of patients per FTE GP per practice. This recognises the differing needs of the registered patients of GP practices. However, NHS London Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) use a figure of 1,800 patients per GP FTE to benchmark capacity.
- 7.60 The average number of patients per FTE GP is 1,556 within 1 km of the Site and 1,767 across the wider NHS South West London CCG area. Therefore, patient levels at both the local and wider level are lower than the HUDU benchmark.
- 7.61 The surgery closest to the Site (Johnson and Partners – Sheen Lane falls well below the HUDU benchmark at 1,082 Patients per GP FTE. The merger of Dr Jezierski & Partners (previously closest to the Site) and North Road Surgery has formed Richmond Medical Group, which has a ratio of 2,185 patients per GP FTE. This is an increase from 1,067 patients per FTE at Jezierski & Partners but a decrease from 2,567 patients per FTE at North Road Surgery.
- 7.62 Both surgeries within 1 km of the Site are accepting new patients indicating there may be spare capacity.

Table 7.11: GP Provision

	Within 1 km of the Site	NHS South West London CCG Average
No of GPs (FTEs)	18.9	974
Registered patients	29,372	1,721,246
Patients per FTE GP	1,556	1,767

Source: NHS Choices 2021. Date Accessed: November 2021

### Open Space Provision

- 7.63 LBRuT is renowned for its green spaces and large parks such as Richmond Park, Old Deer Park, The Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew and its highly accessible green space alongside the River Thames.
- 7.64 There are several publicly accessible open spaces within proximity to the Site, including those that have play areas and other community uses such as sports fields. **Table 7.12** summarises the open space categories defined by the GLA. Although Watney's Sports Ground playing fields are greater than 2ha and are located within the Site, it has private access only. In addition, part of the tow path is located within the redline but is currently not accessible from the Site. As such, there is currently no publicly open green space as defined by the GLA on the Site.

<sup>5</sup> A number of sites that are located north of the river have been discounted as the actual distance from the Site exceeds 1 km.

Table 7.12: GLA Open Categorisation and Benchmarks

Open Space categorisation	Size Guideline	Distances from Homes
Regional Parks	400 ha	3.2 to 8 km
Metropolitan Parks	60 ha	3.2 km
District Parks	20 ha	1.2 km
Local Parks / Open Spaces / Small Open Spaces / Pocket Parks	2 ha	<=400 metres

Source: GLA, 2011

- 7.65 There are several open spaces within proximity to the Site, including those that have play areas and other community uses such as sports fields. The **Table 7.13** summarises the open space provision within 1.2km of the Site.

Table 7.13: Open Space Provision Within 1.2km of the Site

Type	Distance and Direction from the Site (km)	Typology as Defined By the GLA	Additional Amenities
Mortlake Green	0.2 km to the south	Open space	Play for 7-14 and under 7's, basketball court.
Barnes Common	1.5 km to the east	Open Space	Football pitch.
Barnes Green	1.5 km to the east	Open space	Play for under 7's.
Jubilee Gardens	0.6 km to the east	Open space	Boat race viewing point.
Tapestry Court	0.5 km to the east	Open Space	Boat race viewing point.
Thames Bank	0.2 km to the north	Open Space	Boat race viewing point.
Vine Road Recreation Ground	1.5 km to the east	Local park	Children's play areas, paddling pool and informal space.

Source: LBRuT

- 7.66 The aforementioned LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report identifies around 200 open space sites in the District equating to a total provision of 527ha. The assessment divides LBRuT into three areas for the purposes of analysis, Mortlake and Barnes Common is located within the Richmond assessment area. The area performs well above the LBRuT average on all typologies of space in terms of provision per 1,000 population.
- 7.67 **Table 7.14** summarises the play space provision in proximity to the Site. Based on consultation with LBRuT<sup>6</sup> the closest space for children and young people is Mortlake Green Play Area, which is of sufficient size and within 400m of the Site. However, the play area does require reinvestment in some of the play equipment which is now old and of poor quality. This facility also provides limited play space for people aged 15+ years.
- 7.68 Mullins Path is also less than 800m from the Site. The Open Space Assessment Report suggest that the location is of sufficient quality for its size and purpose. However, it is very small in size and would only serve the population within its immediate vicinity.

<sup>6</sup> LBRuT/Wild Futures, Parks and Open Space Team

Table 7.14: Play Space Provision in Proximity to the Site

Play Area Name	Size (ha)	Distance and Direction from the Site (km)	Facilities
Mortlake Green	1.54	0.2 km to the south	Play area, Natural play, Fitness, Half basketball
Mullins Path Open Space	0.05	0.3 to the southeast	Play area
North Sheen Recreation Ground	3.30	1.6 to the west	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Palewell Common	15.38	1.6 to the southeast	Play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Vine Road Recreation Ground	2.32	1.7 to the east	Play area, Natural play, Paddling pool
Old Deer Park	28.62	3.4 to the west	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness,

Source: Wild Futures and LBRuT

- 7.69 The District contains a high proportion of Locally Equipped Area for Play (LEAP) and Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) sized play areas, many of which score high for quality and value. The majority of play sites (95%) across LBRuT are assessed as being above the threshold for quality.
- 7.70 According to the LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report, the Richmond assessment area has the highest amount of play space provision per 1,000 population compared to the other assessment areas in the District and has the greatest number of play sites in LBRuT. **Table 7.15** sets out the provision of open space per 1,000 population in the Richmond Assessment Area compared to LBRuT as a whole. It demonstrates that area is relatively well provided across all typologies of open space. However, consultation has suggested that local play space could be improved in terms of its quality and provision for older children (i.e. 15+).
- 7.71 In addition, LBRuT's Playing Pitch Assessment Report, includes an assessment of education provision of playing pitches, concluded a shortfall in football provision, capacity for cricket, a potential shortfall in rugby provision, only one tennis court, one full sized hockey all weather pitch and a need for three full sized 3G (synthetic) pitches.

Table 7.15: Open Space Summary, Richmond Assessment Area

Typology	Number	Total Provision (ha)	Richmond Provision per 1,000 Pop	LBRuT Provision per 1,000 Pop
Parks and gardens (urban parks and formal)	4	47.25	0.61	0.39
Natural & semi-natural green space	19	237.78	3.08	1.44
Amenity space	31	57.62	0.75	0.52
Provision for children and young people	17	3.49	0.05	0.03
Allotments	13	12.48	0.16	0.15

Source: LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report, April 2015, Knight Kavanagh Page



- 7.72 In addition to the above, the Site is located adjacent to the River Thames. This provides a significant amount of usable open space. The tow path alongside the River Thames and within the Site also links together open space sites, which would otherwise be isolated from one another.
- 7.73 The Development is located between a number of larger parks with more facilities for weekend or occasional visits. The Thames towpath gives access to nature and links to smaller passive parks such as Thames Bank and Jubilee Gardens, but only Mortlake Green provides access to open space facilities such as playground and informal recreation within 400m.
- 7.74 The other locations within 400m are Thames Bank (small grassy area, two benches), Tapestry Court (a narrow cut through between the towpath and Mortlake High Street) and Mullins Path (a small site with 1 bench and 4-5 pieces of play equipment). These are very small, low on features and unlikely to attract visitors away from Mortlake Green.

### Other Community Facilities

- 7.75 There are a number of existing community uses within a 1km of the Site (a reasonable walking distance). These are summarised in **Table 7.16**.

Table 7.16: Community Facilities Provision

Name	Services
Power Station Youth Centre	Youth club, multi-purpose sports hall, music production and rehearsal studios.
East Sheen Library	Library facilities.
Sheen Sports Centre	Fitness centre, multi-use sports hall, all weather pitches.
St Mary's Church (including St. Mary's Rooms)	Community groups and church services.
Guide Hall	Guides and Scouts.
Mortlake Community Garden	Communal Garden.
The Old Bakery	Mortlake Community Association.

Source: LBRuT

- 7.76 The community facilities situated close to the Site such as Sheen Sports Centre, East Sheen Library and Power Station Youth Centre are of good quality. The Sheen Sports Centre provides a range of facilities such as floodlit outdoor pitches, indoor sports hall, fitness suite and spin studios. The Power Station Youth Centre, provides music rehearsal space, workshops, an indoor gym and a mentoring programme. Barnes Children's Centre is located at the same facility as the Youth Centre.

## Crime, Community Safety and Wellbeing

7.77 **Table 7.17** provides a summary of the crime rates in the LIA and LBRuT over the period of July 2019 to June 2021.

Table 7.17: Crime Rates, per 1,000 Population (July 2019 - June 2021)

Offences per 1,000 Population	July 2019 - June 2021	
	Mortlake and Barnes Common	LBRuT
All offences	130.5	37.5
Burglary	16.8	12.5
Robbery	3.2	0.2
Vehicle	26.2	-
Violent	28.2	-
Shoplifting	4.0	-
Other Theft	12.2	-
Drugs	4.1	5.1
Bike theft	9.4	-
Theft from the person	1.0	-
Possession of Weapons	0.6	0.6
Public order	9.8	9.8

Source: Metropolitan Police Data last accessed November 2021

7.78 The latest statistics show that the overall crime rate in Mortlake and Barnes Common ward (LIA) is higher than in the LBRuT. However, the data gaps at Borough-level (possibly due to COVID-19) imply that this may not be an accurate comparison. With the exception of drug-related offences, the crime rate for individual offences was higher in the LIA compared to LBRuT.

Table 7.18: Yearly Crime Rates (January-December, 2013-2021)

Year	Mortlake & Barnes Common Ward			LBRuT		
	Total crimes per year	Total crimes per year per 1,000 population	%Change	Total crimes per year	Total crimes per year per 1,000 population	% Change
2013	764	66.93	-1%	10,758	53.79	-10%
2014	660	57.82	-14%	10,717	53.58	0%
2015	665	58.26	1%	10,738	53.69	0%
2016	642	56.25	-3%	11,457	57.28	7%
2017	782	68.51	22%	13,238	66.19	16%
2018	727	63.69	-7%	12,707	63.53	-4%
2020	843	72.29	16%	12,280	61.99	-2%
2021	646	55.36	-23%	10,992	46.24	-25%

Source: Metropolitan Police Data last accessed November 2021

- 7.79 **Table 7.18** shows the latest available crime data for the LIA and LBRuT (with the exception of 2019, for which data is not available). It shows total crimes per year in both absolute and per head terms and the yearly percentage change. The crime rate and overall crimes in the LIA and LBRuT have decreased over the past 5 years, despite an increase from 2018 to 2020 in the LIA.

### Summary of Baseline Receptors and Their Sensitivity

- 7.80 **Table 7.19** provides a summary of the identified baseline receptors and their relative sensitivity to change that may be brought about by the Development.

Table 7.19: Summary of Baseline Assessment and Receptors

Receptor	Summary	Sensitivity of Receptor
Population and labour market	Labour market challenges relate to the need to accommodate the growing population across the impact area as well as London and this is a driver of housing and economic growth. Overall, the LIA and District as a whole perform well relative to London averages.	Low
Housing Supply	There are existing pressures in terms of overall housing affordability, availability and below average levels of home ownership. The delivery of housing is a strategic objective of the Local Plan and London Plan.	High
Employment	Local economic challenges within the LIA and District include underperformance in terms of overall employment growth. However, there is relative strengths in a number of higher value sectors such as ICT, scientific and professional services and finance and insurance.	Medium
Education Provision: Early Years	Whilst there is a reasonable provision of spaces amongst childcare providers there are some capacity constraints amongst maintained nurseries in particular. Any net increase in the number of children within a given area implies additional demand for early years places. Demand for additional Early Years places will place greater pressures upon nursery / day care centres and impose additional costs upon individual education providers.	Medium
Education provision: Primary	Any net increase in the number of children within a given area implies additional demand for school places. There is evidence of some existing capacity within local primary schools as well as expansion plans.	Medium
Education provision: Secondary	Any net increase in the number of children within a given area implies additional demand for school places. Capacity within Secondary schools is more limited and the need for an additional school has been identified.	High
Primary Health Facilities	Any net increase in the population implies additional demand for health services. There is evidence of capacity amongst local GPs within 1 km of the Site accepting new patients. The average number of patients per FTE GP in the LIA is below both the CCG average and NHS HUDU benchmark of 1,800.	Medium
Open Space	An increase in the resident population of the Site would increase pressure on existing provision of open space. However, the Site is well catered for with above average levels of open space relative to other parts of the District.	Low
Other Community Facilities	The provision of community centres in the LIA is diverse. The Development would increase the demand for local amenities. However, the current supply does not appear to be over capacity. It is also anticipated there would be some community provision as part of the Development, which would help absorb some of the additional demand.	Low
Crime	Crime rates in the LIA are higher than the District as a whole and for the both LIA and borough crime rates have increased over the last few years.	Medium

Source: Hatch 2021

## Likely Significant Effects

### The Works

#### Loss of Existing Employment Floorspace

- 7.81 Existing floorspace on the Site comprises buildings associated with the operations of the former Stag Brewery including Brew House, Grains Handling and Energy Centre. Collectively, this floorspace amounts to 35,402m<sup>2</sup> (GIA).
- 7.82 Whilst the amount of existing floorspace on the Site is substantial, the Stag Brewery ceased brewery operations in 2015. The LBRuT Planning Brief for the Site<sup>21</sup> acknowledges that the Site was a low-density employment generating site and that on-Site employment levels typically averaged 185 staff whilst the Brewery was in operation. In June 2020, a temporary planning consent (ref: 19/3870/FUL) was granted for a period of two years allowing the use of the Site for film production operations (B1 use) and ancillary activities. However, as stated earlier in this Chapter in Paragraph 7.35 and in **Chapter 2: EIA Methodology**, for the purposes of the EIA, the short-term temporary uses currently on the Site have not been assessed on the basis that the Site will be vacated by June 2022. As such, this Chapter assumes that there is no existing economic activity present on the Site.
- 7.83 During the Works, all of the existing space on Site would be lost to other uses either through demolition or in the case of the Maltings, the façade of the (former) Bottling Hall and façade of the (former) Hotel, alterations to provide other uses. As part of the Development a range of employment uses are expected, which would be of a higher employment density than the previous brewery usage. The likely effects of this employment is considered later within this Chapter.
- 7.84 The receptor is existing employment floorspace (not the number of jobs) and magnitude of change has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is **low**. The Local Plan notes that additional employment floorspace is required throughout the borough. However, it is recognised the floorspace in its existing format is not suitable for long-term employment generating uses and there is currently no permanent employment on Site.
  - the loss of 35,402m<sup>2</sup> (GIA) of existing employment floorspace would not materially alter LBRuT's stock of useable / fit for purpose employment generating floorspace and the Development would generate operational employment in the future. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **negligible**.
- 7.85 Considering the above, the effect of the Works on existing employment floorspace is considered to be **insignificant**.

#### Employment Generation and Local Spend During the Works

- 7.86 Employment associated with the Works is relatively mobile. Based on the estimated costs of the Works and using the approach presented earlier in this Chapter, it is estimated that the Works would generate demand for 8,000 workers over the seven-year build period (March 2023 to October 2029).
- 7.87 Due to the varied nature of construction projects, these jobs would not necessarily be FTEs. However, to provide an indication of the number of jobs the Works could support, the number of workers has been divided over the seven-year build period. Based on this assumption, this would equate to an average of up to 1,140 workers per annum over the period of the Works.

- 7.88 Given the scale of the construction works, jobs and workers would likely be drawn from all over London and potentially further afield.
- 7.89 The estimated construction effect represents jobs directly linked to the Development. It would therefore include on-Site and off-Site jobs including jobs in the suppliers of materials and services to the Development. There may be employment benefits further down the supply chain which are not captured in this estimate, although these effects are likely to be relatively small. Some workers paid as a result of the construction activity may live locally, and their expenditure on household goods and services would also support employment in local businesses.
- 7.90 As such and as previously indicated, an estimate of the induced (local expenditure) effects of construction expenditure cannot be quantified. It is not possible to quantify this effect with any accuracy therefore this has been excluded from this assessment.
- 7.91 The receptor is employment and magnitude of change has been assessed as follows:
- the latest BRES data shows that the construction industry accounts for around 3.6% of London's and LBRuT's employment and 3% within the LIA. Construction jobs would likely be generated all over London and similarly workers would be drawn from across the region. Supporting economic growth is a key policy within the LBRuT Local Plan and this Site supports this. The Local Plan Policy LP29 also requires Local Employment Agreements (LEA) to be in place for large scale developments which would assist in ensuring that local residents have access to the employment opportunities arising from the Development. Based on this, the sensitivity of this receptor is deemed as **medium**.
  - as noted, the Development could generate construction jobs both on-Site and off-Site. An average of 1,140 construction jobs per annum would represent a small increase within London's construction employment levels (1%). Therefore, the magnitude of change brought about by the development is **low** at the regional level. At the District level it is reasonable to expect a proportion of the construction jobs would be secured locally, however, it is not possible to quantify the likely number of jobs that will be captured within the borough, therefore the magnitude of change is also assumed to be **negligible**.
- 7.92 Considering the predicted employment generation detailed above, the likely effects on employment is anticipated to be **short-medium term, beneficial**, and of **minor** significance at the **regional** level and **negligible at the District** level.

## Completed Development

### Population and Labour Market

The provision of up to 1,085 residential units would generate a total population of around 2,472 according to the methodology described in paragraph 7.20. For the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed all of this population would be net additional, and so would increase the existing population in the LIA by 21% and the District by around 1.3%. According to the same methodology, around 1,891 of this population would be of working age (18-64 years old).

- 7.93 The receptor is population and labour market and the significance of effects has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **low**; and
  - an additional 2,483 population equates to an increase of 21% for the LIA and 1.3% for the District and economic activity rates and skills profile are expected to remain in line with the area. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **high** for the LIA and **low** for the District.

- 7.94 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on population and labour market is considered **long-term, beneficial, and of moderate** significance at the **local** level and **minor significance** at the **District** level.

#### Housing Supply

- 7.95 The provision of up to 1,085 new dwellings would contribute up to 26.4% towards meeting the London Plan housing target for LBRuT (4,110 dwellings per annum (dpa) for the period up to 2029).
- 7.96 **Table 7.20** sets out the indicative mix of dwellings. Around 70% of the proposed dwellings are 2 bedrooms or more, therefore contributing towards LBRuT's policy objective of providing family housing.

Table 7.20: Indicative Dwelling Mix for the Development

	Flats				Total
	Studio/1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	
Market and Intermediate Units	318	417	165	20	<b>920</b>
Social Rented	12	63	84	6	<b>165</b>

- 7.97 The Development includes affordable housing provision of up to 22% by habitable room, subject to viability discussions, therefore making a contribution to local affordable housing policies.
- 7.98 The receptor is housing supply and the significance of effect has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **high**. New housing development is a strategic objective in the Local Plan and London Plan and it must respond to pressure from household growth; and
  - the provision of new residential units from the Development would represent an increase in the LIA's housing stock of around 21%, and around 1.3% of that of the District. The contribution to the London Plan housing target would be 26.4% The proposed mix of housing would make a positive contribution to local policy objectives including the provision of family units and affordable housing. The magnitude of the change is therefore assessed as **high** at the LIA level and **low** at the District level.
- 7.99 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on housing supply is considered to be:
- **long-term, local, beneficial** and of **major significance**; and
  - **long-term, District, beneficial** and of **minor significance**.

#### Employment

- 7.100 The likely FTE job creation derived from the Development is set out in **Table 7.21**. As described in paragraph 7.15 this assumed a worst-case scenario in terms of employment densities. On this basis, the total gross direct FTEs are estimated to be 364. These are likely to be minimum figures given that a worst-case scenario is assumed for the flexible floorspace element of the Development.
- 7.101 Once leakage, displacement and multiplier effects have been considered, the total net effects for LBRuT are likely to be 326 FTEs.



Table 7.21: Employment Effects

Type	Floorspace (m <sup>2</sup> GIA)	Gross Direct FTEs	Leakage	Displacement	Net local Direct FTEs	Multiplier	Total Net FTEs LBRuT
B1 office space	4,547	129	0%	25%	97	1.1	106
Hotel	15 keys	8	0%	25%	6	1.1	6
Cinema	1,606	8	0%	25%	6.0	1.1	7
Secondary school (6FE, 1,200 pupils)	9,319	87	0%	0%	87	1.1	96
Flexible Uses (Assumed Worst Case Scenario)							
A1 Retail	1,177	71	0%	25%	53	1.1	58
A2 Professional Services	0	0	0%	25%	0	1.1	0
A3 Restaurant / Cafe	0	0	0%	25%	0	1.1	0
A4 Pub/Bar	0	0	0%	25%	0	1.1	0
B1 Office	2,000	57	0%	25%	43	1.1	47
D1 Community	1,282	4	0%	0%	4	1.1	5
Suis generis Boathouse	380	1	0%	0%	1	1.1	1
<b>Total</b>		<b>365</b>			<b>296</b>		<b>326</b>

Source: Hatch

- 7.102 In addition to the likely direct on-Site employment effects associated with the Development, the provision of new households would generate additional retail and other spend that would support the local economy of the LIA, LBRuT and the wider area. This increased expenditure would support employment in retail and other service providers both on-Site and off-Site.
- 7.103 The level of the employment generated locally, in addition to that supported on-site, would be determined by the types of goods and services the new residents consume and where they choose to spend their income.
- 7.104 When the Development is complete and fully occupied, it is estimated that the total annual expenditure generated by the new households on comparison and convenience goods and retail services would be around £20.5m per annum. This represents a 1.3% increase in total household spending across the District.
- 7.105 The receptor is employment and magnitude of change has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the employment receptor is assessed as **medium at both the local and District level**. Local economic challenges within the LIA and District include underperformance relative to London in terms of overall employment growth. However, there is

evidence of relative strengths in a number of higher value sectors such as ICT, finance and insurance and professional, scientific and technical services; and

- the total increase in jobs supported locally would increase by around 16% at the LIA level and less than 1% at the wider District level. The magnitude of the change is considered to be **high** at the LIA level and **negligible at the District level**.

7.106 In view of the above, the significance of the likely effects of the Development on employment is:

- **long-term, local, beneficial and of major significance;** and
- **District insignificant at the District level.**

#### Capacity of Education Facilities

7.107 **Table 7.23** below provides a summary of the child yield for the Development based on the GLA's Population Yield Calculator. Each stage of education is then assessed in turn in terms of significance of effects.

Table 7.23: Child Yield

GLA 2019	
Aged 0-4	252
Aged 5-11	185
Aged 12-15	73
Aged 16-17	39

Source: GLA Population Yield Calculator (2019)

#### Early Years Education

7.108 It is estimated that the Development would result in an Early Years child yield of 52. Not all of these children would require an Early Years education place and not all would be additional to the borough. However, it is prudent to assume the Development would yield this worst-case demand.

7.109 The latest available Child Care Sufficiency Assessment (February 2020)<sup>22</sup> sets out '*there is broadly sufficient childcare availability in Richmond with continual changes of models available within the childcare market so that most families can access a suitable model that meets their needs*'. Whilst it is reasonable to assume a proportion of the Early Years child yield from the proposed Development could be accommodated within existing provision, due to the existing pressures on maintained nurseries, choice may be limited to private providers or to providers outside of the LIA.

7.110 The magnitude of change is assessed as medium at the local level and low at the District level.

7.111 The receptor is Early Years education provision and the **sensitivity of the receptor** is assessed as **medium**.

7.112 The significance of effect of the Development is considered to be

- **Long-term, local, adverse and of moderate significance;** and
- **Long-term, District, adverse and of minor significance**

#### Primary School Education

7.113 It is estimated that the Development would result in a primary school aged child yield of 185. It is possible that some of the children in the Development would already be residing in the area and

attending local schools, however, for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed all children would be additional.

- 7.114 There is a current surplus in capacity of primary school places within two miles of the Site. The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy suggests that due to recent expansions and the ability to put in place a shared form of entry system, no further action is needed at present or in the foreseeable future. In addition, a recent Planning Committee Report (January 2020) for the 2018 Application noted that there is existing and forecast capacity in planning Area 7 which could accommodate demand arising from the proposed Development.
- 7.115 The receptor is primary school education provision and the significance of effects has been assessed as follows:
- any net increase in the number of children implies additional demand for school places. Sufficient school places are a key priority for LBRuT, however evidence indicates that capacity is currently sufficient and therefore the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **medium**; and
  - an additional 185 children yielded from the Development is unlikely to exceed any surplus in capacity within the local catchment areas once expansion plans and capacity within other school place planning areas have been considered. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **low**.
- 7.116 As such, the likely effect of the Development on primary school education provision is considered to be **direct, long-term, adverse** and of **minor** significance at both the **local** and **District** level.

#### *Secondary School Education*

- 7.117 It is estimated that the Development would result in a secondary school aged child yield of 111 (including sixth form aged children). It is possible that some of the children in the Development would already be residing in the area and attending local schools, however, for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed all children would be additional.
- 7.118 The Development includes provision of a six-form entry Secondary School with a sixth form with capacity for up to 1,200 pupils. It is therefore considered the additional demand arising from the Development could be absorbed by the existing surpluses together with the new on-Site provision.
- 7.119 The receptor is secondary school education provision and significance of effects has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **high**. Capacity data shows there are some existing surpluses across secondary schools in the catchment area but LBRuT has identified the need for an additional secondary school going forward.
  - an additional 111 children yielded from the Development could be accommodated within the provision of an on-Site six form of entry Secondary School with a sixth form as part of the Development, which would substantially increase the capacity for secondary school aged children residing within three miles of the Development. The magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **negligible**.
- 7.120 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on secondary school education provision is considered to be **insignificant** at both **local** and **District** level.

### Primary Health Care Capacity

- 7.121 As previously stated, the Development would likely generate a total population of 2,472. As a worst-case scenario, it is expected that all of these residents are additional and would register with a local GP.
- 7.122 There are two GP surgeries within one kilometre of the Site. These surgeries have a list size averaging 1,556 patients per FTE GP, which is below the HUDU benchmark (1,800) and below the CCG average of 1,776. If all residents of the Development were to register with a local GP within 1 km of the Site, the average list size per FTE GP would increase to 1,687 (+8.4%).
- 7.123 The receptor is primary health care and the significance of the effects are assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **medium**. The requirement for health services would impose additional demands and costs upon the existing provision. However, the baseline assessment demonstrates a below average list size within 1 km of the Development and local surgeries continue to accept new patients; and
  - if all residents registered with a surgery within 1 miles of the Site, the average patient list size per FTE GP would increase by 8.4% within the LIA. District. The magnitude of the change is therefore assessed as **medium at the local** level.
- 7.124 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on GP facilities would be **direct, long term, adverse and of moderate significance at the local** level.

### Demand for Open Space and Play Space

- 7.125 According to the GLA's population yield calculator (2019) the total requirement for children's play space is 5,481 sqm.
- 7.126 The Development includes provision of up to 7,470m<sup>2</sup> GEA of children's play space with a further estimated contribution of 2,903 m<sup>2</sup> from the play space provided as part of the 6FE Secondary School. This has been based on intermittent use equating to around 2 days out of 7 outside of school hours of the 10,161 m<sup>2</sup> available with the intention to arrange a community use agreement with the resident community. This brings total on-Site provision to 10,374 m<sup>2</sup>, which is more than sufficient to accommodate additional demand arising from the Development.
- 7.127 As indicated within **Chapter 5: The Proposed Development**, play facilities for different age groups would be positioned within residential courtyards, parks, plazas and open space areas throughout the Development, to achieve the required areas of play and the distribution related to residential units, as follows (including provision associated with the School):
- Up to 3,156m<sup>2</sup> of Doorstep Play (0-4yrs) within 100 m of residential units;
  - Up to 4,395m<sup>2</sup> of Local Play space (5-11yrs) within 400 m of residential units;
  - Up to 2,823m<sup>2</sup> of Neighbourhood Space (12+yrs) within 800 m of residential units; and
  - Play on the way (all ages).
- 7.128 Play elements and facilities would be provided in a range of forms within the public and private realms of the Development, including designated and fenced playgrounds, unfenced but contained play spaces with a range of play elements and carer seating, topographic variation and play opportunities in the landscape (within planting areas) and 'play on the way' elements within circulation spaces and public realm areas. This provision and distribution of play facilities within the Development has been developed in line with the GLA (Play and Informal Recreation SPG 2012) and the LBRuT (Planning Obligations SPD 2020).

- 7.129 The 10,161m<sup>2</sup> of play space associated with the school would comprise an external Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) to the south of the school building and a full sized artificial all weather sports pitch with spectator facilities to the west of the school building. The Applicant (and the Education Schools Funding Authority (ESFA) have committed to a Community Use Agreement which would enable local groups, teams, clubs, organisations and bodies the opportunity to use the external play pitch, indoor sports hall, activity studio and MUGA of the school out of school hours.
- 7.130 In terms of open space, the baseline analysis has indicated the local area already has above average levels of provision per head of population when compared to the LBRuT average. The Development would result in the loss of 2.06 ha of privately open space (Watney's Sports Ground playing fields) but would provide a total of 4.24 ha of total publicly accessible amenity space. When considering the additional population arising from the Development (up to 2,472) this level of provision (4.24 ha) amounts to around 1.7 ha per 1,000 population which is above average levels of provision for the majority of types of space set out in **Table 7.16**.
- 7.131 The receptor is open space and play space and magnitude of change has been assessed as follows:
- the sensitivity of the receptor is assessed as **low**. The Site is in an area which is already well provided for in terms of open space and play space with above average levels of provision per population; and
  - the Development includes provision of 7,470 sqm of children's play space as well as provision provided as part of the secondary school, and a total of 4.24 ha of total publicly accessible amenity space. This is sufficient to cater for demand arising from the on-Site population, and taking the loss of Watney's Sports Ground playing fields into account provides a net increase in overall provision. The magnitude of the change is therefore assessed as **medium**.
- 7.132 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on open space and play space provision is considered to be **direct, long term, beneficial, and of moderate significance at both the local and District level**.

#### Demand for Community Facilities

- 7.133 The local area is well provisioned in terms of community facilities, with a range of amenities within 1km of the Site. The quality of these facilities is also of a good standard
- 7.134 In respect of community facilities, the Development would provide a school (with community facilities via a Community Use Agreement), cinema, an area for flexible community uses which could include a community boathouse. In addition, the Development would provide up to 5,967m<sup>2</sup> private amenity space and up to 4.24ha of public amenity space (Including external and internal play space for residence and school play space) and includes provision of Public Community Park.
- 7.135 The receptor is community facilities and magnitude of change has been assessed as follows:
- the additional resident population would increase demand for these types of amenities however, there is no evidence to suggest these facilities are over capacity, therefore the sensitivity of this receptor is deemed as **low**.
  - the provision of school facilities, cinema, and an area for flexible community uses on-Site would help meet some of the additional demand generated by the Development. Based on this the magnitude of change is therefore assessed as **low**.

7.136 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on community facility provision is considered to be:

- **direct, long-term, beneficial, local and of minor significance;** and
- **insignificant** at the **District** level.

#### Community Safety and Wellbeing

7.137 It is expected the profile of the additional population derived from the Development would be similar to that of the surrounding area and LBRuT as a whole. As such, therefore incidents of crime per head of the population are unlikely to materially change from the existing situation.

7.138 Nevertheless, designed in line with designing out crime features, the Development would animate and activate the Site and the mix of uses would mean there would be a new residential population as well as employees and visitors to the Site. The proposed mix and layout of land uses, high street and publicly accessible spaces would provide active frontages at ground floor level and encourage activity at all times throughout the day. This would maximise natural surveillance, thereby reducing the opportunity for crime and improving perceptions of safety.

7.139 Furthermore, the Development would include pedestrian routes through the Site which would open up the Site improving access and permeability in and around the Site. This would help to ensure a safe environment for pedestrians. Specific measures to design out crime include:

- ground floor level private garden areas provided with railings in order to clearly define private space and to provide a more secure threshold to ground floor level dwellings;
- the publicly accessible landscaped areas will be designed to avoid areas that are hidden from view;
- main entrances to residential buildings will be from well lit main streets and or pedestrian routes through the site;
- basement level car parking will have a management strategy that limits access to the basement level during evening hours; and
- further security measures include CCTV and access control.

7.140 In view of the above, the likely effect of the Development on community safety and wellbeing is considered to be:

- **direct, long-term, beneficial, local** and of **minor significance;** and
- **insignificant** at the **District** level.

## Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects

### The Works

#### Loss of Existing Employment Floorspace

7.141 Due to employment floorspace being provided on-Site as part of the Development no mitigation is required. Therefore, the likely residual effect to the loss of existing employment floorspace would remain **insignificant**.

#### Employment Generation

7.142 The Works could support an average of up to 1,140 FTEs per annum over the 7 year period of the Works. Jobs and workers would likely be drawn from all over London. A Local Employment Agreement, as required by the adopted Local Plan would assist in ensuring that residents have

access to the employment opportunities arising from the Development. The measures to target local employment during Site preparation and construction would be secured through a Section 106 agreement. The likely residual effects on employment during the works remain as **short-medium term, beneficial, effects of minor** significance at the **regional** level and would become **medium term, beneficial, effects of minor significance** at the **District** level.

## Completed Development

### Population and Labour Market

- 7.143 No mitigation measures are required and the likely residual effects of the Development on population and labour market would remain **direct, long term, beneficial** and of **moderate significance** at the **local** level and **minor significance** at the **District** level.

### Housing Supply

- 7.144 The Development would provide new dwellings contributing towards LBRuT's annual housing target and the annual housing target for East Sheen, as set out in the emerging Local Plan. As such, no mitigation measures are required and the likely residual effects of the Development on housing supply would remain as:
- **long-term, local, beneficial** and of **major significance**; and
  - **long-term, District, beneficial** and of **minor significance**.

### Employment and Local Spend

- 7.145 On account of the generation of jobs as a result of the Development and expenditure of the new resident population, no mitigation measures are required and the likely residual effects of the Development remain as:
- **long-term, local, beneficial** and of **major significance**; and
  - **insignificant** at the **District** level.

### Early Years Education Capacity

- 7.146 District is considered that a proportion of additional demand for early years education arising from the proposed Development could be met through existing providers. Therefore, the likely residual effects remain as:
- **Long-term, local, adverse** and of **moderate significance**; and
  - **Log-term, District, adverse** and of **minor significance**.

### Primary Education Capacity

- 7.147 District is expected that whilst the child yield will inevitably place additional pressure on capacity amongst existing schools, demand could be met through existing and forecast capacity elsewhere in the borough. Therefore the residual effects remain as **long-term, adverse** and of **minor significance** at both the **local** and **District** level.

### Secondary Education Capacity

- 7.148 The Development includes provision of a six form entry Secondary School with sixth form with capacity for up to 1,200 pupils. It is therefore considered the additional demand arising from the Development could be absorbed by the existing surpluses together with the new on-Site provision and the likely residual effect remains as **insignificant**.



#### Primary Health Care Capacity

- 7.149 Owing to the existing pressures on the capacity of primary healthcare facilities within the LIA and District, mitigation via contributions under a Section 106 agreement from the Development may be a matter for negotiation to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development. With mitigation, the likely residual effect from the Development on primary healthcare providers would be **insignificant** at the **local District level**.

#### Demand for Open Space and Play Space

- 7.150 Owing to the provision of 10,374m<sup>2</sup> of children's play space (including provision associated with the school) and a total of 4.24 ha of publicly accessible amenity space on Site, there is more than sufficient play space to accommodate additional demand arising from the Development. As such, the likely residual effects of the Development on open space and play space capacity are considered to remain **direct, long-term, beneficial** at **local to District level** and of **moderate significance**.

#### Demand for Community Facilities

- 7.151 Owing to the provision of school facilities for multi-use via a Community Use Agreement, as well as provision of a cinema, and an area for flexible community uses on-site, the likely residual effects of the Development on community facilities would remain as:
- **direct, long-term, beneficial, local** and of **minor significance**; and
  - **insignificant** at the **District level**.

#### Community Safety and Wellbeing

- 7.152 On account of the consideration of designing out crime features and that the Development would animate and activate the Site, the likely residual effects of the Development on community safety and wellbeing would remain as:
- **direct, long-term, beneficial, local** and of **minor significance**; and
  - **insignificant** at the **District level**.

## Summary

7.153 **Table 7.23** provides a summary of the likely significant effects together with mitigation measures and likely residual effects.

Table 7.23: Summary of Likely Significant Effects, Mitigation Measures and Likely Residual Effects

Description of Effect	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Measures	Likely Residual Effect
<b>The Works</b>			
Loss of 35,402m <sup>2</sup> GIA of employment floorspace.	<b>Insignificant.</b>	No mitigation required – employment floorspace and employment generating uses being provided as part of the Development.	<b>Insignificant.</b>
Generation of an average of up to 1,140 FTEs per annum over 7 years.	<b>Short-medium term, beneficial, regional. Insignificant at District level.</b>	S106 Agreement to target local employment during Site preparation and construction.	<b>Short-medium term, beneficial, District to regional and of minor significance.</b>
<b>Completed Development</b>			
Population and Labour Market.	<b>Long-term, local beneficial and of moderate significance. Long-term, District, beneficial and of minor significance.</b>	No mitigation required.	<b>Long-term, local beneficial and of moderate significance. Long-term, District, beneficial and of minor significance.</b>
Provision of housing contributing to LBRuT targets.	<b>Long-term, local, beneficial and of major significance. Long-term, District, beneficial and of minor significance.</b>	No mitigation required.	<b>Long-term, local, beneficial and of major significance. Long-term, District, beneficial and of minor significance.</b>
Generation of employment as a result of the Development and expenditure of the new resident population	<b>Long-term, local, beneficial and of major significance. Insignificant at the District level.</b>	No mitigation required.	<b>Long-term, local, beneficial and of moderate significance. Insignificant at District level</b>
An additional population of children under the age of 5 and demand for early years places.	<b>Long-term, adverse and moderate significance at the local level and minor at the District level.</b>	No mitigation	<b>Long-term, local, adverse and of moderate significance. Long-term, District, adverse and of minor significance.</b>
An additional population primary school aged children and demand for primary school places.	<b>Long-term, local, adverse and of minor significance.</b>	No mitigation	<b>Long-term, local, adverse and of minor significance.</b>

Description of Effect	Likely Significant Effect	Mitigation Measures	Likely Residual Effect
	<b>Long-term, District, adverse and of minor significance.</b>		<b>Long-term, District, adverse and of minor significance.</b>
The additional demand for secondary school places arising from the Development would be accommodated by proposed Secondary School and existing surpluses.	<b>Insignificant.</b>	No mitigation required – Secondary school provided as part of the Development.	<b>Insignificant.</b>
Additional demand by the new population of the Development for primary health care.	<b>Direct, long-term, local, District adverse and of moderate significance.</b>	Section 106 receipts to mitigate.	<b>Insignificant.</b>
Provision of 10,374m <sup>2</sup> of children’s play space and a total of 4.24 ha of publicly accessible amenity space on Site as part of the Development to accommodate additional demand.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial at local to District and of moderate significance.</b>	No mitigation required – Provision of children’s play space and amenity space provided as part of the Development.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial at local to District and of moderate significance.</b>
Provision of a school (with shared sports facilities via a Community Use Agreement), cinema, and an area for flexible community uses which could include a community boathouse, together with up to private amenity space, public amenity space and Public Community Park.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial, local and of minor significance. Insignificant at the District level.</b>	No mitigation required – community facilities and inclusion of Community Use Agreement as part of the Development.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial, local and of minor significance. Insignificant at the District level.</b>
The Development would seek to design out crime features and would animate and activate the Site.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial, local and of minor significance. Insignificant at the District level.</b>	No mitigation required.	<b>Direct, long-term, beneficial, local and of minor significance. Insignificant at the District level.</b>

## References

---

- 1 Office for National Statistics (2020): 'Business Register and Employment Survey', ONS, London.
- 2 Office for National Statistics (2021): '2011 Census of Population' and 'The Annual Population Survey', ONS, London.
- 3 Office for National Statistics (2017): 'Family Expenditure Survey', ONS, England.
- 4 LBRuT (2020): 'Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)', LBRuT.
- 5 [www.nhs.uk/Service-Search](http://www.nhs.uk/Service-Search)
- 6 [www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-school-capacity](http://www.gov.uk/government/collections/statistics-school-capacity)
- 7 Greater London Authority – SPG Child Yield and Play Space Calculator;  
<https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/implementing-london-plan/supplementary-planning-guidance/play-and-informal>
- 8 GLA Population Yield Calculator, V3.2 June 2019.
- 9 <https://data.london.gov.uk/>
- 10 GLA (2008): 'Open Space Strategies: Best Practice Guidance'.
- 11 LBRuT (2025): 'Open Space Assessment Report', April 2015, Knight Kavanagh and Page; Table 2.3.
- 12 Homes and Communities Agency (2015): 'Calculating Cost Per Job, Best Practice Note 2015', 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition.
- 13 Office for National Statistics, Family Expenditure Survey, 2016-18.
- 14 HCA (2015): 'Employment Densities Guide', 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, November 2015.
- 15 Department for Education, School Workforce England, 2013;  
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/school-workforce-in-england-november-2013>
- 16 LBRuT (2018): 'Local Plan', July 2018.
- 17 GLA (2021) 'London Plan' March 2021.
- 18 LBRuT (2019): 'LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy'.
- 19 LBRuT (2020): 'Childcare Sufficiency Assessment', February 2020.
- 20 LBRuT (2020): 'Planning Committee Report', 29th January 2020.
- 21 LBRuT (2014): 'Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Stag Brewery, Mortlake SW14 Planning Brief', Adopted July 2014, LBRuT.
- 22 LBRuT (2020): 'Childcare Sufficiency Assessment', February 2020.