From: Sent: 28/April/2022 17:43 (BST) To: envprotection@richmond.gov.uk Subject: Redevelopment of Stag Brewery site, Mortlake. 2 applications. Ref A 22/0900/OUT. Ref B22/0902/FUL My address is: 100 Christchurch Road, East Sheen, London SW14 7AX Dear Head of Development Management I write as a former Director of Wildlife and Countryside and Head of the UK Biodiversity Group at the Department of the Environment. I was also the Chair of the London Sustainable Development Commission (2009-14). My main concern is the impact of the redevelopment on the River Thames. The Thames Barrier will in due course no longer offer the protection it once did unless a new barrier

The Thames Barrier will in due course no longer offer the protection it once did unless a new barrier is erected in the next decade or so. It is already under growing pressure and the barrier is being raised much more frequently. With sea level rise, and more frequent weather events which could lead to rising water levels, there is a real risk of flooding in the Mortlake area. This would be exacerbated by measures to strengthen the walls around the development so that the enormous water pressure will be channeled into the next open space either in Mortlake or in neighbouring areas.

The risk of flooding could have a significant impact on the existing houses in Mortlake, the railway line, schools and other facilities not to mention the south circular road. We need a plan that addresses these issues explicitly.

Other concerns include the impact of additional houses and population growth on air quality and the environment. Has any assessment been carried out on the ecological impact of the development on the area? What plans are there for mitigation?

Aesthetically, any structure 9 storeys high is bound to have an impact, especially in an area of predominantly low rise buildings. What do the relevant authorities think of this? Why does it need to be 9 storeys high anyway? Just to make more money for developers? There is no sense that the average citizen's view are reflected in the development.

My conclusion is that although I can accept there may be a desire for more housing in the area(though no figures to demonstrate this have been made available to me so far-they may well exist) there seems to be no sensitivity to the character of the local area and no obvious recognition of the threat to people and infrastructure from flooding and to the environment from what appears to be an entirely developer driven agenda.

I hope you are able to offer some reassurance on these points.
Best wishes,

John Plowman