

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 May 2022 17:57
To: StagBreweryRedevelopment
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: OBJECTIONS TO STAG BREWERY PLANNING APPLICATION

These objections are sent from the two residents named below, at the address indicated below.

We **OBJECT** to these applications for the following reasons

APPLICATION A

1. The Traffic Plan for the area (as it always has) remain wholly unrealistic for the following reasons:

- it takes no proper account of deliveries, arrivals and departures from the site which is increasingly the way retail is going
- its impact in relation to the school collections and arrivals has not taken proper account of particular given that much of this will happen during already busy hours
- there are other major development sites being developed or (in some cases) subject to consent) in the area in Kew, In Brentford, on the Homebase site in Manor Road and on the old Barnes hospital site which will all add to the existing congestion at this important confluence of major roads leading West on main commuter routes in and out of West London.
- it seems be accepted that there is no mitigation that will work for traffic in the Lower, Upper Richmond Road and Clifford Avenue and Chalkers Corner that will alleviate the stress already experienced in those areas due to traffic density and flow
- we share the concern of Chertsey Court residents about the level of traffic at Chalkers Corner, and consequent air pollution both during construction and at completion of the Stag scheme. There have been warnings enough about this about which the developers and the Council are well aware but do not sufficiently take into account through any action they are prepared to take.
- access in and out of the site is limited by the river and existing restrictions close to the site, including the railway and the lower Richmond Road..

2. These applications are seemingly deaf to previous objections raised by the local community on the issue of both density and height. This is so, for the following reasons

- there are still 1114 units (far, far more than originally mooted for this site) with no convincing evidence that a decent, or lawful proportion will be genuinely 'affordable', let alone capable as being defined as 'social housing'. This needs to be fully clarified on all issues of details relating to numbers, size and location of any affordable housing, with proper estimates of cost so that affordability can be assessed. The reality of a cynical attempt to reduce this kind of social housing (a housing need we support) has been exposed at every stage of these repeatedly amended applications since their inception. This third major attempt to gain consent should fail again for this site, and as the Mayor Of London has pointed out in refusing the previous application, the Council has failed to have proper regard to their responsibilities provide the right kind of housing. The Council do not seem to have 'stepped up". This new application continues

to demonstrate a collaboration between the developers and the Council planners which looks like objectors are being ignored at every stage. The Council's original scheme considered only about 600 units. Respect for community feeling has been abandoned in favour of an increased level of general housing, when such a development is already demonstrably unsuitable for this part of the Arcadian Thames. The area cannot take the pressure on roads and services e.g. NHS funded medical services in the area.

- We object to the segregated nature of the so-called affordable housing units. This is divisive and will understandably create community division. This soulless place, segregating a community located on the site based on the ability to pay what the developers will require, will not become the "new heart of Mortlake" as it is, rather objectionably, called. It will be where nobody wishes to go, or stay.
- no account has been taken of the Community Plan or seemingly the reasoning and good sense that underlies it. No good reason why not has ever been given. The heights of buildings proposed remain excessive particularly on the riverside frontage and the towpath. This is not optimisation which might be justified, but maximisation.
- we don't like the now outdated design which is not sympathetic to the area, and its location close to the river.
- the affect on the green space close to Mortlake station will be catastrophic.

Application B

Our objections are simple. A secondary school is not needed, and not is it justified by ALL of the evidence. RBRUT has been blind to the written evidence it has been presented with which support this objection by those who have taken the time trouble and expense to investigate it, using independent assessors. They have also seemingly been deaf to the schools leaders, and community members that have expressed concern about it in the area. The Council has sought to justify it by other developments which have not yet been consented and are themselves subject to object. I suggest this is an unlawful justification. The figures which support the suggested need are still going in the opposite direction suggesting this plan should be abandoned. The alternative of a primary school is supported by the developers, was part of the original plan, and remains the best option involving the re-siting of the existing primary school at Thompson House. We feel too that the provision of a primary school rather than the large secondary school (too large for the site) will help to alleviate some of the traffic concerns that so many are expressing in the area.

Application C

Our objection is that the proposed mitigations will do nothing to solve the depth of the problems that currently exist and will increasingly exist if the mistake is made to build this site on the sale and density proposed.

Finally

As long standing citizens of Mortlake (we have lived close to this site for over 50 years) we find ourselves experiencing continued decision making from a council which appears deaf to the long-standing and clearly expressed concerns of the existing population of Mortlake. Frankly it has been depressing at every stage. Hardly anyone in this locality is against this site being developed for the benefit of those that need homes. What is proposed is far too dense and unsympathetic, and manifestly will not work for anyone save perhaps the developers. It will do nothing to provide homes for those low earning public workers (for example) that really need it, and who need to be attracted to live here. The Council needs to put much greater pressure on the developers to consider the Community Plan and

take account of it, and listen to the detailed objections, provided over many years, from the people who actually live here, and work to achieve the best for the area. The local ratepayers across the borough will ultimately have to pay for the failures of the Council over several years now, to take account of the need for genuinely affordable homes which as the Mayor of London has said has not been fulfilled by these proposals. This perhaps will be realised through reduced public services which are the Council's responsibility. The financial effect on one or two the schools in this area, if the proposed large secondary school is built, may well prove fatal to the continued viability of specific schools where head teachers have expressed concerns. This remains the case, and once again it will be the ratepayers and their families that will suffer for years to come as a result. A failure by the Council to properly assess and report back to the community on all these concerns about schooling needs and the changes in the local demographics, may well prove (if the situation continues) to be an act of considerable negligence.

regards

Bruce and Stella Houlder

9 Little St Leonards
East Sheen
SW14 7LT

