

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 May 2022 00:30
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Stag Brewery development plans

To Whom it may concern,

These plans propose over a thousand dwellings in an area confined by the river, the A316 and the SW railway with only two small traffic exits onto the Lower Richmond Road. This road is already severely congested in the morning and evening, and thereby causes serious air pollution and risk to the health of local residents. The only proposal to mitigate the undoubted huge increase in traffic is to remove a wide grass verge and a significant number of mature trees alongside Chertsey Court. All this will achieve is an extra queue of cars between Chalker's Corner and Watney Cottages with nowhere for the vehicles to go. This extra lane will increase pollution further and remove oxygen providing plants that also help to remove particulate matter and provide a wildlife habitat that includes many bird species, stag beetles and bats. Similarly, the present sports field will be lost with further ecological deprivation.

It's not clear whether the development will accommodate 1000 additional vehicles to avoid overflow in an area where parking spaces are already at a premium; and this assumes only one vehicle per household. Flood defences are mentioned, but the Thames barrier was only designed to last until 2030, and ideas have changed about flooding strategies, so it is surprising that such a dense development is planned with no definite provisions for future flooding at ground floor levels.

Similarly, it is not clear whether there is adequate provision for waste water and sewerage from over a thousand dwellings and a school of 1000 pupils.

Some of the buildings exceed the 7 stories agreed. Higher buildings will intrude considerably on the historic riverscape.

In conclusion, the planned buildings are too densely packed and the loss of habitat will be very damaging to the health and well-being of local residents and wildlife.

I do not feel sufficient evidence of the need for secondary school in the borough has been presented. The school would remove the playing field and the trees that presently provide recreation and amenity for local inhabitants. The pupils will also be affected by the increase in pollution due to the extra traffic in the area.

I feel it is not particularly sensible to locate a school right next to the River when there is insufficient recreational area; even though the river provides special sporting act opportunities. The area around the school is 30% less than the Department of education recommends

The transfer of the local primary school to the site seems a more sensible solution.

Yours faithfully,
Karen James

117 Sheen Lane
[REDACTED]