### Richmond Design Review Panel

Following a request from the London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames post submission, a Design Review Panel (DRP) was arranged to present the scheme for feedback. The DRP took place on 10th May 2019 with a mixture of professionals included on the panel. Planning officers and ward councillors were also in attendance. The DRP included a site walk around before a presentation by the Architects, a discussion and then feedback.

Officers and the panel were generally aligned in their comments and responses as detailed here.

#### Summary of DRP comments:

- The site represents an ideal opportunity for providing new housing in the borough, regaining access to the riverfront and potentially creating a pedestrian link across the railway to connect with Twickenham Station;
- The Panel supports the idea of the residential street reflecting the surrounding context. The Panel acknowledge that, although the urban grain may be slightly tight, it does comply with the New London Plan standards for amenity space;
- · Supportive of the industrial aesthetic and material palette;
- Given the industrial backdrop, overall the height is appropriate;
- Supportive of the clear public realm concept, however the location of car parking at the north end of the site and overall quantum was questioned;
- The space for the bridge landing feels compromised with car parking and playspace. This should be interrogated further and the bridge should be pursued;
- Concern around the size of the rear gardens of houses C15-C30 where neighbours are in close proximity. The gardens of D1-D4 also feel small;
- Concerns over the massing at the junction of Gould Road and Crane Road in relation to existing terraces and overlooking from the roof gardens on Building F;
- Fourth storey and balconies to the western end of Building F could have a negative impact and potential overlooking;
- Review the lantern roof and look at the option of a flat roof instead. Also not convinced of the darker tone;
- Losing the four houses proposed at this end would enable a more effective use of the external space on the riverfront.



View of east terraced houses



View of west terraced houses



Riverside CGI



Riverside elevation

#### Comments

### Riverside, playspace and Gould Road houses (DRP comment)

Supportive of the clear public realm concept, however the location of car parking at the north end of the site and overall quantum could be reduced to improve the landscaping and river edge. Little space is left for seating, play and recreation. Consider mitigation measures to soften the hard edge towards the river-front and create a sense of place by the river edge.

The space for the bridge landing feels compromised with car parking and playspace. Suggest taking forward the opportunity for a pedestrian crossing over the River Crane and the railway and interrogate this space to ensure sufficient landing area. Losing the four houses may help assist in improving this.

### Our response

#### Riverside, playspace and Gould Road houses

Accommodating sufficient parking and appropriate landscaping has been a careful balance. Following advice from our transport consultant parking was reduced marginally to enhance the landscaping with further measures as follows:


- Greatly enhanced river edge treatment with extension of board walk and play space;
- Reduced no. car parking spaces considered acceptable by Richmond's Highways team;
- Detailed design of playspace and bridge landing showing how these interact and ensuring the space is sufficient;
- Future-proofed bridge landing with additional safe guarded area added to drawings;
- 100 metre board walk runs the full length of the river providing further opportunities for interaction and play;
- Increased planting buffer improves biodiversity and reduces light-spill onto the river corridor;
- Spaces for seating, play and walking provided;
- Clear delineation between car and pedestrian spaces;
- Four houses proposed to the rear of Gould Road houses to be retained as previously submitted. These houses have been designed to fit comfortably in front of the playspace, provide natural surveillance enhancing the security of the riverside area and avoid overlooking to neighbours. Their height has also reduced during the design process.



Planning submitted landscape proposal



Proposed revision



Planning submitted through Gould Road houses section

#### Rear garden sizes (DRP comment)

Lack of amenity space for houses (specifically C15-C30 and D1-D7). Adjust the typology and provide more generous space. Explore the inside outside relationship to make them more usable.

### Rear garden sizes (pre-application 2 comment)

Increase in back garden depths is supported and are policy compliant however some still remain small.


#### Rear garden sizes

All houses have been provided with a rear private garden which meets the London Plan and policy requirements, however garden sizes have been increased where possible. These measures include:

- House types C-15 to C30 shortened to increase garden sizes (houses remain London Plan compliant);
- Larger accessible houses with the smallest gardens relocated elsewhere and provided as apartments more suitable for wheelchair users;
- Patio doors to be provided with level threshold giving seamless access to the gardens, creating usable inside-outside space;
- · House layouts D1-D4 amended to improve relationship with the garden.







Planning addendum proposal



#### Massing improvements - Gould Road & Crane Road (DRP comment)

- Concerns over the massing at the junction of Gould Road and Crane Road in relation to existing terraces and overlooking from the roof gardens in Building F;
- Review the lantern roof and look at the option of a flat roof instead; not convinced of the darker tone.

#### Massing improvements - Gould Road & Crane Road (pre-application 2 comment)

The roof of Building F appears over-heavy and appears to emphasise the upper-storey finish.



#### Massing improvements - Gould Road & Crane Road

We have tested a variety of approaches in response to these comments. The flat roof option was tested but this gave a very blocky form that is largely alien to the area and did not compliment the existing roofscape. The following design amendments were subsequently made:

- Reduced parapet and roof terrace extent at junction of Gould Road and Crane Road, improving
  the relationship with the existing terrace of houses and reducing potential overlooking from
  the roof terrace;
- · Amended treatment of fourth floor and roof profile to reduce visual impact from the street;
- · Different material to reduce 'heavy' appearance;
- Retained lantern profile and roof pitch within a gable to best respond to existing buildings on site and local character.



Planning submitted scheme showing roof terrace



Potential scheme showing residential terrace area



Planning submitted scheme: looking north down Crane Road



Planning addendum proposal



Planning submitted scheme: looking north down Crane Road



Planning addendum proposal

### Overlooking & privacy


Fourth storey and balconies to the western end of Building F could have a negative impact and potential overlooking.

## Overlooking & privacy

A full review of overlooking has been undertaken on these properties. The current proposal does not overlook existing windows, but does partially overlook the gardens of 4 Gould Road. Overlooking of gardens is a common condition within the area and within London and was considered acceptable by officers as part of the previous application. It is also important new apartments are provided with balconies where possible to meet London Plan.

However the design incorporates the following changes to reduce this perceived overlooking to benefit the existing owners of the gardens.

- Overlooking to neighbouring gardens minimised by garden of number 2 Gould Road and proposal to increase height of existing perimeter wall at site application boundary;
- Balcony railings amended to blades directing views towards the river providing residents with additional privacy and reducing overlooking from those sitting on the balcony or within the rooms.



Section showing visibility splay from balconies


# Summary of post-submission elevation and massing amendments to Building F

Design changes made following DRP & pre-application include:

- 1. Top floor and roofscape reduced angle and change of material;
- 2. Balcony design amended;
- 3. Massing reduced by lowering the top floor parapet and the communal roof terrace omitted.




Elevation of amended balcony



Plan view of amended balcony with directional arrows



Key



Planning submitted elevation



Amended elevation

### **Environment Agency & Friends of the River Crane comments**

The following changes and clarifications were made to the scheme post-submission in response to comments from Environment Agency (EA) and Friends of the River Crane (FORCE).

#### Comments

#### Riparian habitat (EA comment)

Loss of riparian semi-natural habitat within 8m of the River Crane.

#### Riparian habitat (FORCE comment)

FORCE supports the concept of the riverside walkway in principle. The walkway should be clearly signed from adjacent streets as a public pathway, and it must remain fully and freely accessible to the general public at all times in order to register as a benefit to the wider community. Any proposal of this nature should also be entirely compatible with the developments proposed in the Lower River Crane Restoration Vision, and must in no circumstances be allowed to frustrate the Restoration Vision.

#### Impact on nature conservation and Water Framework Directive Requirements (EA comment)

The Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP) states that the water environment should be protected and enhanced to prevent deterioration and promote the recovery of water bodies. A natural corridor reduces roadside runoff into the watercourse and maintains water quality.

## Impact on nature conservation and Water Framework Directive Requirements (FORCE comments)

FORCE would expect the developer to provide permeable surfaces wherever feasible throughout the site, in particular in proposed car parking locations. We also expect the developer to provide for rain water recycling in its residential and commercial units.

#### Lighting encroaching on the river corridor and channel (EA comment)

The scheme makes note of a sensitive lighting plan suitable for light sensitive species such as bats that are known in the area. We support the plan to use such lighting schemes however we feel the lighting is still encroaching on the river corridor and channel. Light-spill could be better prevented through the use of a natural corridor as a screen for the river.

#### Lighting encroaching on the river corridor and channel (FORCE comment)

We are concerned the proposed development – in particular the five storey buildings facing the river – will increase light-spillage into the existing 'Dark Corridor' of the River Crane. Large accommodation buildings adjacent to the river will inevitably lead to extensive light pollution, having a detrimental impact on the environmental value of the river corridor.

#### Overshadowing of the river corridor (FORCE comment)

Overshadowing of the river corridor – particularly given the development is directly to the south of the river and will cast a significant physical shadow into the corridor, reducing its environmental potential.

### Our response

#### Riparian habitat

Richard Graves Associates, appointed for ecology and biodiversity, have confirmed that there is negligible riparian semi-natural habitat affected by the proposals. The river stretch fronting the site is channelised with vertical piled sheet metal or concrete sides with limited terrestrial ruderal vegetation overhanging the wall such as bramble and buddleia offering limited potential water vole (Arvicola amphibious) burrowing habitat or kingfisher (Alcedo atthis) and sand martin (Riparia riparia) nesting habitat and the site having been subject to levels of noise disturbance and light trespass as a result of the former Greggs Bakery operation. The proposals now incorporate additional greenery along the river edge, and opportunities for burrows and nesting within a low level wall and native hedgerow.



Existing riverbank condition

#### Impact on nature conservation and Water Framework Directive Requirements

It is acknowledged that hard surfaces adjacent to river corridors have the potential to cause a deterioration of water quality, however the proposed drainage strategy mitigates the risk and provides an improvement over the existing situation in line with the CIRCA SuDS Manual. The proposed hard standing and parking provision adjacent to the river also reduced during the design evolution further increasing ecology and soft landscaping ensuring the existing condition is greatly improved. The landscape plans to the right show these improvements. The use of permeable paving materials is proposed where feasible maximising SUDs measures.



Planning submitted landscape plan



Revised planning landscape plan

#### Lighting encroaching on the river corridor and channel

An Exterior Lighting Assessment Supplementary Report has been prepared by Desco, in consultation with the Project Ecologists. This sets out that illuminance from the proposed development do not significantly impact the river 'Dark Corridor'. The proposals also represent an improvement upon the existing conditions, where factory windows are directly on the river edge and factory noise would also have been present.


The proposals have been further enhanced by the introduction of a low level wall, railings, tree planting and hedgerow to the river edge, which will further protect the river corridor from light encroachment.



Lux level analysis from lighting report

#### Overshadowing of the river corridor

An analysis has been undertaken on the levels of overshadowing compared to the existing condition. This demonstrates that there will be less overshadowing of the river with the new proposal. This is due to the buildings being significantly set-back from the river edge when compared to the existing factory buildings, whilst large areas adjacent to the river are landscaped.



Proposed 01:00pm

### 8.6 Planning objection comments

During the consultation period of the previously submitted application (LPA ref 19/0646/FUL) a number of objections and comments were raised by members of the public. A number of design changes were subsequently made to address these objections. These include further explanation of some items and revisions to other elements to directly address the concerns raised.

Further consultation also took place with the local authority, local stakeholders and a Design Review Panel. This section runs through the feedback from these meetings and how the proposals were revised accordingly.

As outlined, the previous application was only refused on two grounds, with all other matters, including design, scale, massing, and parking considered acceptable.

Comment	Frequency
Density of housing is too high	63
Generate additional traffic	67
Inadequate on site parking provision	46
Overlooking/loss of privacy	34
Insufficient play/recreational space	24
Dverdevelopment	18
Insufficient community benefits	12
Highway safety	16
Insufficient access to the River Crane corridor	14
Incongruent design (Houses)	10
No provision of visitor parking	11
impact of construction traffic	33

	Enforcement of CPZ	10
]	Extend CPZ hours	8
]	Local schools are oversubscribed	8
	Insufficient sewage infrastructure to sustain development	6
1	Support principle of redeveloping the site for residential use	9
1	Increased pollution (air and noise)	5
1	Deliver footbridge over the River Crane	3
1	Impact on NHS facilities	3
1	Proposals should not exceed 3 to 4-storeys	3
1	Strictly access through Edwin Road	3

Summary of objections relating to previous application

#### Comments

#### Parking & transport

A large majority of the comments raised related to transport and parking. This is often a common concern amongst residents and its importance is increased in this area due to a controlled parking zone (CPZ) being introduced. The specific issues raised included: insufficient on-site parking provision and potential for overspill to neighbouring streets; why visitor parking hasn't been accommodated; and specifics on traffic calming measures being introduced.

#### Density

Some residents expressed concern that the scheme was too dense for the area and not in keeping with the urban grain of the surrounding streets.

Table 3.2 Sestimable residential quality (SRO) density matrix (habitable rooms and declines are habitable

Selting	Public Intringral Accessibility Level (PTAL)						
	Part	75:3	100				
3 Journal .	150-200 halfas	130-250 M/hai	200-350 Juffur				
SA-LEMINE.	15-55 Who	35-65 Wha	45-00 mha				
11-0.7 hr/m/t	40-65 whs	40-60 tultus	55-115 m/m				
27-a0 Infuna	50-76 u/m	50-95 u/kg	70-128 uffa				
Urbain	150-250 hr/hu	700-450 hr/ha	200-700 hr/ha				
3.8 -4 Bining	35-05 L/4m	45-120 ts/fvs	45-185 18710				
5.1-3.7 te\.int.	40-00 p.m.	55-145 L/ha	55-225 who				
27-3@fwim#	60-46 Wes	70-170 u/ha	70-786 Who				
Denteal.	150-300 fer/fee	500-850 hulton	650-1100 ts//sa				
Say Bluggett	35-80 //ш	35-170 altu	145-295 u/n				
21-57 lehaid	40-100 wiles	88-210 u/tu	175-355 u/ba				
2.7-3:8 fr/Linit	50-110 u/lir	100-240 u/ha	215-465 of a				

2016 Current London Plan Density Matrix, highlighting where our development falls (In the draft London Plan Density Matrix has been omitted)



### Our response

••••••

••••••

#### Parking & transport

The proposals include restricting all new residents in the development from applying for a residents parking permit to ensure additional pressure is not added to the existing on-street parking provision. Visitor parking is not encouraged by either the Council's prevailing policies or the London Plan, especially at sites where there is good public transport and we have therefore decided not to provide additional parking spaces for visitors. Safety is paramount to the development and whilst no specific traffic calming measures have been introduced the design of the landscaping and reinstatement of footways will greatly improve the current condition. London Square Developments Ltd support the implementation of longer controlled parking periods to maintain adequate parking for local residents. Further details are included in the accompanying transport assessment.

#### Density

We have undertaken the following analysis of our density compared with neighbouring streets in the surrounding area which indicates that the scheme is in line with the local context and achieves similar densities. Additionally the footprint of the proposals fits comfortable with the urban grain and pattern of the street scape.

Planning Submission Proposal Density Study: **362 hab. rooms / hectare, 103 units / hectare**.

Norcutt Road Density Study: **440 hab. rooms / hectare, 103 units / hectare, including approved student building**.

Hamilton Road Density Study: 396 hab. rooms / hectare, 99 units /hectare.

In line with the London Plan and the current need for housing, the design team has worked hard to maximise the sites potential in a highly residential area, on a brownfield site, whilst being sensitive to neighbouring properties and the character of the local area. The proposed density was supported by officers for the previous application and is therefore unchanged.



Plan illustrating surrounding densities

#### Comments

#### Height

A number of comments expressed concern that the scheme was incongruent with the area in terms of height and character. They expressed that proposals should not exceed four

### Our response

#### Height

••••••

The height of the proposals has been an important consideration of the design and has evolved over the design process. This included:

- Complete redesign of the building backing the Gould Road houses, from a two storey apartment building with roof, to single storey two bedroom houses with a bedroom within the roof space;
- The three storey apartment building (Building A) adjacent to the northern end of Crane Road had the roof profile removed from the side closest to the boundary, reducing its height;
- The tallest apartment building (Building F) was reduced from six storeys to five storeys matching the number of floors proposed on the approved affordable residential building adjacent (19/2789/FUL).

The tallest building is a modest five storeys towards the north of the site. This matches the approved affordable residential building less than 40 meters away. It is also similar in height to the apartment buildings on Langhorn Drive across the river. We understand residents are concerned about this height which is why the four and five storey building have been positioned where it will have minimal impact on the surroundings, with no effect on sunlight to neighbouring properties nor does any residential building look directly towards them.

The external material of the four storey element was revised and the roof pitch and parapet heights reduced to minimise its impact on the surrounding streets. This is shown on the images to the right.



Planning submitted proposal



Planning addendum proposal

#### Character

Some of the comments raised related to the character of the proposals and questioned whether they are in keeping with the area.



### Character

Careful analysis was undertaken on the surrounding residential streets to ensure that the character of the proposals are complementary and of a consistent architectural language. So that the site is not treated as one single development, which could have become overbearing, the design is split into three character areas. This helps increase variety and allows the development to respond to the changing context at opposite ends of the

Whilst the design is split into three character areas, all of the scheme incorporates design elements and façade treatments that are inspired by the local area. The selected materials of brick, metal and stone are robust, natural and hard wearing, fit comfortably within the existing context and will provide the proposal with character whilst also giving the impression the development has emerged over time.

The proposed design was welcomed by officers, with paragraph 7.65 and 7.66 of the committee report for the previous application stating: 'The proposal also has the support of the Council's Urban Design team and, on balance, this element is considered to comply with Policy LP2.' 'It is considered that the 'mews' design is appropriate and relates to the scale and grain of the local area, and this is in line with the Twickenham Village Plan guidance.'



Revised proposal

#### Comments

#### Overlooking & privacy

A number of comments submitted related to overlooking of gardens or rooms from the proposals.

#### Our response

#### Overlooking & privacy

Privacy and overlooking has been a key consideration throughout the design process. The scheme is in a residential area with a number of residential houses in close proximity. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that the existing buildings occupy the full width of the site and therefore are closer to neighbouring houses than the proposed buildings.

The scheme has been designed to minimise overlooking through measures such as opaque glazing, reduced opening windows and defensible planting at boundary and roof edges. Where direct overlooking is possible the buildings have been located more than 20m from the neighbours.

This means that there are no windows, roof terraces or balconies in the scheme where overlooking of other residential properties would be possible within the 20 meter distance.



Plan illustrating overlooking distances and mitigation strategies

#### Daylight & sunlight

A number of residents have expressed concerns that the proposals will reduce the amount of daylight and sunlight received to their properties and gardens



#### Daylight & sunlight

A daylight sunlight analysis has been undertaken and a report will accompany the planning application. This report demonstrates there are a number of significant improvements to the daylight and sunlight benefiting many of the surrounding houses due to the proposed heights and separation distances compared to current buildings.



#### Playspace

Some comments received voiced concerns regarding the amount of playspace being provided on the site.

Friends of the River Crane (FORCE) rejects the assertion that: "there is sufficient play space for 5+ year olds in the surrounding area. It is therefore proposed that play space for 5-12+ year olds will be accommodated within the Parks and Greens listed below" (Refused scheme DAS, p98).

FORCE seeks greater provision of community space on the site, even at the expense of a reduction in the number of housing units built, in order to ensure that the site is more self-sufficient in terms of its impact on adjacent open spaces.



#### Playspace

Using the latest GLA occupant yield and play space calculator the predicted child yield for the site is 52 children (based on the addendum area schedule). The proposal is for ages 11 and above to accommodated off-site in larger play areas more suitable. A contribution via Section 106 will be made by the developer to facilitate this. Removing the 11+ children, results in a play space requirement of 400 sq m.

All houses of 3-bed or more are provided with a garden reducing the policy requirement for 0-4 playspace to circa 100 sq m under Richmond SPD guidance. Despite this the amended proposals have increased the public realm playspace area giving a total of 368 sq m and a further 165 sq m within communal terraces. This ensures the current proposal is policy compliant.



#### 8.7 Summary of amendments following meeting with Richmond Council

#### Overlooking & privacy

A number of comments submitted related to overlooking of gardens or rooms from the proposals.


### Our response

#### Overlooking & privacy

To mitigate overlooking south east towards Alcott House rooms and gardens from Building E oriel windows were introduced. The adjacent plans demonstrate the overlooking arc of oriel windows angled 30 degrees away from Alcott House. The overlooking arc does not reach Alcott Hosue from any window.

To mitigate overlooking south towards Crane Road houses rooms and gardens the roof terrace was re-designed as an intensive green roof with the minimum external provision for the apartments fronting the roof terrace and no access for other residents.






Proposed revision to Building G model

Proposed revision to Building G plan





Planning submitted landscape proposal Proposed revision

### PV panels

There was concern whether the amount of pv panels proposed would be sufficient.



• • • • • • • • • • •

#### PV panels

Increased PV provision with 200 PV panels across the scheme and all feasible roofs utilised.



Proposed revision roof plan identifying pv panel locations

Planning objections were raised with regards to the impact of the proposal on wildlife along the River Crane and the amount of likely illumination the development would cause to the 'Dark Corridor' of the river.



Further changes to the landscape and lighting design along the riverfront restrict the amount of light-spill reaching the sensitive area so as to have the absolute minimum impact on wildlife. The lighting will be designed in line with the Exterior Lighting Assessment by Desco.

The introduction of a 5m buffer zone heavily planted with native and wildlife friendly planting, natural pathway and play elements; a 1.2m wide pathway will consist of self binding gravel (Breedon / Hoggin or similar acceptable materials); and a 1.5m high hedge with 600mm tall woven willow trellis to the southern face which will prevent light-spill onto the river.

All vehicular routes, building footprints and hard-landscaping are outside of the 5m buffer zone.







### 8.8 River crossings

In response to comments made at the public consultation we have looked at the possibility of facilitating a new pedestrian crossing over the River Crane as part of the design process.

The map identifies existing crossing points and the time it takes to get to key destinations. As identified, there are two crossing points within 6 minutes walk.

#### Key









- Popular locations within walking distance
- Existing pedestrian bridges over river

x mins walk Existing time from site

Starting point

Due to the presence of the river and railway, providing a new pedestrian bridge is not a straight forward proposal. This is further complicated by the private land owned by Twickenham Rifle and Pistol Club and Mereway Cottage.


To the right is a brief analysis of possible bridge locations.

There are two main options:

Option 1 would require a bridge to go over both the railway line and river. This would require the bridge to go up a significant height and traverse a long distance. It would also need to be approved by Network Rail.

Option 2 requires a diagonal span to the Mereway Nature Park. This is dependent on ground conditions to the west and is likely to have a negative effect on the biodiversity of the nature park.


It is considered option 2 is the only feasible option for a future bridge.



Existing routes and bridges



Option 1 - Bridge location over the river and railway




Option 2 - Bridge location and new path through Mereway Nature Park

## **Appendices**

This diagram shows the decrease in walking time if a pedestrian bridge was to be provided from the site in the future.

#### Key

- Public land presenting opportunity for potential bridge over river to enhance connectivity
- Private land restricting opportunity for potential bridge
- Twickenham station
- --- ↑ Potential pedestrian route from site
- Popular locations within walking distance
- Potential bridge location
- x mins walk Time from site via potential new bridge
  - Starting point



Possible new routes with bridge option 2

## 8.9 Appendix 2 - Planning Drawing list

### A2871 Greggs Bakery

PLANNING DRAWING TRACKER

Drawing / Document Issue Sheet

**Assael** 

Assael Architecture Limited
123 Upper Richmond Road, Putney

n  on Plan  round Floor Plan  st Floor Plan  stender Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Gould Road Block G  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3  te Sections/Elevations Plan  te Sections/Elevation Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan  First Floor Plan  Fourth Floor Plan	1:1250 @	11 RS1 11 RS1 13 RS1 14 RS1 15 RS1 16 RS1 17 RS1 18	31 04 18 01 02 02 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22 22	R51	122		
on Plan  round Floor Plan rst Floor Plan second Floor Plan second Floor Plan becond Floor Plan 1. Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan First Floor Plan Flo	1:1250 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	Current revision  11	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
round Floor Plan rst Floor Plan rst Floor Plan scond Floor Plan 2.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fior Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
round Floor Plan rst Floor Plan rst Floor Plan scond Floor Plan 2.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fior Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R53 11 R52 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
round Floor Plan rst Floor Plan rst Floor Plan scond Floor Plan 2.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fior Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R53 11 R52 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
round Floor Plan rst Floor Plan rst Floor Plan scond Floor Plan 2.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fior Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R53 11 R52 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
rst Floor Plan  cond Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Gould Road Block G  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3  Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
rst Floor Plan  cond Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Floor Plan  of Gould Road Block G  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3  Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:100 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R53 11 R53	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51			
scond Floor Plan  bof Floor Plan  1.1 Gould Road Block G  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3  te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3  Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan  Boron Floor Plan  First Floor Plan	1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:000 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R52 R52 R52			
oof Floor Plan  1.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan First Floor Plan Fiourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foorth Floorth Floort	1:500 @/ 1:100 @/ 1:100 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R52 R52			_ _ _ _
2.1 Gould Road Block G te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fiourth Floor Plan	1:100 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R52 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R52 R52			
te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 1/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foor Plan	1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R52 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R51 R50 R51	R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R51 R52 R52		<del> </del>	
te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 2/3 te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3 Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Find Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Foorth Floor Plan Foorth Floor Plan Foorth Floor Plan	1:200 @/ 1:200 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/ 1:500 @/	11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R50 R51	R51 R51 R51 R51 R52 R52 R52		# 	
te Sections/Elevations Site Wide Sheet 3/3  Ilterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan  Second Floor Plan	1:500 @/s	11 R51 11 R51 11 R53 11 R53 11 R53 11 R52	R50 R50 R50 R50 R51 R50 R51	R51 R52 R53 R52 R53		<del>Ⅱ</del>	_
Alterations/Demolition Plan  Ground Floor Plan  First Floor Plan  Second Floor Plan  Third Floor Plan  Courth Floor Plan  Roof Plan	1:500 @/  1:500 @/  1:500 @/  1:500 @/  1:500 @/  1:500 @/	11 R51 R53 R53 R52 R52	R50 R51 R50 R51	R51 R52 R53 R52 R53			_
First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Initrd Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A	1 R53 1 R52 1 R52	R50 R51	R52 R53		<del>                                      </del>	
First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Initrd Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A	1 R53 1 R52 1 R52	R50 R51	R52 R53	$\blacksquare$	$\top$	
First Floor Plan Second Floor Plan Initrd Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A	1 R53 1 R52 1 R52	R50 R51	R52 R53	+		_
Second Floor Plan Third Floor Plan South Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @A 1:500 @A 1:500 @A	1 R52 1 R52				+	_
Third Floor Plan Fourth Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @ <i>A</i> 1:500 @ <i>A</i>	1 R52			++	++	_
Fourth Floor Plan Roof Plan	1:500 @A		R50	R51 R52 R51 R52	+	+	_
Roof Plan		1 R52	R50	R51 R52	++	++	_
Elevations Site Wide	<u> </u>		R50	R51 R52	世	世	_
Elevations Site Wide							
Lievations one vide	1:500 @A	1 R51	R50	R51		$\overline{}$	_
Sectional Elevations Site Wide	1:500 @F		R50	R51		廿	
			l least	I lect			_
					$\perp$	$\bot$	
					+	+	
		_			+	+	_
		_			+	+	_
		_			+	++	_
			1550	101	+	++	_
, , ,			R50	R51	+	++	-
					++	+	_
			R50	R51	$\pm$	++	_
Building E	1:100 @A	1 <b>R51</b>	R50	R51	$\Box$	$\top$	
Ground Floor Buildings A & F	1:100 @#		R50	R51			Ξ
					$\perp$	$\bot$	_
					$\bot$	+	_
					+	+	_
		_			+	+	_
Root Plan Buildings A & F	1:100 @F	() noi	Rou	ROI	++	++	_
Building B Commercial	1:100 @A	1 R51	R50	R51		耳	
Sections Buildings A & E	1:100 @/	1 R51	P50	P51	++	++	_
		_			+	++	_
Sections Buildings A & I	1.100	1101	1.00	<del>                                      </del>	+	+	_
Elevations Buildings A & F	1:100 @A	1 R51	R50	R51	+	+	-
			R50	R51	$\perp$		_
					$\top$	$\Box$	
ction & Bay Elevation 1 Building F	1:50 @A	1 <b>R51</b>	R50	R51	$\neg$	$\top$	_
			R50	R51			Ξ
		1 <b>R51</b>	R50	R51		╜	_
			R50	R51	$\bot$ Т	47	_
ction & Bay Elevation 5 House Type 6	1:25 @A	1 R51	R50	R51			_
			R50	R51	$\perp$	П	
			R50	R51	$\bot$ $\bot$	Д	
			R50	R51	$\bot$	44	
			R50	R51	++	++	_
	1.20   @/		1.00	1 1:1			-
			L				_
ZZ-ZZ-SC-A-700 Area Schedule	NTS @#	.3 <b>R53</b>	R50 R5	1 R52 R53		$\perp T$	_
	I	1					
		1					_
	No.2 Gould Road Block G House Type 1 284P House (Building G) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 236P House (Building C) House Type 236P House (Building C) House Type 236P House (Building C) House Type 4 385P M4(3) House (Building C) House Type 4 385P M4(3) House (Building C) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 7 487P House (Building D) House Type 7 487P House (Building D) House Type 7 487P House (Building C) Building E Ground Floor Buildings A & F First Floor Buildings A & F First Floor Buildings A & F Forth Floor Buildings A & F Fourth Floor Buildings A & F Building B Building B Building B Building A B F Fourth Floor Buildings A & F Elevations Buildings A & F Elevation & Bay Elevation 1 Building F ction & Bay Elevation 3 Building F ction & Bay Elevation 3 House Type 6 M4(3) Adaptable 1 Bed Apartment Layout M4(3) Adaptable 2 Bed Apartment Layout M4(3) Adaptable 3 Bed Apartment Layout	House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building C) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 4 386P House (Building D) House Type 4 387P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building C)  Building E Ground Floor Buildings A & F 1:100 @A Forth Horo Buildings A F 1:100 @A Forth Horo Buildings	House Type 1 284P House (Building G) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building D) House Type 5 386P House (Building D) House Type 6 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building C) House Type 8 386P House Building R 8 F1 1:100 @A1 R51 R51 House Type 8 R51	House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P M(3) House (Building C) House Type 3 386P M(3) House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building C) House Type Building A & F  Second Floor Buildings A & F  1:100 @A1 R51 R50  Building E  1:100 @A1 R51 R50  Brits Floor Buildings A & F  1:100 @A1 R51 R50  R51 R50  R52 R50	House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building C) House Type 5 386P House (Building D) House Type 5 386P House (Building D) House Type 6 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building C) House Type	House Type 1 284P House (Building G) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building C) House Type 5 587P House (Building C) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 5 587P House (Building D) House Type 6 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building D) House Type 8 386P House (Building C) House Type 8 386P House (Building F) House Type 8 486P House (Building F) House Type	House Type 2 386P House (Building G) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 2 386P House (Building C) House Type 3 386P House (Building C) 1:100 (QA1 R51 R50 R51

## **Appendices**

### A3164 Greggs Bakery

Drawing / Document Issue Sheet

# **Assael**

Assael Architecture Limited 123 Upper Richmond Road, Putney London, SW15 2TL

### PLANNING DRAWING TRACKER

Project Details:			Job No. A3164		Date of issue						
Greggs Bakery Site Twickenh	am - Scheme 1 (Residential)		70104	A3104		02	4		-	$\dashv$	
					Year	22	22				
Dwg No.	Description		Sca	ıle	Current revision						
Drawing Number											
1000 SERIES											
Site Survey / Plan											
GBT-ASA-ZZ-00-DR-L-0100	Proposed Ground Floor La	andscape General Arrangement	1:500	@A1	P2		P2				
GBT-ASA-ZZ-01-DR-L-0101	Proposed First Floor Landscape General Arrangement				P2		P2				
GBT-ASA-ZZ-03-DR-L-0102	Proposed Third Floor Land	scape General Arrangement	1:100	@A1	P2	P1	P2				
GBT-ASA-ZZ-ALL-DR-L-0110	Proposed Urban Greening	Factor	1:200	@A1	P2	P1	P2		I		
Key:		٦									
X = Issue sheet only	1 = A3 size print										
I = Information	1*= A1 size print										
A = Approval	E = Electronic Issue										
R = Comment	** = In DWG format										
P = Planning		Distribution:			-						
C = Construction		London Borough of Richmond upon Thames					Е	_	Е	_1_	
T = Tender		Purpose of Issue	·		-	Р	Р	Р	Р	Т	

161

## **Assael**

#### **Assael Architecture**

123 Upper Richmond Road London SW15 2TL

+44 (0)207 736 7744 info@assael.co.uk www.assael.co.uk

#### Document control form

Project number A2871 Greggs Bakery, Twickenham Project title Document title Design and Access Statement London Square Developments Ltd Client Document status Planning Submission 05 August 2022 Date of issue Chloe Simons, Architectural Assistant Prepared by Ed Sharland, Associate Director Checked by

This document is issued by the relevant Assael group company, the relevant Project Appointment Letter or Agreement to which this document relates. Nothing in this document shall be construed as being issued by or on behalf of, or constituting any advice or commitment from, any other Assael group company. A full list of Assael group companies can be found at assael.co.uk/terms-of-use/.

We have prepared this document in accordance with the instructions of the Client under the agreed Terms of Appointment. This document is for the sole and specific use of the Client and the relevant appointed Assael company shall not be responsible for any use of the document or its contents for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared and provided. Should the Client require to pass copies of the document to other parties for information, the whole of the report should be so copied, but no professional liability or warranty shall be extended to other parties in this connection without the explicit written agreement thereto by the company under the agreed Terms of Appointment.

#### © Assael group of companies 2022

The copyright of this design and the document is owned by within the Assael group of companies, which must not be reproduced in whole or part without the written permission.

Computer generated photo montages that may be contained in this document that have an image identification number containing the letters 'AVR' conform to our 'Accurate Visual Representation Methodology' as set out by the London View Management Framework. In the absence of the letters 'AVR' the image cannot be used as proof of visual impact but as an 'impression'.

Status	Revision	Date issued	Prepared by	Checked by
P50	Planning DRAFT	04/02/2022	CS	ES
P51	Planning DRAFT	08/04/2022	CS	ES
P52	Planning Submissio	n 05/08/2022	CS	ES



Please consider the environment before printing this document