Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 22/0900/OUT

Address: The Stag BreweryLower Richmond RoadMortlakeLondonSW14 7ET

Proposal: Hybrid application to include:1. Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks, to allow for the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:2. Detailed application for the works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:a. Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one to two storeys below ground to allow for residential apartments; flexible use floorspace for retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses, offices, non-residential institutions and community use and boathouse; Hotel / public house with accommodation; Cinema and Offices.b. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway worksc. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and landscapinge. Flood defence and towpath worksf. Installation of plant and energy equipment3. Outline application, with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:a. The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeysb. Residential developmentc. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking the form 3 to 8 storeysb. Residential development. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and play space and landscapinge. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and play space and landscapinge. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses of Ship Lane which comprise:a. The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeysb. Residential developmentc. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parkingd. Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscapinge. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. James Wallace-Dunlop

Address: 140 Upper Richmond Road West East Sheen London SW14 8DS

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: We need more homes in Richmond, but we also need the transport infrastructure and services to be upgraded to handle the population & traffic generated. This representation is lodged as an objection because, as it stands, the infrastructure and transport are not dealt with adequately. The new secondary school is welcome, as is the cinema. But the transport investment is inadequate

If the developers want to provide only 400 car parking spaces for perhaps 3,000-4,000 residents, then why not use part of the site for a new underground station linking to Hammersmith? That would require TFL as well as the developers, but it is the only way to avoid vastly increased traffic on the local roads.

Without a new tube station, the level crossings at Sheen Lane and White Hart Lane will see much greater traffic. The developers talk of 'level crossing improvements' that 'will give more priority and safety to pedestrians and cyclists'. But the problem is not 'how the pie is divided' between rail, car, bike & pedestrian. We need greater capacity, which means moving away from the level crossing structure that was designed when we had far fewer residents and vehicles. One option would be a tunnel under the rail lines so that vehicles could flow even when trains were using the rail lines.

At Chalker's corner, we need more than just 'a package of works which will allow traffic to discharge faster from Lower Richmond Road'. Giving greater priority to this area of traffic flow implies less capacity for those on the A205 or coming from Chiswick bridge. Meaningful improvement means building more road capacity, not just changing the utilisation of existing capacity. At a minimum, Lower Richmond Road from the brewery to Chalker's corner needs to be made double carriage way, and traffic needs to be able to flow freely into, within, and from, the site.

If making these traffic improvements viable requires greater density, then so be it. I am aware that these suggestions would involve cost. But, if the transport and infrastructure questions are not solved, the new development will come to be seen as a blight, when it should be an enhancement.