

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 22/0902/FUL

Address: The Stag Brewery Lower Richmond Road Mortlake London SW14 7ET

Proposal: Erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and other associated works

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Andrew Conroy

Address: 65 Westfields Avenue Barnes London SW13 0AT

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I wish to confirm my objection to Application A - 22/0900/OUT and Application B 22/0902/FUL in relation to the redevelopment of the Stag Brewery site, Mortlake.

The updated scheme remains deeply flawed. This is so very, very frustrating. There is clearly an opportunity to develop a key part of the local area but it is being wasted. The scheme is way too dense. There is a no credible, believable transport plan. And where are the affordable housing units? The first problem is practical, the second relates to my safety and the third reflects our – yours and my – morality.

Because of this, I do believe the latest changes do not address any of the failings of the previous plans. Part of me does not understand how these submissions are allowable on that basis. My beefs are as follows:

The following is a taken from the material provided by the local campaign group, the Mortlake Brewery Community Group. It is pithy and I agree with it.

There remains no justification for the need of the proposed new secondary school. Data produced almost 10 years ago to support this is now invalid.

The proposed school is still located on protected OOLTI green open space, sports fields which represent the largest open green space in Mortlake.

Jubilee Gardens and Mortlake Green are the only other meaningful green open spaces in the area and are already highly pressured in use by the existing population, and in the case of Mortlake Green, by further recreational use by pupils of Thomson House Primary School.

OOLTI re-provisioning is simply not achieved by the nine pocket-sized open spaces in the proposed scheme. The spaces simply do not re-provision in terms of quality, quantum or openness and thus contravene Policy.

Two of the spaces are all hard surfaced in any case and the Richmond Design Review Panel has stressed a need for less hard surfaced space and more soft green.

Furthermore, daylight-sunlight data now illustrates many of the open spaces are highly over-shadowed due to the increased building heights compared to the 2020 design proposals.

Finally, the school site is far too small for 1250 pupils and necessitated play areas on the roof.

Following Covid experiences outdoor open space for children is especially precious both for health and well-being. The site's total area is just 30% of DfE guidelines for secondary schools of this pupil size. If the fenced off, All-weather sports pitch is in use then the remaining open area for the majority of the 1250 pupils is woefully inadequate.

This is simply unacceptable and a vast under-provision which Richmond should not accept.

For these reasons both inter-linked applications should be refused.

Again, I write this as a frustrated local resident. I remember standing up at one or two local meetings and saying, we must develop this site. It is a fantastic opportunity. I feel 'mugged' by this proposal. The previous version was poor: this is worse. There is no reason for this to be supported.

Taking a step back, the council should take advantage of the creative industry's use of the site in the short term to go looking for another partner who would respect both the spirit and letter of the guidance for the site use. If that means the site remains relatively speaking under-used for a few years more, so be it. Whatever we build there will last for decades. We should assess with that in mind.