

## 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. Paul Velluet

**Address:** 9 Bridge Road Twickenham TW1 1RE

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** comments continued

#### THE SCALE OF THE PROPOSALS

The proposed development of residential buildings rising to 6, 7, 8 and 9 storeys across Development Area 1 and rising to 6, 7 and 8 storeys across Development Area 2 is entirely in conflict with the prevailing scale of residential development in the immediate area of the application sites – both within and outside the Mortlake and Mortlake Green Conservation Areas – which comprises 19th century, 2 and 3-storey houses and 20th century mansion blocks and blocks of flats generally rising to no more than 4 storeys in height (Cowley Mansions, Ripley House, Ashleigh House, Avondale House, Montgomery House, Kindell House, John Dee House, Craven House and Rann House and other, more recent developments along Mortlake High Street, such as Tideway Wharf) – the only exceptions being Elm Bank Mansions and River House on The Terrace, which rise to 5 storeys in height (with an additional, but well set-back storey on the latter) and parts of Chertsey Court fronting the Lower Mortlake Road and Clifford Avenue, which rise to 5 storeys in height. Significant to the context too, is the fact that buildings of key townscape value and local historic interest such as The White Hart, PH, the grade II\* listed Church of St Mary-the-Virgin and its Vestry House, The Ship, PH, The Jolly Gardeners, PH, and The Tapestry (formerly The Jolly Milkman, PH) only rise to a maximum of 3 and 4 storeys in height. Whilst noting the suggestion made in the Council's own Supplementary Planning Document -Planning Brief for the Stag Brewery Site of July, 2011 that residential development of up to 6 and 7 storeys would be acceptable across the greater part of the sites east and west of Ship Lane, it is quite clear from the submitted elevations and sections and other illustrative material that the proposed development of residential buildings rising to 6, 7, 8 and 9 storeys across Development Area 1 and rising to 6, 7 and 8 storeys across Development Area 2 would have a seriously damaging impact on the character, appearance and significance of the Mortlake and Mortlake Green Conservation Areas and their settings; on the settings of nearby historic buildings – both listed and unlisted; and, importantly, on this significant stretch of the Thames. The presence of the anomalously tall Maltings Building of 1902 on the riverside at the northern end of Ship Lane, which rises to 8 (and, in limited part, to 9) diminutive (undersized) storeys does not justify perpetuating similar or greater heights of new buildings across the two sites.

#### THE PROPOSALS ASSESSED AGAINST THE RELEVANT LOCAL, LONDON-WIDE AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

In urban design and conservation terms, the submitted proposals run contrary to many relevant, local, London-wide and national planning policies.

Assessed against the relevant policies contained in the Richmond-upon-Thames Local Plan of July, 2018, the proposals would:

- Fail to respect, contribute to and enhance the local environment and character, failing to establish compatibility with local character including the relationship to existing townscape, development patterns, views, local grain, scale, height, massing and density contrary to Policy LP1;
- Fail to respect and strengthen the setting of the Borough's valued townscape and landscape through appropriate

building heights by failing to reflect the prevailing buildings heights within the vicinity, failing to preserve the settings of the Borough's heritage assets, failing to respect local context or to enhance the character of the area through appropriate scale height, urban pattern contrary to Policy LP2 and the ninth bullet-point of Site Allocation SA 24;

- Fail to give great weight to the potential impact on the significance of the two conservation areas as heritage assets, and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the two conservation areas, contrary to Policy LP3 and the ninth bullet-point of Site Allocation SA 24;

continued