

**From : Jackie Herring
94 Christchurch Road
London
SW14 7AX**

4 January 2023

Head of Development Management
LB Richmond upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

Your ref: stagbreweryredevelopment@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

**Redevelopment of Former Stag Brewery, Lower Richmond Road, Mortlake SW14 7ET Application
A: Ref 22/0900 Application B: Ref 22/0902**

I wish to lodge objections in regard to this application arising from recent announcement of further amendments and your invitation to receive comments.

I have been a member of the Mortlake with East Sheen Society for over 20 years, and I am pleased to note that they have already written to you in considerable detail setting out their key observations, comments & objections and which considerations echo my own strong opinion on the unsuitability that the current package of development is offering. In principle my observations & objections can be summarised as follows:-

The housing and community hub Density, traffic, and a healthy environment

- The density of the development must be dictated by the site's accessibility by road and by public transport. And, in the post-Covid era, we must now add a third dimension, namely a healthy environment.
- Accessibility is poor as the road accessing the site (Lower Richmond Road and its continuation into Mortlake High Street) is highly congested through a narrow corridor between the river and railway with capacity constraints at Chalker's Corner junction at one end and at the Sheen Lane and White Hart Lane level crossings at the other.
- Accessibility is also poor because both Lower Richmond Road and the parallel Upper Richmond Road south of the railway carry orbital traffic, for which public transport alternatives are limited, and the orbital traffic is now being increased by development within its corridor – and also in its offshoot corridor from Brentford to Heathrow.
- The site's public transport accessibility level is very low and yet the proposed density is akin to that of central London.

- Homes for an additional 3,000+ people will exert huge pressure on existing services, notably the medical, for which the developer must make a financial contribution under s106.

In terms of a healthy environment.

- The proposed building heights do not conform with those shown in the Planning Brief for the site nor with the draft update of the Borough's Local Plan as they will overshadow the river and towpath and impact negatively on the local heritage.

The apartment blocks appear very dense and bulky with problems of restricted daylight/sunlight, overlooking, invasion of privacy and with some apartments having single aspect facing north.

Urban design, building heights and heritage

- The proposed building heights do not conform with those shown in the Planning Brief for the site nor with the draft update of the Borough's Local Plan as they will overshadow the river and towpath and impact negatively on the local heritage.

Affordable housing

- The Borough and GLA targets are for 50% of the housing to be affordable including 40% at social rent. The current proposal is for 19% of the units being affordable and, due to the increase in construction costs, this has now been reduced to 15% with minimal social rent. This is not acceptable.

Climate change

- There is not enough planting proposed on the site due in part to the proposed basement carpark below the surface, and not enough soft ground to absorb heavy rainfall.
- The proposed defence works could exacerbate potential flood risk to the east along The Terrace to Barnes Bridge in the event of a storm surge from the North Sea.

The school and sports pitch

- The site is too cramped for a secondary school of 1,200 pupils, and accessibility is very poor.
- The replacement of grass playing fields with an all-weather surface, fenced in and floodlit, and the reversion of this OOLTI into a fragmented layout of open spaces does not meet the Local Plan's criteria of quality, quantum and openness.
- The proposed school is likely to draw pupils away from the two existing nearby secondary schools (RPA and Christ's) and the inclusion of a new 6th form could have a negative effect on the viability of the 6th forms at the other two schools, indeed all three 6th forms could be unviable.

In conclusion, I support the major view of residents, in considering that once again the development is like a quart being squeezed into a pint bottle.

I would please ask that my views here are brought to the attention of the Planning Committee.

Yours faithfully

Jackie Herring