28 Victoria Road, Mortlake SW14 8EX

9 January 2023

Dear Sirs,

OBJECTION to Planning Application A - 22/0900/OUT and Application B 22/0902/FUL in relation to the redevelopment of the Stag Brewery site, Mortlake.

In principle, I am in favour of a new development at the Stag Brewery site, but I am very concerned most particularly that the local infrastructure is already stretched to breaking point. The closure of Hammersmith Bridge has added further traffic problems to Mortlake and the reduced train and bus service is not helping.

Hence I hereby register my formal 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 latest proposals and changes still do not address any of the earlier significant failings of the applications. These are summarised as follows: -

Applications A & B

Density, Building Height & Scale of Development

- The scheme now proposes 1071 residential units, a minor reduction of 14 from the March 2022 submission, and **thus remains far too dense** given the prevailing scale and density of the existing community, the sensitive riverside location, heritage context, and the severe and unique access constraints of this site.
- The Council's own Design Review Panel (DRP) "felt the scheme is too dense for this area and resonates more with Central London where higher density is expected." (DRP letter 28.02.22).
- Many of the residential blocks still exceed seven floors in height and overwhelm the character of the Thames bankside setting and still dominate the locally-protected Maltings building and adjacent heritage assets.
- An almost rural character prevails along the Thames from Putney/Hammersmith to Kew creating a green landscape corridor. The densely packed blocks combined with their height and scale will destroy this unique stretch of the River Thames.
- Those buildings above seven floors contravene both the original Planning Brief but also the Local Plan and indeed the Pre-Publication Local Plan. There are absolutely no mitigating factors which could justify any relaxation of Policy.
- Building 10 has been reduced in height by one floor which is welcomed.

• Infrastructure, Highways & Access

- Traffic generation and congestion continue to be of major concern and are serious grounds for objections to these proposals. There is just one means of access/egress to the site which is already gridlocked and not just at peak times. The supporting reports and data simply do not reflect the actual conditions of severe congestion and poor air quality.
- Local residents are experiencing huge delays in travelling out of the area by car due to already increased congestion throughout the day, and equivalent delays on returning into Mortlake.
- Development of the Homebase site, the Barnes Hospital site, and future redevelopment of the Kew Retail Park will make local conditions unsustainable.
- Hammersmith Bridge remains closed to traffic with no prospect of it being fully re-opened for vehicular traffic and bus services for many years.

- Local bus and train services have also been reduced and although 106 Agreement funds are allocated for improved local bus services, TfL have confirmed there are no definitive plans.
- How Stantec can justifiably substantiate their proposed upgrading of the PTAL accessibility of the site given the above is implausible. (See Technical Note Bespoke PTAL Calculation Summary 01.07.22).
- The proposed location of the bus stops and pedestrian crossings on the Lower Richmond Road and Mortlake High St, together with the Mortlake Station level crossing, will create unbearable constraints to traffic movement especially at am-peak times with the concentrated arrival of 1250 school pupils/staff and other site generated traffic/deliveries.
- The scheme will significantly increase the local population by around 2,500 residents and yet there is little or no provision for increased community facilities. The employment uses and a student population of 1,250 will simply add to these local infrastructure pressures.

Application B - New Secondary School School Place Needs, Siting and OOLTI

- 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. Since then, we have experienced families moving out of London, drop in population statistics and this is already feeding through to reductions in primary school place needs.
- 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.
- 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.
- The school site is too small for 1,250 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 1,250 pupils is woefully inadequate.

I strongly believe that these inter-linked applications should be refused in their current form. Once again the objection is not to development but to what kind of development and how it can realistically be delivered into the community without addressing further the above points.

Yours faithfully

Susan P Parker