



Stag Brewery, Mortlake

Community Uses and Cultural Strategy

For Reselton Properties

March 2022



The former Stag Brewery: Community and Cultural Facilities Assessment

A Report by Hatch
March 2022

Reselton Properties Limited

The former Stag Brewery: Community and Cultural Facilities Assessment

March 2022

www.hatch.co.uk

Contents Page

1.	Purpose of Assessment	1
-----------	------------------------------	----------

2.	Baseline Assessment	6
	Education	6
	Health & Social Care	10
	Leisure & Recreation	14
	Community & Emergency Services	22

3.	Demand Assessment	29
	The Proposed Development	29
	Effect on Existing Provision	29
	Summary of Impacts	37

	DISCLAIMER AND LIMITATIONS OF USE	1
--	--	----------

	Appendix A - List of Primary Schools	
--	---	--

	Appendix B - List of Secondary Schools	
--	---	--

	Disclaimer & Limitations of Use	
--	--	--

1. Purpose of Assessment

- 1.1 This Community and Cultural Assessment has been prepared by Hatch on behalf of Reselton Properties Limited (“the Applicant”) in support of two linked planning applications (“the Applications”) for the comprehensive redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery Site in Mortlake (“the Site”) within the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).

Proposals

- 1.2 The Applications seek planning permission for:

Application A:

“Hybrid application to include the demolition of existing buildings to allow for comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site:

Planning permission is sought in detail for works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise:

- Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks
 - Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeys plus a basement of one and two storeys below ground
 - Residential apartments
 - Flexible use floorspace for:
 - Retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses
 - Offices
 - Non-residential institutions and community use
 - Boathouse
 - Hotel / public house with accommodation
 - Cinema
 - Offices
 - New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works
 - Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level
 - Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
 - Flood defence and towpath works
 - Installation of plant and energy equipment
- 1.3 Planning permission is also sought in outline with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise:

- The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys
- Residential development
- Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking
- Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping
- New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works”

Application B:

“Detailed planning permission for the 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”

- 1.4 Together, Applications A and B described above comprise the ‘Proposed Development’.

Background to Submission

- 1.5 The current applications follow the refusal of earlier planning applications which were refused by the Greater London Authority and the GLA. The refused applications were for:

- Application A – hybrid planning application for comprehensive mixed-use redevelopment of the former Stag Brewery site consisting of:
 - 1) Land to the east of Ship Lane applied for in detail (referred to as ‘Development Area 1’ throughout); and
 - 2) Land to the west of Ship Lane (excluding the school) applied for in outline (referred to as ‘Development Area 2’ throughout).
- Application B – detailed planning application for the school (on land to the west of Ship Lane).
- Application C – detailed planning application for highways and landscape works at Chalkers Corner.

- 1.6 The London Borough of Richmond (the Council) originally resolved to grant planning permission for Applications A and B but refuse Application C.

- 1.7 Following the LBRuT’s resolution to approve the Applications A and B, the Mayor called-in the Applications and became the determining authority. The Mayor’s reasons for calling in the Applications were set out in his Stage II letter (dated 4 May 2020) but specifically related to concerns regarding what he considered was a low percentage of affordable housing being proposed for the Site and the need to secure a highways solution for the scheme following the LBRuT’s refusal of Application C.

- 1.8 Working with the Mayor’s team, the Applicant sought to meaningfully respond to the Mayor’s concerns on the Applications. A summary of the revisions to the scheme made and submitted to the GLA in July 2020 is as follows:

- Increase in residential unit provision from up to 813 units to up to 1,250 units;

- Increase in affordable housing provision from (up to) 17%, to 30%;
- Increase in height for some buildings of up to three storeys;
- Change to the layout of Blocks 18 and 19, conversion of Block 20 from a terrace row of housing to two four storey buildings;
- Reduction in the size of the western basement, resulting in an overall car parking spaces reduction of 186 spaces and introduction of an additional basement storey under Block 1;
- Internal layout changes and removal of the nursing home and assisted living in Development Area 2;
- Landscaping amendments, including canopy removal of four trees on the north west corner of the Site; and
- Alternative options to Chalkers Corner in order to mitigate traffic impacts through works to highway land only and allow the withdrawal of Application C.

1.9 The application was amended to reflect these changes.

1.10 Notwithstanding this, and despite GLA officers recommending approval, the Mayor refused the applications in August 2021.

1.11 The Mayor's reasons for refusal in respect of Application A were:

- height, bulk and mass, which would result in an unduly obtrusive and discordant form of development in this 'arcadian' setting which would be harmful to the townscape, character and appearance of the surrounding area;
- heritage impact. The proposals, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and massing would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of several listed buildings and conservation areas in the vicinity. The Mayor considered that the less than substantial harm was not clearly and convincingly outweighed by the public benefits, including Affordable Housing, that the proposals would deliver;
- neighbouring amenity issues. The proposal, by reason of the excessive bulk, scale and siting of Building 20 and 21 in close proximity to the rear of neighbouring residential properties in Parliament Mews and the rear gardens of properties on Thames Bank, would result in an unacceptable overbearing and unneighbourly impact, including direct overlooking of private amenity spaces. The measures in the Design Code would not sufficiently mitigate these impacts; and
- no section 106 agreement in place.

1.12 Application B was also refused because it is intrinsically linked with Application A and therefore could not be bought forward in isolation.

The Proposed New Scheme

1.13 This 3rd iteration of the scheme seeks to respond directly to the Mayors reasons for refusal and in doing so also addresses number of the concerns raised by the LBRuT.

1.14 The amendments can be summarised as follows:

- A revised energy strategy is proposed in order to address the London Plan (2021) requirements;

- Several residential blocks have been reduced in height to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront and to respect the setting of the Maltings building, identified as a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) by the LBRuT;
 - Reconfiguration of layout of Buildings 20 and 21 has been undertaken to provide lower rise buildings to better respond to the listed buildings along the Thames riverfront; and
 - Chalkers Corner light highways mitigation works.
- 1.15 The school proposals (submitted under ‘Application B’) are unchanged. The Applicant acknowledges LBRuT’s identified need for a secondary school at the Site and the applications continue to support the delivery of a school. It is expected that the principles to be agreed under the draft Community Use Agreement (CUA) will be the same as those associated with the refused school application (LBRuT ref: 18/0548/FUL, GLA ref: GLA/4172a/07).
- 1.16 Overall, it is considered that together, the Applications respond successfully to the concerns raised by stakeholders in respect of the previous schemes and during pre-application discussions on the revised Proposed Development. As a result, it is considered that the scheme now represents a balanced development that delivers the principle LBRuT objectives from the Site.

Purpose of Report and Approach

- 1.17 The purpose of this document is to assess the impact the proposed Development will have on community and cultural infrastructure locally. There are two elements to this work which are as follows:
- firstly, an analysis of the existing provision of Community & Cultural facilities within close proximity to the Development and across the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (LBRuT).
 - secondly, an assessment of the impact which the proposed Development would have on Community & Cultural facilities, once fully operational.
- 1.18 As part of the assessment, Community & Cultural facilities have been broken down into the following categories;
- **Education & Learning:** nursery education & childcare, primary schools, secondary schools & 6th form and further, higher and adult education
 - **Health & Social Care:** primary care, intermediate care facilities, acute care
 - **Leisure & Recreation:** libraries, indoor sports and recreation, open space and arts & culture
 - **Community & Emergency Services:** civic council & community services, community centres, youth centres, police force, fire service, ambulance service and places of worship
- 1.19 To help assess impact, recognised standards or benchmarks have been used (including maximum walking distances, journey times, quantity per capita), however in the absence of recognised standards, professional judgement has been used. To help understand the current and future needs of social community infrastructure, a number of policy documents have been referred to, including the following: (amongst others)
- LBRuT Local Plan 2018 and 2020
 - LBRuT Infrastructure Delivery Plan, 2017

- LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy, 2019
- LBRuT Indoor Sports Facilities Needs Assessment, 2015
- LBRuT Open Space Assessment, 2015
- LBRuT Playing Pitch Assessment, 2018
- LBRuT School Census, 2019

1.20 To support the Applications, an Environmental Statement (ES) has been completed. As part of this a Socio-Economic Environmental Statement Chapter has been prepared, which assesses the provision of specific social and community infrastructure (SCI) such as; **education, primary health care** and **open space**. This has been referred to in this assessment where relevant.

Policy Context

- 1.21 The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (2021) advocates for development to create “*strong, vibrant and healthy communities*” which provide high quality environments with a sufficient number and range of homes and accessible local services that support communities health, social and cultural well-being (para 8)
- 1.22 The London Plan (2021)¹ places a strong emphasis on delivering additional and enhanced social infrastructure to meet the needs of London, with Policy S1 (2021) supporting proposals which provide high quality, inclusive social infrastructure in light of strategic and local need. Supporting para 5.1.1 (2021) sets out that social infrastructure includes health, educational, community, cultural, play and sport, faith and emergency facilities. Policy S2 recognises that social infrastructure that is co-located with housing can ensure effective usage, encourage inclusion and community participation and improve accessibility. Where new health, social and community uses are provided, these should be accessible for all and in locations that are easily accessed by public transport, cycling or walking. Where possible, the extension of new social uses to serve the wider community will be encouraged.
- 1.23 Local policy also sets out that new social and community infrastructure will be supported with detailed policies going on to state that this support will be where it responds to local need, is of a high-quality design and accessible for all, is in a sustainable location and considers impact on transport and local character and amenity adopted Local Plan (2018 and 2020) Policy LP 28). In line with the London Plan, the provision of services which can be extended to other areas of the community, through the provision of multi-use, flexible and adaptable buildings or co-located services will be encouraged to increase public access and minimise capital or revenue costs. Local Plan Policy 28 also states that developments of 10 or more residential units should assess the potential impacts on existing social and community infrastructure to demonstrate there is sufficient capacity.
- 1.24 Both the Stag Brewery Planning Brief (2011) and the adopted Site Allocation (Policy SA 24) identify that the redevelopment of the Site should provide a mix of vibrant uses, which includes social infrastructure and community uses, including leisure and sport and health uses.

¹Publication London Plan (December 2020)

2. Baseline Assessment

- 2.0 The baseline assessment has been carried out to measure the current levels of provision local to the Site (definitions are set out in the relevant sections) and across LBRuT. Establishing the baseline will allow the extent of the impact of the proposed Development to be measured and quantified, where possible.

Education

- 2.1 There is a range of educational facilities within LBRuT, however the standards and benchmarks differ dependent on the level of education. The table below sets out the different benchmarks used to assess the existing provision locally.
- 2.2 The Site is located in the Eastern half of LBRuT, therefore any education facilities that are located on the Western half of the Borough or outside of LBRuT have been omitted from the baseline, as agreed through consultation with LBRuT education officers.

Table 2.0 Existing Provision Benchmarks/Standards/Impact Areas

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Early Years	Within LBRuT	Based on LBRuT guidance.
Primary	2 miles	Based on DfE ² recommendations and LBRuT guidance.
Secondary	3 miles	Based on DfE ³ recommendations and LBRuT guidance.
Further/Higher/Adult Education	LBRuT	No set standards.

- 2.3 The current provision of education, at the various levels is explored in more detail below.

Early Years

Early Years: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.4 Pre-school education facilities for children under 5 years are provided through a range of resources including local authority children centres and private run nurseries.
- 2.5 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy (2019) suggests that demand for Early Years places across the Borough as a whole is generally high. According to the Strategy, 20 of the 40 infant and primary schools in the Borough have attached maintained nurseries, and there is one stand-alone nursery school. Between them there is total of 1,083 places and each of the maintained nurseries is resorting to oversubscription criteria in order to allocate places.
- 2.6 A review of data from the LBRuT website indicates there are seven maintained nurseries within the LIA. These provide services ranging from full-day care from the age of zero to pre-school and from 3-5 years old. The total capacity is around 390 places. There are also 46 private, voluntary

² Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. This is used as the upper bound for determining eligibility for free school transport. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to assess nursery provision. Facilities that are located on the Western side of the Thames river or outside LBRuT have been excluded from the assessment, as per consultation with the local education authority.

³ See Footnote 1

and independent (PVI) nurseries within 2 miles of the site, however capacity and demand is difficult to measure for these facilities.

- 2.7 The latest available Child Care Sufficiency Assessment (February 2020) sets out that there is a total of 356 childcare providers in LBRuT with 9,083 places. These include child minders, nursery school places, private, voluntary and independent nurseries, pre-school and out of school providers.
- 2.8 According to the Assessment at the time of writing, *'there is broadly sufficient childcare availability in Richmond with continual changes of models available within the childcare market so that most families can access a suitable model that meets their needs'* and no further information on vacancy rates was included as part of the assessment.

Early Years: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.9 As stated in the LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy, it is difficult to estimate the amount of unmet demand for maintained nursery places within the borough. Evidence shows that parents are challenged to find places which are entirely free of charge. However, it also notes that many state-funded schools are reviewing their nursery class offer as the number of children taking up places is decreasing as a result of a higher number of children remaining in PVI full day care until they join a Reception class.
- 2.10 The LBRuT Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) 2017 states that whilst future demand is likely to remain high for pre-school and nursery places, providers are responding to need and there is no obvious indication of a gap in provision.

Primary Education

Primary Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.11 Summary information on primary school provision is set out in Table 2.2. There is a total of 14 primary schools within 2 miles of the Site. The latest admissions data⁴ from LBRuT suggests there is a +883 surplus across all primary schools within a 2-mile radius. This is based on the number of admissions and capacity across all primary schools and all year groups (Reception to Year 6), within the specified distance.
- 2.12 The closest primary school to the Site is Thomson House School where there was +82 capacity in 2018-19. One of the 14 schools within the 2-mile radius has a capacity deficits. Further detail is provided in Appendix A.

Type of school	No. of schools	Number on roll	Capacity	Surplus / Deficit
Primary Schools	14	5,910	5,027	+883

Source: Department for Education; School Capacity Tables 2018-19. Primary Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.13 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy 2019 sets out LBRuT's strategy for meeting current and future demand for school places at primary level up to 2022 and secondary up to 2024, based on population projections.

⁴ Department for Education; School Capacity Tables 2018-19

- 2.14 The Site falls within the LBRuT's Area 9 for school places planning which comprises the wards of Mortlake and Barnes Common and Barnes. The Strategy highlights there is a need for at least one more form of entry (30 pupils) in Area 9. Despite a declining birth trend, there has been a 3.5% increase in applications in the Eastern half of RBRuT for 2019 entry, alongside 30 fewer places available in this part of RBRuT due to the cessation of the 'shared form of entry' between St Elizabeth's, St Mary Magdalen's and St Osmund's.
- 2.15 The Strategy estimates a current capacity of 236 Reception Year places and anticipated demand by 2023 of 240 places. The Strategy states that the expansion of Barnes Primary School is necessary to meet this expected demand. Alternatively, the shared-form system of entry between St Elizabeth's (in Area 6), St Mary Magdalen's and St Osmund's could be re-established as a cost-efficient way of adding a form of entry. The recent LBRuT Planning Committee report (January 2020)⁵ also noted that planning Area 7 has spare capacity which could absorb additional demand generated by the proposed Development.

Secondary Education

Secondary Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.16 Summary information on secondary school provision is provided in Table 2.3 below. There are three secondary schools within three miles of the Site. Latest data for 2018-19 shows that in these schools there were 3,146 pupils on roll with a capacity of 3,438, suggesting a surplus of +292 places. Richmond Park Academy is the school closest to the Site which had a surplus capacity of +245 places in 2018-19.

Table 2.2 Secondary School Provision within 3 miles

Name of school	Numbers on roll	Capacity	Surplus / Deficit
Richmond Park Academy	865	1110	245
Christ's Church of England School	888	930	42
Grey Court School	1,393	1,398	5
Total	3,146	3,438	292

Source: Department for Education; School Capacity Tables 2018-19 Secondary Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.17 The LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy 2019 states there were 2,027 places in Year 7 across the District. However, this is a significant decrease in vacancy rates as a proportion of total places – from 8.8% in 2018 to 1.9% in 2019. This has taken place alongside a 26% increase in applicants for Year 7 places over the past 5 years. Take-up increased in all three schools between 2011 and 2019, and spare capacity at Richmond Park Academy has reduced to nil (for Year 7 starters).
- 2.18 The Strategy notes that the catchments for Richmond Park Academy and Grey Court School have shrunk since 2018, and the Christ's catchment only increased by 200 metres. Primary expansions over the last decade – which are now feeding into the secondary phase – are contributing to the need for smaller catchments. Additionally, the Thames acts as a physical and perceived barrier in terms of long travel times across the bridges which limits the choice of secondary schools for parents further afield.

⁵ LBRuT, 2020, Planning Committee Report, 30th January 2020

- 2.19 The methodology for forecasting Year 7 places has changed since 2018, with a focus on east/west halves instead of a whole-borough approach. According to the latest estimates, there is a large and increasing forecast shortfall of places in the eastern half of the borough, requiring substantial additional permanent provision. The Strategy states that only the provision of a new secondary school – Livingstone Academy – as part of the redeveloped Stag Brewery site will meet that shortfall. This reiterates the 2018 Strategy, which stated that the Stag Brewery Site was the only suitable location for a new school in the east of LBRuT. The LBRuT Local Plan Site Allocation (SA24) has allocated the land for a new secondary school.
- 2.20 The Strategy states that in the last two years, there were a significant number of children in the eastern half of the LBRuT, mostly in Barnes and Kew, for whom offers could not be made at any of the three local schools at the initial allocations stage. In 2019, 106 children were unplaced in the eastern half of LBRuT and 6 children were unplaced in the western half.
- 2.21 Based on recent forecasts, LBRuT would be unable to meet its statutory duty to provide places for those children unless a new school was provided. It is forecast that the children who are at most risk of not being admitted to any of the three schools in the eastern half of the LBRuT live in Kew, north Richmond and east and north Barnes.

Further Education

- 2.22 There is a wide range of facilities that offer further education to residents of LBRuT. There is no set benchmark for measuring maximum distance for further education institutions. Unlike primary and secondary education people are willing to travel greater distances to access further education. The assessment therefore considers supply across the whole of LBRuT.

Further Education: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.23 There are seven Sixth Form colleges across LBRuT with the closest provision to the Site being Richmond Park Academy and Christ’s School.

Name	Distance (miles)
Richmond Park Academy (Sixth Form)	1.0
Christ’s Church of England School (Sixth Form)	1.5
Richmond University	2.2
Orleans Park (Sixth Form)	3.0
Grey Court School (Sixth Form)	3.5
Hawk Training	3.8
St Mary’s University College	4.5
West Thames College	4.6
Waldegrave School (Sixth Form)	4.6
Teddington School (Sixth Form)	5.0
Kingston College	6.0
Richmond upon Thames College	6.0
Kingston University	6.3
Hampton High (Sixth Form)	6.4
Esher College	10.0
Brooklands College	13.6
Childcare Company	16.5

- 2.24 Sixth form and further education is fluid and there is currently capacity amongst providers within LBRuT and neighbouring areas. It should also be noted that there are also a number of

further education providers across Greater London which are highly accessible to residents within LBRuT.

- 2.25 With a large number of Further Education providers within LBRuT and in surrounding areas, there does not appear to be any shortage or gaps in provision. The IDP states there is a wide range of courses on offer locally catering for all types of learning. Accounting for this the existing provision is deemed sufficient.

Further Education: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.26 There are currently no plans to increase capacity or the overall provision, except at the three schools which have opened in the last few years (St Richard Reynolds, Turing House and The Richmond upon Thames School). St Richard Reynolds sixth form and Turing House are both now open with The Richmond Upon Thames School due to open in 2022. There will also be capacity provided as part of the school built as part of the proposed Development.
- 2.27 As stated in the LBRuT IDP; St. Mary's University and LBRuT are working together to develop a masterplan in partnership to address the growing demand for university places in the area.

Education Summary

- 2.28 Table 2.5 provides a summary of all existing education provision local to the Site.

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Early Years</i>	Whilst there are some capacity constraints amongst maintained early year places the latest Childcare Sufficiency Assessment notes that most families can access a model that suits their needs and there is broadly sufficient capacity taking account of the range of providers.	Sufficient
<i>Primary Education</i>	The LBRuT, School Place Planning Strategy 2019 and IDP all suggest that there has been pressure on existing supply however, expansion at East Sheen and Sheen Mount and Barnes Primary (future) mean demand is met for the foreseeable future.	Sufficient
<i>Secondary Education</i>	LBRuT state there is a current shortage in places in the Eastern half of the Borough, with an extra secondary school needed to meet future demand.	Insufficient
<i>Further Education</i>	The LBRuT IDP states there is a diverse range of further education provision in the area, catering for all needs. Plans to expand the offer further at St. Mary's University will also enhance the offer further.	Sufficient

Health & Social Care

- 2.29 There are a range of health care facilities within LBRuT, however the standards and benchmarks differ depending on the type of facility. The table below sets out the different benchmarks used to assess the existing provision locally.

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
GPs	1 km	Based on LBRuT Planning Obligations SPD (2020)
Dentists	LBRuT	No recognised standards
Intermediate Care	2 miles	Reasonable walking distance based on DfE minimum walking distances and consultation with LBRuT CCG
Pharmacies	20-minute walk	Walking distance based on British Medical Journal research.
Acute Care	15 mins drive time	London average as per DfT Journey Time Statistics, 2014 and consultation with LBRuT CCG

Primary Health Care

GPs: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.30 Summary information on GP provision is set out in **Table 2.7**. Based on data from NHS Choices there are currently 2 GP centres based within 1 km⁶ of the Site providing a total 18.9 GPs (FTEs) and with a total of 29,372 registered patients.

	Within 1 km of Site	NHS South West London CCG average
No of GPs (FTEs)	18.9	974
Registered patients	29,372	1,721,246
Patients per FTE GP	1,556	1,767

Source: NHS Choices 2021. Date Accessed: November 2021. According to the NHS, there is no recommended number of patients per FTE GP per practice – this recognises the differing needs of the registered patients of GP practices however, NHS London HUDU use a benchmark of 1,800 patients per GP FTE.

- 2.31 The average number of patients per FTE GP is 1,556 within 1 km of the Site and 1,767 across the wider NHS South West London CCG area. Therefore, patient levels at both the local and wider level are lower than the HUDU benchmark.
- 2.32 The surgery closest to the Site (Johnson and Partners) falls well below the HUDU benchmark at 1,082 Patients per GP FTE. The merger of Dr Jezierski & Partners (previously closest to the Site) and North Road Surgery has formed Richmond Medical Group, which has a ratio of 2,185 patients per GP FTE. This is an increase from 1,067 patients per FTE at Jezierski & Partners but a decrease from 2,567 patients per FTE at North Road Surgery.
- 2.33 The surgeries within 1 km of the Site are accepting new patients indicating there may be spare capacity. The latest Care Quality Commission inspection report⁷ continues to recognise health care services as “Good” overall.

GPs: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.34 The LBRuT CCG Strategy states the CCG are working towards increasing the number of community-based health services, rather than hospitals, closer to where people live. LBRuT CCG (now part of the South West London CCG) are working with Hounslow & Richmond Community Health NHS Trust to establish multi-disciplinary hub teams which will work in the community to address future health care demands. An example of this process is the merger of Dr Jezierski & Partners with North Road Surgery, both of which are close to the Site.

Dentists: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.35 According to NHS Choices, there are three dentist surgeries within 1.5 km of the Site. There is no information on the number of dentists within each surgery or the number of registered patients. Data from NHS Digital indicates that the total number of dentists within NHS South West London CCG is around 807 and that the population per dentist is 1,865. This is lower than the average for London (2,145) and suggests the CCG area is well provided for.

⁶ A number of sites that are located north of the river have been discounted as the actual distance from the Site exceeds 1 km.

⁷ CQC Inspection; NHS South West London CCG: Inspection Report October 2019

Table 2.7 Dental Provision in NHS South West London CCG

	South West London
Total No. of dentist	807
Population per dentist	1,865
Dentists seen per 100,000 population	54

Source: NHS Digital (2021)

Dentists: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.36 LBRuT NHS CCG have previously indicated there are no plans to expand any existing surgeries and Hatch is not aware of any changes to this.

Intermediate Health Care

Health Centres: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.37 There are seven health care centres within LBRuT, all providing a range of inpatient and outpatient services, a list of the existing health centres is listed below.

Table 2.8 Health Care Centres

Facility	Services	Distance (mile)
Centre House	Community Health Care Centre	0.5
Richmond Rehab Unit	Physical Rehabilitation Facility	1.7
Ham Clinic	Community Health Care Centre	3.7
Whitton Corner Health and Social Care Centre	Community Health Care Centre	4.8
Teddington Health and Social Care Centre	Community Health Care Centre	5.3
Teddington Memorial Hospital	Diagnostics dept. & in-patient rehabilitation	5.3
Walk-in Centre at Teddington Memorial Hospital	Walk-in Centre	5.3

- 2.38 Centre House is the closest centre to the Site and is within 0.5 miles, the services provided by this facility are; immunisations, ante-natal, family planning, minor surgery, phlebotomy and children’s health & development.
- 2.39 Richmond Rehab Unit is located within 1.7 miles of the site which also provides a range of specialist therapies, such as; neuro-physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech and language therapy and neuro-psychology.
- 2.40 It is anticipated that new residents resulting from the Development would most likely access the three Centres in closest proximity: Centre House, Richmond Rehab Unit and Ham Clinic.
- 2.41 Whilst there are no set standards for health centres, it would appear there are a sufficient range of services within proximity to the Site.

Health Centres: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.42 However, the South West London Health and Care Partnership 1-Year Report⁸ identified concerns around closures of several mental health centres in the Sutton area and the absence of a local mental health crisis centre within the CCG area.

⁸ [STP-refresh-FINAL-V.01.pdf \(swlondon.nhs.uk\)](https://www.swlondon.nhs.uk/STP-refresh-FINAL-V.01.pdf)

Acute Care

- 2.43 Acute care is often referred to as secondary care, such as; serious illness, intensive care, childbirth, medical imaging to name a few. This type of care is often provided in a hospital rather than a health centre or GPs.
- 2.44 Whilst there are no official standards for accepted distances to hospitals, the Department for Transport (DfT) average journey times to hospitals is approximately 15 mins drivetime.

Hospitals: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.45 There are seven hospitals within 15 minutes' drive-time of the Site, these are listed below.

Organisation Name	Services	Distance (miles)	Drivetime (mins)
Barnes Hospital	Mental Health Services	0.5	6
Priory Hospital Roehampton	Mental Health & Counselling Services	0.8	8
Richmond Royal Hospital	Mental Health Services	1.5	10
Queen Mary - St George's University Hospital	Wide range of Outpatient & Inpatient Services	1.5	18
The Huntercombe Hospital - Roehampton	Mental Health Services	1.9	14

Source: NHS Choices. Drive times are based on Google Maps during normal traffic.

- 2.46 The closest hospital to the Site is Barnes Hospital which is located 0.5 miles away however this is a specialist hospital which focuses on mental health services, this is also true of the Priory Hospital Roehampton and Richmond Royal Hospital.
- 2.47 Queen Mary – St George's University Hospital is the closest hospital which provides a comprehensive range of secondary care, the hospital is rated as 'Requires Improvement' by the Care Quality Commission.
- 2.48 The largest hospitals within the closest distance to the site is Charing Cross, this is approximately 16 minutes' drive-time away from the Site. This particular hospital is a large regional hospital and provides a significant number of services. Following consultation with LBRuT; it was suggested that Imperial College and Kingston Hospitals would also be used by residents from the Development.
- 2.49 The Site is considered well served by a number of hospitals within a 15 minute-drive time, West Middlesex University Hospital is only 17 minutes' drive-time away and a range of specialist hospitals are located within Central London.

Hospitals: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.50 Naturally, as the population grows and continues to age, it is anticipated that demand for acute care, as with other elements of health care, will also increase.
- 2.51 There are no plans to build any new hospitals local to the Site, however there are medium term investment plans to improve Charing Cross Hospital Estate, which will improve quality and capacity.

Pharmacies

- 2.52 There is no set threshold for pharmacy provision for local residents however, a study by the British Medical Journal⁹ suggests that 89% of the population have access to a community pharmacy within a 20-minute walk.

Table 2.10 Pharmacies within 20-minute walk

Pharmacy	Distance (miles)	Walking Time
Superdrug Pharmacy	0.4	8 mins
Boots	0.4	9 mins
Round the Clock Pharmacy	0.5	10 mins
Spatetree Pharmacy	0.5	10 mins
Dumler's Pharmacy	0.6	13 mins
Boots	0.7	18 mins
Lloyds Pharmacy	0.8	20 mins
Barnes Pharmacy	0.9	20 mins

- 2.53 There are eight pharmacies within a 20-minute walk of the Site which provide a range of services catering for both NHS and non-NHS patients. Based on the existing number of providers in the local area, the current supply is deemed sufficient.

Healthcare Summary

- 2.54 Table 2.12 provides a summary of all existing health care provision local to the Site.

Table 2.11 Health – Summary of Supply

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Primary Healthcare</i>	Patient to GP ratios in the local area are lower than the NHS HUDU benchmark. There is good provision of public and private dentists across LBRuT.	Sufficient
<i>Intermediate Healthcare</i>	There are a number of health centres across LBRuT, offering a range of services.	Sufficient
<i>Acute Care</i>	Based on relative drive-times it was deemed that the Site is well served by hospitals and acute care centres.	Sufficient
<i>Pharmacies</i>	There are six pharmacies within 1 mile of the Site, suggesting local supply is good.	Sufficient

Leisure & Recreation

- 2.55 Leisure and Recreation has a broad scope however for the purpose of this assessment we have looked at the following: Libraries, Indoor Sports & Recreation, Open Space and Arts & Culture.
- 2.56 There are few or no set standards for the provision of leisure and recreation, therefore most have been assessed at the Borough level, however open space has been benchmarked with regional standards, as explained later in this section.

⁹ British Medical Journal; The Positive Primary Care Law; an area-level analysis of the relationship between community pharmacy distribution, urbanity and social deprivation in England

Table 2.12 Leisure & Recreation Benchmarks/Impact Areas

Provision	Benchmark/Impact Area	Justification
Libraries	LBRuT	No set standards
Indoor Sports & Recreation	LBRuT	No set standards
Open Space	Various	As per regional benchmarks
Arts & Culture	LBRuT	No set standards

Libraries

- 2.57 There are numerous libraries throughout LBRuT, all of which are operated by the local authority. LBRuT is also home to the National Archives, which is of national significance and is located 1.4 miles away in Kew.

Libraries: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.58 There are currently 12 libraries within the LBRuT, as listed in the table below.

Table 2.13 Libraries within LBRuT

Name of Library	Distance (miles)
East Sheen Library	0.3
Kew Library	1.2
Castelnau Library	1.6
Richmond Lending Library	1.8
Richmond Reference Library	2.1
Twickenham Library	3.4
Ham Library	3.6
Whitton Library	4.5
Teddington Library	4.8
Hampton Hill Library	5.4
Hampton Wick Library	5.5
Hampton Library	6.7

Source : LBRuT. www.richmond.gov.uk

- 2.59 Previously undertaken consultation¹⁰ with LBRuT has suggested that all libraries are well used with a large number of members. However, the current provision of libraries across LBRuT is sufficient for the number of residents within LBRuT.
- 2.60 The closest library to the sight is East Sheen (0.3 miles), which is a well-used library, with a user-base of mainly families and adults using the ICT facilities.
- 2.61 There are currently no mobile libraries in operation in LBRuT however there is a home delivery and digital library service.

Libraries: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.62 The LBRUT IDP states that the Council anticipate libraries to continue to be well used. There are plans to move some libraries to more prominent high street locations whilst modernising the existing provision at Richmond Lending Library and the Old Town Hall. It appears there are no plans to close any of the existing libraries.

¹⁰ Based on consultation with LBRuT Library Service Manager.

Indoor Sports and Recreation

- 2.63 There are a range of indoor sports and recreation facilities available throughout LBRuT, with facilities being managed by a mix of both the private and public operators.
- 2.64 The LBRuT Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment¹¹ (ISFNA) found that LBRuT has high levels of physical activity amongst residents along with low levels of inactivity. The Borough also has good overall provision of sports and recreation facilities within LBRuT and in neighbouring areas.

Indoor Sports & Recreation: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.65 There are seven indoor fitness centres within LBRuT; offering a diverse range of activities for its residents. The table below details all publicly accessible indoor sports centres within the Borough.

Name of Facility	Distance (miles)	Facilities
Shene Sports and Fitness Centre	0.6	Fitness Suite, All Weather Pitch, Dance Studio, Spin Studio, Sports Hall
Pools on the Park	1.8	Swimming Pools (indoor and outdoor),
Teddington Pools and Fitness Centre	4.8	Swimming Pool, Fitness Suite
Whitton Sports and Fitness Centre	4.8	Sports Hall, MUGA, Dance Studio, Football Pitch (Flood lit)
Teddington Sports Centre	5.0	Netball (outdoor), MUGA, Volleyball Courts, All Weather Sports Pitches, Sports Hall, Squash Courts, Tennis Courts, Dance Studios
Teddington Hydrotherapy Pool	5.0	Pool for rehabilitation and people who require supported exercise
Hampton Sports & Fitness Centre	6.4	Football Pitch (floodlit), 5-a-side Football, Fitness Suite, Gymnasium, MUGA, Netball (indoor & outdoor), Sports Hall, Tennis Court (floodlit), Volleyball Court

Source : LBRuT. www.richmond.gov.uk

- 2.66 The LBRuT ISNFA acknowledges the indoor sports and recreation facilities across the Borough to be sufficient in quantity and of good quality. However, the ISNFA highlights that there are some quantity and quality issues in relation to public swimming pools, with a number of residents stating they visit facilities in neighbouring boroughs.
- 2.67 The IISFNA shows LBRuT benefits from a significant number of private leisure facilities across LBRuT, of which, a large number of LBRuT residents are members, which helps meet demand for facilities across the Borough.
- 2.68 Other private sector providers include Virgin Active (Twickenham), Twickenham Fitness and Wellbeing Centre, Lensbury Health Centre, David Lloyd (Hampton Hill) and St. Mary's University College.
- 2.69 In terms of outdoor playing pitches, the LBRuT Playing Pitch Assessment (2015) suggests that provision across the Borough is good however there are some potential shortfalls in the Richmond analysis area (which includes Barnes and Mortlake). The LBRuT IDP recognises that

¹¹ LBRuT; Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment, Knight Kavanagh and Page, 2015

the level of satisfied demand across the Borough is high with 90% of residents having their needs satisfied, which is the second highest in London.

- 2.70 However, this means there is still a slight shortfall in provision, which is mainly down to lack of daytime access to indoor sports. It has been suggested this shortfall could be assessed by working with education partners to open their sports hall for longer, especially at peak times.

Indoor Sports & Recreation: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.71 The most significant changes to sports and recreation provision within LBRuT is the development of Richmond upon Thames College and associated sports centre. There are no plans to expand any of the sports centres locally however the Indoor Sports Facility Needs Assessment recommends that investment is made at Shene Sports Centre, which is the facility located closest to the Site.
- 2.72 The assessment also highlighted the need to upgrade and expand existing swimming pool provision with LBRuT, which is currently limited and outdated.
- 2.73 In addition, the Borough's Playing Pitch Strategy Report, undertaken in May 2015 and updated in March 2018 includes an assessment of playing pitches linked to education provision. This concluded that there is a shortfall in football provision, capacity for cricket, a potential shortfall in rugby provision, four full sized hockey pitches and a need for five full sized 3G (synthetic) pitches.

Open Space

- 2.74 LBRuT is well renowned for its green spaces and large parks such as Richmond Park, Old Deer Park, Kew Gardens and its highly accessible green space alongside the Thames.
- 2.75 The benchmarks used for open space are those that are set by the Greater London Assembly (GLA) in the London Plan.

Table 2.15 GLA Open Categorisation and Benchmarks

Open Space categorisation	Size Guideline	Distances from homes
Regional Parks	400 ha	3.2 to 8 km
Metropolitan Parks	60 ha	3.2 km
District Parks	20 ha	1.2 km
Local Parks / Open Spaces / Small Open Spaces / Pocket Parks	2 ha	<=400 metres

Source: GLA, 2011

Open Space: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.76 There are several open spaces within close proximity to the Site, including those that have play areas and other community uses such as sports fields. The table below summarises the open space provision within 1.2km of the Site.

Table 2.16 Open Space Provision near the Application Site

Type	Typology	Additional Amenities
Mortlake Green	Open space	Play for 7-14 and under 7's, basketball court
Barnes Common	Open Space	Football pitch
Barnes Green	Open space	Play for under 7's
Jubilee Gardens	Open space	Boat race viewing point
Tapestry Court	Open Space	Boat race viewing point
Thames Bank	Open Space	Boat race viewing point
Vine Road recreation ground	Local park	Children's play areas, paddling pool and informal space

Source: London Borough of Richmond

- 2.77 The LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report (April 2015) identifies around 200 open space sites in the Borough equating to a total provision of 527ha. The assessment divides the Borough into three areas for the purposes of analysis and Mortlake and Barnes Common is located within the Richmond assessment area. The area performs well above the Borough average on all typologies of space in terms of provision per 1,000 population.
- 2.78 The closest space for children and young people is Mortlake Green Play Area, which is of sufficient size and within 400m of the site. However, the site does require reinvestment in some of the play equipment which is now old and of poor quality. The site also provides limited play space for people aged 15+ years.
- 2.79 Mullins Path is also less than 0.5 miles from the site. The Open Space Assessment Report suggests that the site is of sufficient quality however, is very small in size and would only serve the population within its immediate vicinity.

Table 2.17 Play Space Provision near to the Application Site

Play Area Name	Size (ha)	Distance (miles)	Facilities
Mortlake Green	1.54	0.2 km to the south	Play area, Natural play, Fitness, Half basketball
Mullins Path Open Space	0.05	0.3 to the southeast	Play area
North Sheen Recreation Ground	3.30	1.6 to the west	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Palewell Common	15.38	1.6 to the southeast	Play area, Fitness, Paddling pool,
Vine Road Recreation Ground	2.32	1.7 to the east	Play area, Natural play, Paddling pool
Old Deer Park	28.62	3.4 to the west	Senior play area, Toddler play area, Fitness,

- 2.80 The Borough contains a high proportion of LEAP and NEAP sized play areas, many of which score high for quality and value.
- 2.81 Richmond Analysis Area has the highest amount of play space provision per 1,000 population and has the greatest number of play sites in the Borough.
- 2.82 The majority of play sites (95%) across the Borough are assessed as being above the threshold for quality.

Table 2.18 Open Space Summary, Richmond Assessment Area

Typology	Number	Total Provision (ha)	Provision per 1,000 Pop	LBRuT Provision per 1,000 Pop
Parks and gardens (urban parks & formal)	4	47.25	0.61	0.39
Natural & semi-natural green space	19	237.78	3.08	1.44
Amenity space	31	57.62	0.75	0.52
Provision for children and young people	17	3.49	0.05	0.03
Amenity space	31	57.62	0.75	0.52
Allotments	13	12.48	0.16	0.15

Source: LBRuT Open Space Assessment Report, April 2015, Knight Kavanagh Page

- 2.83 The Site is also situated along the River Thames, which provides a significant amount of usable open space. The Thames River path also links together open space sites, which would otherwise be isolated from one another.
- 2.84 The development is located between a number of larger parks with more facilities for weekend or occasional visits. The Thames towpath gives access to nature and links to smaller passive parks such as Thames Bank and Jubilee Gardens, but only Mortlake Green provides access to open space facilities such as playground and informal recreation within 400m.
- 2.85 The other sites within 400m are Thames Bank (small grassy area, two benches), Tapestry Court (a narrow cut through between the towpath and Mortlake High Street) and Mullins Path (a small site with 1 bench and 4-5 pieces of play equipment); these are very small, low on features and unlikely to attract visitors away from Mortlake Green.
- 2.86 The Site is deemed to be well served by open space of all forms, however consultation has suggested that local play space could be improved in terms of its quality and provision for older children (i.e. 15+).

Open Space: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.87 There are continuous improvements being made to existing spaces, however providing additional supply of open space is difficult, based on less and less space being available.
- 2.88 However, with an increasing population, demand is growing therefore it is anticipated that new open spaces will be designed into new developments, to meet additional demand.

Arts & Culture

- 2.89 There are no maximum walking distances identified for arts and cultural attractions therefore, provision has been looked at across the LBRuT. To provide some context minimum walking distances set by the DfE for primary schools have been used as proxy.

Table 2.19 Existing Provision Benchmarks/Standards/Impact Areas

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Arts & Culture	2 miles	Based on Department for Education recommendations ¹² .

¹² Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to assess access to arts and culture.

Arts & Culture: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.90 LBRuT has a range of arts and cultural attractions with major national attractions including Kew Gardens and Twickenham Rugby Stadium Museum.
- 2.91 There are 15 arts and cultural facilities within LBRuT which include; six art galleries & centres, three museums, two theatres, three cinemas and one botanical garden.
- 2.92 Based on DfE statutory walking distances, there are seven arts and culture facilities within 2 miles of the Site. There is also a significant number of arts and culture attractions located 7.4 miles away in London.

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Distance (miles)
OSO Community Arts Centre	Arts Centre	1.0
Longfield Art & Pottery Studio	Arts Centre	1.1
Olympic Cinema Studios	Cinema	1.3
Orange Tree Theatre	Theatre	1.6
Kew Gardens	Botanical Garden	1.7
Richmond Theatre	Theatre	1.8
One Paved Court	Arts Centre	2.0
Museum of Richmond	Museum	2.1
Riverside Gallery	Art Gallery	2.1
Odeon Cinema Richmond	Cinema	2.3
Curzon Cinema Richmond	Cinema	2.4
The Twickenham Museum	Museum	3.4
Orleans House Gallery	Art Gallery	3.4
Stables Gallery	Art Gallery	3.4
World Rugby Museum	Museum	3.6

- 2.93 The baseline assessment along with the LBRuT IDP suggest that there is a diverse range of arts and cultural attractions close to the Site, with even greater provision located nearby in Central London.

Arts & Culture: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.94 There are no plans to develop any new attractions within LBRuT however the Cultural Strategy¹³ states that existing cultural facilities will be retained. A number of attractions have been expanded or refurbished, such as;
- a new children’s educational and play garden at Kew Gardens, and;
 - extension of the Orleans House Gallery in Twickenham.
- 2.95 It is anticipated that the demand for arts and culture will continue to increase based on the increasing population. However, there are a large number of attractions within LBRuT as well as internationally recognised arts and culture amenities close by in Central London, which should satisfy future demand.

¹³ LBRuT, Cultural Partnership Strategy 2015 – 2019 (2019)

Public Houses: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.96 Public Houses provide an important resource and meeting place within a local community. Whilst Public Houses play a part in supporting the local community they also have an important economic role.
- 2.97 There are no set metrics to measure the provision of public houses within a local area however, a study by GVA Humberts Leisure¹⁴ found that the average number of working age adults (16-64) per Public House in London was 1,197.
- 2.98 As the table below shows there are eight Public Houses within the Mortlake and Barnes Common Ward. Using a working age population of 7,230 within the ward this would equate to 904 adults per pub.

Public House	Distance (miles)
The Jolly Gardeners	0.1
The Old Ship	0.2
White Hart	0.5
The Crossing	0.7
Bulls Head	0.8
The Brown Dog	0.8
Stags Head	0.9
The Sun Inn	0.9

- 2.99 Taking account of the number of public houses per working age population in the Barnes and Mortlake Common ward, which is below the London average, the supply of public houses is sufficient.

Public Houses: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.100 There are no indications of new public houses being developed in the area. The two existing public houses located next the Site are not part of the Development and will therefore not be lost as a result of the proposals.

Heritage

- 2.101 The Stag Brewery forms a major part of the river frontage in the centre of Mortlake, having served as a productive brewery site for many hundreds of years, and the site of the original Mortlake Manor house, the centre of the large estate, originally including thousands of acres, extending to Richmond Park. A brewery has existed on this site since 1493 when brewer John Williams was granted half an acre by King John, with the Stag Brewery finally closing in 2015.

Heritage: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.102 The site is partially located within the Mortlake conservation area and some of the buildings are locally listed. Heritage elements on the existing site include; the Former Hotel Building, Bottling Plant Building, Maltings Building and the existing boundary brick wall. These are important heritage assets and Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM), that need to be partially retained as part of the proposed Development to ensure the historical character of the area is preserved.

¹⁴ GVA Humberts Leisure, 2012; Cambridge Public House Study

Along with the historical assets that form part of the existing sites are plaques commemorating Brewery workers who died during World War I and II.

- 2.103 The Site also has strong historical links to the University Boat Race, with the finish line to the race located within close proximity to the Site. Preserving the Site’s historical ties to the boat race are important and need to be considered as part of the proposed Development.
- 2.104 LBRuT is rich in heritage and has a large number of historical assets, of which the existing Site is one, therefore it is important this is well preserved as part of the proposed Development.

Heritage: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.105 The LBRuT IDP stresses the importance of preserving the Borough’s heritage assets and the high priority will be given to the retention of original structures, features, materials and plan form or features that contribute to the significance of the asset. The flexible-use space proposed on the Site could include a new boat house, further strengthening the Site’s links to the University Boat Race and boat racing on the River Thames. The Development will also enable better links and access to the River, which is another significant heritage asset.

Leisure and Recreation Summary

- 2.106 Table 2.23 provides a summary of all existing leisure and recreation provision local to the Site.

Service	Summary	Current Supply
<i>Libraries</i>	Consultation with LBRuT suggested existing supply was sufficient with East Sheen being the closest to the Site. IDP reinforces this and suggest all services will be retained in the future.	Sufficient
<i>Indoor Sports & Recreation</i>	The ISFNA suggests the supply of fitness centres is good. However, the report identifies a small deficiency in indoor sports and sports pitches.	Insufficient
<i>Open Space</i>	Consultation with LBRuT suggested that open space within the local area is of good quality and of sufficient supply.	Sufficient
<i>Arts & Culture</i>	LBRuT has a strong arts and culture offer, which is also supported in the IDP. There are no plans for any of the existing facilities to be closed or lost	Sufficient
<i>Public Houses</i>	The number of public houses close to the Site is good and the number people per pub is lower than the London average, which would indicate provision is high.	Sufficient
<i>Heritage</i>	The existing site has a strong historical identity and heritage links. The Site is of historical importance which needs to be preserved.	Sufficient

Community & Emergency Services

- 2.107 To help establish existing emergency service provision close to the Site, the various response times set by Fire, Ambulance and Police services have been used.
- 2.108 Table 2.23 below shows the different response times used by the three emergency services. There are no recognised standards for community services and places of worship therefore these have been assessed at the district level. Community services have been assessed based on the DfE minimum walking distances for primary school children.

Table 2.23 Community & Emergency Services Benchmarks/Impact Areas

Provision	Benchmark	Justification
Fire Service	6 mins drive time	London Fire Brigade Response Time Targets 2015/16
Ambulance Service	8 mins drive time	London Ambulance Service target response time
Police Service	15 mins drive time	Home Office; The use of targets in policing
Civic Council	LBRuT	No recognised standards
Community Services	2 miles	Based on Department for Education recommendations ¹⁵
Place of Worship	LBRuT	No recognised standards

Emergency Services

Police: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.109 LBRuT has one police station – Twickenham Police Station. Based on police response times, the police station is within 15 minutes’ drive-time¹⁶ of the Site.).
- 2.110 The Site is therefore located within close proximity to a police station and within the recognised response time set by the police.
- 2.111 Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) crime rate data shows that in 2021 (Jan – Dec), there were 46.24 crimes per 1,000 of the population of LBRuT, which is significantly lower than the London average (177.33 per 1,000 of population). There was a -25% reduction in crimes per 1,000 of the population from 2020.
- 2.112 The latest statistics¹⁷ at the ward level show that the crime rate in Mortlake & Barnes (55.36 per 1,000 population) is slightly higher than the LBRuT average (46.24). Crime rates relating to burglary are higher at the ward level compared to the borough.

Police: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.113 Whilst there are no quantitative estimates on future demand for police over the coming years; based on historic trends and the changing nature of crime, it is anticipated there will be increased demand for policing in the future.
- 2.114 Following an announcement from the MPS that it was closing 50% of London stations, the Borough saw a closure of two out of three police stations.
- 2.115 The LBRuT IDP does not recognise any deficiencies in police provision within the LBRuT area.

Fire & Rescue: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.116 There are three fire stations located close to the Site, of which all are within 5.4 miles of the Site.
- 2.117 Based on London Fire Brigade (LFB) response time targets, there is one fire station within the LFB six minutes’ drive-time¹⁸ target, which is located in Richmond, less than 1.0 miles away (within 4 minutes’ drive-time).

¹⁵ Section 444(5) of the Education Act 1996 suggests a maximum walking distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) for a child who is under the age of eight. As this guidance applies to children under the age of eight, the distance of 2 miles (3.2 km) is used to as a proxy to assess access to arts and culture.

¹⁶ Based on Google Maps average drive time.

¹⁷ Metropolitan Police, 2021, Stats and Data, Crime Data Dashboard

¹⁸ Based on Google Maps average road speed not blue light response, therefore actual response may be quicker.

- 2.118 LFB response data shows that the average number of incidents per London borough during 2018¹⁹ was 2,088. LBRuT had a lower number of incidents (1,106) compared to the London average and is the Borough with the third lowest number of incidents across London so far, this year.

Table 2.24 Fire Stations

Name of Station	Distance (miles)	Drive Time (mins)
Richmond Fire Station	0.9	4
Chiswick Fire Station*	2.4	10
Twickenham Fire Station	5.4	19

Source: London Fire Brigade, 2017. * Outside of LBRuT

- 2.119 The proposed Development is easily accessible and within a short drive time of the nearest Fire Station.

Fire & Rescue: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.120 The Review of Resourcing of the London Fire Brigade²⁰ states that the number of attendances made by the LFB in 2015/16 had decreased by 16,000 since 2011/12, which would indicate a reduction in demand. However, LFB are piloting a co-response project with LAS, which would mean LFB would be responsible for attending certain types of health-emergencies.
- 2.121 There are no indications of additional facilities being provided in the local area or within LBRuT. The LBRuT IDP identifies Twickenham Station is in need of replacing which is currently being considered, whilst it has been acknowledged that Richmond Fire Station will require some renovation.

Ambulance Service: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.122 There are two ambulance stations located close to the Site, of which both are within 3.1 miles of the Site.
- 2.123 Based on London Ambulance Service (LAS) response time targets, none of the ambulance stations are within an eight minutes' drive-time²¹ of the Site. The nearest ambulance station is located in Richmond, which is 1.7 miles away (within 9 minutes' drive-time).
- 2.124 However, it should be noted that ambulances and rapid response vehicles are not always situated at ambulance stations and can be positioned at various locations at any point throughout the day, therefore drive times may be less.

Table 2.25 Ambulance Stations

Name of Station	Distance (miles)	Drive Time (mins)
Richmond Ambulance Station	1.7	9
Chiswick Ambulance Station*	3.1	11

Source: London Ambulance Service, 2021. * Outside of LBRuT

¹⁹ London Fire Brigade, 2018; LFB Incident Data (January to December)

²⁰ London Fire Brigade, 2017; Review of Resourcing of the London Fire Brigade 2017 – 2020.

²¹ Based on Google Maps average drive time.

- 2.125 The 2017 average LAS response time statistics²² suggest that the 74% of all Category A calls were responded to within 8 minutes, which is marginally lower than the target of 75% but higher than the London average (71%) over the same period. New targets have now been introduced as a result of incidents being re-categorised therefore, the 2017 data is currently the latest available.
- 2.126 The 2021 average LAS response time statistics²³ suggest that the average response time for a Category 1 call has decreased since 2017, from 7:18 to 6:44. This means the average response in London meets the target of under 7 minutes. At the 90th centile, responses take 11:23 minutes i.e. 90% of call-outs take less than this time.

Ambulance Service: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.127 The London Ambulance Service 5 Year Strategy 2014/15 – 2019/20²⁴ shows that demand for ambulance services is increasing, with 999 calls increasing by 10% between 2011-13. There are no plans to increase the number of ambulance stations locally, however LAS state within the Strategy that there will be investment in updating and growing the fleet of vehicles.

Civic Council & Community Services

- 2.128 There are no set benchmarks for access to council services and community, however the benchmarks and impact areas used are set out at the beginning of this section.

Civic Council: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.129 There are currently nine LBRuT civic council offices that are accessible to the general public which are detailed in the table below.

Name of Facility	Distance (miles)
The Croft Centre	1.2
Supported Travel Team	3.3
Civic Centre & Tourist Information	3.3
Electoral Services	3.7
Registration Services	3.7
Social Services	3.7
York House	3.7
Twickenham Training centre	3.8

- 2.130 Based on the most recent residents survey²⁵ over 87% of residents stated they are satisfied with the way in which the Council operates. This was higher than the national average (65%) reported by the Local Government Association (LGA) in the same year (2017). The overall satisfaction results were higher for Mortlake with 90% of residents stating they are satisfied.
- 2.131 The survey indicates that residents contacted the council in relation to the following issues (over a 12-month period); Parking (22%), Waste & Recycling (17%) and Pavements (12%).

²² NHS London Ambulance Service, Response Times; January – July 2017, Category A response times: target 75% within eight minutes

²³ NHS London Ambulance Service, Ambulance Quality Indicators Time Series (2017-2021)

²⁴ Latest statistics available.

²⁵ LBRuT Residents Survey 2017; Perceptions of Richmond Council.

Civic Council: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.132 Based on a number of planned developments in LBRuT, it is anticipated there will be increased pressure on civic services in the future. There is no evidence that suggests current services will be expanded. However, LBRuT, as part of the Corporate Strategy²⁶ aims to improve resident satisfaction with the Borough and improve local engagement and improve inclusive growth, investing in local services that protect the most vulnerable and a borough that is affordable for all.

Community Services: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.133 Our assessment has shown that there are 19 community and children’s centres across LBRuT, of which nine are within a 2-mile walking distance of the Site with Mortlake Children’s and Family being the closest.
- 2.134 There are also a number of community centres within close proximity, such as Kew and The Avenue Club community centres. The nearest youth centre (Powerstation) is located 0.5 miles away in Barnes.

Table 2.27 Community Services

Name of Facility	Type of Facility	Distance (miles)
Mortlake Children and Family Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	0.2
Barnes Children's Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	0.3
Powerstation	Youth Centre	0.5
Windham Croft Centre for Children	Family & Children’s Centre	1.1
Kew Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	1.5
The Avenue Club	Community Centre/Social Club	1.5
Lowther Primary School	Family & Children’s Centre	1.9
Castelnau Youth Club	Youth Centre	1.9
Cambrian Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	2.0
Vineyard Community Centre	Community Centre/Social Club	2.3
Heatham House	Youth Centre	3.5
Ham Youth Centre	Youth Centre	3.7
Ham Children’s Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	3.8
Whitton Youth Zone	Youth Centre	4.4
Stanley Children and Family Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	4.9
Heathfield Children's Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	5.1
Norman Jackson Children's Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	5.8
Hampton Youth Project	Youth Centre	6.7
Tangley Park Children and Family Centre	Family & Children’s Centre	6.8

- 2.135 The baseline assessment and LBRuT IDP would indicate that there are a range of community services located within the LBRuT, with almost half of them within 2 miles of the site.
- 2.136 Quality assessments of each of the facilities is not available, however five of the children’s centres have been assessed by Ofsted. Three of the five centres achieved a rating of ‘Good’ (Ham Children’s Centre, Norman Jackson Children’s Centre and Heathfield/Whitton Children Centre) whilst the remaining two received ratings of ‘Satisfactory/Requires Improvement’ (Barnes Children’s Centre and Stanley Children’s Centre).

²⁶ LBRuT Corporate Plan 2018 – 2022 (2018)

Community Services: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.137 Desk-based research suggests there are no plans to expand or provide additional community facilities locally however, the LBRuT IDP suggest capital expenditure is needed to improve existing facilities, however none of these facilities are within close proximity to the Site.
- 2.138 There are also aspirations to change the way in which community centres are run, with LBRuT encouraging local community groups to take ownership of public assets such as Community Halls, through asset transfer programmes.
- 2.139 It is expected that there will be an element of community space planned as part of the flexible-use floorspace within the Development.

Places of Worship

- 2.140 LBRuT is predominantly Christian, with 55% of residents stating they were of Christian faith during the Census 2011, this is higher than the London average (48%) yet lower than the levels for England (59%).

Table 2.28 Population by religion - Census 2011

Religion	Richmond upon Thames	London	England
Christian	55.3%	48.4%	59.4%
Buddhist	0.8%	1.0%	0.5%
Hindu	1.6%	5.0%	1.5%
Jewish	0.8%	1.8%	0.5%
Muslim	3.3%	12.4%	5.0%
Sikh	0.8%	1.5%	0.8%
Other religion	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
No religion	28.4%	20.7%	24.7%
Religion not stated	8.5%	8.5%	7.2%

- 2.141 As would be expected, this is reflected in the types of places of worship that are located within LBRuT with the vast majority linked to Christian denominations and in particular, Church of England.

Places of Worship: Existing Supply & Demand

- 2.142 There are 74 Places of Worship within LBRuT, of this total, nearly all are churches. The closest Place of Worship to the Site is St. Mary's, which is approximately 0.3 miles away.

Table 2.29 Places of Worship in LBRuT

Place of Worship	Count
Church of England	34
Roman Catholic Church	13
Baptist Church	8
Methodist Church	5
United Reform	4
Christian Fellowship Church	2
Christian Spiritualists Church	1
Congregational Church	1
Free Church of England	1
H.M. Forces Church	1
Independent Evangelical Church	1
Spiritualist Church	1
Synagogues	1
Unsectarian	1

- 2.143 Whilst there are a number of places of worship across LBRuT, these are mostly connected to the Christian faith. Therefore, residents of other religions may have to travel to neighbouring boroughs to access a place of worship.
- 2.144 Notwithstanding this, London is an extremely diverse city and therefore residents will not have to travel significant distances to access a place of worship.
- 2.145 Taking this into account it would appear that LBRuT has a vast number of places of worship however, the diversity of these places of worship is limited.

Places of Worship: Future Supply & Demand

- 2.146 There is limited information available indicating future supply and demand for religion. Based on the number of churches in LBRuT it would appear there is sufficient supply to satisfy future demand from Christian residents however, this is more difficult to judge for residents of other religious denominations. Provision in neighbouring locations and at the wider London level will help satisfy any increased demand.

Community and Emergency Services Summary

- 2.147 Table 2.32 provides a summary of all existing community and emergency service provision local to the Site.

Table 2.30 Community & Emergency Services: Summary of Supply

Service	Summary	Supply
<i>Emergency Services</i>	Taking into account emergency drive time targets and existing provision, the Site appears to be well served.	Sufficient
<i>Civic Council & Community Services</i>	The LBRuT IDP highlights that there is a range of community services local to the Site, of which all are to be retained in the foreseeable future.	Sufficient
<i>Places of Worship</i>	Whilst it is difficult to gauge the supply and demand for places of worship, supply does not seem to be an issue.	Sufficient

3. Demand Assessment

3.0 This section will look at the demand for community and cultural facilities generated by the proposed Development.

The Proposed Development

3.1 The proposed Development will be a mixed use consisting of; residential, commercial, retail and community uses, a secondary school and community space. The proposed Development will also deliver significant amount of new public open space. The proposed Development masterplan includes provision of 1,092 residential units.

3.2 The Table 3.1 below sets out the schedule for the residential element of the proposed Development. The proposed Development includes affordable housing provision of 22% by habitable room (subject to financial viability review) therefore contributing to local affordable housing policies.

Table 3.0 Indicative Dwelling Mix

	Studio/ 1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4 bed	Total
Market Units & Intermediate	318	417	165	20	920
Social Rented	12	63	84	6	165

3.3 As part of the proposed Development a range of other uses are proposed which will consist of the following;

- School
- Cinema
- Hotel
- Flexible Uses
- Office and workspace

3.4 Part of Development is proposed as flexible use floorspace and could consist of retail, office, workspace, community and boat house (Sui Generis) uses.

3.5 The flexible floor space will enable the proposed Development to respond to market demand in future. However, a cap on the amount of floor space has been suggested for each land use to be secured via condition. The rest of the proposed Development will consist of a range of uses including; offices, cinema, hotel and school.

Effect on Existing Provision

3.6 This section provides an overall assessment of effects, as a result of the proposed Development, taking into account any on site provision of social and community infrastructure. This assessment has been based on the quantum of development listed in the previous section 'The Development'.

- 3.7 The potential effects have been quantified however, where this is not possible a qualitative approach has been taken.

Education

- 3.8 The estimated child yield range resulting from the proposed Development is based on the GLA Play and Informal Recreation SPG²⁷ 2012 and the GLA Population Calculator 2019. This estimated the potential child yield generated by a development based on the proposed scheme and tenure mix.

Early Years

- 3.9 According to the GLA guidance and the proposed Development could generate 252 children aged 0-5. Not all of these children would require an Early Years education place and not all would be additional to the borough. However, it is prudent to assume the proposed Development would yield this worst-case demand.
- 3.10 Whilst some of the additional early years population will take places within private nurseries, there will be fewer places for residents looking to enrol their child within state funded nurseries, resulting in insufficient supply. However, the latest available Child Care Sufficiency Assessment (February 2020) sets out *‘there is broadly sufficient childcare availability in Richmond with continual changes of models available within the childcare market so that most families can access a suitable model that meets their needs’*.
- 3.11 Taking this into account, whilst the additional demand arising from the proposed Development will likely place additional and adverse pressure on maintained provision, with alternative choices available, the effect of the additional child yield is not considered to be significant.

Table 3.1 Summary

Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Early Years	Insufficient	No mitigation required as alternative choices/providers are available.	Insignificant

Primary Education

- 3.12 The Development is estimated to generate a maximum of +185 children of primary school age. There is a current surplus in capacity of primary school places within two miles of the Site and the LBRuT School Place Planning Strategy suggests that, due to recent expansions and the ability to put in place a shared form of entry system, no further action is needed at present or in the foreseeable future. In addition, a recent Planning Committee (2020) noted that there is existing and forecast capacity in planning Area 7 which could accommodate demand arising from the proposed Development.
- 3.13 Taking this into consideration, the effect of the Development is deemed to be insignificant.

²⁷GLA Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation SPG; Play & Informal Recreation SPG Calculator. Both the 2012 and 2019 calculators have been referred to and the yields are represented in using a range to reflect the use of both calculators.

Table 3.2 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Primary Education	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Secondary Education

- 3.14 The GLA's child yield calculator suggests there will be 111 children of secondary school age (including 38 children of sixth form age) yielded from the proposed Development.
- 3.15 The additional children of secondary school age generated by the proposed Development will put additional strain on existing resources. However, the six-form entry (FE) secondary school that is being provided as part of the proposed Development will create a number of places and help address any deficits.
- 3.16 Therefore, taking into account the provision of a Secondary School on-site, it is deemed there will be sufficient capacity and the effect of the Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.3 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Secondary Education	Insufficient	Six FE Secondary school built as part of the development.	Insignificant

Further Education

- 3.17 It is also anticipated there will be increased demand for further education, with the Development yielding a total of +38 young people aged between 16 to 17. There is no information on the exact number of further education places available across LBRuT, however it is acknowledged there are a number of providers within LBRuT and neighbouring areas, as well as further afield within Central London.
- 3.18 The proposed Development includes provision for a Sixth Form which will be capable of absorbing any demand that arises for places from this age group. There is also capacity amongst a range of other local providers and there are sixth form centres opening at two schools within LBRuT over the next 5 years which will increase capacity further.
- 3.19 Taking this into consideration it is assumed that the existing capacity at this level will be sufficient and the effect is insignificant.

Table 3.4 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Further Education	Sufficient	Provided as part of the onsite school.	Insignificant

Health & Social Care

- 3.20 The Development is estimated to generate a maximum of 2,472 new residents. Taking this into account, the effect the additional population could have on local health care provision has been considered.

Primary Healthcare

- 3.21 As a worst-case scenario, it has been assumed that all residents yielded (2,483 residents) from the Development will register with a local GP (e.g. within 1 kilometre). Based on this assumption, the number of patients per GP (FTE) would increase from to 1,556 to 1,687 (+8.4%). This remains below the HUDU benchmark level of 1,800.
- 3.22 Primary health care also includes dentist provision and the number of patients per dentist with LBRuT is 1,947, which is 13% lower than the national average (2,228 patients per dentist) which suggests the LBRuT is well provided
- 3.23 Accounting for this and acknowledging that mitigation in the form of S106 agreement is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development, it is assumed that the provision of primary health care local to the site will be sufficient and the impact will be insignificant.

Table 3.5 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Primary Healthcare	Sufficient	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement from the Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced.	Insignificant

Intermediate Care Facilities

- 3.24 Unlike primary healthcare there are no benchmarks for intermediate care facilities, therefore quantifying the potential effects is not possible. However, the baseline assessment has suggested there is Centre House Health Centre within 0.5 miles of the Site which provides a comprehensive range of services and there are a number of other intermediate care facilities within the LBRuT.
- 3.25 This would suggest there are a sufficient number of intermediate care facilities to accommodate the additional demand generated by the Development. Based on current supply and acknowledging that mitigation in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy funds from the proposed Development is likely to be required to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the proposed Development the effect of the proposed Development would be insignificant

Table 3.6 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Intermediate Health Care	Sufficient	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement may be required to off-set the potential pressures faced by existing providers in accommodating the additional demand arising from the Development.	Insignificant

Acute Care

- 3.26 There are no benchmarks to assess the effect on acute care, namely hospitals. However, the baseline assessment showed there were a number of hospitals within 15 minutes' drive time,

Charing Cross and West Middlesex within 17 minutes and a range of specialist hospitals nearby in Central London. Therefore, the provision of hospitals near to the Site has been deemed sufficient and the effect of the proposed Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.7 Summary

Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Acute Care	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Pharmacies

- 3.27 Whilst there are no official benchmarks set to assess the effects, British Medical Journal research suggests that 89% of the population in Britain lives within a 20-minute walk of a pharmacy. Using this benchmark shows there are six pharmacies within a 20-minute walk of the Site. The proposed Development will generate a number of additional residents who will be using the local pharmacies, it is assumed that the existing capacity will absorb the additional demand. Taking this into account, it is deemed that the effect of the proposed Development will be insignificant.

Table 3.8 Summary

Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Pharmacies	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Leisure & Recreation

- 3.28 It is envisaged that the residents yielded as a result of the proposed Development will access the local leisure and recreation facilities, the effect of the additional population has been assessed as follows.

Libraries

- 3.29 There is sufficient provision and range of services within the area close to the Site and at Borough level; therefore, the effect of the proposed Development is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.9 Summary

Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Libraries	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Indoor Sports & Recreation

- 3.30 The provision of sports and recreation across LBRuT good, however consultation suggested that there were shortfalls in some sports pitch provision. These deficiencies would be addressed through the provision of a sports pitch linked to the secondary school proposed on Site.
- 3.31 There will also be a Community Use Agreement which will enable local groups, teams, clubs, organisations and bodies the opportunity to use the external play pitch, indoor sports hall and MUGA of provided by the proposed school.
- 3.32 Relevant financial contributions to improve the quality of existing provision will also help address these deficiencies. Taking this into account it is deemed that the potential effect of the proposed Development on leisure and recreation will be insignificant.

Table 3.10 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Indoor Sports & Recreation	Insufficient	Sports pitch as part of the school and public access to school sports facilities.	Insignificant

Open Space

- 3.33 LBRuT has a number of significant, high profile open spaces, with a large proportion of the Thames riverbank accessible to the public. The Borough has a good supply of open space, which would come under increased pressure from the proposed Development however, it is deemed LBRuT would still have a sufficient supply.
- 3.34 According to the GLA’s population yield calculator (2019) the requirement for children’s play space is 5,481m² and the proposed Development will provide the following;
- 7,470m² GEA of children’s play space;
 - An estimated contribution of 2,903 m2 from the play space provided as part of the 6FE Secondary School. This has been based on intermittent use equating to around 2 days out of 7 outside of school hours of the 10,161 m2 available, with the intention to arrange a community use agreement with the resident community.
- 3.35 This equates to a total of 10,374 m² of playspace, which is more than sufficient to accommodate additional demand arising from the proposed Development. A range of play facilities for different age groups would be positioned within residential courtyards, parks, plazas and open space areas throughout the proposed Development, to achieve the required areas of play and the distribution related to residential units, as follows (including provision as part of the proposed school):
- Up to 3,156m² of Doorstep Play (0-4yrs) within 100 m of residential units;
 - Up to 3,395m² of Local Play space (5-11yrs) within 400 m of residential units;
 - Up to 2,823m² of Neighbourhood Space (12+yrs) within 800 m of residential units; and
 - Play on the way (all ages).
- 3.36 Play elements and facilities would be provided in a range of forms within the public and private realms of the proposed Development, including designated and fenced playgrounds, unfenced but contained play spaces with a range of play elements and carer seating, topographic variation and play opportunities in the landscape (within planting areas) and ‘play on the way’ elements within circulation spaces and public realm areas. This provision and distribution of play facilities within the Development has been developed in line with the GLA (Play and Informal Recreation SPG 2012) and the LBRuT (Planning Obligations SPD 2020).
- 3.37 It is also proposed that the new sports pitch included as part of the school will be accessible to the local community outside of school hours (via a community use agreement). In addition, the proposed Development will improve access and open space along the Thames River. Taking this into account, the effect would be significant beneficial.

Table 3.11 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Open Space	Sufficient	Open space and play space designed into the Development which exceeds the requirement for provision and will improve access to open space for residents, visitors and users of the Site and its surrounds.	Significant beneficial

Arts & Culture

- 3.38 The baseline assessment has shown that LBRuT hosts a number of arts and cultural facilities including, theatres, cinemas and galleries. The Site is also within 1 hour of Central London, which offers internationally renowned attractions.
- 3.39 The proposed Development also includes the provision of a cinema onsite, which will further improve local provision. Therefore, taking the aforementioned into account it is deemed the effect will be insignificant.

Table 3.12 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Arts & Culture	Sufficient	A cinema will be included onsite	Insignificant

Heritage

- 3.40 The design of the Site will preserve partial elements of the heritage assets and listed buildings such as; the former Hotel Building, Bottling Plant Building, Maltings Building and existing boundary brick wall and gates to the site.
- 3.41 The proposed Development is anticipated to support the Site's links to University Boat Race by providing a new boat house (which may come forward as part of the flexible use floorspace). Taking into account, the preservation of the existing heritage onsite and the potential provision of a new boat house, the strong historical links of the Site will be maintained. The effect of the proposed Development is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.13 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Heritage	Sufficient	Preservation and enhancement of all current heritage assets onsite.	Insignificant

Public Houses

- 3.42 There are a number of Public Houses within the local area, with supply being higher than the London average. There are two pubs (The Jolly Gardener and Ship) that are located next to the Site (not within the red line boundary) which will remain operational following completion of the proposed Development. Taking this into account the effect is deemed insignificant.

Table 3.14 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Public Houses	Sufficient	Retention of both the Jolly Gardener and Ship Public Houses	Insignificant

Community & Emergency Services

- 3.43 The assessment is also required to look at both emergency and community services local to the Site. Considering the baseline assessment and the scale of the proposed Development the following effects have been considered.

Emergency Services

- 3.44 Based on the location of the Site and existing emergency service provision, the Development is expected to have minimal effect. According to the Design & Access Statement the design of the proposed Development will ensure the Site is accessible to emergency services. Access will be via a proposed route along Thames Street which will service the east of the Site and a new route on the west of the Site which will service the school and wider development area. The project design team has carried out consultation out with the Metropolitan Police Secure by Design Team. This is to ensure crime and safety considerations are addressed through the design of the proposed Development.

Table 3.15 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Emergency Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Civic Council & Community Services

- 3.45 There are a number of community services within two miles of the Site, including; family centres, youth centres and community/social clubs. Whilst there is no indication of current usage, the baseline assessment suggests that existing provision is adequate despite the proposed Development increasing demand locally.
- 3.46 There could also be an element of community floorspace designed into the proposed Development. If this is brought forward it will increase capacity locally and also provide community space for the resident population.

Table 3.16 Summary			
Social & Community Infrastructure	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Civil & Community Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Places of Worship

- 3.47 The baseline suggests there are a significant number of places of worship within the local area although, the places of worship are heavily focussed around Christian denominations.

Table 3.17 Summary			
Places of Worship	Existing Supply	Mitigation	Effect
Civil & Community Services	Sufficient	None required	Insignificant

Summary of Impacts

- 3.48 The table below provides a summary of the impacts of the proposed Development on the various elements of Social & Community Infrastructure assessed in the report.
- 3.49 Based on the assessment of various elements of social and community infrastructure and the suggested mitigation, it has been judged that there would be no significant effects resulting from the proposed Development and it is therefore in line with Local Plan Policy 28.

Table 3.18 Development: Summary of Impacts		
Service	Mitigation	Effect
Education		
<i>Early Years</i>	None required	Insignificant
<i>Primary Education</i>	None required	Insignificant
<i>Secondary Education</i>	New secondary school onsite	Insignificant
<i>Further Education</i>	Provided as part of the secondary school onsite	Insignificant
Health & Social Care		
<i>Primary Healthcare</i>	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement is likely to be a matter for negotiation	Insignificant
<i>Intermediate Healthcare</i>	Mitigation in the form of financial contribution via a Section 106 agreement is likely to be a matter for negotiation	Insignificant
<i>Acute Care</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Pharmacies</i>	None Required	Insignificant
Leisure & Recreation		
<i>Libraries</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Indoor Sports & Recreation</i>	Sports pitch as part of the school and public access to school sports facilities.	Insignificant
<i>Open Space</i>	Open space and play space designed into the Development.	Significant Beneficial
<i>Arts & Culture</i>	New cinema onsite	Insignificant
<i>Heritage</i>	Preservation of heritage assets and provision of a new boat house	Insignificant
<i>Public Houses</i>	Retention of existing public houses onsite.	Insignificant
Community & Emergency Services		
<i>Emergency Services</i>	None Required	Insignificant
<i>Civic Council & Community Services</i>	Community space being provided onsite.	Insignificant
<i>Places of Worship</i>	None Required	Insignificant

Appendix A - List of Primary Schools within 2 miles of the Site

A.1 Table A.1 provides a list of Primary Schools within a 2-mile catchment of the Site excluding schools that are located outside of within the western half of LBRuT.

Name	Postcode	Type	Enrolment	Capacity	Surplus
Thomson House School	SW14 8HY	Academy	310	392	82
St Mary Magdalen's Catholic Primary School	SW14 8HE	Maintained	181	210	29
Kew Riverside Primary School	TW9 4ES	Maintained	187	210	23
East Sheen Primary School	SW14 8ED	Maintained	555	630	75
Barnes Primary School	SW13 0QQ	Maintained	445	450	5
Sheen Mount Primary School	SW14 7RT	Maintained	595	630	35
Darell Primary and Nursery School	TW9 4LH	Maintained	261	420	159
Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School	TW10 5AA	Maintained	223	420	197
St Osmund's Catholic Primary School	SW13 9HQ	Maintained	218	270	52
The Queen's Church of England Primary School	TW9 3HJ	Maintained	419	420	1
Marshgate Primary School	TW10 6HY	Maintained	450	500	50
St Elizabeth's Catholic Primary School	TW10 6HN	Maintained	298	308	10
Lowther Primary School	SW13 9AE	Maintained	316	420	104
The Vineyard School	TW10 6NE	Maintained	569	630	61
		Total	5,027	5,910	+883

Appendix B - List of Secondary Schools within 3 miles of the Site

B.1 Table B1 provides a list of Secondary schools within a 3-mile catchment of the Site, excluding schools that are located outside of within the western half of LBRuT.

Name	Postcode	Type	Enrolment	Capacity	Surplus
Richmond Park Academy	SW148RG	Academy	865	1,110	245
Christ's Church of England Comprehensive Secondary School	TW10 6HW	Maintained	888	930	42
Grey Court School	TW10 7HN	Academy	1,393	1,398	5
		Total	3,146	3,438	292

DISCLAIMER AND LIMITATIONS OF USE

This Report was prepared for Reselton (the “Client”) by Hatch Associates (“Hatch”) based in in part upon information believed to be accurate and reliable from data supplied by or on behalf of Client, which Hatch has not verified as to accuracy and completeness. Hatch has not made an analysis, verified or rendered an independent judgement as to the validity of the information provided by or on behalf of the Client. While it is believed that the information contained in this Report is reliable under the conditions and subject to the limitations set forth herein, Hatch does not and cannot warrant nor guarantee the accuracy thereof or any outcomes or results of any kind. Hatch takes no responsibility and accepts no liability whatsoever for any losses, claims, expenses or damages arising in whole or in part from any review, use of or reliance on this Report by parties other than Client.

This Report is intended to be read as a whole, and sections should not be read or relied upon out of context, and any person using or relying upon this Report agrees to be specifically bound by the terms of this Disclaimer and Limitations of Use. This Report contains the expression of the professional opinions of Hatch, based upon information available at the time of preparation. Unless specifically agreed otherwise in Hatch’s contract of engagement with the Client, Hatch retains intellectual property rights over the contents of this Report.

The Report must be read in light of:

- the limited readership and purposes for which it was intended;
- its reliance upon information provided to Hatch by the Client and others which has not been verified by Hatch and over which it has no control;
- the limitations and assumptions referred to throughout the Report;
- the cost and other constraints imposed on the Report; and
- other relevant issues which are not within the scope of the Report.

Subject to any contrary agreement between Hatch and the Client:

- Hatch makes no warranty or representation to the Client or third parties (express or implied) in respect of the Report, particularly with regard to any commercial investment decision made on the basis of the Report;
- use of the Report by the Client and third parties shall be at their own and sole risk, and
- extracts from the Report may only be published with permission of Hatch.

It is understood that Hatch does not warrant nor guarantee any specific outcomes or results, including project estimates or construction or operational costs, the return on investment if any, or the ability of any process, technology, equipment or facility to meet specific performance criteria, financing goals or objectives, or the accuracy, completeness or timeliness of any of the data contained herein. Hatch disclaims all responsibility and liability whatsoever to third parties for any direct, economic, special, indirect, punitive or consequential losses, claims, expenses or damages of any kind that may arise in whole or in part from the use, review of or reliance upon the Report or such data or information contained therein by any such third parties. The review, use or reliance upon the Report by any such third party shall constitute their acceptance of the terms of this Disclaimer and Limitations of Use and their agreement to waive and release Hatch and its Client from any such losses, claims, expenses or damages. This Report is not to be referred to or quoted in whole or in part, in any registration statement, prospectus, fairness opinion, public filing, loan agreement or other financing document.

Readers are cautioned that this is a preliminary Report, and that all results, opinions and commentary contained herein are based on limited and incomplete data. While the work, results, opinions and commentary herein may be considered to be generally indicative of the nature and quality of the subject of the Report, they are by nature preliminary only are not definitive. No representations or predictions are intended as to the results of future work, nor can there be any promises that the results, opinions and commentary in this Report will be sustained in future work. This Disclaimer and Limitations of Use constitute an integral part of this Report and must be reproduced with every copy.

HATCH



www.hatch.co.uk

London: 0207 336 6188 Manchester: 0161 234 9910