

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 22/0900/OUT

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

**Proposal:** Hybrid application to include: 1. Demolition of existing buildings (except the Maltings and the façade of the Bottling Plant and former Hotel), walls, associated structures, site clearance and groundworks, to allow for the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site: 2. Detailed application for the works to the east side of Ship Lane which comprise: a. Alterations and extensions to existing buildings and erection of buildings varying in height from 3 to 9 storeys plus a basement of one to two storeys below ground to allow for residential apartments; flexible use floorspace for retail, financial and professional services, café/restaurant and drinking establishment uses, offices, non-residential institutions and community use and boathouse; Hotel / public house with accommodation; Cinema and Offices. b. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highway works. c. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking at surface and basement level. d. Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping. e. Flood defence and towpath works. f. Installation of plant and energy equipment 3. Outline application, with all matters reserved for works to the west of Ship Lane which comprise: a. The erection of a single storey basement and buildings varying in height from 3 to 8 storeys. b. Residential development. c. Provision of on-site cycle, vehicle and servicing parking. d. Provision of public open space, amenity and play space and landscaping. e. New pedestrian, vehicle and cycle accesses and internal routes, and associated highways works.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Andrew Conroy

**Address:** 65 Westfields Avenue Barnes London SW13 0AT

### Comments

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

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

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

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

Both applications A & B

Density, Building Height & Scale of Development

The scheme now proposes 1071 residential units, a minor reduction of 14 from the March 2022 submission. This is too many, and remains way too high given scale and density of the existing housing, the sensitive riverside location, heritage context, and the severe and unique access constraints of this site. You are forcing a pint into a quart pot.

This despite the Council's own Design Review Panel (DRP) - "felt the scheme is too dense for this area - and resonates more with Central London where higher density is expected." (DRP letter 28.02.22).

As a result, some of the residential blocks still exceed 7 floors in height. They tower over the setting, dwarfing the character of the Thames bankside setting. Have we not learnt from further downstream? This one of the world's great rivers: we need to manage its banks carefully. Sure some building at scale .. but not everywhere.

This area has a particular character which is worth protecting. I saw it described in a local newsletter as, '.. an almost rural character prevails along the Thames from Putney/Hammersmith to Kew creating a green landscape corridor..' A green corridor. Not if these blocks, tightly packed piled high are built.

I spent some time reviewing the documentation, and if I understand what I have read, those buildings above 7 floors contravene both the original Planning Brief but also the Local Plan and indeed the Pre-Publication Local Plan. I can't see any explanation for relaxing these guidelines: I can't imagine any, either.

The developer's true motives are revealed by Building 10. Good to see this being reduced in height by one floor but at what cost? A reduction in the number of affordable units. Rubbish. We need housing that satisfies a number of goals not just one or the other.

### Affordable Housing

Despite the increase in residential units to 1071 from 813 in the earlier 2020 planning applications the affordable percentage remains way too low at around 19% (39 Intermediate units and 165 Social Rent, according the documents I read last week, if I understand the numbers correctly).

How can the affordable number be so low after a large increase in the proposed unit numbers compared to the 2020 scheme? We – this country - needs more affordable housing. We have a chunk of land here which offers the chance to build a number of new homes. We must take advantage of that. All the various plans and policies - London Plan and Local Plan Policy – make sense. This proposal contravenes both. We need to hold a firm line on this issue. This is a once in a lifetime chance to make a structural change on this scale.

I have seen discussion about the challenges facing the developer in terms of costs etc., as reasons for creating a better affordable offer. That is their business decision. We should reject this offer if they cannot make it work within our rules. The unit is currently generating income with the TV production base. TO BE CONTINUED IN SUPPLEMENTARY DOCUMENTATION