

## 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:** Dr. Steven Bramwell

**Address:** 12 Earl Road East Sheen London SW14 7JH

### Comments

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

**Comment:** I wish to object to the planned development on the Mortlake Brewery site for two reasons. (1) I oppose it on the grounds that the density of housing is far too high for the area to sustain. The area can only be accessed in two directions, the others being essentially cut off by the river, the railway line and Richmond Park. There is no underground and the rail service is only just adequate for the density of population, while the roads are already heavily congested, with considerable pollution. The latest scheme, which proposes 1071 new residential units represents a negligible reduction of 14 on the previous one. The extra population density will add impossible new strain on the transport infrastructure and lead to further traffic gridlock and pollution. I commute to work in Central London every day and it is helpful to me to get a seat in the train so I can work while travelling – also I am in my sixties and would find it exhausting to stand all the way in a packed train carriage. My job is such that I can work to as old an age that I can cope with, but I am worried that the inevitable transport problems caused by this development will make it impossible for me to work. For example, I often take the first train e.g. the 6.53, to be sure of getting a seat, but even that train is quite crowded: the new development will ensure that there will be a “scrum” for seating even at 6.53 in the morning. (2) A second reason that I oppose the development is the terrible effect it will have on the environment and wildlife. Not all areas of London are as lucky as Mortlake is to have the river and riverbank as a “green artery”, which is good for the planet and local wellbeing, but that does not mean that these last remaining bits of green space in London should all be all be destroyed to even things up. The insensitive developments further into London have sadly turned the river and riverbank from a living thing into a dead one, and this will happen in Mortlake too if a development of this magnitude goes ahead. If Sadiq Khan is genuine about protecting the environment and combatting climate change he should protect the river as a vital environmental resource. In general the problem with the scheme is that there are far too many units. The area could perhaps sustain 100 units, but not 1000, and it is disingenuous for anyone to claim otherwise.