

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. Paul Velluet

Address: 9 Bridge Road Twickenham TW1 1RE

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: comments continued

Assessed against the relevant policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework of July, 2021, the proposals would:

- Fail to have regard to the presumption against building upon existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields contrary to Paragraph 99;
- Fail to take account of the desirability of maintain the area's prevailing character and setting (including residential gardens), contrary to Paragraph 124.d);
- Fail to take account of the importance of securing a well-designed, attractive and healthy places, contrary to Paragraph 124.e);
- Fail to add to the overall quality of the area, contrary to Paragraph 130.a);
- Fail to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping contrary to Paragraph 130.b).;
- Fail to be sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, contrary to Paragraph 130.c);
- Fail to establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of spaces, building-types and materials to create an attractive, welcoming and distinctive place to live, work and visit, contrary to Paragraph 130.d);
- Fail to either sustain or enhance the significance of both designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets in the surrounding area, including the Mortlake and Mortlake Green Conservation Areas, and Locally Listed/Buildings of Townscape Merit (by causing potentially serious harm to their settings, thereby substantially harming their significance), contrary to Paragraph 197.a);
- Fail to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, contrary to Paragraph 197.c);

- Fail to provide clear and convincing justification for the potentially serious harm that will be caused to the settings of the Mortlake and Mortlake Green Conservation Areas, thereby substantially harming their significance as designated heritage assets, contrary to Paragraph 200;
- Fail to demonstrate that the potentially serious harm that will be caused to the settings of the nearby Mortlake and Mortlake Green Conservation Areas, thereby seriously harming their significance as designated heritage assets, will be balanced by relevant and adequate public benefits contrary to Paragraph 202;
- Fail to demonstrate that the potentially serious harm that will be caused to the significance of nearby non-designated heritage assets – both within and outside the two respective conservation areas is justified, contrary to Paragraph 203; and
- Fail to either enhance or better reveal the significance of nearby heritage assets – both designated and non-designated - contrary to Paragraph 206.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above, I would urge the Council to refuse the current applications, or to defer their determination, pending substantial revisions to the proposals relating to both application sites that will secure the long overdue regeneration of this part of Mortlake in accordance with local, London-wide and national planning policies.

Finally, please will you let me know when the applications are due to be considered by the Planning Committee and the outcome of such consideration in due course.