

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: Ms. Joanna Western

Address: 73 Cleveland Gardens Barnes London SW13 0AJ

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I would like to respond to the latest changes to the proposals for the Former Stag Brewery site as part of the formal consultations period.

By the way I have noted that the changes which have been made to the scheme designs in relation to the Application 'A' - 22/0900/OUT for the whole site, and that there are no changes to Application B for the school as this is unaffected by the changes to fire escape requirements.

My main comments are as follows:-

- I see that nine of the buildings have been affected by the new fire escape regulations for buildings over 18m in height. The design amendments still conflict with the Local Plan and the approved Planning Brief for the site with several buildings above the height limit of 7 floors, and do not diminish sufficiently in height below this maximum limit to the edges of the site. In fact most of the buildings located on the towpath perimeter are over 7 storeys in height.
- I note that the number of units is now reduced to 1075 (previously 1085), due to internal design changes to many of the buildings. This is despite replacing office space above the cinema with new residential units. However, the percentage of affordable units is pitifully low, and considerably below the levels required by the London Plan and the Local Plan - and now considerably lower than the percentage rejected by the Mayor of London on the earlier planning application.
- The layout and external areas of the scheme are amended but the open space provided between buildings would certainly be required in any case to comply with current residential design standards and codes. The open space between buildings cannot therefore be considered 're-provisioning' required within the Local Plan to account for the loss of the sports fields (protected Open Space referred to as OOLTI) - due to the siting of the new secondary school in Application B.

None of the changes address these three fundamental non-compliant aspects of the London Plan, the Local Plan, and the approved Planning Brief for the Stag site.

There was much debate by committee members at the July Planning Committee about general scale, massing and context but these key issues of non-compliance were not specifically addressed by members. Other perceived public benefits of the proposals can in no way over-ride such weighty planning considerations and are highly unlikely to be overlooked at Inquiry.

I object strongly to this application and the latest design changes. I still consider this a gross over-development of this highly constrained site which will make local conditions and traffic even more intolerable. I wish to see a more sustainable community led plan for this unique site.