

25 September 2018

Dear Members of MESS



Mortlake Brewery Site Meeting 24 September

Yesterday evening I attended a Public Meeting organised by the Mortlake Brewery Community Group (MBCG). Points of interest that came out of this were:

1. The Planning Applications are unlikely to be heard by the Planning Committee until the end of the Year. Final detailed comments are yet to be received from TfL, Network Rail and Sport England. TfL delays centre on doubts on Traffic Modelling carried out by the Developer (these are producing very unexpected results) and the effect of Hammersmith Bridge closure.
2. To excavate the Car Park as currently proposed it is estimated that 3,000 truck trips would be needed. Ouch! The smaller the Car Park the less traffic!
3. General difficulties with the Application as seen by MBCG are:
 - a. the density of the development is much higher than the surrounding area and in part exceeds the Planning Brief;
 - b. inadequate provision of Affordable Housing- the GLA requires 35% of which 20% of that 35% should be Social Housing- and none is provided on Phase 1- the Eastern Section- too many developers do this and then argue that Phase 1 was more expensive than expected so can't afford Affordable Housing on Phase 2;
 - c. the School (should it be Primary or Secondary?) is too large and encroaches on Playing Fields where there should be grass not all weather and two not just one;
 - d. if development proceeds as applied for it is estimated there could be 450 extra traffic movements in the morning peak;
 - e. effect of Secondary School on Level Crossing- chaos!- hence need for improved footbridge, pedestrian tunnel at Station;
4. The GLA has commented in detail. Some points are supportive of the MBCG position, others are not and MBCG are challenging these.
5. The initial TfL comments are generally supportive of the MBCG position and in particular
 - a. suggest the car parking provision is too great which would help Point 2
 - b. show concern that the Level Crossing (LC) issue-dwell time for cars- likely to increase because trains are longer and South Western Train proposal to increase frequency,
 - c. show concern about lack of provisions for vulnerable people i.e. the elderly and children,
 - d. cast doubts on the Chalkers Corner (now Chokers Corner!) proposal,
 - e. acknowledge the need for more bus provision but has no money- hence a

demand for £3.675m.

- f. If the Chokers Corner proceeds TfL are concerned to see the land required is obtained.
6. Network Rail's initial comments highlight similar concerns to TfL on the LC but highlights width of pedestrian provision at the LC as well. Their final position is not known, but interestingly they objected to the Thomson House School location due to heavy use by children, but the Council ignored that objection and granted permission!
7. In summary MBCG position is to require development to be no greater than contemplated by Planning Brief;
 - a. on Eastern Part of Site improve residential design by reducing areas covered by buildings and improve plans so that Community Use in area provided in the Maltings is fully useable;
 - b. on Western Part reduce footprint of buildings,
 - c. reject any development on existing Playing Fields including provision of a Bus Turning Circle as at Avondale Road;
 - d. Chokers Corner proposal is unnecessary- money saved should be invested around the LC instead.

MBCG have a draft plan showing how their comments would affect the Developer's proposals but these have not yet been shared with the Developer or the Council.

8. MBCG has met the new Leader of the Council, Mortlake and North Richmond Councillors but strangely not all East Sheen Ward Councillors despite the Ward having lodged the most comments on the Application- I have queried that position!
 - a. MBCG has also queried the need for a Secondary School instead of a Primary School particularly as Richmond Park Academy (RPA) and Christs sit on at least 3.5 hectares whilst this Site is only 1.6 and neither RPA nor Christs are full!
 - b. They have also challenged the method of appointment of the intended operator of the new school- there is a petition circulating about this.
 - c. MBCG have maintained contact with the GLA, TfL and Network Rail;
 - d. met the Council for the Preservation of Rural England- re the playing fields and the River presumably -and supported Chertsey Court residents meeting with the Developer.
9. Finally someone from Chertsey Court mentioned that children there proportionately were more reliant on inhalers than others and the proposals are potentially increasing traffic. Oh dear!

I hope this is helpful background. Any comments, queries please contact me below.

Yours sincerely,

Shaun Lamplough, Chair, Mortlake with East Sheen Society

Please contact us on info@mess.org.uk