



Dear Member

The Brewery and other Planning Applications of Note

The Brewery

You will have recently heard or indeed received a letter from the Council indicating that the developer has submitted revised plans and documents relating to the three planning applications for the Brewery, vis. (1) the housing and community hub, (2) the secondary school and playing fields and (3) the realignment of the Lower Richmond Road junction with Chalkers Corner. The plans and documents are on line (www.richmond.gov.uk/searchplanning) and also on display in the East Sheen Library.

A cursory glance has revealed that the changes are minor. This is disappointing but it must be understood that they are in response to the Mayor of London's comments of 30 July 2018 (these are on-line under 'consultees') – and that the Mayor has an important role in the decision-making in view of the scale of this development. The Mayor's main comments are summarised in a schedule on page 2/3 together with the developer's response and our comments thereon. If you feel concerned about the impact of the Brewery development you must write to the Council before the deadline of 24 July. Feel free to use our comments in the third column as a basis for your own representation. The Council's decision may be in October – it will be a draft decision subject to final decision by the Mayor.

You may recall that the representation made by the Mortlake Brewery Community Group (MBCG) was 125 pages long and MESS's representation on each application was deliberately only one page long. The latter is reproduced for your information on pages 3-4.

Barnes Hospital

The application for retention of a specialist medical centre and redevelopment to provide 83 housing units and a special needs school was determined by Council's Planning Committee three weeks ago. We supported the scheme in principle but urged the Committee to delay its decision on the housing element until there had been further thought given to whether the proposed parking for the housing (40 spaces) was adequate given the low PTAL rating. The Committee gave approval.

Homebase, Manor Road

The application for 385 housing units and only 12 parking spaces was refused by Council's Planning Committee last night on grounds of overdevelopment subject to direction from the Mayor of London. We raised concern on these very grounds. The Mayor could overturn this decision

South Worple Way garages

We have objected to the proposal to replace 30 garages with six detached houses on grounds of the development being out of character. Awaiting decision.

Tower House School, Sheen Lane

We have supported the proposal for the school to expand onto the next-door site where the house and garden would be replaced by a new school hall and four classrooms. We have recommended conditions be imposed about the rational use of the new hall by the local community outside school hours in order to protect neighbours.

| Mayor' comments in para 99 of letter dated 30 July 2018 | Developer's response 24 June 2019 | Our comments on developer's response |
|---|---|--|
| Principle of development: the mixed use development is supported and the partial loss of playing fields and open space, in view of the education use, is justified... but the Council should ensure that there is a robust and evidenced case for a secondary school... | No change. | Council has not ensured there is a robust and evidenced case and our concern about the impact of this school on the other secondary schools in the area and on the traffic in Lower Richmond Road and Mortlake Station level crossing remains as before. In addition we remain concerned about the loss of a cricket ground. |
| Housing: 17% affordable is unacceptable. | No change. Only 17% being offered because land is also being offered for the school and sports field. | There is scope to offer more than 17% if cost of basement construction is reduced (see in transport section below). Also there is still concern about how the affordable component is spread. |
| Urban design: overall approach is supported. Further amendments are required to secure appropriate residential quality and higher standard of urban design... | Number of units reduced from 817 (inc. 150 care units and exc. the nursing home) to 813. Plans show improvements to remnant historic building facades and to landscaping. | Residential quality can only be secured by decreasing the density which at present is excessive and hence reducing heights which are in excess of those in the Planning Brief. |
| Climate change: further clarifications and revisions are required to the energy assessment to verify the carbon savings proposed and to the sustainable drainage strategy | Revisions are in Addendum Reports | Not yet reviewed. |
| Transport: reductions to the parking, further highways impact modelling, and a Healthy Streets assessment of the Chalker's Corner proposals are required. Financial contributions to bus service improvements, and conditions and planning obligations are also required. | No reduction in parking. TfL has evidently now approved the modelling and Health Streets assessment of Chalkers Corner proposal; it has also agreed the bus strategy including costs and asked for cycle parking which has since been achieved. Network Rail has agreed to improvements to footbridge including signage, moving | Parking can be reduced if TfL can recognise the east end of the Brewery site as having a higher PTAL rating as at the Barnes Hospital site where planning permission has now been granted for housing with 0.5 parking space per unit. We should also demand to see the correspondence from both TfL and Network |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | bollards back in North and South Worples Way and setting back vehicle stop lines. | Rail – they ought to be on the website under ‘consultees’ but they are not. |
|--|---|---|

MESS’s previous objections to the Brewery development

Application A: Housing and Community Hub

MESS is wholly in agreement with the current representation being made by the MBCG. While the redevelopment of the Brewery presents a golden opportunity for an attractive mixed use sustainable development complete with much needed new community hub, we are of the opinion that the development currently proposed is far in excess of what was envisaged in the Planning Brief of 2011.

The Brief showed inter alia new housing of up to 7 storeys in the east (with stepping back from the river) and 3 storeys in the north west, a primary school for 400 pupils and retention of the playing fields. The development proposed shows housing on a larger scale, densely packed with overshadowing of internal spaces and the riverside, a secondary school for 1200 pupils and replacement of the two grass playing fields with a single all-weather pitch fenced in and floodlit. In our opinion the development proposed is refusable for reasons of non-compliance with the following key policies contained in the Council’s Local Plan:

- (1) DM DC1 and LP1 - local character and design quality, in particular scale, height, massing, density
- (2) DM DC5 and LP8 - amenity and living conditions, in particular overshadowing
- (3) DM OS3 and LP14 - OOLTI protection
- (4) CP18 and LP29 - schools must be conveniently accessible to users
- (5) DM HO6 and LP36 - affordable housing not sufficiently generous
- (6) DM TP1 and LP44 - too dense for a PTAL2 zone, hence too much traffic and associated air pollution and too little public transport (bus).

Application B: Secondary school and all-weather sports pitch

With regard to the proposed development of a 6-form entry plus sixth form secondary school MESS is of the view that this development is too large for the site. The Planning Brief of 2011 showed a primary school for about 400 pupils which was perfectly sustainable. The proposed secondary school will accommodate about 1200 pupils and some 100 staff. We understand that ESFA has already approved the development and the proposed all-weather pitch in place of the grass playing fields but their approval should not be seen as any guarantee of planning approval. The proposed school will generate a substantial amount of traffic in the morning peak on Lower Richmond Road which is already gridlocked at that time of day due to major constraints at Chalkers Corner and the Sheen Lane level crossing. Many secondary pupils travel to school by bus and there are inadequate bus services in Lower Mortlake Road. Staff have been provided with 15 parking spaces (of which five are for people with disabilities) and journey times for them are likely to be lengthy as there is very little affordable housing in the area.

The proposed all-weather pitch associated with the school with its fencing and floodlights will degrade the quality of the existing grass space which is both a visual asset (it has been designated as Other Open Land of Townscape Importance - OOLTI) and also to some extent a biodiversity asset.

MESS has suggested other options, vis. (1) further expansion of existing secondary schools in the area, (2) the relocation of this school to Barn Elms (where it could be a school of sporting excellence) or (3) a compromise of the two, i.e. further expansion of existing schools on a smaller scale combined with a much smaller secondary school on the Brewery site. The third option

would involve a school with a much smaller footprint thereby allowing the grass playing field to be saved, protected and upgraded with reinforced grass to allow greater usage. The school will benefit by offering cricket as an alternative sport during the summer (as does Christ's School in South Richmond).

In our opinion the development proposed is refusable for reasons of non-compliance with the following key policies contained in the Council's Local Plan:

- (1) DM OS3 and LP14 - OOLTI protection
- (2) CP18 and LP29 - schools must be conveniently accessible to users
- (3) DM TP1 and LP44 - too dense for a PTAL2 zone, hence too much traffic and associated air pollution and too little public transport (bus).

Application C: Reconfiguration of Chalkers Corner

MESS is of the view that the resultant increased capacity will merely attract latent demand and traffic will very soon reach the same saturation level seen today. It is not going to solve the traffic problem, bus services will not benefit, and the residents of Chertsey Court will be exposed to loss of trees and garden space, which have been designated as Other Open Land of Townscape Importance (OOLTI), and an increase in traffic noise and air pollution.

In our opinion the development proposed is refusable for reasons of non-compliance with the following key policies contained in the Council's Local Plan:

- (1) DM OS3 and LP14 - OOLTI protection
- (2) DM TP1 and LP44 - the overall development is too dense for a PTAL2 zone, hence too much traffic and associated air pollution and too little public transport (bus). The proposed reconfiguration is not going to solve this problem.

Postscript

It should be noted that the above representations were dated April last year and that the Council's updated Local Plan was formally adopted in July last year. The above DM and CP policies are thus superseded by the above LP policies, the latter being still in draft at that stage and now formally adopted.

Shaun Lamplough
Chair, Mortlake with East Sheen Society

Please contact us on info@mess.org.uk