

Note of meeting with developer at no. 40 Crawley Mews on 10 August 2016 at 4.30pm

Present:

Developer Group (DG): Guy Duckworth (Dartmouth Capital), Rowan Cole (Community Liaison) and Bob Parker (Peter Brett, Transport Planners)

MBCG: Una O'Brien, Francine Bates, Tim Catchpole

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss points raised in Peter Eaton's letter following the developer's presentation on 18 July.

1. Site Development Density & Traffic Generation

DG: Did not feel that the development could be described as "intense". The planning brief of 2011 gave no indication of the number of housing units but there was some indication of the height and massing from which DG has been able to deduce 1,000 units approx. DG's recent redevelopment scheme for the Teddington Studios, which has been granted planning approval, was for 254 homes on 4.5 acres (i.e. pro rata 1,000 homes on the Brewery site would require roughly 18 acres which is the extent of the site less its playing fields).¹ Guy Duckworth said he did not think it logical to consider transport capacity before designs given these were based on the adopted brief.

MBCG: Nevertheless there is much concern about there being 1,000 parking spaces and the traffic generation therefrom when Lower Mortlake Road is already congested.

DG: Lots of parking spaces does not mean lots of car usage. DG has met the Council who have indicated they are currently undertaking a detailed study of parking. It was clear that Chalkers Corner was a concern for the Council and described as a "congested junction" by Bob Parker. There is also a review of the frequency of buses and trains. DG is about to meet TfL and have already taken traffic surveys/counts at Chalkers Corner.

MBCG: The most crucial time for traffic surveys is October when levels are particularly high. Will DG be including traffic surveys of other recent major housing developments in PTAL 2 areas, e.g. in Barnes and Kew, in order to assess levels of generation there?

DG: There is much literature on this subject which will be referred to. DG's traffic study method will be outlined in the Scoping Report for the TIA which will be agreed with the Council and TfL and published at the end of September.

2. Site Development Density & Town Planning

MBCG: Has DG finalised its housing mix? There seem to be too many apartments and not enough terraced housing.

DG: The housing mix reflects the Council's emerging policy which favours family housing. The mix is 10% studios, 35% 2-bed units and 55% 3-bed and 4-bed units. The Council's parking standards for terraced housing are higher than for apartment housing, hence the need to reduce terraced housing in order to reduce parking. With regard to affordable housing the Council has in the past applied a viability test but the new Mayor has now decreed that all largescale development throughout London should include a flat 35% affordable component. The extra care housing for around 130 is not included in the affordable housing mix.

¹ N.B. Following the meeting, the planning approval for the Teddington Studios was checked and it shows 213 apartments and 6 houses which is somewhat less than what Guy Duckworth had indicated (he was very likely referring to the number of parking spaces which was 258). Thus, if the density of this approved development is to be a yardstick, then the number of housing units at the Brewery site needs to be reduced to about 800.

3. Riverside

DG: Various studies are ongoing. DG is still looking at the possibility of a commuter boat service from Mortlake to Hammersmith but recognised that this would be very difficult given tides and usage.

MBCG: Reiterated again that the river gets very narrow and shallow at low tide, that there won't be much room for a commuter boat service alongside the rowers and other recreational users and that these users are likely to strongly object to any such service and to any development of a pontoon. The business case was therefore likely to be poor; even if a pontoon were possible (which is doubtful), the size of passenger craft allowed on this stretch of the river is restricted because of the low draft, meaning many craft would be needed. Furthermore, a commuter service would coincide with the peak times for rowing (morning and evening) and therefore it could not be seen as a practical way forward. It would be better to put time and effort into addressing the issues of road, rail and bus capacity.

DG: There won't be any attempt to bring the river into the site but maybe some water features.

4. Height of Residential Blocks nearest Thames Bank

DG: Residents on Thames Bank should not be alarmed about the proposed height of development. The higher development will be the same height as – and in the same location as – the existing industrial buildings and set on a line further back. The blocks immediately behind Thames Bank will be 3-storey terraced housing with back gardens. DG is still planning to construct a high tower on the site as an iconic building. Guy Duckworth said property values will increase as a result of the development which should please some residents.

MBCG: But a key issue here is privacy, which the residents of Thames Bank currently enjoy but which they will soon see eroded. It was this that was the concern of the residents. It was suggested that separate consultation take place with this group and care taken to explain with CGI materials how this will look,

DG: The intention is to consult the Thames Bank residents separately next month.

5. Cinema

MBCG: DG needs to support its plan for a cinema with a traffic study of other cinemas to prove that traffic impact is not a problem.

6. Link from Mortlake Green to the Riverside Public Space

DG: The issue of the link not being strong enough is being addressed as part of its traffic study of Lower Mortlake Road/Sheen Lane/Mortlake High Street which includes inter alia the issue of whether Mortlake High Street still needs to be a dual carriageway and what, if anything, can be done about the level crossing downtime.

MBCG: Mortlake High Street must continue to be wide enough to accommodate its right turn filter due east of the Sheen Lane junction as this is the only entrance into that part of the Mortlake hinterland.

7. Secondary School

MBCG: There is much concern as to why a secondary school has been proposed on this site when there is to be a new secondary school opening in Richmond in 2017. It seems that further provision of yet another secondary school is being driven by the realisation that funding bodies, e.g. EFA, favour new schools rather than the expansion of existing schools; also an additional school in this area could provide competition with RPA which is seen as healthy. MBCG is concerned that the decision by the Council to opt for a secondary school on this site was taken without any local ward or borough wide consultation.

DG: Early discussions with local residents has revealed this to be the most significant issue – even more so than traffic, albeit the school will require 60 parking spaces. The Council has indicated that they are about to appoint an architect for the school.

MBCG: Pointed out that the objection to the school was largely on planning grounds and not education grounds. The impact of siting the school in the scheme would generate traffic and affect integrity of the development. The Group will be giving this issue more thought and a paper is being prepared for the next meeting in September. A meeting with Councillors is also being arranged to coincide with this to convey the Group's concerns.

DG: The Council had not been hugely forthcoming about the school and this was causing hold-ups. Guy Duckworth said they had good contacts at EFA and he would explore with them whether funding would be better spent on expanding the capacity of existing secondary schools. He floated the idea that perhaps that part of the site should be shown as blank for the time being.

MBCG: Francine Bates said this was a good idea!

8. Bus Terminal

DG: The issue of moving the bus terminal from Avondale Road to the SW part of the site will be discussed with TfL at its forthcoming meeting.

MBCG: Increasing the frequency of the 419 service must also be discussed and also the prospect of a new fast non-stop bus service to Hammersmith over Chiswick Bridge

9. Baseline Surveys & Technical Matters

DG: Work is in progress.

10. Further Community Engagement

DG: The programme must not be delayed by indecision over the school and DG is determined to proceed with an exhibition in late September with the level of detail shown to be determined. It has been noted that no Councillors have been involved yet to date. Typically they should be attending meetings.

MBCG: Survey data was going to be very important to convince residents of the merits of a scheme shown in late September. Local councillors have been approached but have been rather cagey. Efforts are being made to approach them again particularly on the issue of the school.

It was suggested that approaches to local residents should begin now with a focus on those immediately affected by the development. Following the approach to Thames Bank these are

- 1) Williams Lane development
- 2) Watney Cottages/Guinness Trust
- 3) Shalstone Road/Kingsway
- 4) Houses on Lower Richmond Road
- 5) Chertsey Court (owned by Richmond Housing)