



Minutes

Stag Brewery Community Liaison Group Meeting 02

Date: 16.05.2017

Time: 19:00 – 20:30 (prolonged until 21:00)

Venue: Stag Brewery Sports Club, Lower Richmond Road, London, SW14 7ET

Chair: Steve McAdam, Soundings

Attendees:

Peter Eaton	Mortlake Brewery Community Group , Developer Liaison
Helen Edwards	Thomson House Parents Voices Group , Representative
Avril Daglish	West London River Group , Chair
Jackson Fiorini	The Tapestry
Ann Hewitt	Towpath Group/West London River Group
Andrew Howard-Smith	Thames Bank , Representative
Kate Humber	Thomson House School, parent
Graham Kench	Lower Richmond Road , Resident
Ben Knight	Local Resident
Shaun Lamplough	Mortlake with East Sheen , Chair
Ash Lawrence	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace , Representative
Tim Lennon	Richmond Cycling Campaign , Chair
Amanda Letch	Thomson House School , Principal
Jen Loudon	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace , Representative
Ben Mackworth-Praed	Barnes Community Association , Environment Group
Robert Orr-Ewing	Mortlake Brewery Community Group , Chair
Dame Una O'Brien	Mortlake Brewery Community Group , Representative
Danny Masting	Local Resident
Max Millington	Williams Lane , Representative
Steven Mindel	Barnes Community Association , Chair
John Repsch	Chertsey Court Action Group , Representative
Margaret Woolmore	Chertsey Court Action Group , Representative
Anna Sadler	LBRuT , Community Links Officer
Kate Woodhouse	Mortlake Community Association , Chair
Alistair White	Local Resident

Project Team:

GD Duckworth	GD	Dartmouth Capital , Developer
Michael Squire	MS	Squire and Partners , Architect
Barney Johnston	BJ	Squire and Partners , Architect
Murray Levinson	ML	Squire and Partners , Architect
Robert Copeland	RC	Gillespies , Landscape Consultant
Neil Henderson	NH	Gerald Eve , Planning Consultant
Kevin Watson	KW	Gerald Eve , Planning Consultant
Steve McAdam	SM	Soundings , Community Consultant
Rowan Cole	RCole	Soundings , Community Consultant
Janet Hall	JH	Soundings , Community Consultant
Leonora Grcheva	LG	Soundings , Community Consultant

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

1.1 SM introduces the agenda for the evening.

2.0 Review of minutes of last CLG



- 2.1 SM reviewed the minutes from the previous CLG, attendees agreed that the following changes will be made:
- The report on positive feedback on the school location would be amended to acknowledge that this was not fully unanimous.
 - The agreed number of hotel rooms will be reduced and reviewed

3.0 Masterplan presentation by Squire

- 3.1 MS/ML present the evolving masterplan with new changes and details that include:
- Another alternative location and position for the school was presented, based on the MBCG proposal. In this option, the school is on the east side. In this option, there is still one full-sized pitch, enclosed by residential buildings from Williams Lane, for security and sheltering, and a smaller park. Astro turf is essential for a school of this size, they have a life span of ten years, can be sustainably recycled as carpet or road surfaces.
 - Some changes in heights. Densities were elaborated, including an analysis of the Policy Brief guidelines, GLA density recommendations, and proposal.
 - Architectural styles and in-between spaces.
 - Retail, commercial space and active ground floors etc.

4.0 Open discussion

- 4.1 *Last time you stated that only 8% of people would access the school by car, why focus on vehicular access now?*

MS stated that even if the number is 8%, it is still better not to go through people's back gardens. He confirmed that adjustments could still be made to the access and traffic flow, addressing the issue of sustainable transport.

An attendee commented that schools have a travel plan, and the school management can opt for a zero car plan.

- 4.2 *You said you would focus on sustainable traffic, if you want people to start walking and cycling more, having a car route that conveniently passes next to the school and encourages people to drive is not a good start.*

MS confirmed that this is a fair point that will be taken into consideration and addressed when working out access routes in detail.

- 4.3 *Are these full sized football pitches?*

BJ answered that they are full sized youth pitches. This is the recommended size for EfA, we need to check the dimensions but they may be slightly bigger than the present pitches.

- 4.4 *Where is the underground parking located?*

It is under the residential blocks.

- 4.5 *There is a Richmond council reference document that talked about 200-300 units, but you suggest 900. The Planning Brief also states a preference for lower densities.*

KW responded that there have been numerous documents published by the council throughout the years, but they have taken as guiding reference points the adopted official documents – the SPD, the GLA London Plan, so the heights and densities are according to official policies.

- 4.6 *But you have taken the 'up to 7 story' guideline to the maximum, and the brief does say that the scale should diminish towards the edges.*

KW/MS showed a site section demonstrating that the heights are lower towards the edges. MS showed that there are only several buildings that are exceptions to the council SPD height limitations.

An attendee noted that these exceptions are going against the SPD.

4.7 *How many housing units are there in your proposal?*

ML responded that there are 945 units.

4.8 *Have you taken the entire area into consideration when calculating the densities?*

MS responded that the 111 units/ha is a number for the entire area, and if you exclude the school and commercial spaces it amounts to 137 units/ha.

4.9 *You should make models to test what the figures would be if you reduce 1 or 2 stories throughout the site.*

KW highlighted that there is also a national need for housing, but maybe there is space to test whether the heights of some individual buildings can be reduced, these discussions can be used to identify which.

4.10 *Which of the open spaces are actually public?*

ML responded that all open spaces are public, with the exception of the garden houses and shielded spaces protecting the privacy of apartments on the ground floors. Different treatments will be used for public squares and residential open courts as appropriate, but all would be open to the public.

4.11 *I live in this area, and I am very positive about the images I see, but I can tell that the view from the Lower Richmond Road towards the river is not accurate – you can't really see the river.*

Another attendee commented the wider green link was an opportunity to connect to the river, and they want to make sure this is not lost.

A third attendee commented that the images look really exciting, particularly the public square, but why can't the green link remain wider as in the SPD?

ML assured the attendees that the views are based on accurate 3D models, and that the images are aspirational. He then explained that the main reason for reducing the width of the green link was so that green public spaces can be disseminated throughout the site, near all residences. Making the site more permeable, with more connections to the river, and more green public spaces.

MS further elaborated that the wide green link had a less attractive dimension from an urban design viewpoint; in the SPD it was neither a park, nor a square, whereas its current dimension along with the activities and greenery would make it more dynamic.

KW stated that the scheme has exceeded the amount of greenery predicted by the Planning Brief, and have introduced a more balanced approach, with many spacious pockets and better amenity value.

4.12 *Several attendees stated that they really like how the public realm scheme looks.*

4.13 *Other attendees confirmed that it looks very nice, but that they want to make sure that the road crossing (LRR) issue is addressed.*

The project team confirmed that this is being worked on, and the transport consultants will present all transport and traffic related issues on the next CLG.

4.14 *An attendee remarked that the Maltings building looks like it has 8 floors, but inside the floors are half-height, and that they should check if this is being accurately represented.*

4.15 *On plan it looks like some of the buildings on LRR are right against the road, are they?*

ML Buildings are set back from the ownership on LRR line by 7-8m, giving a generous pavement area outside the cinema.

4.16 *In the view towards the river, have flood defence walls been accounted for?*

MS/BJ The green route is lifted up, so you are walking at the flood defense level.

4.17 *I was not at the previous discussions, but why can't you keep the sport fields? Children and adults need it, why must there be a school?*

MS Agreed it is important to have green space and that a full-sized football pitch is being provided.

Attendee stated that it is a shrunk pitch.

An attendee stated that the other pitch has been replaced with a school, and that for many parents in the area this is a priority.

Another attendee stated that immediate residents might disagree with this.

4.18 *What happened with the debate on density relating to the hotel and the final number of rooms?*

MS said that after the previous CLG discussions a new number has not yet been determined.

GD said that as a hotel does generate additional traffic, he is more comfortable with a smaller size hotel that is managed well.

We will all be choking on traffic here!

4.19 *I like how the scheme looks, the regeneration potential it has is huge, and I particularly like the green spaces. However, we see other riverside developments that remain with empty units, how will you prevent this here?*

GD said that none of their developments have needed marketing overseas, as there have always been interested people locally. They intend to put emphasis into making the development liveable – other developments struggle with residential-only buildings and soulless ground floors; this scheme has high percentages of commercial floor space, leisure spaces and a cinema that would additionally help create small scale evening trade and atmosphere in the area.

4.20 *I recognize the dedication of the team to the scheme, the ideas and the professionalism, however there will be additional 1,500 people living here, and we really want to hear more of your recognition of the impact that this will have on us, the existing local community and to ensure the liveability of Mortlake.*

KW said that many impact analyses are being developed, along with transport solutions to relieve impact.

An attendee stated that transport is not the main issue, as much as the number of new people.

KW highlighted that this scheme is more than just housing – there is also a school, retail, community spaces – there is a need for a certain density to make this viable.

5.0 Public spaces and landscaping presentation by Gillespies

5.1 RC presented the public space and landscaping plans, including:

- An overview of the public realm, the connections and amenity space between buildings, trees and greenery
- The green link between the station and the river, the towpath details, improvements and additions
- Street sections, typologies and limited access for emergency in some streets
- Typical courtyard layouts, Maltings plaza, multiuse areas and play areas

6.0 Open discussion

6.1 *What about the level crossing? How will the cinema affect traffic flow? Are all streets car accessible?*

Some streets would have limited access only. The team confirmed that all these issues would be discussed in

detail at the next CLG meeting on transport.

- 6.2 *Looks very exciting! What about the flood wall – BCA with Barnes Ponder have done work to replace sections of the concrete flood defence wall with glass, from White Hart Lane to Barnes Bridge, is this something you would look into?*

RC said that this sounds good and they would be open to doing this, not for the entire section, but for parts.

- 6.3 *The drawings look beautiful, but who will look after all that?*

GD The whole estate would be a managed entity; we are also looking into including the towpath as part of the site that will be managed.

Several attendees supported this.

- 6.4 *You've built a relationship with the river unlike others, and that's great, but to make this a truly mixed-use scheme, with offices and ground floor commerce – it seems a little unrealistic to expect to fill these. There is a danger and a risk to getting the balance right, what would be achievable based on the community living here, and how this could be flexible?*

Another attendee commented that the riverside should be used for local employment opportunities, and consider the potential for community use such as for instance, the rowing club.

We are all fearful that it will become just full of estate agents.

GD expressed that he fully agrees, and highlighted that it is important to show aspirations from the beginning, as this encourages interest. He said that they are looking at degrees of activity and vitality on the ground floor level – from cafes and restaurants next to the cinema, to stores and hairdressers etc.

KW explained that there would be mechanisms to control variety of uses. The planning application will be made for flexible uses – with limited percentages of each use across the site.

GD highlighted the importance of successful active ground floors, the place making value of this is enormous. There is the option to consider more accessible rentals, affordable retail, to ensure the liveliness of the area.

- 6.5 *How would shadows affect the public areas, taking into consideration the heights of buildings?*

MS said that this analysis can be done using models, however the public spaces in-between buildings are quite generous (30m and more). The high street was deliberately made narrower, for character and atmosphere, so there may be some issues with shadow in these commercial areas, but not in the residential ones.

- 6.6 *I would like to validate your work, lets keep up this open dialogue, and particularly focus on the liveability for people already living here, lets try to meet each other half way, and talk about worst case scenarios and risks.*
- 6.7 *There is an interest to discuss health space options with the GPs in the area, to develop a shared approach to health, which may involve slight design adjustments.*

GD confirmed that they would be glad to establish direct communication and dialogue on this issue.

7.0 Closing remarks

- 7.1 SM closes the meeting and it is agreed with a vote that the next meeting will officially last 2 hours.