



Minutes Stag Brewery Community Liaison Group Meeting 01

Date: 25.04.2017

Time: 19:00 – 20:30

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

Chair: Steve McAdam, Soundings

Attendees:

Peter	Eaton	PE	MBCG, Developer Liaison
Graham	Kench	GK	Lower Richmond Road, Resident
Ben	Knight	BK	Local Resident
Shaun	Laplough	SL	Mortlake with East Sheen, Chair
Ashley	Lawrence	AL	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace, Representative
Lynette	Lawson	LL	LBRuT, Community Links Officer
Tim	Lennon	TL	Richmond Cycling Campaign, Chair
Amanda	Letch	AL	Thomson House School, Principal
Danny	Masting	DM	Local Resident
Max	Millington	MM	Williams Lane, Representative
Steven	Mindell	SM	Barnes Community Association, Chair
Robert	Orr Ewing	RO	MBCG, Chair
Paul	Rawkins	PR	Barnes & Mortlake History Society, Chairman
Emma	Robinson	ER	Barnes Community Association, Town Centre Manager
Stephen	Tester	ST	Waldeck Road & Waldeck Terrace, Representative
Kate	Woodhouse	KW	Mortlake Community Association, Chair
Jackson	Fiorini	JF	The Tapestry

Project Team:

Guy	Duckworth	GD	Dartmouth Capital Advisors, Project Manager
Michael	Squire	MS	Squire and Partners, Architect
Barnaby	Johnston	BJ	Squire and Partners, Architect
Kevin	Watson	KW	Gerald Eve, Planning Consultant
Steve	McAdam	SM	Soundings, Community Consultant
Rowan	Cole	RC	Soundings, Community Consultant
Leonora	Grchena	LG	Soundings, Community Consultant

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 Steve McAdam, Soundings
SM welcomed everyone to the Community Liaison Group (CLG) and thanked them for attending. SM introduced his role and Soundings as facilitators of community consultation.
SM explained that recordings would be taken during the meeting.
- 1.2 Guy Duckworth, Dartmouth Capital Advisors
GD introduced his role as Project Manager, advising Reselton Properties Limited who own the Stag Brewery.
- 1.3 Michael Squire and Barnaby Johnston, Squire & Partners
MS and BJ introduced their role as project architects.
- 1.5 Kevin Watson, Gerald Eve
KW introduced his role as a planning consultant from Gerald Eve.
- 1.6 Rowan Cole, Soundings
RC introduced his role in facilitating community consultation.

2.0 Purpose of the CLG

SM introduced the purpose of the CLG. The CLG consists of representatives of local residents and stakeholder groups as well as some local residents. As the project progresses it is envisioned that this group will be added to.

Role:

- The CLG will act as a sounding board if, and when, a scheme develops. Key members of the project team will attend each of the meetings.
- To capture community hopes and aspirations.
- To promote planned consultation events amongst the wider community.

3.0 Summary of feedback from public consultation by Steve McAdam

3.1 SM presented the findings from the public consultation. Massive feedback was received – 1450 people attended the exhibition, 330 emails and 650 forms were received.

3.2 Key concerns highlighted in the feedback included:

- Size and location of the school.
- Traffic and transport.
- Environmental impact.
- Building height and scheme density.

4.0 Brief overview of masterplan changes by Michael Squire

4.1 MS presented the masterplan and changes implemented in response to the public consultation, including:

- Changed location and position of the school.
- Reduction in height of the marker building (campanile building) from 14 storeys to 6.
- Reduction to number of rooms in the hotel – from 96 to 15.

5.0 Presentation on the revised school proposal by Michael Squire

5.1 MS presented the changed position and location of the school and playing pitch area, and of the residential building adjacent to the pitch area.

According to the newly proposed layout:

- The school building would be located north of the pitches, with an access from a new east-west road.
- West of the school building, towards Williams Lane, there would be an outdoor space for the school.
- South from the school building, there would be a football pitch that could be used both by the school and by the local community.
- A residential building, for assisted living, is proposed to face along Williams Lane at the western edge of the site, framing the football pitch.
- A community park was added to the plan, south from the football pitch, towards Lower Richmond Rd.

6.0 Open discussion

6.1 *An attendee commented that the feedback form was difficult to answer, as issues such as 'new homes' cannot be narrowed down to a 'like' or 'dislike'.*

SM explained the goal of this format is to provoke a longer comment that would elaborate on the issues.

6.2 *An attendee commented that the meaning of some phrases used in the form were not understandable, namely, 'public realm' and 'non-residential uses'.*

SM clarified that public realm includes all accessible public spaces (streets, parks, squares, playgrounds). A non-residential use is any use of building space other than residential (commercial, educational, tourist etc.)

6.3 *When and where will the exhibition take place? Should collaboration with the Mortlake Summer Fair (24th June, organised by St Mary Magdalen School) be considered?*

GD/SM agreed that options would be discussed with the Fair organisers, and to potentially invite a representative from St Mary Magdalen to join the CLG. Attendees offered to help establish the communication.

6.4 *The council brief stated the need for an open community space, but the football pitch would allow for only limited weekend and evening use by the community – is this enough? Won't the evening lighting be a problem for nearby residents?*

KW confirmed that the use of the pitch could be regulated with a community agreement, drafted in consultation with the community so that it would cater to the needs of all its users and nearby residents.

6.5 *Is the footprint and height of the school building determined by EFA funding?*

MS stated, yes, the EFA have strict guidelines/and requirements which that the project team must consider where developing the school.

6.6 *Isn't the 3G pitch surface expensive to maintain and can this pitch be used as both an outdoor space for the school and for football?*

MS/KW confirmed that these matters will be taken into consideration as the project moves forward and that the pitch would be multi-purpose.

6.7 *The football pitch/outdoor area is too small for the school – is it what the EFA required?*

MS/BJ that a football pitch would be re-provided in the new scheme and that this had been discussed with Sports England. BJ stated that the school is being designed with EFA's guidelines/requirements in mind.

6.8 *Why is the school plot surrounded by roads on all sides, would this not increase traffic flow? Should the access to the school not be designed in a manner that encourages cycling and walking?*

The project team (MS/KW/GD) confirmed that sustainable transport, alternative (non-vehicular) access options, and an emphasis on cycling and walking would be taken into consideration and discussed further.

It was also said that Richmond council statistics say that only 8% of school users arrive by car, to which attendees commented that this might not necessarily apply to the Mortlake area.

6.9 *Why is there a bus turnaround, is this asked by council or proposed by project team?*

BJ/KW explained that the potential extension of the 209 bus route would require a larger bus turnaround than is currently available at Avondale Road. It is also an aspiration of the council to move the bus stop to the Stag Brewery site.

6.10 *Can the number of pupils attending the new school be reduced? Does the school have to have 1,200 pupils?*

It was noted that the current brief for the school is for a six-form entry, with a sixth form. The project team noted the community's desire to reduce the total number of pupils, and would raise this with the Council.

6.11 *If the school building cannot be reduced, can the residential building be taken out, leaving more space for the open area?*

MS highlighted that the proposed building frames the open pitch, sheltering it from the street, however these comments will be taken into consideration.

6.12 *Why was the hotel reduced so much? 15 rooms are too few, and if the hotel rooms are replaced by residences this would still cause traffic flow. The hotel would help the local economy.*

It was noted that there was a preference to increase the number of hotel rooms to around 50.

6.13 *Returning to the principle topic, the new school location and its position were discussed further. Attendees agreed this version is definitely better than the previous option, however they still feel very strongly about reducing the number of pupils and size of the school.*

7.0 **Closing comments**

SM thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.