

REPORT on DEVELOPERS CONSULTATION PART 2 HELD ON 16 MAY 2017

A similar team were present from the Developer's team as for the first Meeting plus a representative from their Landscape Designers. The purpose of this Meeting was to address amendments to the Masterplan (there was a model showing what the scheme currently proposed looked like) and the landscape strategy and public open space.

Concerns were expressed by the Community representatives that the first Meeting had been dominated by what the Developer's team had to report and not enough time given to their hearing the Community's thoughts. This was supposed to be a Consultation so each side should have equal time.

After the first Meeting Peter Eaton of MBCG had forwarded a proposal to the Developer's Architect to relocate the Secondary School from the rear of the Playing Fields as was proposed then, to the East side where the Sports Pavilion is currently located. This would also produce two pitches. The architect had noted concerns that there would be noise from traffic circulating from his original scheme for the school and was proposing to address that.

If the school was to be in the MBCG position (not the best solution in the architect's view as he would prefer the access to the school to come East of the existing Playing Fields with an exit along Ship Lane - objected to by the Cycling Group representative who didn't want a short cut for cars through the development - a hardly credible position given what was proposed) then the Developer would still want 3 blocks of flats (two storeys high plus a storey in the roof) along Williams Lane which would need to be widened. That would mean the school, one full size all weather pitch and some green space between that pitch and the Lower Richmond Road as proposed in the previous scheme.

The Williams Lane representative maintained that one of the Richmond Council Planning documents says the limit of residential units was 200 to 300 (therefore no need for flats on Williams Lane) but that is not in the Planning Brief and the Developer's advisers said they had never seen this piece of paper. The Planning Brief had talked about 6 to 7 storeys in the centre of the Site but lower on the boundaries.

Plans were shown which would result in 903 units in 4,5,4,5,5,4 storeys fronting the Thames and 6,7,6,7,3,3 at rear or 106 units per hectare (within London guidance for suburban area with current transport facilities) but after Secondary School take this would reduce to 860 units.

Their preferred scheme has extra storeys (some buildings are 8 storeys high) which is in breach of Planning Brief. The Greater London Authority Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) requirement for this site would be no more than 142 units per hectare, this proposal is 111 units. If you took the whole site, excluding the school and commercial buildings still only 137 units per hectare. By comparison it was claimed that Riverside Gardens (Edwardian low level mansion blocks on the South side and to the east of Hammersmith Bridge) is 142 units per hectare- not necessarily a fair comparison as there are three regular bus routes serving those blocks and used to be four until the 283 was withdrawn due to Hammersmith Bridge's problems. There is also one intermittent service (485).

The architect acknowledged that they could lower the 8 storey blocks to 7.

There were then shown various schematic drawings of what the development might look like. One of those purported to show the view from the mound on Mortlake Green looking down the green Walkway to the Thames. There were challenges as to its accuracy but more importantly it seemed to show a pedestrianised crossing area from Mortlake Green to the Brewery site on the corner near to the Sheen Lane Lower Mortlake Road roundabout. This gave it the feel of Exhibition Road traffic calming by the V & A and Science museum, no bad thing, but whether practical who knows. Does this mean that junction would become traffic light controlled? Effect on queueing traffic for the Level Crossing.

The Green Walkway has been dissipated somewhat to create public squares between the residential blocks. This is intended to give the feel of squares in Brighton leading down to the Sea Front.

The hotel is likely to have 20 rooms and be a boutique operation. A 120 room Premier Inn type operation would generate too much traffic and thus raise the bar for sorting the traffic issues. This will be reported on at the next Meeting.

The developer was challenged as to whether the residential units would be marketed to the local market or overseas. He was firm that as with Richmond Riverside and Teddington Studios site (the latter has 400 plus expressions of interest for 220 units) they would be marketed locally. There was quite a high commercial element on this development (a plus if it is fully let) with the cinema generating business for brasserie style operations e.g. Picture House Clapham. There were expressions of concern on the impact for existing Mortlake residents e.g. density, traffic but the Planning Brief sets the tone. Maybe reduce development by 1 storey to reduce impact?

On Public Realm, the intention is to protect existing trees as much as possible. Those fronting Lower Richmond Road will be retained. Towpath connections will be improved by the Development. The old tram lines and pier at the east end of the site would be retained. Much as is contemplated along the Barnes Riverside it was suggested from the floor that part of the wall fronting the Thames could be glass, not concrete. This would improve visibility of the Thames. The developer would certainly look at that idea.

Was there too much commercial space 40-45,000 sq. ft., what about a boat club? Whilst restaurants would pay a market rent, the developer recognised that other uses e.g. hairdresser would need lower rents. The developer wanted to control the mix of tenants, but in reality, will that work?

The developer would be checking how much shade there would be and effect on trees.

It was reported that efforts were being made in discussions with two surgeries in Sheen Lane Centre and the Barnes surgery and the CCG (Clinical Commissioning Group) for a Diagnostic Centre/ Health use on the site. This might wrap in to what was happening on the Barnes Hospital site.

There was a final plea to reduce the density of the scheme and mitigate the impact of the development on people already living in the area.