

Mortlake Brewery Community Group

Notes of a meeting held at St Mary's, Mortlake High Street, SW14 8JA on Monday 24 September 2018

Approximately 100 people present, including members of the 2nd Mortlake Cubs

Robert Orr Ewing, chair of the Group, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked whether anyone was new to these meetings, it was about twenty people. Robert outlined the agenda and explained that the planning department is still preparing their report for the Planning Committee, which is unlikely to be held before the end of the year. The slides from the meeting are available [here](#).

Planning applications overview

Robert outlined the three applications (3): a detailed application for the eastern part of the site and an outline for the western part; the secondary school; Chalker's Corner. He pointed out the detail of the first application (4), the extent of and exits from the proposed carparks (6) and the changes to Chalker's Corner (6). He noted positive aspects to the development (7).

MBCG responses to the applications

Tim Catchpole showed a table setting out the number of responses on the planning website. MBCG's response and some others are not on the planning website as they have not been finalised. MBCG is grateful for the crowdfunding that took place. This enabled professional support from Harwood Savin to help us compile a comprehensive response to the applications. In summary the cumulative density of the site is overwhelming and the local infrastructure and public transport cannot support it.

The density of the site is far higher than the surrounding streets (8) at 160 units per hectare. In the eastern area it exceeds GLA guidelines; the height of buildings blocks sunlight; overall the provision of affordable housing is too low, there is no provision in phase 1 which is unacceptable (9). The heights are greater than in the original 2011 planning brief for the site; there is building on the field; the proposed school is too large for the plot; there is no primary school; less green space than in the planning brief and no provision for NHS services (10).

Howard Potter summarised the MBCG response on infrastructure (11): local infrastructure is at capacity; the proposals for Chalker's Corner are not the solution; there is no public transport strategy; the issues of the level crossing are not addressed; the impact of air is not properly assessed; modelling by the developers underestimated traffic movements. A slide of the level crossing at 8.30am (12) clearly demonstrated the dangers it poses to pedestrians and cyclists.

Responses from statutory bodies

The GLA has submitted a lengthy report on the planning applications. Tim ran through the most significant of these (14 and 15) and MBCG's response to them. MBCG agrees with those covering housing and transport and the need for evidence for a secondary school but disagrees that the proposal for the new sports facilities is better than at present.

TfL has not yet submitted its completed report as scrutiny of the traffic modelling is continuing (19, 20). MBCG disagrees with the proposed turning place for buses on the playing field and is surprised there is no mention of the level crossing. TfL seeks £3.675m from the developer for additional bus services. Our MP called a meeting of Network Rail/TfL/LBRUT/Developer/MBCG to develop an effective solution to the footbridge problem, there is no news of any plans for action from this.

Network Rail has not submitted its final report (21). MBCG agrees with its concerns so far.

Alternative plan

Peter Eaton, MBCG's architect expert, is drawing up an alternative plan which reduces the number of units, gives greater light, lower heights towards the edge of the site, retains the sports field and replaces the secondary school with a primary school.

Recent activities and next steps

Francine Bates set out MBCG activities since June (25): briefing meeting with the new Council Leader and councillors; asking councillors to review evidence for the need for a new secondary school; backing the call for consultation with a new provider; maintaining contact with the GLA, NR and TfL; supporting the residents of Chertsey Court meeting with the developers and maintaining a presence on social media and at events; displaying a prominent banner at Chalker's Corner. Francine asked that people continue to communicate their views on the plans to local councillors, especially as a number were newly elected in May (28).

Questions

Would a one-way system help the traffic?

Howard explained that this works in some places, but it would be difficult in Mortlake. One proposal for lessening the number of cars would be car clubs.

Does affordable housing include social housing?

Affordable housing is defined broadly and usually includes units for sale under shared ownership schemes. These have to be offered at below market value and usually to local residents who meet certain criteria (ie on lower incomes, registered on the waiting list, key worker occupation etc). The affordable discount is determined on the basis of 80% market value. However, given property prices in Richmond, this would still be unaffordable for many local people. Social housing, ie housing for rent is included in the wider definition of affordable housing, and MBCG believe that this is urgently needed in the borough and should be included in the development. The current plans allow for 17% affordable housing including social rented housing in phase 2, but MBCG and the GLA believe this should be 35% in phase 1. The developer has cited cash flow problems not allowing for affordable housing in phase 1, but this frequently results in the affordable housing being dropped altogether.

Who pays TfL £3.64 for more buses?

This would be paid by the developer as a lump sum. There is unlikely to be an agreement setting out what happens to the additional services when this money is spent.

Who will pay for parking on the site?

It is likely that parking on the site will be free for residents but non-residents would pay a fee, but this is a detail that will be part of the parking management plan.

What influence will the reports from the GLA, NR and TfL have on the Planning Committee?

The GLA report is fundamental and has a huge influence. The Council must note their comments, if not the Mayor has the authority to call in the application which the Council will want to avoid. The GLA is essentially the overall authority of all the statutory bodies.

NR objected strongly to the siting of Thomson House, but the LBRUT Planning Committee ignored this.

TfL is fixated on the money it can ask from the developer as much of its funding has been removed by central government. They should be concerned about Chalker's Corner. They have said that they will need to be assured of a clear route to the purchase of Chertsey Court land needed for this proposed work.

Are any of our local councillors on the Planning Committee?

Cllr Gemma Curran explained that she hoped to be on the Planning Committee. Protocol means that she cannot speak at meetings or discuss the applications as this would preclude her from speaking at the Committee. She is listening and reading about the plans. The other councillors have been to public meetings and are keeping themselves informed.

CLlr Curran said she expected the Planning Committee would hold a special meeting about the Brewery applications towards the end of the year and that the planners report would be issued two weeks before the meeting.

Has MBCG been in dialogue with the developer?

Early on MBCG has a number of meetings with Guy Duckworth from Dartmouth Capital who represent the developers Reselton Properties, based in Singapore. The meetings were friendly and constructive but the developers had taken very little notice of our concerns. There are no further meetings planned currently.

What are the implications of the plans for Chalker's Corner being rejected?

This is the developers' only solution to dealing with additional traffic, and it does not take account of traffic from a secondary school. It would put a decision on the main application in the balance. The plan could not be implemented if the sale of land owned by Richmond Housing Partnership (RHP) is not agreed. Some of the residents of Chertsey Court are leaseholders and so any sale would need their consent. The alternative would be a compulsory purchase order.

Why is Christ's School not expanding to offer additional places when it has the space?

MBCG is in touch with Christ's about this and will continue to discuss the issue with them

What are the next steps MBCG should take?

Robert asked the meeting what they thought we should do next? The following steps were suggested:

- Challenge the planning brief which advocates higher buildings
- Focus on addressing the demands of the GLA so avoid the plans being taken from LBRUT as the GLA could decide there should be even more housing on the site
- Highlight the poor air quality around Chertsey Court, the air quality on the pavement is as important as it is off it
- Support the extension of a bus route from Putney Bridge to Chiswick Bridge
- Follow up the issues at Chertsey Court with RHP
- Follow up the lack of consultation about the provider for the proposed secondary school

Conclusion

Robert thanked the meeting for their support and encouraged everyone to get in touch with their local councillors about the issues that concerned them most. Every letter, email, conversation counts, we must all show what we think to achieve the best possible development for Mortlake.