

## Mortlake Brewery Community Group

Notes of a meeting held at St Mary's, Mortlake High Street, SW14 8JA on Wednesday 19 July 2017

Approximately 60 people present.

Robert Orr Ewing, chair of the MBCG, welcomed everyone to the meeting following the developers' second exhibition. Peter Eaton has agreed to highlight the changes and measure these against measured against MBCG's goals agreed at the last meeting.

### Update and review of exhibition

Peter Eaton used a photo of the model of the development to point out changes made since the first exhibition.



- The green link from Mortlake Green to the riverside has been moved and widened, a positive change. The pedestrian crossing will be safer and there will be a clearer view to the River.
- The tower has been removed, and the bottling plant and hotel still retained.
- The height of the buildings on the west of the site overlooking Williams Lane has been lowered to 3 storeys from 4/5. To compensate one of the blocks on the east has been raised to 8 storeys, which is above the heights stipulated in the planning brief. The added height will increase overshadowing.
- The school has been moved from a north/south position on the field to east/west, it is still 3 storeys catering for 1200 students.
- The 209 bus turnaround at the edge of the sports field has gone without clear explanation of what is happening to it.
- The hotel has gone from 200 to 20 rooms with commercial and retail outlets on the ground floor.
- The care village west of Ship Lane has 126 assisted living and dementia units and 10,000 sq ft of space allocated for unspecific health care
- The riverside path has been widened, this is in addition to the towpath.
- A boat club is planned at the edge of the site by Bull's Alley.
- The Chertsey Court proposals have been modified with less land taken and a wall installed but trees will still be chopped down. The work proposed will be hugely disruptive.

- The car park on the eastern side of the site will now have two exits/entrances, the additional one is on Mortlake High Street for traffic towards Barnes, the other will serve Sheen Lane and the Lower Richmond Road.
- There are now about 70 fewer car parking spaces, 760 overall.
- There are now 730 housing units and 126 care village units, a total of 856.
- Architecturally, the darker brown buildings will be mansion-style blocks, the lighter ones will be industrial/warehouse style.

### **Density**

Peter noted that the development is still very dense, particularly the eastern end as can be easily seen on the model. The GLA guidelines have 135 housing units per hectare for urban developments, but arguably Mortlake is suburban, where the numbers are lower. He will be following this up with the developers. He will also check the figures for green space to ensure that the developers are basing their calculations on real green space, not space between buildings. The developers have stated there will be up to 200 affordable units, an inexact figure.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- The balance of flats and houses is not right for the site, the density of the housing on the eastern side too great, the school should be moved further east off the playing field
- The Local Plan is still to be approved and plans should comply with it
- There should not be any residential buildings on the playing field, this is not permissible.
- What counts as green space? It seems that the developers are including space that will not be green. It should be green enough to sustain wildlife and have sunlight so that vegetation can grow
- 'Up to' 200 affordable units could mean just 1, it is a meaningless statement
- What powers does the Council have for horsetrading on aspects of the development?
- The feedback form is designed to give a favourable interpretation of issues, we need to be sure that we say what we want not what the council or developers want us to say, the second part of the form is the more important rather than the specific questions which can skew results
- We should ensure that the Council does not allow affordable housing to be put on another site instead of this one

The majority of the meeting felt the proposed development is still too dense.

Tim Catchpole explained how the figures of 560 housing units was calculated, the number we would like. The habitable rooms/ha range is as shown in the GLA Density guidelines vis. from 200 min. to 450 max. When this is applied to the site areas in the Planning Brief we get a total of 1,680 habitable rooms. Divide this by 3 (on the basis of 2 bedroom units being the average) and we get total units of 560. By the same formula we should get 565 units for the developer's latest scheme, but instead we get 860. The table is on the [slides](#).

### **Traffic and Transport**

Howard Potter noted that the proposals for Chertsey Court have been modified slightly. These proposals are still to be approved by TfL. There is a conflict of objectives for these proposals, one is that they slow down and discourage the traffic in Mortlake High Street and the Lower Richmond Road, while at the same time opening up Chalker's Corner and to increase the flow of traffic. This will be an expensive project which is the responsibility of TfL, is it necessary?

The developers say that the school will increase traffic by 8 – 12% in the morning, Howard estimates that there will be 500 more cars each morning.

The developers have provided less parking per housing unit than the borough recommends. It is the allocation, management and pricing of parking on the site and the surrounding area that is key. The

developers will have to address these issues in a Parking Management Plan as part of their planning application.

The provision for cyclists and pedestrians is a positive, but this is only as far as the station. It is the level crossing that continues to be a major issue, the traffic analysis has shown many near misses. The developers have not made any significant suggestions about the level crossing, this is a more important issue than Chalker's Corner.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- The addition of the cycle lane to the bus stop will on the north side will be a hazard for pedestrians
- Commercial vehicles will use the Barnes/Mortlake route, even more than they do now, as a short cut from Putney thus avoiding the South Circular Road
- Public transport is inadequate, a bus between Putney and Richmond along the Lower Richmond Road would serve many people with the opportunity to link with other buses at the Red Lion in Barnes. Howard noted that extending routes is expensive, but it is something the developer can finance
- Residents of Chertsey Court need to be fully aware of what is happening, Richmond Housing Partnership have not told them anything of these proposals
- Some residents of Chertsey Court are leaseholders, they have not been consulted on what are proposals on shared property which they pay to maintain
- What is the quality of the data from the developers? Howard said it seems reasonably sound, and is being peer reviewed, but he cannot check it directly as he does not have access to it. He has met with the consultants and continues to talk with them, he feels they are competent but are not working to a sustainable solution.

### **Green space**

Ann Hewitt reminded the meeting of four main green spaces: the playing field and Chertsey Court, both Other Open Land of Townscape Importance (OOLTI), the towpath and Mortlake Green. The Local Plan states that OOLTI is the equivalent of green belt land. The Local Plan is being assessed and will be available in September. There are plans to urbanise the wooded towpath. The green link and proposed cycle path across Mortlake Green needs to be monitored.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- The planning application should not be submitted before the Local Plan is approved as they may contradict one another
- The Friends of Mortlake Green has been set up recently
- All the trees need protecting, new trees are an inadequate substitute
- The playing field should stay intact, so many playing fields have been already sold for building. Green space needed to combat and prevent obesity in children
- Children should have access to playing fields, one youth-sized football pitch is not enough

### **Community**

Francine Bates said that we need to talk to the Council about the school. Richmond has a new leader, Cllr Paul Hodgins, formerly Cabinet Member for Education. The government has announced additional funding for schools, this money will be taken from the free school and capital budgets, which means there may not be funding to build a school. The proposals for the care village do not say how they will be run or how the 10,000 sq ft of healthcare space will be used. The plans for the rowing facility are sketchy and there is no detail on the community space. It will be important to monitor all these plans carefully.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- What can we do to contact the Education and Skills Funding Agency (ESFA)? Achieving for Children, who are responsible for providing capital for new schools. Richmond, should be asked to provide information on latest government funding announcement. It may be that the borough will have to pay for a school from their own resources.

- Who will run the care village? The developers have said that three top-rate companies are interested or the units will be leasehold but owners of the nursing home will provide domiciliary care too. If leasehold units will be sold on at an ever-increasing price. The care units will be open to people from outside the borough who will be entitled to care from Richmond Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG). The Richmond CCG, which is responsible for all health care in Richmond, has apparently been offered 10,000 sq ft for healthcare by the developers. The CCG would need to pay for fitting out and maintenance. The developers are meeting GPs from the Sheen Lane practices to discuss setting up a satellite site.
- The original plans had a primary school, now replaced by the secondary school. Are the needs of the new residents being addressed now this has been cancelled?
- The North Road surgery in Kew expected to move to a new surgery in the Kew Riverside development as part of the community needs, but lack of a specific plan has meant that they have lost the section 106 money and there is now no funding for a surgery. It is important to be specific about community needs.

### **Heart of Mortlake**

Robert said that it was disappointing that the buildings are not lower, the site is still too dense for the area. He felt it is hard to comment on the design, and defers to the architects for that.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- The developers said that the retail units are for independents, but how many will want to rent space? There are already a number of empty shops in Sheen Lane.

### **Next steps**

Peter explained that the developers have to complete an Environmental Impact Assessment, which will take about 12 weeks, it is unlikely that it will be ready before September. The developers hope to submit their planning application by September, but it is more likely to be towards the end of the year. They will be anxious to ensure it is done by then as the local elections in May mean that business is suspended for six weeks before the election which would delay a decision until June.

The Local Plan, which is important for future of the playing field, has been submitted for assessment to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government. The result of this will be known in September.

The Planning Committee can approve or reject the application and it can approve the application with conditions. It can stipulate how the section 106 and 278 money is allocated to support community and infrastructure projects and the amount of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Francine said that the MBCG Committee is planning to meet with the new Leader of the Council and MP to discuss the latest plans. People will be kept in touch by email and newsletters etc. A social event and another meeting is planned for September. The group could also push for a public meeting with the developer as some people have felt that the community liaison group meetings have not been very effective.

Comments and queries from the meeting:

- Attending a planning meeting in Bedfordshire showed how little opportunity there is to speak
- A letter-writing group is a good way to encourage and involve people to contact councillors
- The local paper does not have the power or influence it did, but there are other local publications and ways of publicising what is happening
- A media strategy is now urgently needed to keep pressure on the council who will be making the decision
- Funding may need to be sourced for legal and planning expertise
- We have to be specific about what needs to change.

Dates of future meetings will be circulated shortly and members of the core group will consider and action all points raised over the summer.