

Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington
Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB

Statement of Case

**Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington
Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB**
Statement of Case

March 2020

WSP | Indigo



Aldermay House
10-15 Queen Street
London EC4N 1TX

T 020 3848 2500
E info@indigoplanning.com
W indigoplanning.com

**Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington
Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB**
Statement of Case

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. The Appeal	3
The appeal site and surroundings	3
Planning history	4
Appeal proposals	5
Appropriate appeal procedure and reasoning	5
Statement of Common Ground	6
3. The Appeal Scheme	7
Public and Statutory Consultation	8
4. The Appellant's Case	10
Scheme benefits	10
Removal of designated waste site	16
Industrial use of site	17
Affordable housing	18
Design	19
Amenity of future residents	20
Transport	21
Carbon offset payment	22
Play space	23
5. Conclusion	25

**Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington
Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB**
Statement of Case

Appendices

Appendix 1

Officer's report to planning committee 18/2714/FUL

Appendix 2

Supplementary late material to planning committee
18/2714/FUL

Appendix 3

Decision Notice 18/2714/FUL dated 19 September 2019

Appendix 4

Decision Notice 94/2139/S191 dated 18 October 1994
and accompanying plan

Appendix 5a

Press cuttings – 1984

Appendix 5b

Press cuttings - 1998

1. Introduction

1.1. This Statement of Case has been prepared by WSP | Indigo on behalf of the Appellant, Sharpe Refinery Service Ltd, in respect of an appeal against the decision of the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (“LBRuT”) to refuse planning application ref. no. 18/2714/FUL, for development at Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB.

1.2. Following pre-application consultation with LBRuT, planning application ref. no. 18/2714/FUL was submitted on 10 August 2018, and validated on 23 August 2018. It sought full planning permission for the following development:

“Redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of commercial space (B1 Use Class) within existing Buildings of Townscape Merit plus a new build unit, 24 residential units in two blocks (5 x 1 bedroom flats, 12 x 2 bedroom flats and 7 x 3 bedroom flats) and associated car parking and landscaping and other works.”

1.3. This is herein referred to as the “Appeal Scheme”.

1.4. After a year of negotiations and consultation, with scheme amendments made and additional information provided to address concerns raised, the application was reported to LBRuT Planning Committee, on 18 September 2019, with a recommendation for refusal. The officer’s report to Committee is provided at **Appendix 1** and the Supplementary Late Material to Committee is provided at **Appendix 2**. The Decision Notice was issued on 19 September 2019 and is provided at **Appendix 3**.

1.5. The eight reasons for refusal put forward by the Council can be summarised as:

- Loss of waste facility;
- Loss of industrial floorspace;
- Failure to provide adequate affordable housing;

- Design;
- Unacceptable co-location of commercial and residential uses;
- Adverse impact upon existing on-street parking;
- Absence of binding agreement to secure a carbon offset payment; and
- Inadequate provision of play space.

1.6. The reasons for refusal are set out in full and discussed further at Section 4 of this Statement. In view of the nature of the issues arising pertinent to the Appeal, and the local interest in the proposals, a public inquiry is necessary to consider and test the relevant evidence.

1.7. This Statement outlines the case for the Appellant that will be presented at a public inquiry and references the documents and evidence upon which the Appellant may rely. The Appellant reserves the right to amend or amplify these in response to representations made by the Council and/or third parties and, further, to update/revise the documents relied upon, as may be necessary to assist the Inspector in determining the Appeal.

1.8. This Statement is set out as follows:

- Section 2 describes the site, surroundings and planning history ;
- Section 3 describes the appeal proposals;
- Section 4 sets out the scheme benefits in the context of the reasons for refusal and outlines the Appellant's case; and
- Section 5 provides the Appellant's conclusions.

2. The Appeal

The appeal site and surroundings

- 2.1. The appeal site comprises 'Arlington Works', which has been owned by the Appellant for many years. The site is bound to the north-west by a railway line and to the south-west by the Twickenham Studios (film and television production) and a block of residential flats to the north. The site is located at the end of an access driveway off Arlington Road, which also provides access to part of the adjacent Studios.
- 2.2. Arlington Road is a residential street located within a predominantly residential area east of the local centre of St Margaret's.
- 2.3. The site is approximately 3,030sqm (0.303ha) in area, including the access driveway, and is entirely brownfield, comprising existing buildings, hardstanding and the area previously occupied by the waste facility which covered approximately 0.05ha.
- 2.4. The site comprises the cleared area previously associated with the treatment of waste oil, which was decommissioned in 2018, together with a range of commercial uses including industrial, music studios and offices. The WLWP refers to the "site" as being 0.23ha in size. It is important to note that what was the lawful waste site extended to only 0.05ha.
- 2.5. The site includes two late Victorian terraced buildings which face inwards towards each other across an access road. These buildings originally provided stables, coach houses and store rooms with associated living accommodation for the grooms and their families. It would appear that they were built speculatively following the arrival of the railway in circa 1850. These buildings are located at the south-west corner of the site and were designated by the Council as Buildings of Townscape Merit ("BTM") in November 2013. Their appearance and condition has become somewhat degraded over time and require investment.
- 2.6. A linear, single-storey corrugated steel-clad arrangement of workshop buildings, believed to have been constructed in the 1950s, and in a very poor state of repair, extends north-

eastwards from the rear of the eastern Victorian terrace. Although still mostly occupied by tenants, these buildings are in an advanced state of dilapidation.

- 2.7. The site is not situated within a conservation area, and none of the existing buildings are statutorily listed. The boundary to the St Margaret's Conservation Area is situated approximately 20 metres to the north-west of the site but is separated from the site by the railway line. The nearest statutorily listed building is the Grade II Listed Church of St Margaret's of Scotland, which is approximately 50 metres to the west of the site and is also separated from the site by the railway line.
- 2.8. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level ("PTAL") of 3, a good level of access to public transport. St Margaret's Railway Station is approximately a seven-minute walk from the site and provides direct services to Richmond, Kingston, Wimbledon, Clapham Junction and London Waterloo. There are six bus routes that operate in the vicinity of the site, with the closest eastbound and westbound bus stops located on St Margaret's Road approximately 450 metres and 470 metres south of the site respectively.
- 2.9. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which denotes the lowest level of risk from flooding. Parts of the surrounding area falls within Flood Zone 2.

Planning history

- 2.10. A Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development ("CLEUD") (ref. no. 94/2139/S191) was granted by the Council, on 23 August 1994, and defines the lawfully permitted area at Arlington Works that is for the 'waste use'. The waste use is defined as the "*refining of waste oil (other than petroleum or petroleum products) (to include the use of fuel storage tanks in this connection)*". This area, approximately 0.05ha, represents only part of the overall site area at approximately 0.303 ha. The Decision Notice and plan for this CLEUD is provided at **Appendix 4**.
- 2.11. This CLEUD is integral in considering the permitted waste area and will be referred to subsequently in this Statement.
- 2.12. Planning permission (ref. no. 89/1750/OUT) was granted on 11 December 1989 for the

redevelopment of the site to provide 1,458 sqm of Class B1a offices. This was not implemented.

2.13. Planning permission (ref. no. 883/59) was granted on 22 October 1959 for the installation of fuel storage tanks at the site. No planning conditions were attached restricting the hours of operation.

2.14. The site's planning history otherwise relates to decisions that are not relevant to the Appeal Scheme with previous applications seeking alterations to antennas, masts and other communications equipment situated at the north-west corner of the site.

Appeal proposals

2.15. The Appellant will explain the appeal proposals at Section 3 of this Statement of Case. It will include the original development proposals and details of changes made (and information submitted) during the pre-application and subsequent application process, in response to feedback from the Council, and from statutory and non-statutory consultees.

Appropriate appeal procedure and reasoning

2.16. The Appellant is seeking the Inquiry procedure in respect of this Appeal which is necessary for the reasons set out below.

2.17. There is significant local interest in the scheme. Prior to the submission of the application in August 2018, a consultation event was organised by the Appellant and was held at the ETNA Community Centre, 13 Rosslyn Rd, Twickenham on 12 June. This was attended by 30 people, including a representative from the neighbouring Twickenham Studios.

2.18. Following the submission of the application, 17 objections were received (duplicate objections were counted once). The Rt Hon Sir Vince Cable, the then Member of Parliament for Twickenham, also made representations during the determination period of the application.

2.19. At the meeting of the LBRuT Planning Committee, on 18 September 2019, the Committee heard representations against the application from Roger Sewell (Twickenham Studios),

Derek Horne (consultant on behalf of an objector) and Councillor Julia Neden-Watts spoke as an interested councillor.

- 2.20. The key issues of contention are complex and predominantly relate to the designation of part of the site as an Existing Waste Site within the adopted West London Waste Plan ("WLWP"); the continued need and demand for such a facility; the Financial Viability Appraisal Report prepared by Grimshaw Consulting; the quality of the design and relationship between future users of the site; and the effect on the nearby Conservation Area and BTMs. These matters can only be satisfactorily addressed through the provision of expert evidence and the testing of that evidence by cross examination.
- 2.21. In summary, the Appeal is likely to involve various legal submissions and expert evidence from a variety of professional disciplines and it is likely to last for more than two days. It also generated interest locally from residents and neighbouring commercial occupiers. It should therefore be heard by way of a Public Inquiry.
- 2.22. This Statement sets out the case for the Appellant that will be presented at a public inquiry and lists the documents to which the Appellant may refer.

Statement of Common Ground

- 2.23. A draft Statement of Common Ground has been prepared by the Appellant and will be submitted to the Council for agreement.

3. The Appeal Scheme

- 3.1. The proposal subject of application ref. no. 18/2714/FUL (“the Appeal Scheme”) seeks to redevelop the site to provide 610sqm of commercial floorspace (Class B1) and 24 residential units (Class C3) comprising five x one-bedroom, 12 x two-bedroom and seven x three-bedroom dwellings.
- 3.2. The two Victorian terraced buildings, which are defined by the Council as Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTMs), would be retained and sensitively refurbished and extended as part of the development of the site to provide 610sqm of self-contained commercial B1 floorspace. The BTM closest to the railway line would be extended to create an additional B1 unit.
- 3.3. The B1 accommodation would be divided into five duplex units, however this arrangement would be flexible and the space could be divided into a smaller number of larger units, or a greater number of smaller units to suit market demand across a range of B1 uses, including studios, workshops for creative industries and offices. The commercial accommodation would be served by two car parking spaces, adjacent to the western BTM, in accordance with the Council’s parking standards.
- 3.4. The proposed residential accommodation would be split across two buildings. The main building would be located parallel to the railway line and would comprise 20 apartments. The smaller building, located adjacent to the eastern BTM, would comprise four affordable homes with a communal garden space. A total of 21 car parking spaces would serve the residential accommodation, including three disabled car parking spaces, again in accordance with Council standards.
- 3.5. Cycle parking would be provided in accordance with adopted London Plan standards for both the commercial units (eight spaces) and residential accommodation (43 spaces).
- 3.6. Each home would have access to private outdoor amenity space in addition to 360sqm of landscaped communal amenity space.

- 3.7. The residential and commercial refuse and recycling would be stored in separate designated storage areas.

Public and Statutory Consultation

- 3.8. The appellant will explain the consultation which took place with all interested parties and the local community, the feedback received and how the final scheme determined by the Council addressed this.
- 3.9. A number of statutory consultees made no objection to the Appeal Scheme, including:

West London Waste Plan Boroughs

- London Borough of Brent
- London Borough of Ealing
- London Borough of Harrow
- London Borough of Hounslow
- London Borough of Hillingdon

Others

- Historic England (Archaeology)
- Environment Agency
- Thames Water
- LBRuT Ecology
- LBRuT Transport
- LBRuT Trees
- LBRuT Environmental Health (Contamination)

- LBRuT Environmental Health (Air Quality)
- LBRuT Environmental Health (Commercial)
- LBRuT Environmental Health (Non-commercial)
- Lead Local Flood Authority (Surface Water Drainage)

3.10. A small number of consultees objected to the planning application, including the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation.

3.11. The neighbouring owners of the Twickenham Studios objected to the application.

4. The Appellant's Case

- 4.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.2. The Development Plan for the site comprises:
- The London Plan (2016);
 - The London Borough of Richmond upon Thames Local Plan (2018); and
 - The West London Waste Plan (2015).
- 4.3. The new London Plan (the Intend to Publish version) is at an advanced stage and is a material consideration, as is the recently issued letter from the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to the London Mayor, dated 13 March 2020, in respect of this version of the London Plan.
- 4.4. The Appellant will set out the benefits of the scheme and address the eight reasons for refusal as set out in LBRuT's Decision Notice of 19 September 2019, application ref. no. 18/2714/FUL, having regard to the Development Plan, NPPF and emerging policy. The Appellant anticipates being able to reduce the extent of reasons for refusal through the Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) and the completion of a S106 undertaking with the Council.
- 4.5. Evidence in respect of each reason for refusal will be provided in the relevant Proofs of Evidence.

Scheme benefits

Use of previously developed land

- 4.6. The site is previously developed land and its redevelopment optimises the use of a sustainable and under-used brownfield site, in accordance with national planning policy

aims. The need for more housing across London is well understood and is highlighted in the very recent Ministerial Statement, issued on 13 March 2020 (see above).

- 4.7. Local, regional and national planning policy promotes the effective use of previously developed land to help deliver much needed new homes as well as employment space. The Strategic Objectives of the LBRUT Local Plan (2018) clearly state that development should take place on previously developed land and reusing existing buildings where possible. Policy D3 of the Intend to Publish London Plan states that development should make the best use of land, particularly in areas well connected to public transport. Similarly, paragraph 84 of the NPPF clearly states that the development of previously developed land should be encouraged, particularly where they are physically well related to existing settlements.

Efficient use of land

- 4.8. The proposed development makes an effective and efficient use of land in meeting the need for homes and employment uses, whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions, in accordance with the national planning policy aims set out within paragraph 122 of the NPPF.

Meeting housing needs

- 4.9. Richmond's latest five-year housing land supply position, as at 31 March 2019, is set out in the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) (2018/19) and the accompanying tables 'Housing Supply Summary and Trajectory'.
- 4.10. The AMR states that the Council has a five-year supply equating to 6.3 years against the adopted London Plan (2016) housing target.
- 4.11. Paragraph 73 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old.
- 4.12. The definition of deliverable in the glossary of the NPPF states that to be considered

deliverable, sites for housing should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.

- 4.13. It states that sites with outline planning permission, permission in principle, allocated in the development plan or identified on a brownfield register should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin on site within five years.
- 4.14. 51% of the Council's reported supply of 1,474 homes is made up of sites without planning permission. This equates to a total of 754 homes.
- 4.15. It will be demonstrated at the Inquiry that not all of the sites included within the Council's reported supply are deliverable within five years and as such the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply against its adopted target.
- 4.16. The new London Plan is also at an advanced stage with a response on the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan provided by the Secretary of State (SoS) on 13 March 2020. This response makes it clear that delivering more housing is a priority and that more should be done through the new London Plan to help achieve delivery, including through sites and proposals such as this appeal scheme.
- 4.17. The Intend to Publish version of the London Plan identifies a ten-year housing target of 4,110 homes for Richmond in the period 2019/20 – 2028/29. This equates to an annual target of 411 per annum. The SoS makes it clear that such targets need to be exceeded if London is to achieve the level of housing it needs.
- 4.18. Based on the Council's latest reported supply of 1,474 homes, the Council will only be able to demonstrate a five-year supply of **3.6 years** even if all sources of supply are considered by the Inspector to be deliverable.
- 4.19. However, as noted above, we will demonstrate that not all of the Council's reported supply is deliverable in the next five years and as such, the Council's supply against the new London Plan draft housing figures is likely to be less than **3.6 years**.
- 4.20. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF states that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in

favour of sustainable development. For decision-taking this means, where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

- 4.21. Footnote 7 of the NPPF makes it clear that policies are to be treated as out-of-date where a local authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply.
- 4.22. Therefore, a presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied in this instance.
- 4.23. In the absence of any adverse impacts, we consider that the delivery of new market and affordable housing alongside new, modern employment floorspace on the site is a significant benefit that outweighs any perceived harm arising as a result of the loss of the non-conforming waste facility on the site.

Development in a sustainable location

- 4.24. Provision of a high quality and accessible mixed-use development in a sustainable location within walking distance to St Margaret's train station and accessible to Twickenham town centre.
- 4.25. This clearly accords with the Strategic Vision and Strategic Objectives set out within the Local Plan (2018) and is at the heart of the London Plan (2016) and ITP London Plan, NPPF and latest statement from the SoS.

Economic benefits

- 4.26. The scheme will provide 610sqm of commercial space (B Class) and 24 residential units comprising of five x one-beds; 12 x two-beds and seven x three-beds.
- 4.27. The development will clearly provide good quality commercial space that meets market requirements. This will be evidenced more within the proofs.
- 4.28. In terms of short term benefits the scheme will provide employment during the construction

phase.

- 4.29. Overall the development will provide economic benefits in both the short and long term. The planning policy context establishes the need to retain employment on the site and this proposal complies with that requirement and provides high quality employment space which is a significant improvement compared to existing. It will also enable more people to be employed on the site.
- 4.30. Section 2 of the NPPF clearly sets out that building a strong, responsive and competitive economy is key to achieving sustainable development. Section 4 goes on to state that Local Planning Authorities should seek to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.
- 4.31. The provision of a variety of employment space is supported at the local level, particularly in respect of Policy LP40. Policy LP41 is also supportive of the development of office space within sustainable locations.

High quality design

- 4.32. The architectural detailing with the proposed development is of high quality and will positively contribute to the character of the surrounding area. The larger and smaller apartment buildings will be arranged as described above and will be finished in yellow London stock brick to match the BTM terraces. To relate to the site's industrial history, zinc metal cladding will be used on the top floors of the two blocks.
- 4.33. Similarly, the units have been designed to address demand in the area for smaller units. The marketing report states that the proposed units are "*ideal for the current levels of demand*". The report concludes that the proposed commercial space will be very well received by tenants and purchasers. The internal configuration of the units has been designed to allow further subdivision or let as smaller units subject to the marketing response and demand.
- 4.34. Overall, the proposed development will positively contribute to the character of the area and significantly enhance the appearance of the existing site. The design of both the commercial

and residential elements are of the highest quality. The development will, therefore, accord with Policy LP1 and enhance the setting of the nearby conservation area and buildings of townscape merit.

Provision of mixed-use development

- 4.35. The proposed development comprises of a mixed-use scheme through the combination of both (replacement) employment and residential uses. Higher quality and fit for purpose employment floorspace will replace the oil recycling and dilapidated commercial units on the site, allowing the local employment opportunities in this area to increase.
- 4.36. The effective, best use of sites, particularly near centres, is clearly supported by the Development Plan, the London Plan and within the NPPF.
- 4.37. The proposed development clearly accords with the policies outlined above and is a benefit of the scheme.

End of non-conforming use

- 4.38. The refining of waste oil at this site has ceased, together with the associated HGV trips, resulting in significant benefits in terms of improved neighbour amenity, sustainability, noise, odour, and public safety in what is a predominantly residential neighbourhood. For instance, a high-profile oil tank fire occurred in 1984 and an oil tank exploded in 1998. Local press cuttings of both incidents are enclosed at **Appendix 5**.
- 4.39. Feedback was received during the consultation process that local residents would like to see the site redeveloped for non-waste related uses. The removal of a non-conforming use in a residential area will be a clear benefit of the scheme. The proposed re-development of this site, with much needed new housing and good quality employment space, is therefore supported by the NPPF, the London Plan and Richmond Local Plan. This is a clear benefit of the scheme.

Retention of buildings of townscape merit

- 4.40. Another benefit of the proposed development is the retention and enhancement of the two

Victorian Terraces which are defined by the Council as Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM). These buildings will be sensitively refurbished as part of the redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of self-contained commercial space. As part of the refurbishment, the northern BTM will be extended to create an additional commercial unit.

- 4.41. In accordance with section 16 of the NPPF, a Heritage Assessment was submitted with the application. The significance of the heritage assets has been assessed. Overall, the proposed development is acceptable on both design and heritage grounds, and the setting of St Margaret's Conservation Area will be enhanced through the removal of low-quality industrial buildings.

Removal of designated waste site

- 4.42. The first reason for refusal is:

"The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing safeguarded waste site and lack of satisfactory full and proper evidence to demonstrate there is satisfactory compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste, in scale and quantity, elsewhere within the West London Waste Plan Area; would result in the unacceptable loss of land accommodating an existing waste manage use which forms an essential resource for dealing with all waste streams within the Waste Plan area. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 5.17 and 5.19 of the London Plan (2016), policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan (2015) and LP24 of the Local Plan (2018)."

- 4.43. LBRuT consider that Arlington Works is a Safeguarded Waste Site, to which policies in the WLWP apply. Local Policy LP24 (Waste Management) states that proposals affecting existing waste management sites will be assessed against the policies of the WLWP (2015).

- 4.44. Policy WLWP 2 of the WLWP states:

"Development for non-waste uses will only be considered on land in existing waste management use, or land allocated in Table 5-2 if

compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste, in scale and quality, is made elsewhere within the West London Boroughs.”

- 4.45. The WLWP refers to the site being 0.23ha in size (compared to an overall application site, including access road of approximately 0.3ha). It is important to note that the lawful waste site, as identified in the CLEUD referred to above, extended to only 0.05ha, a size which is not viable for any commercial waste operation (see Waterman Report submitted with the application). This, combined with the access road constraints and proximity of residential neighbours, renders the site unviable and unsustainable for future waste use. LBRuT is highly unlikely to grant planning permission for a new waste development at the site.
- 4.46. In addition, the Waterman Report identifies that 83% of the material received at the time at Arlington Works (it closed in 2018) originated from sources outside of London. Furthermore, the Appellant referred LBRuT to the WLWP evidence base document ‘Site Selection and Assessment Process – Summary Report’ prepared by BPP Consulting (July 2014), which ranked Arlington Works poorly as a waste site (286 out of 309 sites) and highlighted capacity for waste at other sites within the WLP waste area and wider London area which would compensate for any ‘loss’ of the waste facility at the Appeal Site, thereby complying with Policy WLWP 2.
- 4.47. Within the planning application submission, the Appellant confirmed that the oil recycling business (which operated for many years) was becoming less viable and employing only a skeleton staff as part of its planned closure. The operation was subsequently closed in 2018, and the tanks and associated infrastructure were removed in 2018.
- 4.48. The facility was clearly a non-conforming use of very small size within a predominantly residential location. Its re-provision would be remarkable when considering the site’s characteristics and the lack of demand for such a use. Local residents and commercial neighbours would not wish to see such a use in this location. The Appellant will demonstrate that there is existing capacity in any event at more suitable sites.

Industrial use of site

- 4.49. The second reason for refusal is:

“The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing industrial site and lack of satisfactory full and proper marketing evidence to demonstrate there is a lack of demand for continued use of the premises as a B2 use, or appropriate alternative employment generating uses, or other suitable evidence; would result in an unacceptable loss of an industrial site, to the detriment of the local economy and range of employment premises within the borough. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 4.14 of the London Plan (2016) and LP42 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).”

- 4.50. There is no evidence to support LBRuT’s contention that there is a Class B2 (General Industrial) lawful existing use at the site. In any event, the 610sqm of commercial floorspace proposed could be used by a variety of businesses, including light industrial.
- 4.51. Much of the existing accommodation is in extremely poor condition and is severely limited in terms of the quantum and quality of its provision. This has been documented in marketing evidence and will be further discussed within the proofs.
- 4.52. The Appeal Scheme would make efficient use of the site by significantly increasing the employment density in new and refurbished accommodation to allow businesses to locate to the site for the long term. The appellant will show that the Council has allowed similar mixed-use schemes across the Borough, including on land previously owned by the Council. The appellant will demonstrate that this mixed-use scheme will achieve an appropriate and highly sustainable balance between employment and residential accommodation, creating much needed new homes, including affordable housing on site. The proposal is therefore in accordance with planning policy at all levels.

Affordable housing

- 4.53. The third reason for refusal is:

“The proposed on-site affordable housing provision, by reason of its under provision of affordable units on site below the percentage required, would fail to meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The

proposed shared ownership units would fail to meet the affordability criteria in the Intermediate Housing Policy and would fail to adequately contribute to the Borough's housing stock or maximise affordable housing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 3.13 of the London Plan (2016) and LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Local Planning Authority's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Documents."

- 4.54. The Policy notes that the Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes having regard to economic viability, site costs, the availability of public subsidy and the overall mix of uses and other planning benefits.
- 4.55. The planning application was supported by a Financial Viability Appraisal Report prepared by Grimshaw Consulting, which set out that of the 24 new homes proposed, the development could viably support four on-site affordable dwellings in a shared-ownership tenure comprising two x two-bedroom units and two x three-bedroom units (units 21-24) in a single three-storey building on site with a dedicated private rear garden area.
- 4.56. Following a number of independent reviews of the Viability Assessment, the final offer to LBRuT based on the viability of the scheme was increased to a total of eight affordable homes for London Shared Ownership, equating to 33.3% of the total provision. This is the maximum amount of affordable housing the development can provide in line with the NPPF, Policy LP 36 of the Local Plan and Policy 3.12 of the London Plan and Homes for Londoners Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (August 2017).
- 4.57. This reason for refusal is therefore not justified owing to the clear viability evidence supporting the 33.3% provision on site. A Section 106 Obligation securing this provision will be provided and as such, the proposal is in accordance with policy.

Design

- 4.58. The fourth reason for refusal is:

“The proposed development, by reason of its siting, footprint, mass and of the severe horizontal emphasis of the eastern elevation of the proposed main residential building, combined with the height and siting of the proposed smaller residential building, would result in a cramped and contrived form of over development of the site, and would appear overbearing on the existing Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) on site. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF and policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), LP1, LP4 and LP39 of the Local Plan (2018) and the Design Quality SPD.”

- 4.59. We have set out within the benefits section that the proposed development will enhance the nearby Conservation Area and Buildings of Townscape Merit.
- 4.60. The Appeal Scheme was subject to an extensive pre-application consultation with LBRuT, and a public exhibition with local residents and stakeholders. The Appeal Scheme and the design have been amended and refined in response.
- 4.61. The design is considered to be of high quality and appropriate for the site. It does not result in any harm to heritage assets and would represent a significant enhancement of the site's character and appearance.
- 4.62. The Buildings of Townscape Merit would be refurbished and used as Class B1 commercial accommodation, thereby securing their long-term future.
- 4.63. Evidence will be submitted by the project architect, which will detail the design approach and address this reason for refusal and demonstrate that it is in accordance with policy, including LP1, LP4 and LP39 of the Richmond Local Plan.

Amenity of future residents

- 4.64. The fifth reason for refusal is:

“The proposed development, by reason of its lack of segregated pedestrian/cycle access into/throughout the site and unsatisfactory siting and layout, would result in an unacceptable co-location of uses which

gives rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the proposed commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of proposed residential occupants. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 4.3 of the London Plan (2016), LP1 (A.6) and LP35(A) of the Local Plan (2018)."

- 4.65. The mix and disposition of the B1 commercial and residential uses is entirely appropriate for the site and this location. This consideration was not raised during the pre-application consultation with LBRuT and is wholly unjustified and unreasonable in the Appellant's view. The proposal is in accordance with planning policy, including LP1 and LP35 of the Richmond Local Plan.
- 4.66. The unreasonableness of the Council's decision is further exacerbated by the LPA seeking to protect a non-conforming waste oil facility use at this site, close to existing residential neighbours.

Transport

- 4.67. The sixth reason for refusal is:

"The proposed development, by reason of its lack of sufficient off-street parking provision, the loss of existing parking spaces on the access road and in the absence of a satisfactory parking survey to demonstrate there is capacity in the surrounding roads to accommodate the likely parking shortfall, would adversely impact on existing on-street parking conditions, the free flow of traffic and pedestrian and vehicular safety on the surrounding highway network. Furthermore, in the absence of a binding agreement to secure the removal of rights to parking permits and provision of car club memberships for prospective occupants, the application would fail to adequately promote sustainable modes of transport. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of policies, in particular, policy LP45 of the Local Plan (2018) and the adopted Front Garden and Other Off-Street Parking, and Planning

Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents.”

- 4.68. The provision of parking proposed accords with the Council’s standards, as well as those set out within the London Plan. The proposal will provide 21 on-site car parking spaces for the proposed 24 residential dwellings and two spaces for the commercial units. The residential provision has been increased following pre-application discussions with officers and discussions with the local community. This provision provides an appropriate balance between enabling adequate parking provision whilst not undermining the use of alternative transport modes. Each residential dwelling will also be provided with a two-year car club membership.
- 4.69. The surrounding area is a Controlled Parking Zone (“CPZ”). The planning application was accompanied by an on-street parking survey, which demonstrated that there is capacity on-street.
- 4.70. In any event, the Appellant has offered through a Section 106 obligation to restrict the availability of on-street parking permits for future residents as well as the provision of car club membership
- 4.71. The site is also a short walk from the local centre at St Margaret’s, St Margaret’s Railway Station and local bus services and is therefore considered to be a sustainable location.
- 4.72. As such, it will be demonstrated that the proposals are in accordance with Policy LP45 of the Local Plan; the adopted London Plan and the Council’s SPD on parking.

Carbon offset payment

- 4.73. The seventh reason for refusal is:

“The proposal does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets and in the absence of a binding agreement to secure a financial contribution to a carbon offset payment, the proposal would fail to mitigate the impact of development on the environment. As such, the proposal is contrary the aims and objectives of London Plan Policy 5.2 and Policies LP20 and LP22 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).”

- 4.74. The supporting Sustainability and Energy Statement submitted with the application submission detailed that the residual carbon dioxide emissions are 25.494 tonnes and therefore the carbon offset payment required by the London Plan is £44,089
- 4.75. This reason for refusal can be addressed through a suitably worded planning condition or Section 106 obligation and that this can be agreed through the SOCG. The application is therefore in accordance with national policy, Policy 5.3 and Policy 5.17 of the London Plan and Policy LP20, LP22 and LP24 of the Local Plan.

Play space

- 4.76. The eighth reason for refusal is:

“The proposed development, by reason of its insufficient provision of on-site children's play space, would fail to encourage and promote healthier and more active lifestyles. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy. In particular the proposals would fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policies 3.6 of the London Plan (2011), LP31 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the guidance set out within the Mayor's SPG on Shaping neighbourhoods: Play and Information Recreation (2012) and the LBRUT Planning Obligations SPD (2014).”

- 4.77. Each dwelling within the Appeal Scheme would benefit from outdoor space. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan and policy LP 31 require proposals to include play and informal recreation areas based on the expected child population generated by the scheme and an assessment of future needs. Using the GLA's SPG play space calculation spreadsheet for a 24-unit development, a total of 57.5sqm of play space is required.
- 4.78. Due to the site constraints, it is not practical or feasible to deliver the play space on site. However, the area is well served with parks and gardens which contain play space within a 15 minute walk of the site, including Moormead and Bandy Recreation, Marble Hill Park; Cambridge Gardens and playpark. Richmond Green is also within close proximity to the site.

- 4.79. In accordance with policy LP 31, the Appellant would be willing to make a financial contribution towards the off-site provision of play space within a nearby park/open space to make up any identified and reasonable deficiency. This could be secured by a Section 106 obligation and is expected to be agreed through the SoCG.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Through the submitted application and appeal documents, the Appellant will demonstrate that the proposed development will provide a high quality and fully compatible and sustainable mixed-use development providing a number of planning benefits, including:

- Provision of a high-quality and accessible mixed-use development in a sustainable location within walking distance to St Margaret's Railway Station, St Margaret's Local Centre and Twickenham Town Centre;
- Provision of 24 much-needed new homes, including 8 on-site affordable homes (33%), thereby contributing to LBRuT housing need;
- The previous oil recycling facility/waste use has ceased, thereby presenting significant benefits in terms of residential amenity, sustainability, noise, odour and traffic movements by heavy goods vehicles down narrow residential streets;
- Higher quality and fit for purpose employment floorspace to replace the oil recycling facility and dilapidated commercial units, allowing greater local employment opportunities;
- Sensitive refurbishment of the Buildings of Townscape Merit, which is a clear heritage benefit of the scheme, securing the buildings' viable long term use;
- The provision of policy compliant off-street car and cycle parking thereby encouraging sustainable modes of travel, with the scheme to be permit-free so as to prevent impacts upon the surrounding highway network; and
- Incorporation of high-quality landscaping, particularly at the communal areas, creating a positive environment that integrates with its immediate context.

5.2. In summary, the Appellant will demonstrate that the Appeal Scheme is acceptable on the basis that:

- The site is previously developed land and its redevelopment optimises the use of a

sustainable and under-used site, in accordance with national planning policy aims;

- Makes an effective and efficient use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, whilst safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions, in accordance with national planning policy aims;
- Delivers a provision of new affordable housing that meets the local needs of groups with specific housing requirements, in accordance with national planning policy aims; and
- Delivers a provision of employment land that supports local economic growth and productivity, in accordance with national planning policy aims.

5.3. Specifically, the Appellant will demonstrate the Appeal Scheme is acceptable and would accord with the national, regional and local policies. It will demonstrate that the proposals are in accordance with the Development Plan, as well as emerging policy and the most recent Ministerial Statement on the delivery of housing in London.

5.4. For the reasons outlined in this Statement, the Appeal Scheme should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Appendix 1

18/2714/FUL
ARLINGTON WORKS
23-27 ARLINGTON ROAD
TWICKENHAM

TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE WARD
Contact Officer:
F Dyson

https://www2.richmond.gov.uk/lbrplanning/Planning_CaseNo.aspx?strCASENO=18/2714/FUL



© Crown copyright. All rights reserved. London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames LA 100019441[2019].'- Do not scale '

Application description: Redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of commercial space (B class) within existing Buildings of Townscape Merit plus a new build unit, 24 residential units (5 x 1 bedroom, 12 x 2 bedroom and 7 x 3 bedroom) and associated car parking and landscaping and other works.

Applicant: Sharpe Refinery Service Ltd C/o Indigo Planning

Application received: 10th August 2018

Main development plan policies:

Revised National Planning Policy Framework 2018 (NPPF)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Technical housing standards – nationally described space standards (2015)

London Plan (Adopted March 2016 – Consolidated with alterations since 2011):

1.1 - Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London; 2.6 - Outer London: Vision and strategy; 2.7 - Outer London: Economy; 2.8 - Outer London: Transport; 3.2 - Improving health and addressing health inequalities; 3.3 - Increasing Housing supply; 3.4 - Optimising housing

potential; 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments; 3.6 - Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities; 3.8 - Housing choice; 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities; 3.10 - Definition of affordable housing; 3.11 - Affordable housing targets; 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes; 3.13 - Affordable Housing Thresholds; 4.2 - Offices; 4.3 - Mixed Use Development and Offices; 4.4 - Managing industrial land and premises; 5.1 - Climate change mitigation; 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions; 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction; 5.4 - Retrofitting; 5.5 - Decentralised energy networks; 5.6 - Decentralised energy in development proposals; 5.7 - Renewable energy; 5.9 - Overheating and cooling; 5.10 - Urban Greening; 5.11 - Green roofs and development site environs; 5.12 - Flood risk management; 5.13 - Sustainable drainage; 5.14 - Water quality and wastewater infrastructure; 5.15 - Water use and supplies; 5.16 - Waste net self-sufficiency; 5.17 - Waste Capacity; 5.18 - Construction, excavation and demolition waste; 5.19 - Hazardous Waste; 5.21 - Contaminated land; 6.3 - Assessing effects of development on transport capacity; 6.9 - Cycling; 6.10 - Walking; 6.11 - Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion; 6.12 - Road network capacity; 6.13 - Parking; 7.1 - Lifetime neighbourhoods; 7.2 - An inclusive environment; 7.3 - Designing out crime; 7.4 - Local character; 7.5 - Public realm; 7.6 - Architecture; 7.7 - Location and design of tall and large buildings; 7.8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeology; 7.11 - London view management framework; 7.12 - Implementing the London view management framework; 7.13 - Safety, security and resilience to emergency; 7.14 - Improving air quality; 7.15 - Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes; 7.19 - Biodiversity and access to nature 7.21 - Trees and woodlands; 8.2 - Planning obligations; 8.3 - Community infrastructure levy.

Local Plan – (Adopted 2018):

LP1 - Local Character and Design Quality; LP2 - Building Heights; LP4 - Non-Designated Heritage Asset; LP5 - Views and Vistas LP8 - Amenity and Living Conditions; LP10 - Local Environmental Impacts, Pollution and Land Contamination; LP15 - Biodiversity; LP16 - Trees, Woodlands and Landscape; LP 17 - Green Roofs and Walls; LP20 - Climate Change Adaptation; LP21 - Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage; LP22 - Sustainable Design and Construction; LP23 - Water Resources and Infrastructure; LP24 - Waste Management; LP27 - Local Shops and Services; LP30 - Health and Wellbeing; LP31 - Public Open Space, Play Space, Sport and Recreation; LP34 - New Housing; LP35 - Housing Mix and Standards; LP36 - Affordable Housing; LP39 - Infill, Backland and Backgarden Development; LP40 - Employment and Local Economy; LP41 - Offices; LP42 - Locally important industrial land and business parks; LP44 - Sustainable Travel Choices; LP45 - Parking Standards and Servicing.

West London Waste Plan (WLWP) - (Adopted 2015):

WLWP 2 - Safeguarding and Protection of Existing and Allocated Waste Sites.

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment SPG (October 2014); Affordable Housing and Viability SPG (2017); Character and Context SPG (June 2014); Housing SPG (March 2016); Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and Informal Recreation (September 2012); Sustainable Design and Construction SPG (April 2014); The control of dust and emissions during construction and demolition SPG (July 2014); Land for Industry and Transport (September 2012).

Richmond Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Affordable Housing SPD (March 2014); Buildings of Townscape Merit (2015) Car Club Strategy (2006); Contaminated Land (2003); Design Quality SPD (February 2006); East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance (2016); Housing Optional Technical Standards – internal space standards and inclusive access (update June 2015); Front Garden and other Off-Street Parking Standards (2006); Planning Obligations (in conjunction with Borough CIL - 2014); Nature Conservation and Development (undated); Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements SPD (2015); Residential Development Standards (2010); Security by design

(2002), Small and Medium Housing Sites (2006); Sustainable Construction Checklist Guidance Document SPD (January 2016); Trees: landscape design, planting and care SPG (November 1999); and Trees: legislation and procedure SPG (November 1999).

Summary of Application

The proposed development would result in the redevelopment of an existing waste management site to a non-waste use. As such, in accordance with policy 5.19 of the London Plan (2011), compensatory hazardous waste site provision must be secured in accordance with Policy 5.17H. Whilst the LPA appreciates that identifying capacity locally may be difficult, it is not considered that the information supplied within the application sufficiently identifies that additional compensatory hazardous waste capacity does not exist within the West London waste Plan Area. Therefore, the submitted application does not comply with the requirements of policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan. Furthermore, the submitted information does not identify any agreement or other appropriate means by which suitable compensatory site provision has been secured. As such; the scheme fails to comply with the requirements of Policy 5.17H and 5.19 of the London Plan.

With regard to the loss of an existing Industrial site, the proposal would fail to provide adequate replacement industrial floorspace and result in the unacceptable loss of employment space.

The applicant suggests that the existing site is not compatible to the area given the surrounding residential context. Furthermore; the submitted marketing feasibility report suggests that there would be demand for various small employment units on this site, stating the units as proposed would be "*much sought after and yet very hard to find*" and affordable to purchase for SMEs.

Notwithstanding the above; in this borough, it is common for employment, particularly industrial sites to be within established mixed use or residential areas, because of historic development patterns. This does not provide justification for a change of use, as mitigation can address impacts and constraints such as narrow access, which have been managed by existing occupiers, and therefore do not prevent any future or continued employment use. Until sufficient marketing evidence has been provided, the council maintains an in-principle objection to the loss of industrial floor space.

A residential-led mixed use development is inappropriate given the site's safeguarded use as a waste site. The co-location of commercial units and residential units raises concerns, as it is considered the proposed residential dwellings in this location, with commercial units being situated to the rear of the site would result in an unacceptable juxtaposition of the proposed mix of uses and give rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of residential users.

Whilst the proposed development is not considered to be classified as a taller building; the combined height and footprint of the proposed main residential block's southern elevation would appear overly dominant and fails to fit comfortably within the rhythm of the application site. Additionally, the proposed front elevation would not display the same visual interest as the rear elevation and with little vertical emphasis over four-storeys; would be unsuccessful in breaking-up the mass and scale of the proposed building. As such; the front elevation of the proposed main building would appear visually dominant and incompatible due to the constrained nature of the application site. Furthermore, by virtue of the scale, height and siting of the proposed main residential block and the siting and height of the proposed smaller residential block, it is considered that the proposals would introduce new built

elements to the application site that would be overly dominant and inharmonious with regard to the non-designated heritage assets on the site.

The proposed unit mix would meet the Council's aspirations. The scheme would deliver an acceptable proportion of smaller sized units, appropriate for a mixed-use area. The proposed development would meet all relevant residential space standards and the provision for private and communal amenity space would, on balance, meet the needs of the proposed development. All units would have acceptable levels of daylight/sunlight, privacy and outlook. The proposed development does not include any on-site provision of play space. Whilst the applicant seeks to rely on the nearby parks and public open space to justify this shortfall; it is noted that the nearest park, being Marble Hill Park is located approximately 700m from the application site and therefore; on-site provision is required in order to accord with the aims and objectives of Policy LP31 of the Local Plan and the Planning Obligations SPD.

The proposed affordable housing provision of eight on site shared ownership units does not comply with policy requirements, as it below the percentage required, and does not meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The Council's Housing Officer has raised further detailed concerns, as discussed within the body of this report. Following multiple independent reviews of the submitted viability assessment, subsequent reports and the lack of evidence of any engagement with Registered Providers; the LPA is not satisfied that the proposed scheme, with the inclusion eight shared ownership units, represents the best viable option for the site and it is not considered that the maximum reasonable contribution to affordable housing would be achieved

Given the distance to the nearest residential properties, the existing site configuration and the inclusion of appropriate mitigation measures, the proposal would not result in any significant material impact in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties.

The submitted parking beat survey has been conducted incorrectly whereby the results are based on on-street parking bays being 5.0m in length. The Richmond Council methodology to parking beat surveys specifies that the length of individual parking bays should be measured as 5.50m. As such, the submitted Transport Assessment fails to accurately identify that the shortfall of 10 off-street parking spaces could successfully be accommodated on-street. Additional concern is raised regarding the rearrangement of existing parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios within the access road to the application site. Given the existing circumstance on-site; the proposed alterations to the Twickenham Film Studios parking area would result in the loss of approximately 12 off-street parking spaces which presently serve an existing and established employment use within the adjacent site. The submitted application fails to address these concerns and does not provide any substantial evidence that the loss of approximately 12 parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios would not contribute to a more than severe impact on the existing operation, safety or accessibility of the Local Highway Network.

The potential environmental effects associated with the required demolition and construction works have been adequately identified and assessed, with proposals for their mitigation clearly outlined. Demolition and construction works would be managed under controlling documents, to be secured through planning conditions (Air Quality and Dust Management Plan, Construction Method Statement, Monitoring regime (excavation)).

The development would adopt a number of sustainable features; however, it does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets and in the absence of a completed S.106 agreement securing a financial contribution of £28,102.00 to the Council's carbon offset fund to mitigate the impact of development on the environment, the proposals would fail to comply with policy LP20 and LP22 of the Local Plan.

The proposed landscaping would include a more natural landscape around the proposed buildings (compared to the existing on-site circumstance), which, on balance, is considered to be an overall enhancement to the site with regard to landscaping. However, the application does not include any green roofs and/or walls as part of the proposals. It is set out within policy LP17 that the onus is on applicants to provide evidence and justification if a green roof cannot be incorporated.

The proposal has been considered in the light of the Development Plan, comments from statutory consultees, third parties including appointed external specialist consultants, the National Planning Policy Framework and compliance with Supplementary Planning Guidance as appropriate. It has been concluded that the proposal would fail to accord with the Development Plan and where there are material compliances, the planning assessment by officers has considered that these other overriding planning considerations as highlighted above should be attached greater weight. Therefore, the benefits of the proposed scheme would not overcome the harm identified as a result of the proposals and the planning application should be refused.

Recommendation: REFUSE

Site, Surroundings and Constraints

1. The application site is owned and occupied by Sharpe Refinery Service Ltd. The site refers to 'Arlington Works' and adjoins the railway approximately 80m to the north east of St Margarets Station. Twickenham Film Studios is situated to the south-west and Kelvin Court (flats) is sited to the east. The site is situated to the north of but is not located within the St Margarets Conservation Area. The site comprises a collection of industrial buildings for an oil refinery and associated waste oil recycling, manufacturing, vehicle repair and storage. The site also accommodates two Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM's) which are situated to the south west. It lies to the north eastern side of Twickenham Studios which covers the area adjacent to the railway line from St Margarets Road to the junction between Arlington Road and Arlington Close.
2. The site is irregular in shape with the railway line to the north west. It is approximately 77.5m long and 40m wide, narrowing to approximately 20m wide at the southern boundary with Twickenham Studios. The site covers a total area of approximately 3,030m² (0.303Ha), including the access driveway.
3. At present, the site wholly covered with either the buildings' footprints or hardstanding. The existing site comprises two late Victorian terraced buildings (designated as Buildings of Townscape Merit) to the southwest corner, which face inwards towards each other, separated by a cobbled mews/stable yard. The application sets out that these buildings previously provided stables, coach houses and tack/feed store rooms with ancillary residential rooms to the first floor as accommodation for the grooms and their families. The existing terraces are constructed of yellow stock brick (now heavily soiled) with large black stained/painted timber coach house/stable doors at ground level and painted timber sliding sash windows at first floor level.
4. A linear, single storey corrugated steel-clad workshop building, extends north eastwards from the rear of the eastern (BTM) terrace, and at present, is still occupied by tenants.

5. The site also currently accommodates a telecommunications mast and a series of oil storage tanks and associated machinery.
6. The northern boundary of the site abuts the rear garage parking court of the adjacent post war (circa 1950s-1960s block of flats) Howmic Court, which is defined by an existing approximately 2.0m high brick wall within the main area of the application site; with a low level wall with open metal wired fencing and screen planting sited on the common boundary with Howmic Court along the access driveway from Arlington Road.
7. The southern and eastern boundaries are primarily defined by the flank walls of the Twickenham Studios buildings and extend across the currently open car parking areas, subdivided from the application site by close boarded timber fencing.
8. The western boundary of the application site is bound by the railway line, with the nearest track set approximately 7.5m from the boundary.
9. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3, which is defined by the London Plan as 'moderate'. The nearest bus stops are located on St Margarets Road, serviced by six bus routes (33; 390; R68; R70; H22 and H37) which are approximate walk times from the application site of 7.5 minutes. St Margarets train station is approximately 530m from the application site (approximate walk time of 8 minutes).
10. The application site falls within the St Margarets Area of Mixed Use (AMU) and is designated as an existing waste site, which is safeguarded in the West London Waste Plan (2015) (site: Sharpes Oil, Arlington Works).
11. The site is situated within Flood Zone 1, however, parts of the surrounding area fall within Flood Zone 2, particularly Howmic Court to the north. The area to the north-west of the adjacent railway is situated within Flood Zone 3.
12. The site falls within the Ravensbourne Road and Surrounds Character Area under the East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance, which describes Arlington Road as follows:
The east side of Arlington Road is made up of semi-detached houses of a regular design with inset, round-headed porches and rendered elevations. They appear to have originally had pebble-dash rendered facades which in many cases have been replaced with stucco. Many of the timber casement windows have been replaced with uPVC. The front boundary walls have not survived as well as those on Ellesmere Road; most front gardens have been fully converted to parking. On the west side are blocks of flats from the first half of the twentieth century. By and large, these are fairly unremarkable, but some have attractive Deco detailing. One of these blocks is built of multi-coloured brick and is of an earlier date than the others. The ground floors of the flats are below street level, at the height of a normal basement. On the west side of this junction stands an attractive Victorian house built from gault brick. This street also has wide pavements with tree lined streets, with the perception that they were originally laid out with grass verges that have been subsequently tarmacked over. The pavements here too are a haphazard mixture of materials.
13. In terms of heritage designations, the site falls within an archaeological priority zone, however it does not fall within a Conservation Area, nor does it relate to any statutorily Listed Buildings. The site is not located within any strategic views designated in the London Plan however it is situated within the locally protected views from Petersham Part to Twickenham and from Terrace Garden to South West Twickenham.
14. The nearest listed buildings:

- St Margaret’s Catholic Church (65m to the south west)
- Downes House (100m to the south west)

Relevant planning history

15. There is an extensive planning history related to this site. The most relevant include:

Ref	Proposal	Decision	Dec Date
01/3045	Installation Of A 13m High Column, 6 Antenna And 4 Dishes. Additionally Ten Equipment Cabinets To Be Installed At Ground Level Adjacent To Pole Along Length Of Security Fence.	Granted Permission	03/01/2002
59/0883	Installation of fuel storage tanks.	Granted Permission	22/10/1959
47/1511	Their use for light industry. (textile printing).	Granted Permission	15/05/1950
47/0267	Its use for light industry.	Granted Permission	13/12/1948

Proposal

16. This application proposes the demolition of the existing waste treatment facilities and the redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of commercial space (B class) within the existing Buildings of Townscape Merit and an additional new build unit, erection of 24 residential units (5 x 1 bedroom, 12 x 2 bedroom and 7 x 3 bedroom) and associated car parking and landscaping.



Figure 1 - CGI of proposed scheme overview looking south-west

Commercial Space

17. The two existing Victorian buildings situated to the south west of the site (BTM(s)), are proposed to be retained and refurbished in order to provide 610sqm of commercial floorspace. It is proposed that the BTM sited adjacent to the railway line is extended at ground and first-floor level to create an additional commercial unit within the southwestern corner of the application site.

Residential Space

18. The proposed development would provide residential units within two separate buildings. The main block is situated to the northern corner of the site and comprises twenty residential units. The smaller block, is situated adjoining the rear elevation of the existing eastern BTM, comprises four residential units.

Communal Space

19. The proposed development would provide a combination of hard and soft landscaping across the redeveloped site. The majority of the proposed communal areas would constitute hard landscaping to provide vehicular access and parking to both the residential units and the commercial units. To the rear of the main residential block there would be approximately 115sqm of communal external amenity space, to the rear of the smaller residential block; it is proposed to provide approximately 175sqm of communal external amenity space. The scheme would not provide any children's play space.



Figure 2 - General Site Layout

Design, scale, layout and appearance:

20. The proposal introduces two new buildings to the site; a larger part three/part four-storey building with a broadly rectangular-shaped footprint, sited to the north west of the application site parallel to the adjacent railway line. An additional, smaller three-storey building, adjoining the rear elevation of the eastern BTM is proposed to be constructed within the south eastern corner of the site. The top floors of both residential; buildings

would be at the respective roof levels and accommodate residential floor space. The arrangement of the buildings would allow for the provision of vehicular access and parking through the site, with communal amenity space at the rear of the proposed residential blocks.

21. The primary facade of the larger block, would comprise a varied building line with recessed communal entrances at ground-floor level and projecting balconies at ground, first and second-floor levels. Roof-space accommodation is proposed to be facilitated through a recessed fourth-floor level. The main block would accommodate 20 residential units; with all 20 flats arranged on single levels and accessed via two separate cores (2-3 units per core). Both cores can be accessed from ground-floor level within the front and rear elevations.



Figure 3 – Front elevation: Main Residential Block



Figure 4 – Rear elevation: Main Residential Block

22. The proposed smaller building would be three-storeys in height and would accommodate four additional dwelling units (2no. at ground-floor level and 2no. duplex units across first and second-floor level) and would follow a similar design approach to the main residential block, faced in the same yellow London stock brickwork, interspersed with similar vertical proportioned recessed metal panels and similar fenestration arrangements. The top floor would also comprise of a zinc clad roof with an unvarying rectangular form. Unlike the main residential block; the smaller building would not feature front projecting balconies to its front elevation and would include roof terraces at first-floor level to the rear elevation.




Figure 5 – Front elevation: Smaller Residential Building Figure 6 - Rear elevation: Smaller Residential Building

23. The proposed extension to the existing western BTM would follow the same style and scale as the existing building; with similar external facing materials. The conversion works to the existing BTMs would provide duplex commercial units, each serviced via separate access.



Figure 7 – Front elevation: Proposed two-storey extension to BTM

24. Materials to include: Yellow London stock brick to main front and rear elevations; zinc metal cladding to roof and partial elements of external elevations; grey metallic finish window and door frames (to residential blocks); black stained/painted timber coach house/stable doors and painting timber sash windows for existing BTMs.

Use and amount:

25. Residential: The residential component of the development would include 24 residential flatted units. The residential mix would be formed of 1, 2 and 3-bedroom unit types, at a variety of dwelling sizes. All units are designed to be compliant to meet at least Building Regulation requirement Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings', with three of the total units designed to be compliant to meet at least Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' (wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users).
26. The proposal provides private amenity space to 22 of the 24 proposed dwellings (ranging from 8.8sq.m - 35.7sq.m). The two ground-floor flats within the proposed smaller block would not include private amenity space. In addition to this, a combined total of approximately 290sq.m shared landscaped private communal amenity areas are proposed to be located to the rear of the two proposed residential buildings.
27. The shared landscaped private communal garden would not comprise any plays pace.
28. The proposals include four affordable units on site. This level of provision equates to equates to 17% affordable units out of the total 24 proposed dwellings. According to the submitted Planning Statement the proposed affordable units are within the small

residential block to the south of the application site – units 21, 22, 23 and 24. This block comprises 2no. two-bed three-person flats both of which would have a gross internal area of 62m² and 2no. three-bed four-person duplex flats, with a total gross internal area of 101m². These units are proposed as shared ownership.

29. This does not comply with policy requirements, as it below the percentage required, and does not meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The Council's housing officer has raised further detailed concerns. The 3 bed units significantly exceed national design standards (84 sqm) and therefore involve unnecessary construction costs and their size would also impact on affordability as shared ownership homes. Applying the assumed values results in required household incomes of £58k and £72k respectively. Thus as proposed, none of the shared ownership units offered would meet the affordability criteria in the Intermediate Housing Policy.

Table 1 - Proposed Dwellings Size by type per building:

Unit Type	Number	Size's (GIA sq. m)
Large Residential Block (20 flats)		
One-bedroom (1B2P)	5	51
Two-bedroom (2B3P)	5	62-74
Two-bedroom (2B4P)	5	76-78
Three-bedroom (3B4P)	5	76
Total	20	
Smaller Residential Block (4 flats)		
Two-bedroom (2B3P)	2	62
Three-bedroom (two-storey) (3B4P)	2	101
Total	4	

30. Commercial: the existing BTMs are proposed to be converted at extended to provide five, two-storey commercial units. Units 1-4 would provide 134sq.m and unit 5 would provide 75sq.m. The proposed commercial units would feature a B1 use class as set out on the proposed site plan.

Residential Density:

31. The site is situated within an area identified as a Mixed-Use Area and can be defined as being urban.
 Site Area = 0.303ha
 Habitable rooms/ha = 149hrph
 Units/ha = 79.2

Sustainability

32. It is proposed that through the combination of passive design measures (enhanced fabric efficiency of the building envelope, passive solar gain, natural daylighting, air leakage, *inter alia*), active design (efficient air, lighting and plant systems) and renewable energy technologies (photovoltaics and air source heat pumps) results in the development would achieve a 35.16% reduction over the 2013 Building Regulation standards. The reduction in emissions from renewable technologies would equate to 27.29%.
33. The residual carbon dioxide emissions have been calculated as 25.494 tonnes. Therefore, the applicant has offered a zero-carbon payment to offset the surplus CO₂ the development will produce amounts over a 30-year period in the amount of £44,089, which falls short of the required £45,889.20.
34. The commercial units would achieve the required BREEAM 'Excellent' rating.

Vehicle and Cycle Parking:

35. Vehicular and cycle access would be provided from Arlington Road via the existing private site access road.
36. The proposals would provide 21 residential car parking spaces with 3 being suitable for disabled parking, 2 commercial car parking spaces (23 car parking spaces in total), 42 residential bicycle parking spaces and 8 commercial bicycle parking spaces. The proposal therefore includes the provision of 50 bicycle parking spaces in total.
37. Six car parking spaces would be equipped with active charging facilities (29% of total provision), no detail has been provided regarding passive provision. Three car parking spaces would be designed to be used by people with disabilities.

Refuse and Recycling Storage Strategy:

38. It is proposed that commercial and residential refuse and recycling will be stored in separate designated storage areas.
39. The proposed residential refuse and recycling areas would be accommodated at ground floor level within the northern elevation of the main block. An additional smaller residential refuse storage facility would be provided within the south eastern corner of the application site; servicing the smaller residential block. The commercial units would be serviced by refuse/recycling storage unit sited on the south western boundary.
40. All refuse collection and deliveries are proposed to be accommodated off-street, with vehicles entering and existing the development site in forward gear.

Public Representations

41. Letters were sent to 91 neighbouring properties on 30/08/2018, and a site notice was placed near the application site and an advertisement was placed in the local newspaper.
42. 17 letters of objection (duplicate objections were only counted once) and 1 letter of support were received during the course of the application.
43. The material planning considerations raised are summarised below:

Objection:

Principal

- Change of use away from industrial is not supported by policy
- No robust and compelling evidence has been provided demonstrating that there is no longer demand for industrial use in this location
- Proposed mix of uses is incompatible with paragraph 80 & 82 of the NPPF
- Overdevelopment of the site; a row of terraced housing would be more appropriate;
- Surrounding area is already densely populated;
- Proposed development should greater provide on-site affordable housing;

Neighbour amenity

- Increased noise and disruption associated with de-contamination and construction would detract from residential amenity;
- Loss of privacy and increased overlooking of nearby residential buildings and gardens.

Transport

- Inadequate parking provision, resulting in overspill into the surrounding residential streets;
- Proposed development will remove access to Twickenham Film Studios; increasing traffic within surrounding locality;

- Even with restricted access to parking permits - this would not be enforced outside of CPZ hours;

Impact on public services:

- Increased pressure on community trains which are already at capacity;
- Increased pressure on local schools which are already at capacity (new schools are being built to cope with existing demand)

Other

- Increased noise and disruption during construction would impact operations of adjacent Twickenham Film Studios

Support:

- Existing industrial use is incompatible with the surrounding residential area;
- Present situation results in noise and odour impacts on surrounding residential occupants

44. West London Waste Plan Boroughs:

London Borough of Brent:

No objection received.

London Borough of Ealing:

No objection received.

London Borough of Harrow:

No objection received.

London Borough of Hounslow:

No objection received.

London Borough of Hillingdon:

No objection received.

Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC)

The application site is identified as a site in existing waste management use in Appendix 2 of the adopted West London Waste Plan (WLWP) and that the policies in the WLWP apply to this proposal. As such, OPDC object to the proposal unless compensatory provision for waste is provided in line with policy WLWP2.

45. **Historic England (Archaeology):** Having considered the proposals with reference to information held in the Greater London Historic Environment Record and/or made available in connection with this application, the proposal could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is needed to determine appropriate mitigation. Although the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination; in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that a two-stage archaeological condition could provide an acceptable safeguard.
46. **Environment Agency (EA):** There is currently a permitted activity on the site and prior to any redevelopment occurring the current permit is required to be surrendered. As part of the surrender process of the permit, the operator who holds the permit, will need to demonstrate that the site has been left in a satisfactory state. Given the current condition of the site we insist that it is the responsibility of the current operator to remediate the site to a pre agreed level and not the applicant for the proposed development at this location.

47. With regards to the proposed new development at this site location we consider that planning permission should only be granted to the proposed development as submitted, provided conditions relating to remediation, contamination, no drainage of surface water, details of piling are requested.
48. **Thames Water:** On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water network and water treatment infrastructure capacity; no objection is raised to the proposed development.

Internal Council Consultees:

49. **Ecology:** No objections subject to conditions requesting details of lighting, planting specs and maintenance plans and ecological enhancements.
50. **Transport:** No objection to application, however more detail of parking arrangements required, pre-commencement condition requiring submission of full Construction Method Statement required; to include detail of routes to and from site.
51. **Trees:** As the existing trees on site are unaffected, no objection to the proposal is raised. However, concerns raised regarding the soft landscaping provision (17% of the overall site) and the limited space to plant architectural trees likely to provide some amenity and longevity value for the site.
52. **Environmental Health (Contamination):** Council records and the Phase 1 desktop study and phase 2 site investigation reports submitted, identify that onsite potential sources of contamination include the current and historical land uses associated with the oil recycling centre (oil tanks, waste storage areas etc.) while offsite potential sources of contamination include the adjacent Motor Works and Film Studios.
53. Given the current use of the site and the sensitivity of the proposed development, it is recommended that the standard contaminated land condition is attached to any planning permission granted. It is considered that the submitted report is sufficient for the purposes of discharging part 1a of the recommended condition. Given that further intrusive investigation is required, it is not recommended the remaining parts of the condition are discharged at this time.
54. **Environmental Health (Air Quality):** No in principal objections to the proposed development subject to air quality mitigation and control conditions being implemented. Section 106 contribution of £15,000 required for Council work to improve air quality in the negatively impacted Richmond AQFA (Bridge Street and beyond).
55. **Environmental Health (Commercial):** No in principal objections to the proposed development subject to conditions attached to any planning permission requiring detail on mechanical services noise control, new residential development noise control, new commercial development noise control, CMS required to include detail on noise and vibration.
56. **Environmental Health (Non-commercial):** No principal objections to the proposed development.
57. **Lead Local Flood Authority (Surface water drainage):** no risk of flooding from Thames or Reservoirs and not within Environment Agency breach models for 2010. Some potential for groundwater flooding. Floor levels will be above ground level to mitigate local flooding. Resilience measures not required. There are no flooding related issues in this application.

Independent Specialist Consultants:

Climate Integrated Solutions (CIS) (Independent Sustainability Consultant):

58. Energy and CO2: A site wide reduction in emissions of 35.16% has been reported. The report does not provide figures for the residential and non-residential areas separately. Under the London Plan, both the residential and non-residential areas are required to reach a 35% reduction at the Be Green stage. Conditions required on any permission granted requiring detail of a revised Energy Strategy where appropriate, written in line with the London Plan Energy Hierarchy and Cooling Hierarchy.
59. Energy Modelling Calculations: A sample of the dwellings have been modelled in SAP software and a sample of the non-residential areas have been modelled in SBEM software. Copies of the calculations have been provided for the Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green stages.
60. Energy Efficiency Measures (Be Lean): Details of the proposed specification have been provided. A site wide reduction of 10.83% has been reported at this stage. This is an 18.59% reduction for the non-residential and 7.36% reduction for the residential.
61. Energy Supply (Be Clean): CHP has been found unsuitable which is as expected for a development of this size. Communal heating and designing for a future district heat network do not appear to have been included.
62. Renewable Energy (Be Green): The applicant has confirmed ASHP's are proposed. Potential details have been provided. A 19.8kWp solar PV array has been proposed. Panels will be at a pitch of 15 degrees facing south west. It is assumed the electricity generated will supply communal areas. The panels will be connected to the landlord's meter. A site wide reduction of 35.16% has been reported at this stage.
63. Carbon offset payment: The payment has been shown as £28,102 to account for 15.612 tonnes/yr over a 30 year period.
64. Overheating: Residential risk of overheating is shown as medium. The applicant is encouraged to reduce this. The measures implemented at each stage of the cooling hierarchy do not appear to have been outlined. The applicant has stated the results do not change. This is not the same as detailing the measures which have been incorporated into the design. The report addresses risk of overheating for these areas, due to the small openings the applicant is not proposing to carry out dynamic thermal modelling. This is acceptable for a development of this size. Further details of measures implemented at each stage of the cooling hierarchy required.
65. BREEAM: A BREEAM pre-assessment has been provided for the non-residential areas. This shows an Excellent rating with a score of 71.85%. The applicant is encouraged to increase the buffer of credits or identify back up credits. The pre-assessment includes no notes regarding the assumptions made. Condition necessary requiring submission of BREEAM Final (post-construction) certificate.
66. Green Roof: Due to the presence of solar PV panels and the need to use a ballasted system the applicant has stated a green roof will not be possible. Whilst solar PV panels and green roofs can work well together the ballasted system could make this difficult.
67. Residential water use: The report states an internal water use of 105L/person/day will be targeted. An example of how this could be achieved has been provided.

68. Sustainable Construction Checklist (SCC): A copy of the checklist has been completed. This shows a score of 60 – a B rating for the non-residential elements and an A rating for the dwellings.

Bespoke Property Consultants (BPC) (Independent development viability assessors):

69. The applicant's appraisal (produced by Grimshaw Consulting) and their subsequent reports have been independently reviewed by BPC. Details of the discussions are covered in the Affordable Housing section of the report.

Amendments

70. Revised elevation drawings received including revised (enlarged) fenestration openings to ensure sufficient sunlighting and daylighting of proposed dwellings.
71. No public re-consultation carried out on the revisions received.

Professional comments

72. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
73. The main considerations material to the assessment of this application have been summarised as follows:
- Principle of development (Land use),
 - Financial viability and affordable housing,
 - Backland Development, design, external appearance and height,
 - Impact on heritage assets (both designated and non-designated),
 - Density,
 - Housing mix, standard of accommodation and play space,
 - Impact on Neighbours,
 - Highways and Transportation,
 - Sustainability and Energy,
 - Flood Risk,
 - Arboriculture,
 - Biodiversity and trees,
 - Contamination,
 - Waste Management,
 - Archaeology,
 - Other Matters
 - Community Infrastructure Levy

Principle of development (Land use)

Loss of Safeguarded Waste Site

74. *Each borough has been allocated an amount of London's waste that it is required to positively plan for and manage. This includes ensuring that sufficient capacity is identified to meet the apportioned targets in the London Plan (2011). London Plan Policy 5.17 (Waste capacity) sets out within sections F, G and H that;*
- F - Boroughs must allocate sufficient land and identify waste management facilities to provide capacity to manage the tonnages of waste apportioned in this Plan. Boroughs may wish to collaborate by pooling their apportionment requirements.*
- G - Land to manage borough waste apportionments should be brought forward through:*

- a) protecting and facilitating the maximum use of existing waste sites, particularly waste transfer facilities and landfill sites
- b) identifying sites in strategic industrial locations (see Policy 2.17)
- c) identifying sites in locally significant employment areas (see Policy 4.4)
- d) safeguarding wharves (in accordance with policy 7.26) with an existing or future potential for waste management

H - If, for any reason, an existing waste management site is lost to non-waste use, an additional compensatory site provision will be required that normally meets the maximum throughput that the site could have achieved."

75. In addition to the above; London Plan Policy 5.19 (Hazardous Waste) sets out that development proposals that would result in the loss of existing sites for the treatment and/or disposal of hazardous waste should not be permitted unless compensatory hazardous waste site provision has been secured in accordance with Policy 5.17H. This is with the objective of achieving waste net self-sufficiency in London, details of which are set out in the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.
76. It is prudent to note that the latest draft London Plan including Minor Changes is more explicit on the release of existing waste sites
Draft London Plan Policy SI9 (Safeguarded waste sites) states that:
- a) Existing waste sites should be safeguarded and retained in waste management use.
 - b) Waste facilities located in areas identified for non-waste related development should be integrated with other uses as a first principle where they deliver clear local benefits.
 - c) Waste plans should be adopted before considering the loss of waste sites. The proposed loss of an existing waste site will only be supported where appropriate compensatory capacity is made within London that must at least meet, and should exceed, the maximum achievable throughput of the site proposed to be lost.
77. Furthermore; paragraph 9.9.2 of the Draft London Plan sets out that any waste site release should be part of a plan-led process, rather than on an ad-hoc basis.
78. The PPG on Waste states that, "WPAs should have regard to the apportionments set out in the London Plan when developing their policies. The Local Waste Plan will need to be in general conformity with the London Plan". Adopted Local Plan Policy LP24 - Waste Management states that proposals affecting existing waste management sites, as well as proposals for new or additional waste management facilities will be assessed against the policies of the West London Waste Plan (2015).
79. Prepared jointly by the six west London boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hounslow, Hillingdon, Richmond upon Thames and the Old Oak and Park Royal Development Corporation (OPDC), the West London Waste Plan (WLWP) identifies and safeguards sufficient sites for waste management facilities in the area to satisfy the waste apportionment targets established in the London Plan (2011). These were selected through a rigorous process lasting a number of years where the public and industry were invited to express their opinions and suggest suitable sites. Site no. 335 is the existing 0.23ha Arlington Works, in Richmond upon Thames.
80. With particular reference to Arlington Works, Appendix 2 on page 78 of the WLWP identifies this site (Operator: Sharpes Recycle Oil Ltd, Facility: Arlington Oil Reclamation Facility) as an existing waste management site in West London. The WLWP also makes it clear that this site counts against the apportionment figure. The relevant policy in relation to existing waste management sites is WLWP 2 – Safeguarding and Protection of Existing and Allocated Waste Sites. This policy states that land accommodating existing waste management uses in West London will be protected for continued use for waste management. The safeguarding of these sites is required as they form an essential

resource for dealing with all waste streams within the Waste Plan area. This policy ensures general conformity with Policy 5.17 G (a) and paragraph 5.82 of the London Plan (2011).

81. *To ensure no loss in existing capacity, re-development of any existing waste management sites must ensure that the quantity of waste to be managed is equal to or greater than the quantity of waste for which the site is currently permitted to manage, or that the management of the waste is being moved up the waste hierarchy.*
82. *Development for non-waste uses will only be considered on land in existing waste management use, (or land allocated in Table 5-2) if compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste, in scale and quality, is made elsewhere within the West London Boroughs.*
83. A report has been submitted accompanying the application (prepared by Waterman Infrastructure and Environment, ref:WIE12815-100-R-3-4-1-WasteUseRpt); which contends that, when interpreting policy WLWP-2; it would be a reasonable approach to assume that, an existing waste site can be redeveloped for a non-waste use prior to the actual delivery of compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste elsewhere within the West London Boroughs. With the suggested rationale being that over the course of the WLWP period (2031); appropriate compensation can be provided over the plan period. Severe concerns are raised by the Local Planning Authority at this approach; as it would be irresponsible of the Council's applying the WLWP to take such an approach, as there is no substantive evidence provided as part of this application which prevents the approach set out in the Waterman report from being anything other than arbitrary.
84. The Waterman report also suggests that the size and scale of the Arlington Works facility is insufficient to support the waste management facility types identified in a research study from 2004, nor the West London Waste Plan. The Waterman report also outlines that the site scored poorly in independent studies undertaken for the WLWP and that the application site is not considered by the WLWP to have potential for development as a waste management facility.
85. Notwithstanding the above; it is prudent to note that the LPA is guided by the Development Plan unless other material considerations justify departing from the aims and objectives of adopted policy. The West London Waste Plan (adopted 2015); was concluded to provide an appropriate basis for waste planning in the west London boroughs over the next 17 years, providing a number of modifications are made to the Plan in order to be made sound. Within paragraph 66 of the Inspector's Report on the examination into the West London Waste Plan, the Inspector concluded that the methodology adopted for site selection was perfectly reasonable.
86. Further to the above, appendix 2 on page 78 of the WLWP identifies this site (Operator: Sharpes Recycle Oil Ltd, Facility: Arlington Oil Reclamation Facility) as an existing waste management site in West London. The WLWP also makes it clear that this site counts against the apportionment figure. This policy requires the safeguarding of these sites (as set out in Appendix 2) as they form an essential resource for dealing with all waste streams within the Waste Plan area. This policy ensures general conformity with Policy 5.17 G (a) and paragraph 5.82 of the London Plan (2011). Note that Policy WLWP 3 provides support for waste development proposals on existing waste management sites. Therefore, it is clear that in line with the WLWP, existing waste management sites should be protected and safeguarded for waste use. The WLWP has been adopted in 2015 and has been produced and adopted in co-operation with other boroughs, including the OPDC, and the designation of Arlington Waste Works as an existing waste management site can only be considered as part of a review into the WLWP, together with the other

LPA. This approach was accepted by the Planning Inspectorate during the Examination in Public of the Richmond Local Plan (2018).

87. The application is for proposed redevelopment of the site away from the existing waste use. As such; the application is required by policy, to demonstrate that sufficient compensatory site provision has been secured elsewhere at appropriate sites before release may be considered.
88. In England, if a firm receives, treats or disposes of hazardous waste at a premise; it must acquire an environmental permit or register an exemption, and send consignee returns to the Environment Agency. The waste producer or holder must report on any hazardous waste they accept or reject.
89. Environment Agency data shows that, over the past three years; on average, 10,512.462 tonnes of waste were deposited for hazardous waste transfer by Sharpe's recycle Oil Ltd. at Arlington Works.

Table 2: Environment Agency Waste Data Interrogator data for Sharpe's Recycle Oil Limited

2015	2016	2017	Average
8,445.671	9,687.794	13,403.92	10,512.462

90. During pre-application enquiry 16/P0327/PREAPP; in an email dated 26th February 2018; the planning agent sought clarification from the LPA that, '*...the capacity for Arlington Works (12,000 tonnes) could be compensated by additional capacity for 12,000 tonnes of another hazardous waste stream*' [sic]. Based on the above; the Council accepts that should available capacity up to 12,000 tonnes of hazardous waste be available within the West London Waste Plan area; the redevelopment of the Arlington Works site for non-waste purposes could be considered acceptable, subject to compliance with other policies within the development plan.
91. The submitted waste report (prepared by Waterman), claims to have identified over 20,000 tonnes of unexploited hazardous waste capacity at sites within the WLWP area. Whilst it is accepted that the Arlington oil refinery operations are generally of a small scale and is being run down by the owners; it is still necessary that suitable compensatory capacity is afforded within the WLWP area prior to redevelopment. The applicant's suggested hazardous waste sites in the area include:
 - 1 Associated Reclaimed Oils - Royal Borough of Greenwich;
 - 2 Brent Oil Contractors - London Borough of Brent;
 - 3 Heathrow Airport Ltd - London Borough of Hillingdon; and
 - 4 Williams Environmental - London Borough of Newham.
92. The submitted report claims that Brent Oil contractors are in the WLWP area and have around 1,978 tonnes of spare capacity on average, with which the LPA agrees. However, the other sites oil reclamation facilities are not within the WLWP area (Associated Reclaimed Oils and Williams Environmental). Furthermore, the Heathrow Airport Ltd. facilities in Cranford Lane, Hillingdon is a non-hazardous waste transfer station and is not considered as an appropriate site to absorb waste deposited for hazardous waste transfer by Sharpe's Oil Recycle Ltd.
93. In light of the above; it is not considered that the application identifies that there is sufficient capacity within the West London Waste Plan area to accommodate the change of use of the application site away from the existing waste management facility. The significant majority of unexploited capacity within the WLWP area identified within the

submitted Waterman report is for non-hazardous construction, demolition and excavation waste management.

94. Whilst the LPA appreciates that identifying capacity locally may be difficult, it is not considered that the information supplied within the Waterman report sufficiently identifies that additional compensatory hazardous waste capacity does not exist within the West London waste Plan Area. Therefore, the submitted application does not comply with the requirements of policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan. Furthermore, the submitted report does not identify any agreement or other appropriate means by which suitable compensatory site provision has been secured. As such; the scheme fails to comply with the requirements of Policy 5.17H and 5.19 of the London Plan.
95. The Local Planning Authority does not consider that the applicant's contention that assuming an existing waste site can be redeveloped for a non-waste use prior to the actual delivery of compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste elsewhere within the West London Boroughs is a reasonable approach to planning in this regard. Furthermore, whilst it is acknowledged that finding sufficient capacity locally may be fairly difficult, however the submitted information is not considered sufficient to justify change of use away from the existing waste management use of the application site.
96. In light of the above, there is an in-principle objection to the proposed change of use away from the existing safeguarded waste site. The scheme is contrary to policy and, in particular, would fail to meet the requirements of policies SI9 of the Draft London Plan, 5.17 and 5.19 of the London Plan (2016), policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan (2015) and LP24 of the Local Plan (2018).

Loss of Industrial Floorspace

97. *London Plan policy 4.14 Managing Industrial Land and Premises and Land for Industry and Transport SPG. Policy 4.14 of the adopted London Plan categorises LBRuT as Restricted Transfer of Industrial land to other uses. The draft London Plan is stricter, placing Richmond in the Retain Capacity category for the management of industrial floor space capacity.*
98. *Research for the GLA indicates that there will be positive net demand for industrial land in London over the period 2016 to 2041. Draft Policy E4 states "A sufficient supply of land and premises in different parts of London to meet current and future demands for industrial and related functions should be maintained". It goes on to state that "low-cost industrial and related space for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (see also Policy E2 Low-cost business space) taking into account strategic and local employment land reviews, industrial land audits and the potential for intensification, co-location and substitution (see Policy E7 Intensification, co-location and substitution of land for industry, logistics and services to support London's economic function)."*
99. *Following the unplanned loss of industrial premises and the increased demand for industrial land the Mayor is seeking no net loss of industrial floor space capacity across London.*
100. *Adopted Local Plan Policy LP42 (Industrial Land and Business Parks) states that, the borough has a very limited supply of industrial floorspace and demand for this type of land is high. Therefore; the Council will protect, and where possible enhance, the existing stock of industrial premises to meet local needs.*
101. *With regard to retention of industrial floorspace; the policy sets out that there is a presumption against loss of industrial land in all parts of the borough. Loss of industrial space will only be permitted where:*

- *Robust and compelling evidence is provided which clearly demonstrates that there is no longer demand for an industrial based use in this location and that there is not likely to be in the foreseeable future. This must include evidence of completion of a full and proper marketing exercise of the site at realistic prices both for the existing use or an alternative industrial use completed over a minimum period of two continuous years in accordance with the approach set out in Appendix 5; and then*
- *A sequential approach to redevelopment or change of use is applied as follows:*
 - a) *Redevelopment for office or alternative employment uses.*
 - b) *Mixed use including other employment generating or community uses, and residential providing it does not adversely impact on the other uses and maximises the amount of affordable housing delivered as part of the mix.*

102. The submitted Marketing Report, prepared by Featherstone Leigh states the existing buildings are in a dilapidated condition having been on historic non-repairing (FRI) leases. It states that the existing workshops are constructed from corrugated metal with wooden windows and are no longer fit for purpose. The agents suggest the site is not viable in existing use. The applicants submitted information outlines that the current rent is £6.30 per square foot. With estimate rents of a redeveloped scheme to be £25.00 per square foot for B1a offices, and £10-12.00 per square foot for B2/B1(C) uses. Whilst it may be the case that employment sites used for office purposes may provide a higher yield, the policy requirement to move away from industrial land is clearly set out above and such a position does not justify an exception to this policy requirement.

103. As the application site is an industrial site, policy LP42 requires any development proposals to provide suitable replacement industrial uses and if it is not possible to replace the existing with industrial type uses (B1c/B2/B8/SG); a full and proper marketing exercise of the site at realistic prices both for the existing use or an alternative industrial or other such employment use completed over a minimum period of two continuous years is required identifying that there is no demand for the site in its current use. Appendix 5 of the Local Plan provides further details on marketing requirements.

104. If the Council is satisfied that a full and proper marketing exercise has been undertaken and that there is no demand for continued industrial use on the application site, then redevelopment or change of use away from industrial use may be appropriate, provided the following sequential approach to redevelopment is adhered to as set out in LP42;

- The first step in the sequential test is consideration of alternative employment generating uses. These uses should include in the first instance B Use Classes such as offices and if these are not practicable then social infrastructure and community uses such as health clinics, nurseries and crèches, leisure facilities or other uses identified for community purposes.
- The second step in the sequential test is for mixed use development including other employment generating or community uses. Proposals for mixed use schemes should maintain or improve the amount of employment floorspace on site

105. The applicant suggests that the existing site is not compatible to the area given the surrounding residential context. Furthermore; the submitted marketing feasibility report suggests that there would be demand for various small employment units on this site, stating the units as proposed would be "*much sought after and yet very hard to find*" and affordable to purchase for SMEs.

106. Notwithstanding the above; in this borough, it is common for employment, particularly industrial sites to be within established mixed use or residential areas, because of historic development patterns. This does not provide justification for a change of use, as mitigation can address impacts and constraints such as narrow access, which have been managed

by existing occupiers, and therefore do not prevent any future or continued employment use.

107. Until sufficient marketing evidence has been provided, the council maintains an in-principle objection to the loss of industrial floor space.
108. In the absence of robust and compelling evidence to satisfy the criteria set out in Policy LP42 of the adopted Local Plan (2018), and due to the loss of approximately 860sq.m of existing industrial floor space; the proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of industrial space and would conflict with the local policy objectives of securing the long-term future of industrial sites in the borough.
109. The submitted proposals are therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the proposals fail to comply with the requirements of Draft London Plan Policy E4, Policy 4.14 of the adopted London Plan (2016) and Local Plan Policy LP42 (2018).

Mixed Uses (Residential and Commercial)

110. It is acknowledged that the proposed use of the site for housing is considered an inappropriate use in principle, given that the site is to be safeguarded as a waste site as well as the absence of sufficient marketing evidence to justify change of use of the site away from the existing industrial land use.
111. *The site is located within the St Margarets local centre and identified as an Area of Mixed Use. Policy LP25 of the adopted Local Plan identifies that a combination of residential, retail, office, leisure and entertainment uses (mixed uses) could be suitable in Areas of Mixed Use, provided the use does not adversely impact on the vitality and viability of the centre, or other commercial uses. Further consideration should be given to centre's role and any development should be of a scale appropriate to the size and function of the centre. In particular; mixed-use proposals must ensure that the introduction of residential does not have any negative impact on commercial space (in terms of access, servicing, or any conflict such as hours of operation, noise and between users of different uses), as well as providing an appropriate mix of uses in accordance with policy LP1 (A.6).*
112. *In this instance a suitable mix of uses should ensure suitability and compatibility of uses, taking into account any potential adverse impacts of the co-location of uses through the layout, design and management of the site, primarily serve the needs of the local community or attract visitors and develop cultural opportunities. Development should, wherever possible, include overall improvements and enhancements to centres where appropriate, and/or modernise outdated premises.*
113. *Encouragement for the delivery of new housing is also expressed within Policy 3.3 of the London Plan (2016) and Policy LP35 of the adopted Local Plan (2018); provided the housing provision is appropriate to the site-specifics of the location.*
114. It is acknowledged that outside of this town centre location; the proposed housing mix (21% small units (1-beds)) is partly in accordance with policy LP35 (A), however it is prudent to note that this policy also requires the proposed housing mix to be appropriate to the site-specifics of the location. As outlined above; the application site is safeguarded as a waste management site under policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan and the proposed loss of the existing waste management facility has not been justified.
115. As such; the introduction of residential use to this site as a replacement for the existing waste management site is considered an inappropriate use based on the site-specific circumstance. The proposed development therefore does not provide an appropriate mix

of uses given that the proposed C3 use would not retain any of the existing industrial/waste management land use.

116. The proposed layout would also include two two-storey B1 commercial units that would be situated to the rear of the site and feature shared access with the proposed residential units. However, it is not clearly set out what the proposed use would be. Whilst it is acknowledged that the range of uses proposed is considered appropriate for an area of mixed use; it is necessary to consider the compatibility of the proposed mix of uses, including by taking account of any potential adverse impacts of the co-location of uses through the layout, design and management of the site.
117. Concerns are raised regarding co-location of commercial units and residential units through the proposed layout and design of the site. The proposed development would require that on any given day, commercial occupiers would be entering and exiting the site via the same ingress/egress as the proposed residential occupiers. This is particularly of concern given that the supporting Transport Statement (prepared by Caneparo Associates) identifies that the AM and PM peak periods for number of two-trips generated by the proposed residential units are at time periods when it would be likely that occupiers of a B1 commercial unit would be entering and exiting the site (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00, respectively). In addition to the above; it is noted that the submitted proposed site plan (drawing no. 4786-3-10-Rev:B) does not provide any detail of proposed segregated pedestrian/cycling/vehicular access from Arlington Road.
118. Furthermore, with regard to servicing of the proposed uses, it is noted that the refuse and recycling collection is all proposed to be off-street; along with the projected six deliveries per day across the site. No information has been provided regarding servicing management of the proposals, particularly with regard to conflict between users and in the absence of sufficient evidence identifying otherwise; it is considered the proposed residential dwellings in this location, with commercial units being situated to the rear of the site would result in an unacceptable juxtaposition of the proposed mix of uses and give rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of residential users.
119. In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed residential led mixed use scheme would facilitate the unacceptable loss of an existing industrial land use currently safeguarded as a waste management site, which in-turn would result in an unacceptable co-location of uses in terms of layout which fails to provide a suitable juxtaposition of the proposed mix of uses and gives rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the proposed commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of proposed residential occupants. As such, the scheme would fail to accord with the aims and objectives of policy LP1 (A.6) and LP35 (A) of the adopted Local Plan (2018) in this regard.

Financial Viability and Affordable Housing

120. Policy LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) expects the provision of a range of housing to meet the needs of all households, with a tenure split of 80% (social) rent and 20% intermediate housing. It further states that where employment land is permitted to be used for a residential use, this should be in the form of on-site affordable housing.
121. Further to the above, LP 36 of the Local Plan sets out that the Council will seek the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed-use schemes, having regard to the strategic borough-wide target and the individual circumstances of the site. The provision of affordable housing should be discussed with the Council's Housing Development Manager and Registered Providers who are interested in exploring opportunities and maximising funding opportunities. These discussions are required to show how comments raised by a Registered Provider have

been addressed including an opportunity to influence the proposed tenure, size of units and design to address local priorities, and explore funding options to maximise provision.

122. Where affordable housing contributions are restricted due to economic viability, developers are required to provide a development appraisal to demonstrate that schemes are maximising affordable housing. The developer will be required to underwrite the costs of a Council commissioned economic viability assessment. The Council will rigorously evaluate such appraisals. Any financial contributions will be secured via a Planning Obligation.

123. In simple terms, the viability assessment process comprises a comparison of the residual land value (RLV) for the proposed development against an appropriate benchmark value (BLV) for the existing site or property. Development convention and guidance on assessing the viability of schemes states that where a development proposal generates a RLV which is greater than the appropriate BLV, it is deemed financially viable and therefore likely to proceed. Conversely, if the RLV is lower than the BLV, it is deemed financially unviable. This is based on the accepted assumption that a developer would always seek to bring forward the highest value scheme. The viability assessment process is undertaken to establish the appropriate level of planning obligations and maximum level of affordable housing in the instance where a policy compliant level is considered to be economically unviable.

1st Review

124. The initial proposal submitted with the application included four affordable units on site which equated to a 17% affordable unit provision out of the total 24 proposed dwellings. The proposed affordable units would be located within the small residential block to the south of the application site – units 21, 22, 23 and 24. This block comprises 2no. two-bed three-person flats both of which would have a gross internal area of 62m² and 2no. three-bed four-person duplex flats, with a total gross internal area of 101m². These units were proposed as shared ownership. This was considered to not comply with policy requirements, as it falls below the percentage required, and does not meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing.

125. A Viability Assessment Report by Grimshaw Consulting (GC) was submitted as part of the application. The report suggests that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing that can be provided on site is 4no. apartments (2no. 2-bedroom and 2no. 3-bedroom) for sale on a shared ownership basis. Furthermore, the submitted report did not indicate that the proposals could provide a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision. The applicant has not provided evidence of discussions with Registered Providers (RP) with regard to the site. Additionally, no contact was made with the Council's housing Department at the time of submission to discuss the availability of funding which is a requirement to demonstrate that on-site affordable housing has been maximised in accordance with policy.

126. The Viability Assessment Report by GC was reviewed by independent property consultants Bespoke Property Consultants (BPC), acting on behalf of the Council. BPC's review of the viability assessment found most of the inputs and assumptions used by GC to be reasonable. However, the BPC review identified a surplus of £1,588,00, meaning the scheme is viable and could provide additional S.106/Affordable Housing Contributions.

2nd Review

127. Following this, the applicant submitted a further 2nd report by GC dated December 2018 and asked for it to be independently reviewed by BPC. An updated 2nd review by BPC in February 2019 found that the main issues still in dispute were the build costs and

Benchmark Land Value (BLV). BPC requested that the applicant provided further details on Network Rail costs and Carbon off-set costs to justify the value in the appraisal and stated that the BLV must be 20% not 30%. BPC concluded that the scheme is viable and can deliver on-site affordable housing. It is noted it was only at this stage that the Council's Housing Officer was contacted by the applicants, who advised them to speak to Registered Providers.

3rd Review

128. The applicant subsequently submitted a further 3rd report in April 2019 stating that they had contacted the Council's Housing Officer and it was agreed to consider only the viability position generated by a proposal for 100% market housing. Their report concluded that the maximum reasonable offer remained 4 units on a shared ownership basis.
129. The Council's Housing Officer raised further concerns following the 3rd report by GC. The units are considered to be poorly designed, the three bed units at 101sqm significantly exceed national design standards (84 sqm) and therefore involve unnecessary construction costs and their size would also impact on affordability as shared ownership homes. It is also considered that these could be re-designed as 5 or 6 person units which would then be suitable for use for affordable rent.
130. With regard to the range of income for intermediate housing, there is an upper cap on salaries set by the Greater London Authority (GLA) of £90,000 per annum for shared ownership. The LBRuT intermediate housing policy statement outlines that the Council expects, however, that two-thirds of scheme applicants will have an income up to £47,000 per annum. None of the units (currently offered as shared ownership) would be likely to be affordable at a household income of £47,000 as required by the Intermediate Housing Policy (even at the lower market value now assumed by the applicant). The Council's Housing Officer concluded that the scheme does not provide a policy compliant tenure mix nor maximise the delivery of affordable housing and the units that are provided would not meet the Council's affordability criteria for shared ownership homes.
131. The applicant requested that their report be independently reviewed for a third time by BPC. The 3rd review by BPC concluded that there was a surplus of £1,732,000, which would be available to fund on-site affordable housing.
132. The applicant's final 4th letter in response to BPC's review was submitted in June 2019 and offered a total of 8 units for London Shared Ownership, equating to 33.3% of the dwellings.
133. Whilst it is acknowledged that the offer of affordable units has increased from the original submission, the Council's Housing Officer maintains his objection to the scheme as the proposed tenure does not meet policy requirements, there is no inclusion of rented homes, nor do the majority of the proposed affordable housing provide family sized homes to meet the council's priority needs. Multiple reviews have been undertaken at the request from the applicants, and whilst certain aspects have been agreed with regards to their viability report, the overall offer is not considered to be acceptable.
134. Based on the outcome of the independent assessment by BPC and the lack of evidence of any engagement with Registered Providers; the LPA is not satisfied that the proposed scheme, with the inclusion of eight shared ownership units, represents the best viable option for the site and it is not considered that the maximum reasonable contribution to affordable housing would be achieved. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with the aims and objectives of the NPPF, London Plan Policy 3.13 and Local Plan Policy LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018). Furthermore, the scheme would not accord with the

Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and the Local Planning Authority's Affordable Housing SPD.

Design

135. The NPPF attaches great importance to the design of the built environment and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. New developments are encouraged to respond to local character and history and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.
136. Policy LP 1 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) states that new development must be of a high architectural and urban design quality. Development must be inclusive, respect local and contribute positively, to its surroundings based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context. LP 2 of the adopted Local Plan expands on this by explicitly requiring new buildings to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough's townscapes and landscapes, through appropriate building heights.
137. Taller Buildings will be inappropriate in all areas of the borough except the identified areas within Twickenham and Richmond. Further clarification regarding the definition of tall buildings is provided in the supporting text to Policy LP2 of the Local Plan, which indicates a tall building is defined as being substantially taller than their surroundings or causes a significant change to the skyline and 'taller' buildings are defined as those being significantly taller than the neighbouring buildings, but less than 18 metres in height (below six storeys). This definition is supported by Policy 7.7 of the London Plan.

Height, Massing and Landscaping

Extension to Commercial Units

138. No concerns are raised regarding the proposed two-storey side extension to the existing BTM adjacent the railway. The proposed extension to the existing western BTM would follow the same style and scale as the existing building; with similar external facing materials. The proposed extension would integrate with the existing building appropriately so as to ensure that it harmonises with the historic character of the existing buildings.
139. Given the siting of the proposed two-storey side extension; it is noted that this element of the proposals would generally be obscured from view from within the public realm. Nevertheless; given its scale and design; it is not considered that the proposed ground and first-floor extensions would negatively impact the existing character of the host Building of Townscape Merit, the application site, nor the surrounding area in general.

Residential New Builds

140. The existing corrugated steel-clad industrial buildings on the application site are of no historic or architectural merit, are in a poor state of repair and is heavily dilapidated.
141. The site is clearly visible from the adjacent railway line and the residential dwellings to the north-west of the railway, with some distant views (approx. 150m) afforded toward the site from the railway bridge along St Margarets Road to the south west of the site. The existing site is not considered to detract from the visual amenity of the street-scene given the lack of frontage to the existing streetscape. However, it is noted that the existing buildings are of an unsightly appearance and the site is generally untidy. As such; the existing application site is considered to detract from visual amenity and character of the surrounding area in general, particularly in those views afforded toward the site from the railway line to the north west and the existing residential dwellings beyond.

142. Notwithstanding the in-principle objections raised with regard to the change of use of the site; it is acknowledged that the demolition of the existing steel-clad buildings and refurbishment of the existing Buildings of Townscape Merit would offer an opportunity to enhance the appearance of the application site.
143. The East Twickenham Village Planning Guidance SPD identifies the general character of the surrounding area as part of the former Twickenham park, which was developed with houses from the mid-nineteenth century. The east side of Arlington Road is made up of semi-detached houses of a regular design with inset, round-headed porches and rendered elevations. They appear to have originally had pebble-dash rendered facades which in many cases have been replaced with Stucco. The west side of Arlington Road features blocks of flats from the first half of the twentieth century. It is noted that the ground-floors of these flats are generally below street level with the blocks of flats generally extending up to four-storeys in height (above ground-floor level) or three-storeys (above ground-level) with roofspace accommodation. Adjacent to the application site's entrance off Arlington Road, is two 1960's era blocks of flats, one three-storeys with gabled roof (to the south) and one four-storey block of flats with flat roof forms and integrated balconies. Immediately adjoining the site access road to the south is the Twickenham Film Studios site, with a four-storey brick building generally obscuring view of the application site from within the Arlington Road street-scene.
144. To the north of Arlington Road, continues Arlington Close; which features a short two-storey inter-war residential terrace, as well as single-storey (with roof-space accommodation) semi-detached dwellings fronting the western side of Arlington Close further north.
145. To the south of the application site is Kelvin Drive, a small cul-de-sac which leads to The Barons at its south. Kelvin Drive features three-storey flats constructed c.1930, with the same development extending into The Barons.
146. There are numerous buildings (or groups of buildings) within the immediate surrounds of the application site where the predominant height is generally three-storeys, with a small number of examples which are four-storeys in height and/or feature accommodation at roof level, that give the impression of additional upper floors of accommodation. Consequently, it would be inappropriate to ignore the contribution which these buildings make to the character of the wider area.
147. With regard to the main residential block; although larger than the existing buildings it would replace, and taller than the existing two-storey mews buildings; the design of the roof (upper floor), together with its setback from the front and southern side elevation of the building, would allow for the development to be visually read as a three and four-storey building when viewed from the public realm and from private views towards the building both from outside of, and from within the application site, particularly in the context of the immediately adjacent four-storey Twickenham film studios building sited along the common boundary to the west.
148. For the above reasons, the proposal cannot be described being substantially taller than the surroundings or cause a significant change to the skyline, and so would not meet the criteria for a tall and larger buildings. The proposal would therefore not conflict with Policy LP2 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) which indicates that taller buildings would be inappropriate in this location.
149. Notwithstanding the above, whilst the proposed main residential building is not considered to represent a taller building within the context of the surrounding locality, concerns are raised that the scale of the proposed main residential block would fail to

relate to the existing pitched-roof stable mews buildings (BTMs) to the south-west corner of the application site. The proposed separation distance of approx. 5.0m between the southern side elevation and the adjacent northern side level of the stable blocks to the south would not create an appropriate visual separation between the existing BTMs and the proposed main residential building. The existing BTMs feature an eaves height of approximately 6.1m, with the southern eaves height of the proposed main block sitting at approximately 10.0m. The proposed disparity in eaves height of approx. 4.0m, combined with the separation distance of approximately 5.0m would result in the main residential block subtending an angle of approximately 40° to the horizontal, when measured from the eaves height of the existing stable mews buildings. As such, it is not considered that the proposals would successfully link the smaller scale of the two-storey BTMs to the south, to the larger scale of the three-storey southern elevation of the proposed main residential block. Furthermore, the proposed approx. 13.0m length of the main block's southern side elevation, combined with the abovementioned height and separation distance to the BTMs would exacerbate the vast difference in scale bulk and mass proposed. The combined height and footprint of the proposed main residential block's southern elevation would therefore appear over dominant and fail to fit comfortably within the rhythm of the application site. The visual impact of the proposal has been illustrated through computer visualisations, and whilst it is not considered that the proposed building would appear out of place from within the streetscape of the area, it is considered that the concerns raised above would result in a cramped and contrived form of development which appears as an over intensification of the application site.

150. The proposed rear elevation of the main residential building is modulated through the use of recessed features (roof terrace) projecting balconies and stepped frontages, with two large glazed 'atrium' style openings which break up the otherwise strong horizontal emphasis. These design features would help break up the overall scale and massing of the building and give the rear elevation a distinctive rhythm and vertical emphasis in order to provide it with its own identity in the context of the surrounding, somewhat utilitarian development of the Twickenham Film Studios site.
151. The proposed front elevation similarly features some recessed features (roof terrace, metal panels), stepped building lines and projecting balconies. However, the proposed front elevation would feature a much stronger horizontal emphasis, with minimal visual breaks in the main building line and is dominated by stacked projecting balconies across the entire elevation. The proposed front elevation would not display the same visual interest as the rear elevation and with little vertical emphasis over four-storeys; would unsuccessfully break-up the mass and scale of the proposed building. As such; the front elevation of the proposed main building would appear visually dominant and incompatible due to the constrained nature of the application site.
152. The proposed smaller residential block at the rear of the site, at three-storeys (top floor in roof space), would be lower than the proposed main building, however it would be approximately 1.60m higher than the existing BTMs ridge height and approximately 3.70m taller than the existing BTMs eaves height. The proposed smaller block would be sited adjoining the rear elevation of the existing south-eastern stable-building (BTM). Furthermore, the proposed smaller residential block's second-floor eaves height would protrude approximately 700mm above the eaves of the adjoining BTM. With its flat roof forms and large glazed openings dominating its front and rear elevations, the proposed smaller residential block, by reason of its scale, flat-roof forms and eaves height at both second and third-floor level (roof level), would offer no visual relationship to the existing BTM to which it would be joined. The proposed smaller unit would appear as a visually dominant and incongruous form of development which detracts from the visual amenity of the application site. Furthermore, this element of the proposals would exacerbate the

visual imposition on the existing stable buildings which would occur as a result of the proposed development.

153. The scheme would introduce two new soft landscaped areas to the site. One small landscaped area to the rear of the main residential block, and one larger communal space to the rear of the smaller residential block. It is also proposed to introduce a small planted buffer to the frontage of the proposed main residential block, adjoining onto the north-west side of the hard-landscaped driveway area. The existing hard-landscaped area between the BTMs to the rear of the site is proposed to be repaired and reinstated to the full length of these stable buildings. Whilst concerns remain regarding the functionality and usability of the proposed site layout; it is noted that the existing site is 100% impermeable and does not feature any existing planting. As such; it is considered that the proposed landscaping would provide somewhat of an improvement to the visual amenity of the application site and therefore the LPA would not be able to sustain a reason for refusal on this basis.

154. Had the scheme been considered acceptable; any planning permission granted should be subject to appropriately worded conditions requiring details of hard and soft-landscaping to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Materials and Appearance

Extensions to Commercial Buildings

155. Given the proposed external facing materials would match those of the adjoining BTM; it is considered that the proposed materials of this element of the scheme would suitably harmonise with the host building. As such, no objections are raised in this regard. Similarly, no objection is raised with regard to the proposed and altered fenestration arrangement to the existing BTMS, which would be of a design and layout which remains suitably in scale and proportionate to the host buildings.

Residential New Builds

156. The relatively understated design, with a simple repetitive treatment to the elevations would make a neutral contribution to a varied rhythm and texture of the facades of the buildings in close views, while the contrasting roof materials, brick detailing and use of large glazed elements would add visual interest to longer views.

157. The proposed apartment blocks would be contrasting in their contemporary appearance and form, to the more traditional Victorian detailing of the stable terraces. However, the consistent use of matching yellow London stock brickwork would ensure there is some sense of integration and continuity. This would also ensure that the proposed buildings would appear to relate to the stable terraces (BTMs) when viewed from the railway. It is proposed to refurbish the existing stable terraces (BTMs), with the cleaning off of built-up soot residue, exposing the brighter, original brickwork appearance, which would further ensure that the materials used in the proposed residential buildings would appear to relate to these existing BTMs.

158. The use of high-quality stock brick and contrasting metal cladding and glazing within the proposed modern buildings would complement the surrounding more traditional stock brick and red brick of the adjacent Twickenham Film Studios, providing a unifying feature. It is considered that the use of matching brickwork on the proposed balconies with a contemporary 'hit-and-miss' layout, however this would not overcome the concerns raised regarding the proposed projecting balconies displaying little visual interest and a strong horizontal emphasis when viewed in the context of the proposed front elevation of the main residential block.

159. The proposed zinc clad setback roof and zinc clad stair core surrounds have been incorporated as an attempt to reference the existing industrial character of the site, with windows and doors proposed to have matching grey metallic finished frames. to ensure that the scheme would harmonise with the surrounding development; details of external materials (including fenestration) would have been required by condition; had the scheme been acceptable.

Design Conclusion

160. The proposed two-storey extension to the western most existing BTM to the rear of the site would not detract from the character and visual amenity of the application site, nor the surrounding locality. Whilst no concerns are raised regarding the proposed materials; this would not overcome the concerns raised with regard to the visually dominant and incompatible design of the proposed front elevation, and the visual imposition of the proposed smaller residential block in relation to the existing BTMs, to which it would be joined.
161. In light of the above, the overall siting, footprint and mass, of the proposed main residential building, combined with the height and siting of the proposed smaller residential building; would fail to be of an appropriate scale for the size of the application site without being overly dominant. The proposed development would therefore, result in an inharmonious form of overdevelopment, failing to accord with Policies LP1 and LP 39 of the Local Plan (2018).

Impact on Heritage Assets (both designated and non-designated)

162. The application site is not situated within, or adjoining a Conservation Area, nor does it relate to any Statutory Listed Buildings or Scheduled Monuments. As such; it is not considered that the proposed development would detract from the significance, including the setting of any designated heritage assets.
163. *Policy LP 4 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to preserve, and where possible enhance, the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets, including Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) memorials, particularly war memorials, and other local historic features.*
164. As mentioned above, by virtue of the scale, height and siting of the proposed main residential block and the siting and height of the proposed smaller residential block, it is considered that the proposals would introduce new built elements to the application site that would be overly dominant and inharmonious with regard to the non-designated heritage assets on the site. When considering the impact on the existing BTMs, it is acknowledged that their character and significance are best appreciated in close views, particularly from within the application site. As a result, the existing BTMs are not considered to greatly contribute to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding locality and streetscene. Nevertheless, adopted policy LP4 of the Local Plan seeks to preserve and *enhance* the significance, character and setting of non-designated heritage assets.
165. Whilst unsightly as a result of their age and existing use, the existing buildings on site which are proposed to be demolished are single-storey and are not considered to significantly impact on the setting of the BTMs to the rear of the site. With uninterrupted views afforded toward the existing stable buildings from the northern end of the application site, it is considered that the setting of these BTMs within the context of the site is, at present, somewhat preserved (see images 1 and 2 below).



Image 1 - Existing views toward BTMs from north to south



Image 2 - Existing views toward BTMs from north to south

166. The proposed development would result in the complete removal of any views toward these buildings, preventing any visual appreciation of the non-designated heritage assets when viewed from the north. The submitted design and access statement acknowledges that the existing stable buildings have become somewhat 'land-locked' by the development of Twickenham Film Studios and Arlington Works over much of the last century. The proposed development would exacerbate this issue, and would not preserve the setting of these buildings, to the detriment of the special historical interest of the BTMs in question (see figure 8).



Figure 8 - Proposed views looking north to south.

167. With regard to the proposed smaller residential block; this element of the proposals, by reason of its scale, flat-roof forms and eaves height at both second and third-floor level (roof level), would offer no visual relationship to the existing BTM to which it would be joined. The proposed smaller unit would appear as a visually dominant and incongruous form of development which detracts from the visual amenity of the application site.

Furthermore, this element of the proposals would exacerbate the visual imposition on the existing stable buildings which would occur as a result of the proposed development.

168. Whilst it is noted that the proposed works to improve the appearance of the BTMs and refurbishment/extension of the cobbled pavement between these buildings would be welcomed; this would not overcome the concerns raised with regard to the proposed development of the residential blocks appearing overly dominant and incompatible in relation to the setting, scale and height of the stable block BTMS.
169. As a result, the impact on the setting of the non-designated assets is judged to detract from the existing on-site circumstance given that the proposals would appear overly dominant and would not fit comfortably within the application site. The proposed development would therefore fail to accord with the aims and objectives of policy LP4 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

Protected Views

170. *Policy LP5 of the Local plan (2018) seeks to protect the quality of the views, vistas, gaps and the skyline, all of which contribute to the character, distinctiveness and quality of the local and wider area by protecting the quality of the views and vistas as identified on the Policies Map.*
171. The site is not located within any strategic views designated in the London Plan however it is situated within the locally protected views from Petersham Part to Twickenham and from Terrace Garden to South West Twickenham.
172. As identified above, the proposed development is not considered to constitute taller or larger buildings. This combined with the prevailing heights of neighbouring developments, particularly that of various buildings within the adjacent Twickenham Film Studios site is considered to ensure that the proposed development would not detract from any locally significant views and vistas.

Density

173. *The London Plan outlines the need for development proposals to achieve the highest possible intensity of use compatible with local context, the design principles of the compact city and with public transport accessibility.*
174. The site has a relatively low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 which represents a poor access to services, and its setting can be classified as urban in character. The London Plan density matrix (Table 3.2), therefore, suggests a residential density of between 200 to 450 habitable rooms per hectare, or 70 to 120 dwellings per hectare, for this scheme. The proposed development of 24 units proposes 149 habitable rooms/hectare and results in a residential density of 79.2 units/hectare.
175. The proposal therefore does not meet the suggested density for units/hectare but falls within the suggested density for habitable rooms/hectare. It is acknowledged that the density ranges recommended in the London Plan should not be applied mechanistically and it would be more appropriate to assess whether the proposed building fits acceptably onto the site, is of sufficient high quality of design, appropriate to its context, and does not harm local residential amenity.
176. It is considered that the proposed residential density is appropriate for the site, this is due to the appropriate housing mix for the location and the fact that the proposed development has not been found to cause harm to residential amenity of neighbouring, nor future occupants.

177. Notwithstanding the above; whilst it is considered that the scheme would provide an appropriate residential density; this benefit would not outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development with regard to loss of a safeguarded waste site and unjustified loss of an existing industrial land use, among other concerns raised within relevant sections of this report.

Housing Mix, Standard of Accommodation and Play Space

178. *LP 35 of Local Plan seeks that development should generally provide family sized accommodation, except within town centres and Areas of Mixed Use and that housing mix should be appropriate to the location. All new housing units are required to comply with the Nationally Described Space Standards and appropriate external private and/or communal amenity space necessary to meet the needs generated by the users of the development.*
179. *Policy LP8 requires that developments will be required to protect the amenity and living conditions of the new occupants of new development. Policy LP10 of the Local Plan requires that the local environmental impacts of all development proposals do not lead to detrimental effects on the health, safety and the amenity of new users or occupiers of the development site.*
180. *Further to the above, a single bedroom should be at least 7.5sqm and 2.15m wide. A double should be 11.5sqm and 2.75m wide. The London Plan suggests that head height should be at least 2.3m for a minimum of 75% of the gross internal floor area. The minimum internal space and external space standards are as follows:*

Table 2 - Minimum internal space and external space standards:

Unit Type	Net internal Floor Area	External space standards
One-bedroom (1B2P)	50sq.m	5sq.m
Two-bedroom (2B3P)	61sq.m	6sq.m
Two-bedroom (2B4P)	70sq.m	7sq.m
Three-bedroom (3B4P) (single storey)	74sq.m	7sq.m
Three-bedroom (3B4P) (single storey)	84sq.m	7sq. m

181. *Policy LP 35 of the Local Plan requires that all new homes should be built to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' and 10% would be expected to meet Building Regulation Requirement M4 (3) 'wheelchair user dwellings'.*

Housing Mix

182. The proposed housing mix would comprise of 20.8% small units (5 one-bedroom units), 50% of two-bedroom units and 29.2% three-bedroom units. Policy LP35(A) seeks family sized accommodation outside of main centres and Areas of Mixed Use. The policy does recognise the housing mix should be appropriate to the location and in this instance, it is acknowledged that proposed residential mix would be broadly in accordance with the surrounding locality. Notwithstanding the above, whilst the residential unit mix is considered appropriate to the location in isolation; this does not overcome the aforementioned concerns raised with regard to the unacceptable mix of uses on this site.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

183. The units would have Gross Internal Areas (GIA) of 51sqm for the 1-bedroom units; 62-78sqm for the 2 bed units and 76-101sqm for the 3-bedroom units. All proposed unit

types would comply with nationally described space standards in terms of overall size and bedroom size.

184. The number of dwellings accessed from a single core would not exceed five, and none of the units have been identified as not meeting the required standard.

External amenity space

185. The proposal provides private amenity space to 22 of the 24 proposed dwellings (ranging from 8.8sq.m - 35.7sq.m). The two ground-floor flats within the proposed smaller block would not include private amenity space.
186. The proposal includes a total area of approximately 291sqm of communal amenity space, that would be include approximately 117sqm of communal space to the rear of the main residential block, and approximately 174sqm to the rear of the smaller block. Whilst the proposed communal space to the rear of the main block appears somewhat cramped and contrived; given each of the units within this building would be provided with policy compliant private amenity space; it is not considered that this would render a reason for refusal in this instance. Furthermore; the two units which would not be provided with suitable private amenity space would have direct access to the communal area at the rear of the small residential block. As a result, this space would be considered a usable, functional and safe, amenity space for the requirements of the development.
187. Whilst the under provision of private external amenity space to some units is unfortunate, on balance, it is considered that due to the mixed-use location, the overall shortfall in private amenity space provision could be made up through the incorporation of the proposed shared amenity space to the rear of the smaller residential block.

Privacy, outlook, sunlight and daylight:

188. A minimum distance of 20 metres between habitable rooms within the residential development is generally required for privacy reasons. Where principal windows face a wall that contains no windows or those that are obscured (e.g. Bathrooms), separation distances can be reduced to 13.5 metres. It is however acknowledged that these should be useful yardsticks for visual privacy but adhering rigidly to these measures can limit the variety of urban spaces and housing types in the city and can sometimes unnecessarily restrict density.
189. None of the proposed habitable room windows would be situated within 20.0m of habitable room windows on neighbouring residential buildings; nor within the proposed residential units on the application site.
190. The distance between the windows of the proposed flats within the front elevation of the main residential block, facing onto the rear elevation of the existing Twickenham Film Studios building would be between approx. 12.0m and 20.0m; and the distances between the flats at the rear of the main residential building and the existing residential buildings to the north of the railway line would be greater than 20.0m.
191. It is acknowledged that the minimum separation distance between the proposed flats within the front elevation of the main residential building and the rear of Twickenham Film Studios would be less than the preferred separation distance. However, it is not considered that there would be an undue loss of privacy given the existing use of the adjacent Twickenham Film Studios and the unlikelihood that residential occupiers of the proposed development would be home during business hours. Whilst the proposed units 21-24 within the proposed smaller residential block would be sited perpendicular to the main residential block, it is considered that the oblique views afforded to/from the front elevation of the main residential block and the smaller residential block would not give

rise to unacceptable opportunities for overlooking between habitable room windows. Similarly

192. It is acknowledged that only proposed units 1, 7 and 13 would feature habitable room windows situated less than 13.5m from the existing rear elevation of the Twickenham Film Studios building. Given the proposed separation distances would fall short of the recommended distance by only 0.5m and the siting of the film studios building and the proposed residential units in question; it is noted that relatively unobstructed oblique views would be available from these habitable room windows to the north-east. As such; it is considered that, on balance, the proposed development would provide adequate outlook to proposed habitable room windows.
193. Six units within the proposed main residential block would be single aspect, however none would be north facing. All other units would be dual aspect (75% of all the proposed residential units). All habitable rooms would have access to full height windows, and so a good level of direct sunlight to all of units would be achieved at various times of the day.
194. It is acknowledged that the existing three-storey Twickenham Film Studios building would be situated to the south of the front elevation of the main residential block. The proposed single aspect units (1; 4; 7; 10; 13 & 16) would be situated within the southern elevation of the main residential block, facing toward the Film Studios building. In this regard, the application is supported by an assessment of the daylight and sunlight levels within the proposed new dwellings. The submitted assessment (Prepared by EB7 Ltd, dated: 26 October 2016) focuses on the most constrained units on the ground floor of the development, namely units 1, 2, 4, and 22. The results of the assessment on these proposed units have then been used to extrapolate a likely level of daylighting/sunlighting throughout the remainder of the proposed residential units.
195. The submitted sunlight/daylight assessment has been carried out to a methodology in accordance with the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) 'Site Layout planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice', (BRE, 2011).
196. With regard to residential new builds; the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) test quantifies the average illuminance within a room as a proportion of the illuminance available to an unobstructed point outdoors under a sky of known luminance and luminance distribution. It considers the physical nature of the room behind the window, including; size, window transmittance, and surface reflectivity. As set out within the applicant's internal sunlight/daylight assessment; the BRE guidance sets out that ADF levels for proposed rooms of main habitable use are acceptable as follows:
 - Bedroom: 1.0%;
 - Living Room: 1.5%;
 - Kitchen; 2.0%.
197. Furthermore; it is common practice to apply the criteria relevant to the predominant use of the room where rooms have more than one use. Where kitchens are situated at the rear of open plan living spaces; these areas are assigned a target of 1.5%. The applicant's sunlight/daylight assessment sets out that where kitchens are situated at the rear of generously sized living spaces; the kitchen areas have been notionally internalised, and the remaining living area assessed with a target ADF for its use of 1.5%.
198. The daylight assessment results identify that all of the proposed habitable room windows to units 1, 2, 4 and 22 have been found to exceed the minimum ADF requirement. As mentioned above; the ADF assessment has not been carried out on all of the proposed habitable rooms however it is acknowledged that the habitable room

windows tested are considered to be those most constrained with regard to daylighting based on their siting within the proposed development and their respective relationship to neighbouring buildings. As such; it is considered that; on balance, the proposed development would provide adequate daylighting to each of the proposed habitable room windows.

199. With regard to sunlighting of proposed new dwelling's habitable room windows; the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test calculates the percentage of statistically probable hours of sunlight received by each window in both the summer and winter months. The BRE guidelines outline that main living rooms within new buildings should achieve at least 25% annual sunlight hours, with 5% during winter months.
200. The submitted sunlight assessment identifies that the total and winter APSH assessments carried out identify that two of the four living room windows would experience levels of sunlight in excess of the BRE targets. The remaining two living rooms, located in proposed units 2 and 3, have also been found to experience greater levels of winter sunlight than the BRE targets (7% and 11% respectively, where the target is 5%). It is noted however, that both units 2 and 3 fall slightly short of the total sunlight hours target in accordance with BRE guidance, achieving 13% and 14%, respectively, where 25% is the target prescribed by BRE guidance.
201. Whilst the above shortfall is not ideal, it is acknowledged that BRE guidance on sunlighting of habitable room windows recognises that providing an unobstructed south-facing orientation to all units is not possible where developments are of a larger, urban scale. The BRE guidance outlines that where groups of dwellings are planned, site layout design should aim to maximise the number of dwellings with a main living room that meets the above recommendations. It is noted that only 8% of the proposed dwellings would fall short of the 25% recommendation for annual probably sunlight hours. Furthermore, as set out in the applicant's sunlight/daylight assessment; the obstruction of sunlight to the windows in question is partly due to the presence of projecting balconies to the floors above. it is acknowledged that there is a trade-off between the presence of balconies for private external amenity space and the annual probable sunlight hours received to the windows behind such balconies. It is considered that, on balance; the presence of balconies is considered to provide increased amenity value to the living areas of the proposed dwellings. The British Standard guidance BS8206 part 2 applies to rooms of all orientations and sets out that if a room is within a building in a densely-built urban area, the absence of sunlight is more acceptable than when its exclusion seems arbitrary. It is therefore considered that, on balance, the amenity value lost by removal of the proposed balconies would not be made up for by the additional sunlighting received to the proposed living are windows.
202. Overall the layout and orientation of the flats is considered to be acceptable and would offer satisfactory outlook, aspect and sunlighting and daylighting. It is also worth noting that any future purchaser or occupier of the units would be fully aware of the nature of the current development and would consider this before deciding to whether to purchase.

Inclusive access

203. All units are designed to be compliant to meet at least Building Regulation Requirement Part M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings', The submitted proposed plans show two lift cores within the main building and therefore it would be expected that step-free access requirements are met.
204. Whilst the submitted Design and Access Statement outlines that three of the proposed units would be designed to meet Building Regulation Requirement Part M4(3), the proposed plans do not identify if any of the proposed units are designed to be compliant

to meet at least Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' (wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users).

205. Had the scheme been considered acceptable, clarification would have been sought as to which units would be wheelchair accessible in order for this to be secured by condition.

Children play space

206. *Policy LP31 of the adopted Local Plan seeks to maintain, and where possible, improve the children 'sand young people's play facilities in the borough. It is outlined that new development, where the estimated child occupancy is ten children or more, could lead to increased usage of, and therefore place additional burdens and strains on existing facilities. Consequently, developers for major applications will be required to submit a child occupancy assessment in line with the Council's child yield calculator, as set out in the Planning Obligations SPD.*

207. The Council's SPD outlines that Local Policy requires, in accordance with the Mayor's SPG on Shaping neighbourhoods: Play and Information Recreation (2012), developments with a child occupancy of 10 children or more to ensure there is appropriate play provision to meet the needs arising from developments.

208. In considering play space requirements for a development site, the Mayor's SPG sets out the following requirements:

Table 3: provision of play space to meet the needs of new development

	Actual Walking Distance	Under 5s	5-11 year olds	12+ year olds
No Existing Provision	Within 100m	On-site	Off-site	Off-site provision
	Within 100-400m	On-site	On-site	On-site or off-site provision
	Within 400-800m	On-site	On-site	On-site

209. The Council's population yield calculator estimates that the expected child population the proposed development would be 17.39. Based on the Mayor's Play Space SPG, a requirement of 173.9sq.m of child play space is required.

Table 4 - Child yields for the proposed development (Market Housing)

Unit Type	Number proposed	Child Yield	Total
One-bedroom flat	5	0	0
Two-bedroom flat	10	0.49	4.9
Three-bedroom flat	5	1.11	5.55
Total	20	-	10.45

Table 5 - Child yields for the proposed development (Affordable Housing)

Unit Type	Number proposed	Child Yield	Total
One-bedroom flat	0	0	0
Two-bedroom flat	2	1.12	2.16
Three-bedroom flat	2	2.39	4.78
Total	4	-	6.94

210. The applicant has submitted that, using the Mayor's SPG Child Yield Calculator; the proposed development would require a total area of 57.5sq.m of dedicated play space. However, it is stated that due to the site constraints, it is not practical or feasible to deliver

play space on site and that the area is well served with parks and gardens which contain play park within a 15-minute walk of the site (including Moormead and Bandy recreation ground, Marble Hill Park and Cambridge Gardens and playpark).

211. Notwithstanding the above; the adopted policy (Local Plan (2018) and London Plan (2016)) is clear in setting out when on-site provision is required for specific age groups. Where there is no existing play space provision within 400m - 800m; on-site provision of play space is required for under 5's, 5-11 year olds and 12+ year olds.
212. Whilst the applicant seeks to rely on the nearby parks and public open space outlined above; it is noted that the nearest park, being Marble Hill Park is located approximately 700m from the application site and therefore; on-site provision is required in order to accord with the aims and objectives of Policy LP31 of the Local Plan and the Planning Obligations SPD.
213. Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed outdoor communal area to the rear of the smaller residential block could be dedicated as children's play space to provide the required approx. 174sq.m of play space; doing so would remove any access to a functional; safe and useable outdoor amenity area serving the ground-floor flats (units 21 and 22) of the smaller residential block. As such; the provision of the necessary play space would compromise the shared amenity space and detract from the residential amenity of future occupants of these dwellings.
214. In light of the above; it is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its insufficient provision of on-site children's play space, would be contrary to policy. In particular the proposals would fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policies 3.6 of the London Plan (2011), LP31 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the guidance set out within the Mayor's SPG on Shaping neighbourhoods: Play and Information Recreation (2012) and the LBRUT Planning Obligations SPD (2014).

Air Quality

215. The site falls within an air quality Management area (AQMA). An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted in support of the application (prepared by WSP, ref: 004); which presents the findings of potential air quality impacts during both construction and operational phases of the proposed development. Identifying the type, source and significance of potential impacts, and the measures that should be employed to minimise said impacts across both phases.
216. The application site lies within an area where air quality is mainly influenced by emissions associated with traffic using the local road network. The submitted Air Quality Assessment states that, *'Based on the London Atmospheric Emissions Inventory (LAEI) maps of pollution concentrations, the Site is considered to fall into Air Pollution Exposure Criteria (APEC) A. Therefore, no mitigation is required for this aspect of the Proposed Development.'*
217. An air quality neutral assessment has been conducted which finds that the proposed development is significantly below the BEB but that the transport emissions are above the relevant TEB. The proposed development would therefore not be considered air quality neutral, prior to mitigation. The proposed submitted report therefore outlines that mitigation measures including car club membership (for a period of two years) and on-site electric vehicle charging points provision (six parking bays). Such mitigation measures could be secured by suitable planning conditions and/or obligations in order to ensure that the development scheme protects the proposed residential accommodation from external air pollution and to incorporate the appropriate mitigation measures into the final build.

218. In light of the above; it is considered that subject to suitable conditions; the proposed development would accord with the aims objectives of policy 7.14 of the London Plan (2011) and LP10 of the Local Plan (2018).

Health and Wellbeing

219. *Local Plan Policy LP30 sets out that the Council will support development that results in a pattern of land uses and facilities that encourage sustainable transport, access to green infrastructure, access to local community facilities, local health food, toilet facilities inclusive development layout and active design encouraging wellbeing. Policy LP30 requires that a Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is submitted with all major development proposals.*
220. The application is supported by a HIA prepared by Indigo Planning which include an assessment of the baseline health conditions experienced by Richmond residents, including those living in close proximity to the application site. the HIA defines the Local Impact Area as the Twickenham Riverside ward boundary; and the Wider Impact Area as the LBRuT boundary.
221. The submitted HIA identifies some mitigation measures for potential negative impacts during construction including good site practice. Additionally; it identifies positive health impacts as a result of the proposed development as well as a monitoring plan for temporary health impacts, permanent health impacts and socio-economic effects in order to enhance any positive impacts of the proposals.

Impact on Neighbouring Residential Amenity

222. *Policy LP8 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) requires that developments do not cause harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of daylight/sunlight, outlook, privacy, noise and disturbance. Furthermore, policy LP10 of the Local Plan (2018) specifically sets out the that local environmental impacts of all development proposals do not lead to detrimental effects on the health, safety and the amenity of existing and new users or occupiers of the development site, or the surrounding land.*
223. The application site is bounded to the north-west by the railway line and to the south-west by Twickenham Film Studios site, with the surrounding locality being predominantly residential.
224. The railway line to the north-west runs on an elevated embankment approximately 1.6m above the existing ground-floor level of the site. The railway embankment is approximately 20 metres in width; situated between the north-western boundary of the application site and the rear boundaries of the residential dwellings fronting Heathcote Road.
225. Replacing the existing oil refinery infrastructure and industrial buildings with new buildings of a larger height and mass, would inevitably have some impact on the amenities of nearby properties. The residential properties set to be impacted most from the proposed development are listed below:
- Numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 12a and 14 Heathcote Road (to the north-west of the railway embankment);
 - Numbers 1-24 Howmic Court (to the north-east of the application site, bounding the existing site access road);
 - Numbers 2-12 Kelvin Court (to the south-east of the application site and fronting Kelvin Drive).

Daylight/sunlight and overshadowing

226. *Policy LP8 sets out that in assessing whether sunlight and daylight conditions are good, both inside buildings and in gardens and open spaces; the Council will have regard to the most recent Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance for both new development, and for properties affected by new development. However, in it is acknowledged that in some circumstances, mathematical calculations to assess daylighting and sunlighting may be an inappropriate measure and an on-site judgement will often be necessary.*
227. The BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (P J Littlefair, 2011) guidebook, specifies in paragraph 2.2.4 that, *“Loss of light to existing windows need not be analysed if the distance of each part of the new development from the existing window is three or more times its height above the centre of the existing window. In these cases, the loss of light will be small. Thus, if the new development were 10m tall, and a typical existing ground-floor window would be 1.5m above the ground, the effect on existing buildings more than $3 \times (10 - 1.5) = 25.5\text{m}$ away, need not be analysed.”*
228. Given the siting of the proposed smaller residential block and the siting/layout of existing neighbouring non-residential buildings; it is not considered that the proposed three-storey smaller residential block would detract from the sunlighting or daylighting of neighbouring residential dwellings to an unacceptable extent.
229. The reductions in daylight for the residential neighbouring properties can be summarised as follows:
- Nos. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 12a and 14 Heathcote Road:*
230. The nearest ground-floor rear elevation of dwellings fronting Heathcote Road is at number 8 Heathcote Road. The separation distance between the proposed rear elevation of the main residential block and the existing rear elevation of no. 8 Heathcoat Road is approximately 42.6m. Given the maximum height of the proposed main residential building's rear elevation is approximately 13.0m it is noted that windows separated greater than 39m (being 13x3) from the proposed main residential building need not be analysed.
231. In accordance with the BRE guidance; it is not considered that the impact on the daylighting of windows within the rear elevations of existing dwellings fronting Heathcote Road to the north-west of the application site would be unacceptable in this regard.
- Nos. 1-24 Howmic Court:*
232. The minimum separation distance between the proposed main residential block and the existing rear elevation of Howmic Court is approximately 42.0m. Given the maximum height of the proposed main residential building's front/ northern side elevation is approximately 13.0m it is noted that windows separated greater than 39m (being 13x3) from the proposed main residential building need not be analysed.
233. In accordance with the BRE guidance; it is not considered that the existing windows within the rear elevation of Howmic Court to the north-east of the application site would experience an unacceptable loss of daylighting in this regard.
- Nos. 2-12 Kelvin Court:*
234. The minimum separation distance between the proposed main residential block and the existing rear elevation of Kelvin Court is approximately 32.0m. Given the maximum height of the proposed main residential building's front/southern side elevation is approximately 10.0m it is noted that windows separated greater than 30m (being 10x3) from the proposed main residential building need not be analysed.

235. In accordance with the BRE guidance; it is not considered that the existing windows within the rear elevation of Kelvin Court to the south-east of the application site would experience an unacceptable loss of daylighting in this regard.
236. With regard to sunlighting of existing neighbouring dwellings; the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight (P J Littlefair, 2011) guidebook, specifies in paragraph 3.2.2, *“Obstruction to sunlight may become an issue if:*
- *Some part of a new development is situated within 90° of due south of a main window wall of an existing building;*
 - *In the section drawn perpendicular to this existing window wall, the new development subtends an angle greater than 25° to the horizontal measured from the centre of the lowest window to a main living room.”*
237. It is noted that the application site is not situated within 90° of due south of any main facing window walls of Kelvin Court to the south-east, nor any main facing window walls of Howmic Court to the north-east.
238. Is acknowledged that the proposed development would be sited within 90° of due south of the main rear elevations of existing residential dwellings fronting Heathcote Road to the north-west. However, it is noted that the proposed separation distances to these dwellings would ensure that in the section drawn perpendicular to the existing south-facing windows of these dwellings; the proposed development would not subtend an angle greater than 25° to the horizontal measured from the centre of windows to main living rooms.
239. In light of the above; it is not considered that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of sunlighting to main living room windows of neighbouring dwellings.

Outlook, Privacy and Overlooking

240. With regard to overlooking and loss of privacy; policy LP8 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) specifies that a minimum distance of 20.0m can be utilised as a guideline to limit impacts on privacy amenity of neighbouring residential dwellings.
241. As mentioned above; the proposed main residential block would be sited a minimum separation distance from neighbouring residential buildings of approximately 32.0m. As such; it is not considered that the proposed main residential block would give rise to additional opportunities for overlooking of, or loss of privacy to, neighbouring habitable room windows. In addition to the above; it is acknowledged that a greater separation distance may be required to protect neighbour's privacy amenity in some instances (such as proposed taller buildings). Given the siting of the proposed main residential block and the fact that it would not be considered a 'taller' building in accordance with policy LP2, it is not considered that the proposed development would warrant requiring greater separation distances to neighbouring residential dwellings in this instance. Furthermore, given that the layout of existing neighbouring non-residential buildings to the south, and east of the application site and the presence of the railway embankment to the north-west, direct views to neighbouring residential buildings would generally be obscured. Any views afforded toward the existing hard-standing parking/vehicle manoeuvring area and garages to the rear of Howmic Court would not be considered harmful.
242. With regard to outlook amenity of neighbouring dwellings; the proposed development would only be visible within oblique views afforded toward the application site from Howmic Court to the north-east and Kelvin Court to the south-east. This combined with the proposed separation distances and the presence of existing buildings within the

Twickenham Film Studios site is considered to ensure that the outlook amenity of these neighbouring dwellings would not be unacceptably impeded as a result of the proposals.

243. Whilst the proposed main residential building would be a clearly visible addition within views afforded to the application site from existing residential dwellings fronting Heathcote Road to the north-west, the separation distance from these dwellings to the proposed main block would ensure that the scheme does not impinge on an angle greater than 25° to the horizontal when measured from the centre of the lowest window to main living rooms of these dwellings. As such; it is not considered that the proposals would impact on the outlook amenity of neighbouring occupiers to an unacceptable extent.
244. In light of the above, it is considered that, the proposed development would, on balance, preserve the privacy and outlook amenity of neighbouring residential dwellings and their occupants.

Air Quality

245. In terms of building emissions, the residential units will be individually served by gas combination boilers (27mg NO_x/kWh), which comply with the emissions limits set out within the GLA's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG. The office/commercial units will be heated and cooled by air source heat pumps and as such, building emissions are not associated with the office/commercial space.
246. The project's Energy Consultant has estimated that the residential energy demand from the gas boilers will be 94,360kWh per year. PM10 emissions have not been considered given that all plant within the residential dwellings are to be fuelled by natural gas.
247. With regards to the impacts of local traffic on the air quality for neighbouring residents; the submitted report outlines that the proposal is expected to result in all but one local road experiencing a decrease in traffic because of the proposed change of use. It suggests that an increase of 24 daily movements is expected on A305 Bridge Street (south of Arlington Road) and therefore, no significant effects on air quality are anticipated at existing receptors. With regard to future occupiers of the proposed development; an assessment of the potential for future users/residents to be exposed to poor air quality has also been undertaken.
248. An assessment of construction phase impacts associated with fugitive dust and fine particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5) emissions has been conducted; identifying that there is a low to medium risk of dust soiling impacts and a negligible to low risk of increases in particulate matter concentrations during construction. The submitted report suggests that through the implementation of proper site practice and suitable mitigation measures; such effects could be significantly reduced to ensure that the construction phase would not have a significant effect on air quality.
249. Furthermore, the applicant would be reminded that all commercial road vehicles used on the construction project must meet the European Emission Standards (commonly known as Euro standards) of Euro IV during any works that take place from the date of any consent, and all non-road mobile vehicles with compression ignition engines used within the site must comply with emission standards set in EC directive 97/68/EC. Vehicles must meet Stage III a and b emission limits and from 1st September 2015 must be registered on the Mayor of London's NRMM register.

Highways and Transportation

250. *Policy LP44 outlines that higher trip generating development should only be permitted in areas which are accessible by transport other than the private car. All new*

developments must be designed to improve accessibility, including pedestrian and cycling links. Additionally, proposals for major developments will be required to maximise opportunities to provide safe and convenient access to public transport. Policy LP44 further emphasises that new development should not have a severe impact on the operation, safety or accessibility to the local or strategic highway networks.

251. *Policy LP45 of the Local Plan requires new development to make provision for the accommodation of vehicles (cycle, 2 wheels and, where applicable, lorry Parking and electric vehicle charging points) in order to provide for the needs of the development while minimising the impact of car based travel including on the operation of the road network and local environment, and ensuring making the best use of land.*

252. *Paragraph 109 of the revised NPPF states that “development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.”*

253. A Transport Assessment (TA) has been submitted as part of the application, which examines the effects of the proposed development on the local highway network and surrounding public transport facilities. It also considers issues such as servicing the development, vehicular access and the effect of the development on the pedestrian environment and cycle routes.

Vehicle Trip Generation and impact on road network:

254. For the purpose of estimating the net trip generation, the applicant compared the estimated daily trip generation of the proposed residential use to the existing industrial use (B2). A CCTV camera was installed in order to record movements to/from the application site on Tuesday 19th June 2018 from 00:00 - 24:00. The results provided within the submitted Transport Assessment suggest that a total of 33 trips were made to/from the site on this day, with two peak periods identified between 08:00-09:00 and 16:00-17:00. A total of 9 trips to/from the site were recorded during the AM peak period and a total of 8 trips to/from the site were recorded in the PM peak period.

255. The findings of the estimated trip generation of the proposed development based on TRICS data (Trip Rate Computer Information System), demonstrates that the estimated trip generating potential of the proposed residential element would be low and not noticeable to other transport users, nor have a material impact on the operation of local transport modes. Additionally; the submitted transport assessment outlines that when compared to the existing vehicle activity at the site; the proposed scheme would generate significantly fewer vehicle trips.

256. The council's transport planning officer has raised no objections to the proposed development with regard to trip generation and impact on the road network.

Cycle and Car Parking

257. Commercial: Appendix 3 of the Local Plan sets out the parking standards for commercial developments. For B1 floorspace; the off-street parking standards require one parking space per 100-600sqm of gross internal floor area proposed.

258. The application proposes the provision of two off-street parking spaces serving the proposed employment floorspace. The off-street parking provision is therefore meet the requirements of the Local Plan and London Plan in this regard, given the development would provide approx. 612sqm of commercial floorspace.

259. In addition to the above; in accordance with London Plan standards; appendix 3 of the Local Plan requires the provision of 1 cycle parking space per 150sqm of employment

floorspace. The proposal would include the provision of 8 cycle parking spaces and would therefore accord with the aims and objectives of the Local Plan and London Plan in this regard.

260. Residential: Appendix 3 of the Local Plan sets out the parking standards required for proposed developments. Whilst the Council's parking standards are set to a maximum, these standards are expected to be met unless it can be shown there would be no adverse impact on the area in terms of street-scene or on-street parking. This is reiterated in the parking standards set out in the London Plan which specifies that in outer London areas with low PTAL, borough should consider higher levels of provisions, especially to address overspill parking pressures. For residential developments in areas of PTALs 0-3; 1-2-bedroom dwellings are required to provide 1 off-street parking space and 3+ bedroom units are required to provide 2 off-street parking spaces. For residential developments; 20% of all parking spaces must be for electric vehicles, with an additional 20% passive provision for electric vehicles in the future.
261. The proposed development is for seven 3-bedroom units, and seventeen 1-2-bedroom units. As such; the scheme would be expected to provide 31 off-street parking spaces.
262. The proposed development would include 21 car parking spaces in order to serve the 24 proposed residential units. The submitted TA suggests that given the sites accessibility to public transport, the provision of 21 parking spaces provides an appropriate balance between enabling adequate parking and ensuring promotion of alternative transport modes. Furthermore; the transport assessment includes a parking beat survey which suggests that the surrounding road network could accommodate the proposed overspill parking. Six of the proposed 21 off-street parking spaces would provide electric vehicle charging provision, which equates to 29%. Whilst no specific detail has been provided on the active and passive provision of Electric Vehicle charging facilities; it is considered that this could be secured by appropriate conditions on any future approval.
263. Notwithstanding the above; it is noted that the submitted parking beat survey has been conducted incorrectly whereby the results are based on on-street parking bays being 5.0m in length. The Richmond Council methodology to parking beat surveys specifies that the length of individual parking bays should be measured as 5.50m.
264. In light of the above; the submitted Transport Assessment fails to accurately identify that the shortfall of 10 off-street parking spaces could successfully be accommodated on-street. The proposed development therefore fails to ensure that the scheme would have a less than severe impact on the existing operation, safety or accessibility of the local highway network.
265. In addition to the above; concern has been raised regarding the rearrangement of existing parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios within the access road to Arlington Works. Given the existing circumstance on-site; the proposed alterations to the Twickenham Film Studios parking area would result in the loss of approximately 12 off-street parking spaces which presently serve an existing and established employment use within the adjacent site. The submitted application fails to address these concerns and does not provide any substantial evidence that the loss of approximately 12 parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios would not contribute to a more than severe impact on the existing operation, safety or accessibility of the Local Highway Network.
266. It is acknowledged that the applicants have expressed a willingness to accept a condition attached on any future approval requiring that a scheme is agreed which prevents access to on-street residential/commercial visitor and occupier parking permits. However, whilst it is acknowledged that restricting access to parking permits would be

necessary to deter future occupants from owning a motor-vehicle; this alone would not overcome the concerns raised above, particularly given that the CPZ operational hours are between 10:00 and 16:30, with not control during morning and evening times. Similarly; the provision of car club memberships would not overcome the concerns raised above.

267. The proposal would include 42 residential cycle parking spaces to be provided within a secure cycle storage room within the northern elevation of the main residential block. There would be 8 cycle parking spaces provided for the commercial tenants within a secure cycle storage unit to the rear of the application site. Whilst indicative details have been provided regarding the location of the proposed commercial and residential cycle parking, it is considered necessary to ensure the satisfactory provision cycle parking within the development through imposing an appropriately worded condition on any future planning permission. Such detail would be required to specify the details and final location of the cycle parking arrangements and precise details of the cycle storage facility, including its security.
268. The proposed site layout, in particular the access road into and throughout the site would be designed so that cars could enter and exit the site in forward gear. Specific detail on safety measures have not been incorporated into the scheme. Were the application considered acceptable; it is considered that such detail could be required by suitable conditions ensuring that visibility splays at ingress and egress are clear at all times and ensure the suitable and necessary safety measures installed throughout the site.

Servicing and Deliveries Servicing and Construction

269. The submitted application does not provide sufficient detail regarding the management of servicing and deliveries at each of the proposed commercial units. As these units are relatively far from the entrance to the site, would require that service vehicles/operatives operating through a residential area, and the end users are unknown, had the scheme been considered acceptable; it would be appropriate to impose a condition on any permission that requires the submission of further details regarding the delivery and servicing requirements of each of the respective commercial units.
270. Noise and air pollution caused during the construction phase would need to be managed through a construction management plan to control hours of deliveries and work, and to ensure that safe and efficient traffic operations are undertaken and maintained during the construction works. In addition, an Air Quality and Dust Management Plan to is required so to mitigate air pollution resulting from demolition/construction activities.
271. It should be noted that statutory nuisance legislation would apply through Environmental Services. It is therefore essential that a construction management plan is submitted to and agreed by the local planning authority, prior to the start of any works. Had the scheme been considered acceptable; the above-mentioned conditions would be attached to any future planning permission.

Energy and Sustainability

272. *London Plan Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions states that proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Policy 5.2 further states that carbon dioxide reduction targets should be met on-site or where clearly demonstrated this is not possible the shortfall may be provided off-site or through a cash-in-lieu contribution to secure savings elsewhere.*

273. *The council will seek to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions and require the evaluation, development and use of decentralised energy in new development and seeks an increase in the use of renewable energy on-site.*
274. *Adopted policy LP20 promotes and encourages development to be fully resilient to the future impacts of climate change in order to minimise vulnerability of people and property, new development should minimise the effects of overheating as well as minimise energy consumption in accordance with the councils cooling hierarchy.*
275. *Policy LP 22 of the Local Plan requires major applications such as this, to achieve zero carbon standards in line with London Plan policy. Additionally, it is also required that new developments conform to the Sustainable Construction checklist, meet the targets for water consumption, i.e. 105 litres / person / day for new homes and that all new non-residential buildings over 100sqm will be required to meet the relevant BREEAM 'excellent' standards.*
276. The commercial units would achieve the required BREEAM 'Excellent' rating.
277. The development would adopt a number of sustainable features, including a combination of passive design measures (enhanced fabric efficiency of the building envelope, passive solar gain, natural daylighting, air leakage, inter alia), active design (efficient air, lighting and plant systems) and renewable energy technologies (photovoltaics and air source heat pumps) results in the development would achieve a 35.16% reduction over the 2013 Building Regulation standards. The reduction in emissions from renewable technologies would equate to 27.29%.
278. However, the proposal does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets. The residual carbon dioxide emissions from the proposed residential units have been calculated as 15.612 tonnes. A zero-carbon payment to offset the 468.36 tonnes of CO₂ over a 30-year period would therefore be required. The applicant has offered a zero-carbon payment to offset the surplus the development will produce in the amount of £28,102. This figure has been confirmed as acceptable by an independent sustainability consultant acting on behalf of the Council. Notwithstanding the above; in the absence of a legally binding agreement securing the necessary zero-carbon payment to offset the surplus emission the development would produce over a 30-year period; the scheme fails to comply with Policy 5.2 of the London Plan (2011) and LP22 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).
279. In addition, the proposed development would include the installation of a photovoltaic array totalling 19.8kW comprising 66no. 300W PV panels to the roof of the main residential block. Whilst the submitted application provides indicative detail of the proposed roof layout of the main residential block with approximate PV panel arrangements; further design consideration would be required to ensure that the solar panels are appropriately integrated within the roof. Had the scheme been considered acceptable, further detail would have been secured by way of condition.
280. The submitted Sustainability and Energy Statement has been reviewed by Climate Integrated Solutions (CIS) and it has been confirmed that further detail is required of the measures implemented at each stage of the cooling hierarchy in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.2. Additional information is required where active cooling is recommended providing actual and notional cooling demand. CIS have confirmed that such detail could be secured by way of an appropriately worded planning condition. As such; it is not considered that the LPA would have grounds to refuse planning permission in the absence of the abovementioned detail.

281. With regard to the proposed commercial units; had the scheme been considered acceptable it would be recommended that a BREEAM condition is imposed to ensure an 'Excellent' score is achieved with regards to the commercial units. The condition should also include an action to provide a final (post-construction) certificate for BREEAM Excellent.
282. In light of the above, and in the absence of a binding legal agreement securing the necessary contribution to achieve required standards; the proposed development would not meet the zero-carbon standards required by adopted policy. As such; the development would fail to comply with London Plan Policy 5.2 and the aims and objectives of policies LP20 and LP22 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

Flood Risk

283. *Policy LP21 of the adopted Local Plan highlights the importance that all developments should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, including fluvial, tidal, surface water, groundwater and flooding from sewers, taking account of climate change and without increasing flood risk elsewhere.*
284. The Flood Risk Assessment submitted with the application identifies that the proposed development is located within a Flood Zone 1 area, which is land having a less than 0.1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) of fluvial/tidal flooding.
285. The Flood Risk Assessment shows that the site is at low risk of flooding from all sources. It notes that a review of SUDS options suggests that infiltration methods such as soakaways, trenches, permeable pavements and swales would not be suitable due to the industrial uses on the site and potential for contamination to be present. Green roofs and rainwater harvesting have been discounted as being impractical.
286. It is proposed that a combination of an oversized drainage network and storm cells could be used to ensure that site runoff does not exceed the existing rate. It is considered that further detail could be secured via an appropriately worded planning condition requiring additional design detail in order to suitably address relevant policies in respect of flood risk and drainage.

Drainage

287. *Policy LP21 further sets out the drainage hierarchy for developments to follow, stating any discharge should be reduced to greenfield run-off rates wherever feasible and including a requirement for evidence that capacity exists in the public sewerage network to serve their development where water is being discharged to a public sewer.*
288. The application is accompanied by a pre-planning enquiry to Thames Water for the proposal to connect to the public foul sewer. Thames Water has confirmed that there is adequate capacity in the infrastructure to accommodate the development's predicted flows. Thames Water has also indicated in principle acceptance to the proposed surface water drainage; subject to the Local Authority agreeing specified surface water run-off rates.
289. It is acknowledged that the potential residual risk affecting the proposed development, neighbouring properties and infrastructure must be considered, including the risk to site drainage and water supply infrastructure caused by pump failure, blockage or surcharging of the site and public sewer network. It is considered that further detailed design information regarding the above could be required by a suitably worded planning condition in the event of any future approval.
290. The Lead Local Flood Authority has raised no objection to the proposed development.

Biodiversity and Trees

291. *Policy LP15 of the Local Plan requires all developments to enhance existing and incorporate new biodiversity features and habitats into the design of buildings themselves as well as in appropriate design and landscaping schemes of new developments.*
292. *Additionally, policy LP16 requires that the borough's trees and landscape will be protected and enhanced. The policy notes that where trees are felled, the Council will normally require that an appropriate replacement be planted. It is also important to note that "landscape" refers to the design of all space between buildings, and includes walls and boundaries and paving materials, as well as planting.*
293. *With regard to new major developments with roof plate areas of 100sq.m or more; Policy LP 17 of the Local Plan further encourages that green roofs and/or brown roofs (at least 70%) should be incorporated where technically feasible and subject to considerations of visual impact.*
294. Whilst the proposed development would occupy a large part of the site, the existing site predominantly consists of hardstanding and waste management infrastructure of very low ecological value. The proposed development provides minimal soft-landscaped areas (approx. 17% of site coverage) and would provide only very limited space for planting of any trees likely to provide some amenity and longevity value for the site. Nevertheless, the proposed landscaping would include a more natural landscape around the proposed buildings (compared to the existing on-site circumstance), which, on balance, is considered to be an overall enhancement to the site with regard to landscaping.
295. The proposed development does not result in the loss of on-site trees or shrubs. Whilst the submitted proposed site plan shows indicative detail of the proposed landscaping scheme; had the development been considered acceptable, it would be necessary that further specific detail of proposed hard and soft landscaping is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Additionally; conditions would be required detailing suitable soil improvement works to ensure longevity of any landscaping scheme.
296. The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal which recommends that additional bat roost presence surveys are required. Subsequently a bat emergence and activity survey has been submitted which identifies that a European Protected Species Mitigation Licence (EPSML) would not be required to enable the proposed works to be lawfully undertaken. The Council's Ecological Officer has reviewed the submitted detail and raised no objections subject to conditions ensuring the recommendations set out in the submitted PEA and Bat emergence survey are implemented in full. Additionally, it is recommended that further detail of wildlife enhancements and external lighting should be secured, were the scheme suitable to recommend approval.
297. The application does not include any green roofs and/or walls as part of the proposals. It is set out within policy LP17 that the onus is on applicants to provide evidence and justification if a green roof cannot be incorporated. Where it is demonstrated that a green/brown roof is not feasible; the council will expect a green wall to be incorporated. The applicant's sustainability consultant has confirmed that a green roof has been discounted due to the proposed siting of PV panels using a ballasted system and frame, along with the provision of roof terraces above the proposed third-floor level. The Council's independent sustainability consultant has confirmed that it has been adequately demonstrated that it would difficult to provide a green roof in this instance.
298. As such; in the absence of satisfactory information to identify otherwise; the application does not suitably justify that it would not be feasible to provide green roofs or walls. The

proposed development, by reason of its lack of green roof/walls would thereby fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policy 5.11 of the London Plan (2011) and policy LP17 of the Local Plan (2018).

Contamination

299. *Policy LP10 of the Local Plan promotes, where necessary, the remediation of contaminated land where development comes forward. Potential contamination risks will need to be properly considered and adequately mitigated before development proceeds.*
300. Onsite potential sources of contamination include the current and historical land uses associated with the oil recycling centre (oil tanks, waste storage areas etc.) while offsite potential sources of contamination include the adjacent Motor Works and Film Studios. Therefore, Human Health, Controlled Waters and Property were identified as being potential receptors. Intrusive site investigation was undertaken by Leap comprised 5no. windowless boreholes to depths 3 - 4 mbgl and 3no. shell and auger holes to 10 - 20 mbgl. Groundwater monitoring wells were installed in each of the shell and auger holes and one of the windowless sample holes. One groundwater monitoring visit was undertaken. It is understood that no investigations were possible within/under buildings or the tank farms due to the site remaining operational throughout the duration of the works.
301. Made Ground was encountered across the site at depths up to 1.1 mbgl and was groundwater was struck across the site at depths between 2.7 - 3.3 mbgl. The following exceedances were recorded in the soil samples set for chemical analysis:
- Arsenic 3no. samples (max. 79mg/kg in WS103 at 0.4 mbgl)
 - Lead 8no. samples (max. 7,880mg/kg in WS103 at 0.4 mbgl)
 - Benzo(a)Pyrene 1no. sample (max. 6.9mg/kg in WS102 at 1 mbgl)
 - 3no. samples recorded elevated concentrations of various PAHs
 - Loose Chrysotile fibres were detected in WS101 at 0.4 mbgl and BH103 at 0.4 mbgl
302. The submitted report recommends that further intrusive site investigation is undertaken in all inaccessible areas following demolition. Furthermore, a remediation strategy is likely to be required following the further investigation.
303. Given the current use of the site and the sensitivity of the proposed development, it is recommended that a condition is attached to any planning permission granted requiring the submission of details of further site investigation and findings, including risk assessment and remediation strategy is submitted to the Local Authority, including a follow-up remediation works verification report.

Refuse and Recycling

304. *Policy LP24 of the Local Plan requires that all development proposals provide adequate refuse and recycling storage space and facilities to serve the new development, in line with the Council's SPD on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements.*
305. The proposed residential refuse and recycling areas would be accommodated at ground floor level within the northern elevation of the main block. The main residential block (20 units) would be served by two separate refuse/recycling areas. An additional smaller residential refuse storage facility would be provided within the south eastern corner of the application site; servicing the smaller residential block. The commercial units would be serviced by refuse/recycling storage unit sited on the south western boundary.

Table 5 - Refuse/Recycling Capacity Required

Type	Storage Area Capacity Required	Total Capacity Required
Main Residential Block		
General Waste	70L per bedroom (40 beds)	2800L
Paper recycling	2 x 240L per refuse/recycling area	960L
Mixed recycling	2 x 240L per refuse/recycling area	960L
Smaller Residential Block		
General Waste	70L per bedroom (10 beds)	700L
Paper recycling	1 x 240L	240L
Mixed recycling	1x 240L	240L
Commercial		
Combined waste/recycling	2.6m ³ per 1,000m ² GIA	1.6m ³

306. It would be the responsibility of individual residents to empty their waste and recycling into the communal refuse bins housed in the respective bin store areas. The submitted Transport Assessment outlines that all refuse collection and deliveries will be accommodated off-street, with vehicles entering and existing the site in a forward gear. The submitted swept path analysis within the Transport Assessment identifies that the Council's large refuse vehicle would be able to safely enter and exit the site in forward gear.

307. To ensure adequate refuse storage is provided on site and can be readily collected, had the scheme been acceptable to recommend approval; a condition would be recommended for the submission of and approval by the LPA of a suitable waste and recycling strategy. Subject to conditions; the proposal is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of Policy LP24 of the publication version of the Local Plan and the Council's SPD on Refuse and Recycling Storage Requirements.

Archaeology

308. An Archaeological Desk Based Assessment prepared by AB Heritage (project no. 60407) was submitted in support of the application and the site has been reviewed for its below ground archaeological potential.

309. The Greater London Archaeological Advisory Service (GLAAS) has reviewed the archaeological desk-based assessment submitted by AB Heritage and the information held on the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) for the application site. GLAAS has concluded that whilst this report suggests there could be a low potential for significant remains on the site; this could be due to a lack of previous archaeological data for this area. The submitted report states that there is likely to be disturbance however it does not include an assessment of impact nor a deposit model of the site and its potential survival based on borehole logs mentioned. As a result, further archaeological evaluation is required.

310. GLAAS has reviewed the proposals and advised that the development could cause harm to archaeological remains and field evaluation is required in order to determine appropriate mitigation. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPPF envisages evaluation being undertaken prior to determination, in this case consideration of the nature of the development, the archaeological interest and/or practical constraints are such that GLAAS considers a two-stage archaeological condition could provide an acceptable safeguard. Such a condition would require evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of surviving remains, following by a full investigation if necessary.

311. In light of the above; it is considered that the proposal would, subject to suitable conditions, comply with policy LP10 of the Local Plan and 7.8 of the London Plan in terms of protecting and safeguarding any archaeological remains found.

Other Matters

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

312. The estimated amount of Mayoral CIL for this development is £126,933.90. The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all relevant details are approved and any relief claimed.

Richmond Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

313. The estimated amount of Richmond CIL for this development is £603,777.93. The actual amount of CIL can only be confirmed once all relevant details are approved and any relief claimed.

Conclusion

314. The proposed development would result in the redevelopment of an existing waste management site to a non-waste use. As such, in accordance with policy 5.19 of the London Plan (2011), compensatory hazardous waste site provision must be secured in accordance with Policy 5.17H. Whilst the LPA appreciates that identifying capacity locally may be difficult, it is not considered that the information supplied within the application sufficiently identifies that additional compensatory hazardous waste capacity does not exist within the West London waste Plan Area. Therefore, the submitted application does not comply with the requirements of policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan. Furthermore, the submitted information does not identify any agreement or other appropriate means by which suitable compensatory site provision has been secured. As such; the scheme fails to comply with the requirements of Policy 5.17H and 5.19 of the London Plan.
315. With regard to the loss of an existing Industrial site, the proposal would fail to provide adequate replacement industrial floorspace and result in the unacceptable loss of employment space.
316. The applicant suggests that the existing site is not compatible to the area given the surrounding residential context. Furthermore; the submitted marketing feasibility report suggests that there would be demand for various small employment units on this site, stating the units as proposed would be "*much sought after and yet very hard to find*" and affordable to purchase for SMEs.
317. Notwithstanding the above; in this borough, it is common for employment, particularly industrial sites to be within established mixed use or residential areas, because of historic development patterns. This does not provide justification for a change of use, as mitigation can address impacts and constraints such as narrow access, which have been managed by existing occupiers, and therefore do not prevent any future or continued employment use. Until sufficient marketing evidence has been provided, the council maintains an in-principle objection to the loss of industrial floor space.
318. A residential-led mixed use development is inappropriate given the site's safeguarded use as a waste site. meeting housing demand within the Borough and the proposed flexible commercial uses being in keeping with the commercial units on the High Street, which are generally small in nature and largely serve the local area. Furthermore, the co-location of commercial units and residential units is considered inappropriate for the site. It is considered the proposed residential dwellings in this location, with commercial units being situated to the rear of the site would result in an unacceptable juxtaposition of the

proposed mix of uses and give rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of residential users.

319. Whilst the proposed development is not considered to be classified as a taller building; the combined height and footprint of the proposed main residential block's southern elevation would appear overly dominant and fails to fit comfortably within the rhythm of the application site. Additionally, the proposed front elevation would not display the same visual interest as the rear elevation and with little vertical emphasis over four-storeys; would be unsuccessful in breaking-up the mass and scale of the proposed building. As such; the front elevation of the proposed main building would appear visually dominant and incompatible due to the constrained nature of the application site. Furthermore, by virtue of the scale, height and siting of the proposed main residential block and the siting and height of the proposed smaller residential block, it is considered that the proposals would introduce new built elements to the application site that would be overly dominant and inharmonious with regard to the non-designated heritage assets on the site.
320. The proposed unit mix would meet the Council's aspirations. The scheme would deliver an acceptable proportion of smaller sized units, appropriate for a mixed-use area. The proposed development would meet all relevant residential space standards and the provision for private and communal amenity space would, on balance, meet the needs of the proposed development. All units would have acceptable levels of daylight/sunlight, privacy and outlook. The proposed development does not include any onsite provision of play space. Whilst the applicant seeks to rely on the nearby parks and public open space to justify this shortfall; it is noted that the nearest park, being Marble Hill Park is located approximately 700m from the application site and therefore; on-site provision is required in order to accord with the aims and objectives of Policy LP31 of the Local Plan and the Planning Obligations SPD.
321. The proposed affordable housing provision of four on site shared ownership units does not comply with policy requirements, as it below the percentage required, and does not meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The Council's Housing Officer has raised further detailed concerns, as discussed within the body of this report. Following an independent review of the submitted viability assessment and the lack of evidence of any engagement with Registered Providers; the LPA is not satisfied that the proposed scheme, with the inclusion four shared ownership units, represents the best viable option for the site and it is not considered that the maximum reasonable contribution to affordable housing would be achieved
322. Given the distance to the nearest residential properties, the existing site configuration and the inclusion of appropriate mitigation measures, the proposal would not result in any significant material impact in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties.
323. The submitted parking beat survey has been conducted incorrectly whereby the results are based on on-street parking bays being 5.0m in length. The Richmond Council methodology to parking beat surveys specifies that the length of individual parking bays should be measured as 5.50m. As such, the submitted Transport Assessment fails to accurately identify that the shortfall of 10 off-street parking spaces could successfully be accommodated on-street. Additional concern is raised regarding the rearrangement of existing parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios within the access road to the application site. Given the existing circumstance on-site; the proposed alterations to the Twickenham Film Studios parking area would result in the loss of approximately 12 off-street parking spaces which presently serve an existing and established employment use within the adjacent site. The submitted application fails to address these concerns and does not provide any substantial evidence that the loss of approximately 12 parking

spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios would not contribute to a more than severe impact on the existing operation, safety or accessibility of the Local Highway Network.

324. The potential environmental effects associated with the required demolition and construction works have been adequately identified and assessed, with proposals for their mitigation clearly outlined. Demolition and construction works would be managed under controlling documents, to be secured through planning conditions (Air Quality and Dust Management Plan, Construction Method Statement, Monitoring regime (excavation)).
325. The development would adopt a number of sustainable features; however, it does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets and in the absence of a completed S.106 agreement securing a financial contribution of £28,102.00 to the Council's carbon offset fund to mitigate the impact of development on the environment, the proposals would fail to comply with policy LP20 and LP22 of the Local Plan.
326. The proposed landscaping would include a more natural landscape around the proposed buildings (compared to the existing on-site circumstance), which, on balance, is considered to be an overall enhancement to the site with regard to landscaping. However, the application does not include any green roofs and/or walls as part of the proposals. It is set out within policy LP17 that the onus is on applicants to provide evidence and justification if a green roof cannot be incorporated.
327. The proposal has been considered in the light of the Development Plan, comments from statutory consultees, third parties including appointed external specialist consultants, the National Planning Policy Framework and compliance with Supplementary Planning Guidance as appropriate. It has been concluded that the proposal would fail to accord with the Development Plan and where there are material compliances, the planning assessment by officers has considered that these other overriding planning considerations as highlighted above should be attached greater weight. Therefore, the benefits of the proposed scheme would not overcome the harm identified as a result of the proposals and the planning application should be refused.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):

Reason for Refusal 1 - Loss of Designated Waste Site

The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing safeguarded waste site and lack of satisfactory full and proper evidence to demonstrate there is satisfactory compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste, in scale and quantity, elsewhere within the West London Waste Plan Area; would result in the unacceptable loss of land accommodating an existing waste management use which forms an essential resource for dealing with all waste streams within the Waste Plan area. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 5.17 and 5.19 of the London Plan (2016), policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan (2015) and LP24 of the Local Plan (2018).

Reason for Refusal 2 - Loss of Industrial Floorspace

The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing industrial site and lack of satisfactory full and proper marketing evidence to demonstrate there is a lack of demand for continued use of the premises as a B2 use, or appropriate alternative employment generating uses, or other suitable evidence; would result in an unacceptable loss of an industrial site, to the detriment of the local economy and range of employment premises within the borough. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 4.14 of the London Plan (2016) and LP42 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

Reason for Refusal 3 - Affordable housing

The proposed on-site affordable housing provision, by reason of its oversized unit sizes and inadequate provision of affordable units on site, would fail to meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The proposed shared ownership units would fail to meet the affordability criteria in the Intermediate Housing Policy and would fail to adequately contribute to the Borough's housing stock or maximise affordable housing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 3.13 of the London Plan (2016) and LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and the Local Planning Authority's Affordable Housing SPD.

Reason for Refusal 4 - Design

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, footprint, mass and of the severe horizontal emphasis of the eastern elevation of the proposed main residential building, combined with the height and siting of the proposed smaller residential building, would result in a cramped and contrived form of overdevelopment of the site, and would appear overbearing on the existing Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) on site. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF and policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), LP1, LP4 and LP39 of the Local Plan (2018) and the Design Quality SPD.

Reason for Refusal 5 - Mix of Uses

The proposed development, by reason of its lack of segregated pedestrian/cycle access into/throughout the site and unsatisfactory siting and layout, would result in an unacceptable co-location of uses which gives rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the proposed commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of proposed residential occupants. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 4.3 of the London Plan (2016), LP1 (A.6) and LP35(A) of the Local Plan (2018).

Reason for Refusal 6 - Transport and Highways

The proposed development, by reason of its lack of sufficient off-street parking provision, the loss of approximately 12 existing parking spaces serving Twickenham Film Studios and in the absence of a satisfactory parking survey to demonstrate there is capacity in the surrounding roads to accommodate the required parking shortfall, would adversely impact on existing on-street parking conditions, the free flow of traffic and pedestrian and vehicular safety on the surrounding highway network. Furthermore, in the absence of a binding agreement to secure the removal of rights to parking permits and provision of car club memberships for prospective occupants, the application would fail to adequately promote sustainable modes of transport. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of policies, in particular, policy LP45 of the Local Plan (2018) and the adopted Front Garden and Other Off-Street Parking, and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents.

Reason for Refusal 7 – Co2 emissions

The proposal does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets and in the absence of a binding agreement to secure a financial contribution to a carbon offset payment, the proposal would fail to mitigate the impact of development on the environment. As such, the proposal is contrary the aims and objectives of London Plan Policy 5.2 and Policies LP20 and LP22 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

Reason for Refusal 8 - Play Space

The proposed development, by reason of its insufficient provision of on-site children's play space, would fail to encourage and promote healthier and more active lifestyles. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy. In particular the proposals would fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policies 3.6 of the London Plan (2011), LP31 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the guidance set out within the Mayor's SPG on Shaping neighbourhoods: Play and Information Recreation (2012) and the LBRUT Planning Obligations SPD (2014).

1. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

2. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

3. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

4. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

5. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

6. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200

7. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75+	260	200



Planning Committee

Meeting Date:

Wednesday, 18 September 2019

Agenda

Meeting Time:

7:00 pm

Meeting Venue:

Salon - York House

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Paul Martin', with a horizontal line underneath.

Paul Martin, Chief Executive

Committee Members

Councillor Jonathan Cardy (Chair) Councillor John Coombs (Joint Vice-Chair) Councillor Roger Crouch (Joint Vice-Chair) Councillor Bill Newton Dunn Councillor Piers Allen Councillor Richard Baker Councillor Peter Buckwell Councillor J-F Burford Councillor Michael Butlin Councillor Lotte Campanale Councillor Gemma Curran Councillor Martin Elengorn Councillor Pamela Fleming Councillor Andrée Frieze Councillor Penelope Frost Councillor Kate Howard Councillor Julia Neden-Watts Councillor Suzette Nicholson

Expected Attendance

Councillor John Coombs (Joint Vice-Chair)
Councillor Roger Crouch (Joint Vice-Chair)
Councillor Piers Allen
Councillor Peter Buckwell
Councillor J-F Burford
Councillor Martin Elengorn
Councillor Andrée Frieze
Councillor Kate Howard
Councillor Julia Neden-Watts

Contact

Democratic Services, democratic.services@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk

Speaking at the meeting

To find out more about Planning Committee or register to speak, please visit www.richmond.gov.uk/planning_committee or call 020 8891 1411.

The deadline to register to speak is 12 noon the working day before the meeting.

IF YOU REQUIRE A COPY OF THIS AGENDA FRONTSHEET IN BRAILLE, LARGE PRINT, ON AUDIO TAPE, OR IN A COMMUNITY LANGUAGE, PLEASE CONTACT DEMOCRATIC SERVICES 020 8891 7275. MINICOM 020 8891 7120.



Follow us on Twitter
[@lbrut_democracy](https://twitter.com/lbrut_democracy)

PLEASE NOTE:

1. This meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site. At the start of the meeting the Chair will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The images and sound recording may be used for training purposes within the Council. Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However, the layout of the venue means that the Council is unable to guarantee a seat/location that is not within the coverage area (images and sound) of the webcasting equipment.

By entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for webcasting and/or training purposes.

2. For those members of the public with hearing difficulties induction loops have been fitted in the Council Chamber, Terrace Room, Salon and Room 7. In addition, there is an infra-red system installed in the Terrace Room. Neck loops and stetholoops are available in the Reception Office.
3. Members are reminded that they are required to securely dispose of agenda packs that contain private information.

York House
Twickenham
TW1 3AA

8 October 2019

This agenda is printed on recycled paper.

Nese keni veshtersi per te kuptuar kete botim, ju lutemi ejani ne recepcionin ne adresen e shenuar me poshte ku ne mund te organizojme perkthime nepermjet telefonit.

Albanian

এই প্রকাশনার অর্থ বুঝতে পারায় যদি আপনার কোন সমস্যা হয়, নিচে দেওয়া ঠিকানায় রিসেপশন-এ চলে আসুন যেখানে আমরা আপনাকে টেলিফোনে সোভার্বীর সেবা প্রদানের ব্যবস্থা করতে পারবো।

Bengali

જો તમને આ પુસ્તિકાની વિગતો સમજવામાં મુશ્કેલી પડતી હોય તો, કૃપયા નીચે જણાવેલ સ્થળના વિસ્તારના પર આવો, જ્યાં અમે ટેલિફોન પર ગુજરાતીમાં ઇન્ટરપ્રિટિંગ સેવાની ગોઠવણ કરી આપીશું.

Gujarati

اگر در فهمیدن این نشریه مشکل دارید، لطفاً به میز پذیرش در آدرس قید شده در زیر رجوع فرمایید تا سرویس ترجمه تلفنی برایتان فراهم آورده شود.

Farsi

إذا كانت لديك صعوبة في فهم هذا المنشور، فنرجو زيارة الإستقبال في العنوان المعطى أدناه حيث بإمكاننا أن نرتب لخدمة ترجمة شفوية هاتفية.

Arabic

اگر آپ کو اس اشاعت کو سمجھنے میں کوئی مشکل ہے تو، براؤزر میں دیکھیں کہ اسٹیبائل پر چاکر ملے، جہاں ہم آپ کیلئے ٹیلیفون انٹرپرائزنگ سروس (ٹیلیفون پر ترجمانی کی سروس) کا انتظام کر سکتے ہیں۔

Urdu

ਜੇਕਰ ਤੁਹਾਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਪਰਚੇ ਨੂੰ ਸਮਝਣ ਵਿਚ ਮੁਸ਼ਕਲ ਪੇਸ਼ ਆਉਂਦੀ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਹੇਠਾਂ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਗਏ ਪਤੇ ਉੱਪਰ ਰਿਸੈਪਸ਼ਨ 'ਤੇ ਆਓ ਜਿੱਥੇ ਅਸੀਂ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਤੇ ਗੱਲਬਾਤ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਇੰਟਰਪ੍ਰਿਟਰ ਦਾ ਪ੍ਰਬੰਧ ਕਰ ਸਕਦੇ ਹਾਂ।

Punjabi

Civic Centre, 44 York Street, Twickenham, TW1 3BZ
42 York Street, Twickenham, TW1 3BW
Centre House, 68 Sheen Lane, London SW14 8LP
Old Town Hall, Whittaker Avenue, Richmond, TW9 1TP
Or any library

ADDENDUM

This page is intentionally left blank



Planning Committee 18 September 2019

Addendum

The Addendum details amendments made to the agenda reports since their publication. It may include corrections to the report, additional information (such as extra informatives and conditions) and late correspondence received in relation to the agenda items.

18/0151/FUL – Former Imperial College Private Ground, Udney Park Road, Teddington – Pages 9 – 20

Para 7. Add the following: *'The Inspectorate intends to issue a report to the Council for fact checking in early to mid November.'*

Para 8. Add the following: *'As it is now unlikely that a final decision will not be made on the Local Green Space issue before the Public Inquiry due to start on 5th November, interested parties have requested an adjournment until the issue is decided. This request is being considered by the Public Inquiry Inspector.'*

Para 13. Public Response:

The number of letters objecting to the development has increased from 92 to 101. The number of letters supporting the proposal has increased from 141 to 145. All of these additional letters come from Teddington residents.

One objecting local resident cannot attend the meeting but has asked for specific key points to be noted in relation to her objection on ecology grounds:

- The presence of a protected species is a material consideration and must be established before a permission is granted. This is not just restricted to bats.
- It is unlawful to disturb bats anywhere in particular if the disturbance can be shown to impair their ability to survive or carry out their normal functions.
- The statement in the report that bats would not use the full site is disagreed with.
- The suggestion that floodlighting might be accepted if reduced is also disagreed with.

In response to these points it is emphasized that the recommendation to the Planning Committee does not suggest withdrawal of the reason for refusal relating to bats. It is confirmed that the views expressed, which include a more detailed 89 page report, have been passed to the Public Inquiry Inspector.

Para 26. Add *'It is recommended that a legal requirement for car share provision for residents of the proposed development and a restriction on parking permits in the event of the creation of a Controlled Parking Zone be secured in relation to the proposal.'*

Para 60. Recommendation. Under heads of terms add:

4 Requirement to provide a car club car and space for residents of the proposed development and a restriction on the issue of residential or business parking permits in the event of the creation of a controlled parking zone.

18/3816/FUL– Bushy Park Lodge, Sandy Lane, Teddington – Pages 21 – 38

Late letters

6 further letters of objection have been received raising the following points

- Inappropriate accommodation for homeless persons
- Additional noise and disturbance from use and density of occupation
- Car park overlooked from a residential bedroom – noise generation intrusive plus small rear garden
- Grave concerns about the management of the property by Spear
- No warden on site – residents mainly responsible for reporting noise/disturbances/anti-social behaviour
- Safety and security issues in an area of family housing and Bushy Park
- Spear Management Plan provides inadequate information and assurances for residents eg no complaint response times, no details on tenant assessment criteria, resident support, code of conduct, rules around visitors
- Loss of neighbour amenity
- Not a town centre location
- Units too small – non-compliant with standards – not suitable for long-term occupation
- Limited parking and public transport links
- Lack of consultation/site notices
- Devaluation

Report Amendment

New heading

CIL

The estimated amount of Mayoral CIL for this development is £0.00.

The estimated amount of Richmond CIL for this development is £0.00.

18/2174/FUL – Arlington Works, 23-27 Arlington Road, Twickenham – Pages 39 - 92

Questions submitted by Cllr Neden-Watts:

- Some residents have taken the officer's report to mean that the Council wants to use the Arlington Works site as a waste management site. Is there any reassurance that this is not going to happen? I came to a different conclusion, taking it to mean that there was an in-principle objection due to compensatory provision not being found – rather than imminent re-use as a waste site in the offing but could you clarify this point?

Officer's response: There is an in-principle objection to the proposal as the site is a designated waste site in the West London Waste Plan (WLWP), and it has not been shown that there is adequate compensatory provision or capacity for waste elsewhere (Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hounslow, Hillingdon).

- On industrial/employment space, what obligation if any is there on a developer to re-provide employment space to existing tenants on the site? This is particularly relevant due to the unusual nature of one of the current tenants (blacksmith) who thinks it is unlikely he could find suitable premises elsewhere in the borough to carry out his trade. Or is this consideration completely outweighed by loss of the industrial space being contrary to policy anyway?

Officer's response: The planning system protects land uses rather than specific users. As such, planning policy places no obligation for a developer to re-provide employment space for an existing tenant displaced by a development if the loss of that use is not considered objectionable. In this case, our assessment covers the loss of industrial and employment floorspace and forms one of the reasons for refusals.

Email received from Agent:

Parking

- Twickenham Studios only have **7 designated parking bays** along the entrance drive not 12 as stated. Loss would be 2 bays and not the 12 referred to in the reason for refusal as five are being re-provided for the Studio.
- We note that your report, para 50 states that the Councils transport/highways officer has not raised an objection to the planning application. On this basis this reason for refusal should be removed. The applicant has stated that they would enter into an agreement to remove the right to parking permits for future residents and car club membership.

Officer's response: The proposal includes the addition of new bays to the right hand side of the access road for the residential units. A change to the layout of the existing undercroft parking area is hence proposed which reduces the area of parking on the opposite side of the road. It is acknowledged that it is unnecessary to refer to the users of the assigned

spaces, however it is a loss of parking without adequate compensatory replacement and hence forms part of the reason for refusal drafted. The transport reason for refusal has been updated accordingly.

Affordable Housing

- The report refers a number of times to 4 affordable housing units. As you know, the proposal is for 8 affordable homes, four in the stand alone block and the other four in the main building. This represents 33%. They will be shared ownership units with initial entry at 25% equity and 75% rent. The Housing Officer comment that 'the scheme has not been designed to allow for the inclusion of rented homes' is not correct. It was designed 'tenure blind' and it was the subsequent viability appraisal which led to a shared equity/rental offer as a pure rental model for the affordable was not viable. Bespoke have not argued to the contrary. The affordable offer is for a range of flat sizes comprising 1 x 1b2p flat; 4x2b3p flats; 1x2b4p flat and 2x3b5p flats. So seven of the flats would be suitable for families with at least 1 child.
- In terms of a financial payment in lieu of on-site provision, your report at para 125 is inaccurate as the Grimshaw Consulting (GC) viability report refers to a 100% market scheme generating a viability surplus of £656,496 which could be used by the council as a payment in lieu should the Council prefer this to an on-site provision. Para 126 and 127 - Bespoke did not indicate the quantum of affordable considered to be viable. As you state, GC did speak to the Council's Housing Officer and they agreed that the applicant didn't need to speak to a registered provider until viability matters had been resolved. We have not received any final response from Bespoke/the Council on this matter (until the committee report last week and a subsequent email from Bespoke) and as such these conversations have not occurred. Nevertheless, we would be surprised if a local RP wouldn't be willing to take 8 shared ownership units in this location.
- I note your email yesterday which states that you will remove reference to the quality/size of the affordable housing units.
- The provision of 33% on-site affordable housing provision, as described, will clearly meet a need in the Borough and as the maximum possible is in accordance with policy at all levels
- *Officer's response: It is acknowledged that the updated offer is for 8 affordable housing units representing 33%, and the application has been assessed on those grounds. Final comments from the Council's Housing Officer and Bespoke are attached. The affordable housing reason for refusal has been updated to remove reference to oversized units.*

Land Use

- The existing use of the site comprised the 0.05ha of waste facility (this was the area permitted by the Environment Agency under licence) and a mixture of B1 commercial units and access road/servicing which

together came to 0.3ha. The oil waste recycling facility, in liaison with the EA and the Council, ceased in 2018 and the tanks/equipment removed. The commercial units are not B2 as you refer but a range of B1 uses as they operate in a residential area without causing harm. The planning history section of your report refers to 'light industry' ie B1. It was the waste facility which generated odours, fumes and large vehicles. New and refurbished B1 space will be provided to replace the very poor shed like units and the mews buildings will be refurbished and extended to accommodate this.

- Our client operated the oil refining business, only processing one type of waste (waste oils contaminated with water) for many years but the demand for this has changed – less oil from car garages etc from around the UK which was the main source).
- Only one other oil reclamation facility is listed within the West London Waste Plan Area - Brent Oils who have unexploited capacity of 1,978 tonnes/annum.
- Waste oils received at Sharpes did not only arise from the WLWP area, large majority **83%** came from outside of London (Midlands, Wales, South, South West and South East of England) this data was derived from postcode analysis used for Environment Agency quarterly and annual returns plus Hazardous Waste Data Interrogator (HWDI). Therefore only **17%** of waste received to the site was from the within the **whole of the London area**.
- In 2015 of approx. 12,000 tonnes of oily waste produced in the WLWP area only 17% was received for processing on sites also in the WLWP area; of which **8%** was believed to have been received by Sharpes. (960 tonnes) Brent Oils unexploited capacity of 1,978 tonnes.
- After the treatment/recycling process, beyond the treated water which was discharged to sewer, the remainder was all transported off site outside of the WLWP area and even London for further treatment/disposal by road.
- The WLWP Authority "do not see the need for new hazardous waste capacity"
- Several other waste sites within the London area not specifically the WLWP area, have been identified as also having unexploited capacity which would more than accommodate Sharpes total compensatory provision
- WLWP criteria for suitable waste sites stipulated a minimum size of 0.5 ha, anything less was considered too small for waste management use.
- Under the WLWP certain waste activities such as anaerobic digestion were allocated minimum site size specifications at 0.15 ha as the smallest site acceptable. Arlington Works was deemed too small for any of these activities at 0.05 ha.
- Arlington Works was also ranked by the WLWP on other criteria at 286 out of a total of 309 assessed.
- 87 of the 309 sites were already existing waste management facilities and Sharpes ranked 75 out of the 87 sites.

- Sharpes was only added to the WLWP and hence became a designated waste site because, it already had an existing EPR/IED EA permit.
- Access for 44 ton articulated vehicles was dangerous and difficult as they were required to **reverse** from the main road all the way down the drive and onto the site, this was impossible on occasions due to local residents parking on restricted areas of the road.

Sharpe's Recycle Oil has now been closed for nearly a year (30th Sept 2018) with all of the necessary infrastructure having been removed by mid Nov 2018. No waste has been received at the site for nearly a year. The waste which our client once received has, where necessary, found other facilities for treatment and disposal. Additional compensatory hazardous waste capacity quite obviously does exist some within the WLWP at Brent Oils and the rest at other London facilities such as Williams Environmental and Associated Reclaimed Oils as well as other facilities outside the London area may be within closer proximity to where the waste was produced.

This site is clearly not suitable as a hazardous waste site, for the reasons set out above. The proposed mix of B1 commercial (B1a/b/c) and residential is an appropriate re-use of this site, striking the right balance between homes and employment space for local people.

Officer's response: The existing uses on site have been clarified above. The loss of a waste site has been set out in the officer's report, and the council maintains it's position on this point.

Design

A design led approach has been taken to this development. We note your comments at para 141 that the existing appearance of the site detracts from the area and that the height of the proposed development is consistent with that of the surrounding area (para 147/148). The resulting density, noted at para 31 and 174/175, is at the lower end of the London Plan guidelines for a location such as this. We are surprised therefore that an objection is raised based on the relationship with the mews properties, which are due to be retained and refurbished, and reference to 'over intensification' and 'overdevelopment' in the reasons for refusal (4). The development will make the best use of this site, which is not visible from the street whilst enhancing the BTMs through refurbishment and better quality neighbouring buildings and uses. As mews properties, originally stables to larger residential villas, it is appropriate that that should appear as subservient to and 'hidden' by a larger residential neighbour. The courtyard space and setting of the BTMs will be retained and enhanced.

Amenity Space

All flats will have access to balconies or garden space (eg at the rear of the smaller and larger residential buildings). The child yield for the development of this size and nature will not be significant and formal and informal children's play is available in local parks in addition to the on site space noted above.

We are disappointed that after many months (and years) of negotiations, that this mixed use development, which will enhance the appearance and character of the area, is recommended for refusal. The applicant has confirmed that they would commit to a number of obligations through a s106 agreement, including affordable housing, and as such it is open to members to resolve to approve the application this evening subject to the satisfactory completion of a s106 Agreement.

Officer response: Issues regarding design and amenity space have been fully covered in the Officer's report.

Amendment to Report

Para 4 to be replaced by

- A linear, single storey corrugated steel-clad workshop building, extends north eastwards from the rear of the eastern (BTM) terrace, and at present, is still occupied by tenants. These tenants include a Blacksmith, Carpenter, Car Repair, Stone Mason, Electric repair (all within B2 Use Class), Upholstery and Studios (B1c Use Class) and storage units (B8 Use Class). These are in addition to the site's main use as an Oil Refinery (B6 Use Class).
- Existing B1/B2/B8 uses: 975.5sqm
Existing B6 uses: 394sqm
Total existing uses: 1369.5sqm
Total proposed commercial uses: 610sqm

Amendment to Paragraph 44:

- London Borough of Brent:
No comments received.

London Borough of Ealing:
No comments received.

London Borough of Harrow:
No comments received.

London Borough of Hounslow:
No comments received.

London Borough of Hillingdon:
No comments received.

Amendment to Paragraph 50 to read as:

- No objection in principle to application, however more detail of parking arrangements required, pre-commencement condition requiring submission of full Construction Method Statement required; to include detail of routes to and from site.

Amended reason for refusal 3 – Affordable Housing

- The proposed on-site affordable housing provision, by reason of its under provision of affordable units on site below the percentage required, would fail to meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The proposed shared ownership units would fail to meet the affordability criteria in the Intermediate Housing Policy and would fail to adequately contribute to the Borough's housing stock or maximise affordable housing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 3.13 of the London Plan (2016) and LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability SPG and the Local Planning Authority's Affordable Housing SPD.

Reason for Refusal 6 - Transport and Highways

- The proposed development, by reason of its lack of sufficient off-street parking provision, the loss of existing parking spaces on the access road and in the absence of a satisfactory parking survey to demonstrate there is capacity in the surrounding roads to accommodate the likely parking shortfall, would adversely impact on existing on-street parking conditions, the free flow of traffic and pedestrian and vehicular safety on the surrounding highway network. Furthermore, in the absence of a binding agreement to secure the removal of rights to parking permits and provision of car club memberships for prospective occupants, the application would fail to adequately promote sustainable modes of transport. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of policies, in particular, policy LP45 of the Local Plan (2018) and the adopted Front Garden and Other Off-Street Parking, and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents.

1. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

2. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

3. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

4. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

5. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

6. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

7. The following table shows the number of people who have been convicted of a crime in the last 10 years, by age group and gender.

Age Group	Male	Female
18-24	120	80
25-34	150	100
35-44	180	120
45-54	200	140
55-64	220	160
65-74	240	180
75-84	260	200
85-94	280	220
95-104	300	240
105-114	320	260

Mr P Villars
Indigo
Aldermay House
10-15 Queen Street
London
EC4N 1TX

Letter Printed 19 September 2019

FOR DECISION DATED
19 September 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

The Town and Country Planning Act 1990, (as amended)
Decision Notice

Application: 18/2714/FUL
Your ref: Arlington Works
Our ref: DC/DYF/18/2714/FUL
Applicant: Sharpe Refinery Service Ltd
Agent: Mr P Villars

WHEREAS in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the orders made thereunder, you have made an application received on **10 August 2018** and illustrated by plans for the permission of the Local Planning Authority to develop land situated at:

Arlington Works 23 - 27 Arlington Road Twickenham TW1 2BB

for

Redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of commercial space (B1 Use Class) within existing Buildings of Townscape Merit plus a new build unit, 24 residential units in two blocks (5 x 1 bedroom flats, 12 x 2 bedroom flats and 7 x 3 bedroom flats) and associated car parking and landscaping and other works.

NOW THEREFORE WE THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES acting by the Council of the said Borough, the Local Planning Authority HEREBY GIVE YOU NOTICE pursuant to the said Act and the Orders made thereunder that permission to develop the said land in accordance with the said application is hereby **REFUSED** subject to the reasons and informatives summarised and listed on the attached schedule.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Angus', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robert Angus
Head of Development Management

SCHEDULE OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES FOR APPLICATION 18/2714/FUL

APPLICANT NAME

Sharpe Refinery Service Ltd
C/O Indigo Planning

AGENT NAME

Mr P Villars
Aldermay House
10-15 Queen Street
London
EC4N 1TX

SITE

Arlington Works 23 - 27 Arlington Road Twickenham TW1 2BB

PROPOSAL

Redevelopment of the site to provide 610sqm of commercial space (B1 Use Class) within existing Buildings of Townscape Merit plus a new build unit, 24 residential units in two blocks (5 x 1 bedroom flats, 12 x 2 bedroom flats and 7 x 3 bedroom flats) and associated car parking and landscaping and other works.

SUMMARY OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES

REASONS

U0069278	Loss of Designated Waste Site
U0069279	Loss of Industrial Floorspace
U0069280	Affordable housing
U0069285	Design
U0069282	Mix of Uses
U0069283	Transport and Highways
U0069284	Co2 emissions
U0069281	Play Space

INFORMATIVES

U0037575	Decision drawing numbers ~~
IL26D	NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42

DETAILED REASONS AND INFORMATIVES

DETAILED REASONS

U0069278 Loss of Designated Waste Site

The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing safeguarded waste site and lack of satisfactory full and proper evidence to demonstrate there is satisfactory compensatory and equal provision of capacity for waste, in scale and quantity, elsewhere within the West London Waste Plan Area; would result in the unacceptable loss of land accommodating an existing waste manage use which forms an essential resource for dealing with all waste streams within the Waste Plan area. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 5.17 and 5.19 of the London Plan (2016), policy WLWP2 of the West London Waste Plan (2015) and LP24 of the Local Plan (2018).

U0069279 Loss of Industrial Floorspace

The proposed development, by reason of its complete loss of an existing industrial site and lack of satisfactory full and proper marketing evidence to demonstrate there is a lack of demand for continued use of the premises as a B2 use, or appropriate alternative employment generating uses, or other suitable evidence; would result in an unacceptable loss of an industrial site, to the detriment of the local economy and range of employment premises within the borough. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, policies 4.14 of the London Plan (2016) and LP42 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

U0069280 Affordable housing

The proposed on-site affordable housing provision, by reason of its under provision of affordable units on site below the percentage required, would fail to meet any priority needs for rented affordable housing. The proposed shared ownership units would fail to meet the affordability criteria in the Intermediate Housing Policy and would fail to adequately contribute to the Borough's housing stock or maximise affordable housing. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 3.13 of the London Plan (2016) and LP 36 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the Mayor's Affordable Housing & Viability Supplementary Planning Guidance and the Local Planning Authority's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Documents.

U0069285 Design

The proposed development, by reason of its siting, footprint, mass and of the severe horizontal emphasis of the eastern elevation of the proposed main residential building, combined with the height and siting of the proposed smaller residential building, would result in a cramped and contrived form of over development of the site, and would appear overbearing on the existing Buildings of Townscape Merit (BTM) on site. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF and policies 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan (2016), LP1, LP4 and LP39 of the Local Plan (2018) and the Design Quality SPD.

U0069282 Mix of Uses

The proposed development, by reason of its lack of segregated pedestrian/cycle access into/throughout the site and unsatisfactory siting and layout, would result in an unacceptable co-location of uses which gives rise to inappropriate conflict between users, to the detriment of the proposed commercial use operation and the safety/amenity of proposed residential occupants. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policy, in particular, the NPPF, policies 4.3 of the London Plan (2016), LP1 (A.6) and LP35(A) of the Local Plan (2018).

U0069283 Transport and Highways

The proposed development, by reason of its lack of sufficient off-street parking provision, the loss of existing parking spaces on the access road and in the absence of a satisfactory parking survey to demonstrate there is capacity in the surrounding roads to accommodate the likely parking shortfall, would adversely impact on existing on-street parking conditions, the free flow of traffic and pedestrian and vehicular safety on the surrounding highway network. Furthermore, in the absence of a binding agreement to secure the removal of rights to parking permits and provision of car club memberships for prospective occupants, the application would fail to adequately promote sustainable modes of transport. The scheme is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of policies, in particular, policy LP45 of the Local Plan (2018) and the adopted Front Garden and Other Off-Street Parking, and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Documents.

U0069284 Co2 emissions

The proposal does not meet the zero carbon homes policy targets and in the absence of a binding agreement to secure a financial contribution to a carbon offset payment, the proposal would fail to mitigate the impact of development on the environment. As such, the proposal is contrary the aims and objectives of London Plan Policy 5.2 and Policies LP20 and LP22 of the adopted Local Plan (2018).

U0069281 Play Space

The proposed development, by reason of its insufficient provision of on-site children's play space, would fail to encourage and promote healthier and more active lifestyles. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy. In particular the proposals would fail to comply with the aims and objectives of policies 3.6 of the London Plan (2011), LP31 of the adopted Local Plan (2018) and the guidance set out within the Mayor's SPG on Shaping neighbourhoods: Play and Information Recreation (2012) and the LBRUT Planning Obligations SPD (2014).

DETAILED INFORMATIVES

U0037575 Decision drawing numbers ~~

For the avoidance of doubt the Drawing(s) No(s) to which this decision refers are as follows:-

4786_3_10_B, 4786_3_11_B and 4786_3_20_B received on 26 October 2018

2(Outlines Elevations) and 2(Outlines Elevations 2) received on 21 August 2018

4786_2_01_A, 4786_2_02_A, 4786_3_12_A, 4786_3_13_A, 4786_3_14_A, 4786_3_15_A, 4786_3_21_A, 4786_3_22_A, 4786_3_23_A, 4786_3_24_A, and 4786_3_25_A and TCP 01, TPP 01 A received on 10 August 2018

IL26D NPPF REFUSAL- Para. 38-42

In accordance with paragraphs 38-42 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Richmond upon Thames Borough Council takes a positive and proactive approach to the delivery of sustainable development, by:

- o Providing a formal pre-application service
- o Providing written policies and guidance, all of which is available to view on the Council's website
- o Where appropriate, negotiating amendments to secure a positive decision
- o Determining applications in a timely manner.

In this instance:

- o The applicants sought formal pre-application advice, however, this was not followed and the scheme remained contrary to policy and guidance, and therefore refused without delay.

- o The applicants did not seek formal pre-application advice, and the scheme was found to be contrary to policy and guidance. The Councils recommendations for amendments were not followed, and therefore the application was subsequently refused. The Council is ready to enter into discussions to advise the applicants of relevant policy and guidance; and where possible assist in the preparation of a new planning permission.
- o The applicants did not seek formal pre-application advice, and the scheme was found to be contrary to policy and guidance, and subsequently refused. The Council is ready to enter into discussions to advise the applicants of relevant policy and guidance; and where possible assist in the preparation of a new planning permission.
- o The application was recommended for approval and referred to the first available Planning Committee, where the agents / applicants had an opportunity to present the case. The Planning Committee found the scheme was contrary to policy and guidance, and subsequently refused. The Council is ready to enter into formal pre-application discussions to advise the applicants of relevant policy and guidance; and where possible assist in the preparation of a new planning permission.

END OF SCHEDULE OF REASONS AND INFORMATIVES FOR APPLICATION
18/2714/FUL

FUL Applications

Making an Appeal – Summary Guidance

Whether to appeal

If the Local Planning Authority (LPA) turn down your application, you should look carefully at the reasons why they turned it down before you make an appeal. You should speak to the LPA to see if you can sort out the problem - perhaps by changing your proposal. An appeal should only ever be a last resort.

Type of appeal:

Planning Application

Appeal time:

Within six months of the date of the council's decision letter.

Who can appeal?

The applicant or their agent may lodge an appeal.

The right of appeal:

You can appeal against the council's decision:

- If you applied to the Local Planning Authority and they:
 - Refused permission;
 - Gave permission but with conditions you think are inappropriate;
 - Haven't approved the details of a scheme which they or the Secretary of State have already given outline planning permission for or;
 - Have approved the details of a scheme but with conditions you think are inappropriate or unreasonable.
- If the LPA rejected a proposal arising from a condition or limitation on a planning permission.
- If the LPA don't decide your application within the time allowed. Normally the time allowed is eight weeks from when they accept your application.
- If the LPA told you they needed more information before they could decide your outline planning application, but you do not want to supply this.

You will make your appeal to the Department for Communities and Local Government of which the Planning Inspectorate is a part. Most are decided by specialist officers in the Planning Inspectorate. Only the person or business applying for consent to display an advertisement may appeal. If the council issues a discontinuance notice, only those on whom the notice is served may appeal.

The appeal process:

Appeals must be made

- Online at www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk, or
- Initial Appeals, The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN.

It will be expected that all appeal documentation will be submitted electronically.

The process is fully documented on the website of the Planning Inspectorate www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk, however in summary there are three main types of appeal:

Written procedure:

Written evidence is considered from the applicant/agent/business and the council. The council will send copies of any letters of objection or support they received when considering your application. Within six weeks of the Inspectorate receiving your appeal forms the council will send a copy of their statement to the Inspectorate. You must make any comment on these within three weeks.

Hearing procedure:

Hearings allow you and the council to exchange views and discuss your appeal. Before the hearing the council will send a copy of their statement to you and the Inspectorate. You can comment on their statement in writing otherwise the Inspectorate will treat the reasons given in your appeal form as the basis of your case for discussion.

Hearings are usually held in council offices. The Inspector leads the discussion and invites the people involved to put their points across. The Inspector will visit the site unaccompanied before the hearing and will make a further accompanied visit as part of the hearing.

Inquiry procedure:

Inquiries are normally for large-scale applications. A public inquiry is a formal procedure in which both parties have legal representation.

Making your views known on someone else's appeal:

The LPA will notify anyone who took part in the consultations when you first applied for permission that you are appealing. For appeals decided by hearing or inquiry the LPA will tell interested people when and where this will be and let them know that they can attend. The Inspectorate will also take account of the views of certain groups who have a right to comment, for example, owners of a site, local amenity groups and so on.

Costs:

Normally you and the council will pay for your own expenses in an appeal. You can only claim costs when you can show that the council have behaved in an unreasonable way causing unnecessary expense.

Who to contact?

The Planning Inspectorate

Website www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Email enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Telephone 0303 444 5000

Write to Initial Appeals, The Planning Inspectorate, Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Temple Quay, Bristol BS1 6PN

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Website www.richmond.gov.uk/planning

Email planningappeals@richmond.gov.uk

Telephone 020 8891 1411 for advice

Write to The Appeals Officer, Development Control, Civic Centre, 44 York Street, Twickenham TW1 3BZ

Certificate of Lawful Use or Development

94/2139/S191


The^(a) London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Council

hereby certify that on^(b) 23rd August 1994

the [use] ~~(operations)~~ ~~(matter)~~ described in the First Schedule hereto in respect of the land specified in the Second Schedule hereto and [edged] ~~(hatched)~~ ~~(coloured)~~ ^(c) RED on the plan attached to this Certificate, [was] ~~would have been~~ lawful within the meaning of section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) for the following reason[s]

The use began more than ten years before the date of this application.



Principal Planning Officer.

Signed
authorised officer

On behalf of^(a)

Date 18 October 1994

Delete any words in square brackets which do not apply

FIRST SCHEDULE ^(d)

Use for the refining of waste oil (other than petroleum or petroleum products)
(to include the use of fuel storage tanks in this connection).

(a) Insert name of Council

(b) Insert date of application to Council

(c) Insert colour used on plan

(d) Full description of use; operations or other matter, if necessary by reference to details in the application or submitted plans, including a reference to the use class, if any, of the Use Classes Order within which the certificated use falls

CONTINUED OVERLEAF

SECOND SCHEDULE (a)

Land at Arlington Works, Arlington Road, Twickenham

Notes:

- 1 This certificate is issued solely for the purpose of section [191] [192] of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 2 It certifies that the [use] [operations] [matter] specified in the First Schedule taking place on the land described in the Second Schedule [was] [would have been] lawful on the specified date and, thus, [was not] [would not have been] liable to enforcement action under section 172 of the 1990 Act on that date.
- 3 This certificate applies only to the extent of the [use] [operations] [matter] described in the First Schedule and to the land specified in the Second Schedule and identified on the attached plan. Any [use] [operations] [matter] which is materially different from that described or which relates to other land may render the owner or occupier liable to enforcement action.
- 4 The effect of the certificate is also qualified by the proviso in section 192(4) of the 1990 Act, as amended, which states that the lawfulness of a described use or operation is only conclusively presumed where there has been no material change, before the use is instituted or the operations begun, in any of the matters relevant to determining such lawfulness.]

Delete any words in square brackets which do not apply

(e) Insert address or location of the site

LONDON BOROUGH OF
RICHMOND UPON THAMES

1994

Planning Transport
and Client Services
PLANNING

94/139/5191

CHAIN LINK FENCE ON TOP BUND WALL

GD. FL. WORKSHOPS
1ST. FL. DISUSED

1500 GAL. OIL/WATER
SUMP

225 mm FOUL DRAIN

fall

OFFICE
1ST FLOOR

FIRE
PUMP

GD. FL. WORKSHOPS
1ST FL. DISUSED

CANTEN
HOUSE

LAB

CLAYS

BOILER
HOUSE

STORAGE OF DRUMS
TO BE EMPTIED

100 mm DRAINAGE
GRATING

UNLOADING BAY

POSITION OF MEDICAL SHIP

APPROVED

SINGLE STOREY WORKSHOP

1.8 m HIGH FENCE

LOW WALL

GATE SEE 2

SITE INFORMATION BOARD

BUND WALL
0.5 m HIGH

1.8 m HIGH WALL

WIPED OIL
DISPOSAL

Fire rips through oil depot

Fire crews battled to douse 50ft high flames which engulfed a motor oil reclamation depot.

Four tanks containing more than 100,000 gallons of waste oil caught fire at Sharpes Recovery Service in St Margarets.

Staff from the neighbouring Twickenham Studios were evacuated as huge clouds of thick black smoke drifted into adjoining houses.

The intense heat of the blaze drove some people from their homes, while foam used by firefighters to keep the tanks cool shot into gardens


and on to rooftops. Railway services to St Margarets were severely disrupted.

Large crowds, many of them children on half-term holidays, congregated at places around the exclusion zone to watch the drama.

Some were sprayed when one of the hoses burst.

After the site was declared safe, assessors sifted through the debris to establish the cost of the damage and the cause of the fire, which raged for more than five hours.

Plumes of smoke: Crowds congregate at St Margarets Bridge to see the blaze



memories and old pictures to share with our readers? Do you have a reunion coming up? Anniversary? Are you trying to trace someone? Write to Richmond and Twickenham Times, 10 Road, Twickenham TW1 3SZ, email rtt@london.newsquest.co.uk including a telephon

Twickenham Times

15p

**Accountancy
World**

£6,000 - £17,000

QUALIFIED
PART QUALIFIED

FOUNDATION

TRAINEE

LEDGER CLERKS

Call us NOW!

01-948 1677



Oil tank blaze closes roads

FIFTEEN fire engines were called in to douse flames fifty feet high which engulfed a St. Margaret's motor oil reclamation depot on Wednesday.

Four tanks containing over 100,000 gallons of oil caught fire at Sharpes Recovery Service at about 1.45 p.m. Staff from the neighbouring Twickenham Film Studios were evacuated in the wake of huge clouds of black smoke which drifted into adjoining houses.

The intense heat drove some occupiers from their homes while foam used by firefighters shot into gardens and on to rooftops.

Railway services throughout St. Margaret's were disrupted throughout the afternoon and nearby roads were closed off by police.

A spokesman from the London Fire Brigade said: "The area was dampened by spray jets to keep the tanks, which contained waste oil, cool."

Large crowds, many of them children on half-term holiday, gathered to witness the blaze, some of whom were showered when one of the hoses burst sending water shooting across the road.

Residents living in houses close to Sharpes complained about the potential fire hazards as long ago as 25 years. The firm specialises in refining used motor oil.

Assessors were today sifting through the debris to establish the cost of damage and cause of the blaze which raged for five hours.

Chairman of Richmond Council's General Purposes committee, Cllr Mike Lands, met a representative of the Health and Safety Executive, the national body responsible for the reclamation site, at his request last night.

He said before the blaze: "I have been concerned for two months or so about the activities in the reclamation firm, because of complaints from residents about a strong smell emitted."

"I shall ask what measures were taken to control the activities of the firm and shall also ask the Health and Safety Executive to ensure that no work proceeds at the site which constitutes a danger or nuisance."

FOOTNOTE: The casualty was a little boy who in his excitement to see the fire, tripped over a hose and had to have stitches in his knee.

Mayor's eye view



"NOW with our bigger major... can dispense with the late sitting..."



A TEAM of firemen on their way to tackle the blaze which went on for several hours in St. Margaret's on Wednesday afternoon.

tives crushed

INSIDE PAGE 12

Oil blaze sparks evacuation

TWICKENHAM Film Studios were evacuated last week when tanks containing a quarter of a million litres of oil burst into flames in St Margarets.

Fifteen pumps, three foam tenders and a hose-laying lorry from as far afield as Mill Hill and Shoreditch rushed to the scene to tackle the blaze at Sharpe Recovery Services in Arlington Road behind the 70-year-old studios.

The fire halted work on the film "Vacation II" and the re-make of "The Dirty Dozen", which are being shot at the Studios.

Black smoke billowed over Richmond and Twickenham and huge flames could be seen leaping above surrounding rooftops as more than 80 firemen battled to control the flames.

The cause of the fire is not yet known, but one theory is that sparks from cutting equipment being used nearby might have started the blaze. At least two of the


BY GUARDIAN REPORTER

tanks, which contained waste motor oil awaiting refinement, are thought to have ruptured.

As firemen doused the blazing tanks, the water authorities had to divert resources to St Margarets from other areas to cope and 500 gallons of additional foam was commandeered as back-up.

The fire was finally put out at 5pm and residents were allowed back into the nearby flats and houses threatened by the blaze.

No one was hurt in the fire but road and rail traffic in the area was disrupted for several hours and a pall of smoke hung over the borough, stretching as far afield as Teddington.



Firemen tackle the blaze behind the film studios

Picture: STEVE SHADE

Inquiry to decide future of stables

AN INQUIRY is to be held to decide the future of a Petersham stables who were ordered to end their activities as a riding school.

It follows an appeal by Manor Farm Stables against Richmond Council's order to demolish the stable block in Petersham Road.

An application for planning permission to demolish existing buildings and build a new stable block and car park for use as a

Fury over new home for disgraced ex-councillor

A FURIOUS row is brewing in Whitton over disgraced former Richmond councillor Ray Gillum.

The man who resigned after a series of shock revelations about his past recently sold his £60,000 house in Pauline Crescent to pay off his debts.

Now Mr Gillum and his family are to be rehoused by the Council amid angry claims from neighbours

that he has jumped the housing queue.

A Whitton woman who does not wish to be named told the Guardian the "whole town was up in arms" after learning Mr Gillum is to move to a housing estate, believed to be Fielding Avenue, Twickenham, with his wife and two children.

"This is an embarrassing moment to the town," she

said. "The man got himself into debt — now he is being given the opportunity of a council home. A lot of people have been on the housing list for years and years."

But Richmond Council strongly denied claims that the former councillor had been given preferential treatment.

"Mr Gillum had to be housed by the Council

A crafty afternoon

LIVE demonstrations of every craft from candle-making to calligraphy will be held this Saturday afternoon at Hampton Hill Junior School. The annual exhibition of local arts, crafts and hobbies is organised by the Hampton Hill Association. Local craftsmen will be giving demonstrations of their skills from 2pm to 6pm.

Animal aid

LONDON Zoo have come up with a novel idea for Christmas — every one of their animals is up for adoption. A special Christmas package for adopters has been put together, with a certificate, a card from the adopted animal, a Zoo newsletter and, for the first hundred, a small gift from the Zoo. The cost of adoption varies from £10 a year for a fish to £5,000 for an elephant. Details from Caroline Jeun, Adopt An Animal, London Zoo, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY.

Fine tuning

A HAMPTON firm have won a further contract from the Ministry of Defence, bringing their total orders this year to £2 million. SAFT (UK) Limited have been asked to supply 24-volt nickel-cadmium batteries to the Ministry

Guardian
News
Briefs


Three hour battle at oil storage blaze

FIREMEN fought for more than three hours to bring this blaze under control which resulted in the nearby Twickenham Film Studios being evacuated.

Three foam tenders, a hose-laying lorry and 15 pumps from all over West London rushed to the scene to tackle the blaze at an oil storage works.

Ironically the fire brigade had inspected the premises earlier in the day and everything was said to be in order according to the boss of the premises.

But a spark from an oxy-acetylene lamp being used to clean brackets on the tanks had caught the lagging, surrounding them. Within seconds the flames had run up the side of one of the tanks and black smoke was pouring out hundreds of feet into the sky.



● Twickenham Film Studios were evacuated as a result of this fire.

CONSTRUCTION — THE MAIN KILLER FOR WORKERS — AND NOW A THREAT TO PUBLIC

NOT only did construction kill more workers than any other industry in 1983, it was also responsible for the deaths of eleven members of the public.

Latest Health and safety

Roofer blown off tank by explosion

A roofer was blown into the air when the oil tank he was working on exploded last Wednesday morning.

Residents living near Arlington Road in St Margaret's were shocked to hear the explosion around 10.50am. When fire crews from Twickenham, Rich-

mond and Heston arrived at the Sharpe Refinery Service, they found the worker stunned but unhurt.

The sub-contractor employed by Sharpe to insulate a 10ft by 15ft tank was blown off the tank's roof after using a blow torch to seal some cladding around it. But

the tank contained a mixture of water and oil and it is thought the heat caused the roof to rip off like a sardine tin.

Twickenham fire sub-officer Mark Gurney said: "First reports were there had been a fire and an explosion and we certainly received a lot of phone-calls from peo-

ple who heard the noise. By the time we got there the flames were out and all we could do was make the place safe."

Managing director of Sharp Refinery Service, Brian Roads, admitted he thought the 36,000 litre capacity tank was empty at the time when it fact it contained 4,000

litres of water-soluble oil. He said: "It was being insulated to conserve energy and we thought it was safe."

"The roofer was blown through the air but luckily was unhurt. He's back at work and I must stress that we try to adhere to the strictest safety rules."

Safety fears after oil explosion

SAFETY at an oil storage depot is under investigation after a workman using a blow torch caused a fume filled tank to explode.

Debris was scattered across the site, off Arlington Road in St Margaret's, when the oil storage tank blew up last Wednesday morning.

Luckily the workman escaped serious injury, but the cause of the explosion is now being investigated by the Health and Safety Executive and the Government Environment Agency.

Cllr Laurie Mann, who represents East Twickenham and St Margaret's ward on Richmond Council, said residents were worried after the incident.

He said: "I am told that the explosion was caused by the use of a blow torch on the exterior of the tank - which, as it contained oil, was full of inflammable vapours and ignited."

Cllr Mann added: "I am no expert on the subject of oil storage, but I am slightly surprised that this possibility was not considered before whatever work was in progress commenced."

Local councillors and residents had previously opposed the renewal of the operating licence for the depot which is run by Sharpe Refinery Service.

Managing director Brian Roads said a workman was sealing lagging on the roofing felt of the tank, which was believed to be empty.

He said it was the first accident at the depot since a serious fire in 1984.

Mr Roads continued: "Some fumes managed to come out of the tank which was virtually empty and we did not believe there was fuel in it."

by GRAHAM HARVEY

He added: "We will be bringing in much more rigorous procedures."

Cllr Mann said: "If it cannot be given a completely clean bill of health, it should be closed using the powers available to the Government for that purpose."

A
I
G
G
In

LEADER. 5th Feb.
1998

news

Blast at oil refinery

A WORKMAN with a blowtorch may have accidentally sparked an explosion at an oil depot near Twickenham last week.

The blast at 10.30am on Wednesday at Sharp Refineries Services in Arlington Road, St Margarets, left the worker shaken. But, amazingly, he was not injured.


Nothing was set alight but firemen were called to the depot, which recycles waste water and oil.

"Someone was carrying out maintenance work on one of the buildings and a blowtorch flame touched something that caused an explosion," said one fireman.

The incident has led to renewed calls for the depot to be closed.

Councillor Laurence Mann said: "It is essential that residents of this part of St Margarets can feel safe. If the site cannot be given a completely clean bill of health it should be closed using powers available to the government for that purpose."

His colleague Councillor Mike Rowlands said: "Mercifully no one was hurt. The workman at the centre of the blast was shaken but uninjured."



SCENE OF EXPLOSION: Residents have safety concerns

The depot was at the centre of controversy when councillors and residents opposed the granting of its operating licence, which finally went through in 1995 after a six-year battle.

Owner and managing director Brian Roads said a workman had been using a blowtorch while lagging a rectangular tank.

He said: "The tank was virtually empty. It contained a watery liquid, but not petroleum because we are not licensed to handle petroleum."

He said that he should have been on site before the worker started, but he had been doing his accounts to meet the Government's January 31 tax deadline.

Mr Roads defended the company's safety record. He said: "In 1984 we had a small fire caused by a sub-contractor but we have had no accidents since then. We are not high risk."

A council spokeswoman said: "Our environmental health people will be inspecting the site."



A WEEK after the derelict Three Pigeons pub was gutted by a huge blaze, Richmond Council increased pressure on the site owners to restore the building to its former glory.

With the government's backing, the council has taken powers to force site owners Intrepidur Estates Ltd to secure the pub within a matter of weeks. If they do not act, the council can organise the work themselves and charge the company.

The move follows years of wrangling with Intrepidur, who have twice bid to put luxury flats on the site.

Council leader David Williams said: "We want to see building repaired and used as a pub and restaurant."

"It is on an important part of Richmond riverside, and should be used for public benefit."

"Now Intrepidur will understand we are serious."

But an Intrepidur spokesman said: "We have written to the council and sought a meeting with them at the site."

"That should take place by the end of the week, at which point we can decide the most satisfactory course of action."

A police spokesman confirmed that inquiries are continuing into the huge blaze, which gutted the pub in the early hours of last Sunday morning (January 18th).

See also Pubs' Arson Fears page 16

IN NATIONAL LEAGUE NOTES published this week in which the borough's 11-year-olds were ranked third from 150 local authorities. Leading the way for Richmond-upon-Thames were two Catholic schools, St Elizabeth's in Richmond and St James's in Twickenham. St Edmund's RC in Whiston finished in the top ten of the 31 schools, while Sacred Heart RC in Teddington and St

down to April 1991, and dedication but added that a "strong Christian ethos" was a central factor.

"We have a high quality of personal relationships with a strong underlying notion of pastoral care here, and I believe this contributes to our achievements," she said.

Cllr David Cornwell, Chairman of the Education Committee dubbed the church school's dominance

they approach primary education.

"Catholics are strong on traditional family values and perhaps a higher standard of parenting fosters higher academic results," he suggested.

Other schools scoring highly include St Stephens C of E and Queen's C of E, along with county schools the Vineyard and Sheen Mount - where over 89 per

The news is likely to increase pressure for places on the already oversubscribed church schools which - unlike the borough county schools - have their own admissions policies.

Christine Brett, headteacher of St Elizabeth's revealed that the school has been oversubscribed for some years.

"Like many other schools in the borough, pressure has been increasing for years for places and as we are a one form entry this is particularly difficult for us."

However councillors and education representatives have been

officer on his hip, which canister on his hip, which disables suspects for up to 20 minutes.

The effects are intended to wear off leaving no lasting damage.

A police spokesman confirmed: "An officer may warn a suspect then use the spray at his discretion."

Officers have been trained to help people whose skin comes into contact with the spray.

CS spray was introduced in neighbouring Kingston last October. Since then officers have used it on four occasions.

The weapon was branded controversial after an asylum seeker died after being sprayed. A coroner at the inquest last autumn

Blast leads to call for refinery removal

AN explosion at a St Margarets oil refinery has led to calls from local councillors for its closure.

The calls came after a workman standing on a steel tank accidentally ignited vapours inside it causing an explosion which disturbed neighbours.

The blast, which took place at Sharps Refinery Services in Arlington Road at 11am on Wednesday, was so strong that it split open a corner of the tank scattering debris across the yard but left the workman unharmed.

Cllr Mike Rowlands arrived on the scene soon after the incident.

"Mercifully no-one was hurt. The workman at the centre of the blast was shaken but uninjured," he said.

The incident has renewed calls from residents and councillors to close down the site, the scene of a more serious fire back in the early eighties.

Cllr Rowlands said he will be pressing health and safety bodies to publish

their findings when they next inspect the refinery.

"It is essential that residents can feel safe, and if it cannot be given a clean bill of health, it should be closed using the powers available to the government for that purpose," he said.

According to Managing Director Brian Roads the

tank was thought to be empty.

"We didn't know there were any fumes inside it and we should have checked first," he admitted.

"The workman concerned was working on insulation material covering the tank with a blow torch

Continued on page 17

Two lovely black eyes...

A BRAVE victim fought back against a robber in a Richmond car park, leaving him with a distinctive look which police are confident will help them catch him.

The 32-year-old victim, who was keen to save the £1,000 camera he was carrying, poked the thief in both eyes, leaving him rolling on the ground in agony.

Detective Constable Peter Gason said: "He must have a right couple of shiners. We are appealing for anyone who knows who this man might be to get in touch."

The victim, who sells advertising, was returning

to his car on the ninth floor of the car park in Paradise Road on Tuesday lunchtime when two men approached.

The suspects, aged about 28, who he had seen loitering in the same car park the previous day, grabbed the camera equipment he was carrying on his shoulder.

But the victim, from Preston in Lancashire, punched one man to the ground and poked the other man in both eyes with his fingers.

He grabbed his camera back, got in his car and sped off.

DC Gason said: "He did

Continued on page 17

OLIVER'S POISON-FREE PRODUCE

NO TOXIC TREATMENTS AFTER HARVEST

NO ARTIFICIAL COLOURING

NO ARTIFICIAL FLAVOURING

NO CHEMICAL WAX COATING

NO CHEMICAL PESTICIDE RESIDUES

Car ploughs into Whiston homes after late night chase

Custom-Fit Skin Care

Come see the Clinique Custom-Fit Skin Care and get one of our free skin tests. Start your skin care routine with the Clinique Custom-Fit Skin Care System. It's the only skin care system that's designed to meet your skin's needs. To receive your free skin test, call 1-800-451-1234.

Have a nice day

Clinique's Moisturizing Cream

