

From: [PCU](#)
To: [Rachael Beard](#)
Subject: FW: Objection to use of CPO powers in respect of the the Jubilee Gardens Twickenham Riverside -
Date: 22 November 2021 08:16:56

From: Roger Hackett [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 November 2021 08:56
To: PCU <PCU@communities.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to use of CPO powers in respect of the the Jubilee Gardens Twickenham Riverside -

I wish to object to the proposals by Richmond Council to use a Compulsory Purchase Order to Purchase Diamond Jubilee Gardens.

A Charitable Trust Twickenham Riverside Charitable Trust (charity number 1147557) was formed in 2014 with a 125 year lease designed to protect the Diamond Jubilee Gardens. In January 2014 Diamond Jubilee Gardens, was designated a Public Open Space and formally protected for public use, performances and events.

There are now the Hopkins Design proposals with housing and a pub, and which appear to threaten this unique Conservation Area on the Thames. A popular plan for the Site called Twickenham Lido got around five thousand supporters signing its petition but the Council does not seem to want to replace the outside pool which has been left buried under the site for many years. The council threaten the charitable trust with a CPO if it did not agree to its proposals that would get rid of the public open space.

The Trust say they are "... working hard to improve the provision of public open space within the Council's proposed scheme. Our statutory obligation, as defined by the Charity Commission, is to ensure that any exchange or reversion of land is 'equally advantageous' to the people of Twickenham." They were optimistic that a fair agreement with Richmond Council could be reached. That has not happened and the trust is now opposing the Council's CPO proposals.

In June 2021 LBRUT (Richmond Council) announced that they were submitting a planning application for luxury flats and a pub - there are currently over 20 pubs within walking distance from Twickenham Riverside, on this designated as Public Open Space. There would be affordable housing on the land bought by the Council in 2014 but this will be to the side of the main site and next to a road.

It is wrong for a council to use a CPO to take over a public open space and the cost of a CPO will be enormous. The Council should not commit so much time and money to build a block of luxury flats and a pub on this protected land. There is a need for affordable housing, but this will not be on the main site but next to a road on land already acquired for this purpose - and, an affordable housing component has already been built under a previous scheme. With climate change it is important to balance building and development with care for the environment and the protection of public open spaces in towns and cities

"Our public spaces, rivers and coasts are important to our physical and mental health providing space for exercise and reflection; it is essential that we safeguard them." (the United Nations - World Environment Day).

A contested CPO which is what is now happening will be costly the council estimates

that full fees costs associated with completing this Order to be £250,000. The total estimated acquisition costs for the properties are estimated to be £600k and and if contested there will be additional costs that could increase this to over a £million? The full potential cost was still not available when the latest update report was published. It has been noted that the Council is obliged to pay all the Charitable Trust's costs to oppose any CPO application.

As the Trust has not reached agreement with the Council the authority has now decided to implement a CPO. Pursuing a CPO to acquire this Public Open Space, protected by a Charitable Trust, will use up a disproportionate amount of the Council financial resources and have an adverse impact on other council services. Some members of the Council's Finance Committee had misgivings about committing to the scheme's cost when residents were not aware of these in full." The local Liberal Democrat Party has sent out unsolicited emails to residents promoting the scheme which has attracted criticism locally.

There is no justification for the use of CPO powers. The council should continue negotiations with the charity to reach a settlement.

Roger Hackett

