


From: 
To: [Joanna Vincent](#)
Subject: TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE CPO INQUIRY - GATELEY-GHAM.FID85841
Date: 15 March 2023 18:36:06

I understand that you are managing representations regarding the above Inquiry.

My representations are as below:

I am writing to support the confirmation of the CPO issued by the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames (the Council) on 11 October 2021 which is the subject of this Inquiry.

The powers claimed by the Council are principally under sections 226(1)a and 226(3)b and it is very clear to me that the Council has satisfied the fairly low bars of "thinking" that they need the CPO confirmed in order to carry out planning consent 21/2758/FUL and "thinking" that this will satisfy one or more of the criteria in s.226(1A).

These are:

- (a) the promotion or improvement of the economic well-being of their area;
- (b) the promotion or improvement of the social well-being of their area;
- (c) the promotion or improvement of the environmental well-being of their area

From a simple legal perspective, unless the council's "thinking" was wholly perverse such that no reasonable person could "think" it, the Council's assurance of those thoughts would seem conclusive.

Most of the objections have centred around specifics, which of course is normal for this sort of thing, but it is necessary to look at the proposal as a whole and consider the degree to which the Council's assessment is not an unreasonable one.

That the CPO is necessary to carry out the development cannot be argued with and I propose to leave it at that.

I have lived in the area for some 37 years and throughout the whole of that time this site has been the source of contention, much of it political rather than practical. Scheme after scheme has been proposed and opposed: the pattern being that the initial enthusiasm of those looking at plans has been whittled away by obsession with elements of it which are not quite right in the minds of those opposed; and with that disaffection magnified for political reasons by whichever party was in opposition.

For 8 years, from 1994-2002, I was a local councillor and the site was then, as now, a political football, with schemes that were acceptable in planning terms being obstructed by people who had ideas which were either financially unworkable or would have generated opposition themselves. The stasis has resulted in this area being a backwater instead of a vibrant part of our town, and most residents are completely fed up with the political grandstanding and its result. It is time to end that, and this is an opportunity.

The proposal will undoubtedly improve the local economy, will create a better social environment for the enjoyment of the riverside, and will free the area from being

essentially a car park. There will be changes, and objectors are correct in saying that the replacement of the Jubilee Gardens will be different, and to some minds worse, but overall, it is very far from perverse to say that by reason of these statements not being unthinkable the proposal satisfies all three of the s.226(1A) criteria. It only needs to satisfy one of them.

That is enough to have the CPO confirmed. It is not relevant that other schemes may be better or do different things. This is the proposal, and that is that. As far as I can see, not one of the objectors has dealt with the legal framework for CPO Inquiry decisions with even the slightest conviction.

Inevitably, objectors to a proposal outnumber supporters, but this is not a numbers game: the inquiry should be determined on the basis of the law relating to it and not the volume of objections, many of which just repeat each other in a frenzy of cutting and pasting, and are not germane to the grounds for decision. It should also not be assumed that groups such as the Twickenham Society, of whom I am a life member, have reflected every view of all of their members, but as I say, theirs too is just an empty cutting and pasting exercise.

With kind regards,

--

Laurence N Mann

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]