

## **Statement of Evidence**

I object to the CPO as the reprovision is clearly inferior to the existing Diamond Jubilee Gardens.

### **1. Size**

Existing: 2482 square metres of non-floodable enclosed safe space.

Proposed: 3635 square metres of which 1902 sq.ms is floodable which 'will impact upon usability of the area and is a harm'\* . This floodable area will also need to provide a route for heavy lorries servicing the businesses on Eel Pie Island. Only 1733 square metres will be non- floodable - rather less than existing.

### **2. Public Realm and Footfall.**

Existing: 89% of respondents to Council's own consultation said they were regular visitors to Twickenham Riverside.

Proposed: 84% respondents said they would visit the proposed site.

One third of people with disabilities said they would no longer visit. I would suggest that this was due to overall inferior amenities, loss of cafe supporting people with learning disabilities, public toilets (now only an aspiration) and inaccessibility caused by total loss of over 80 parking spaces. This will also impact on many other visitors who are unable to cycle, walk or use public transport.

Other negative impacts of proposal.

### **3. 'Significant loss of trees'\***

40 mature trees will be lost including a specimen tree which can on only be preserved by taking cuttings!

### **4. Ecology**

'The scheme will result in loss of habitats'\*

### **5. Highways and Transport.**

'Concerns'\*. The Council's own consultants state the traffic arrangements are a danger to pedestrians and cyclists. See also 1 and 2 above.

### **6. Energy**

'...does not meet reduction of CO2 emissions'\* How much CO2 will be produced to reprovide the Gardens is not known as it is a 'complex calculation'. The required hard landscaping alone is 2525 sq metres covering the majority of the site will generate many tonnes of CO2 to produce the extensive paving.

Note \* this text is taken from the Council Officer's report to the Planning Committee held on 24th November 2022.

The proposals also conflict with Council's own Strategic Vision and Objectives and Spatial Strategy in the Richmond Local Plan in terms of the climate emergency, supporting the town's jobs and

businesses, retaining and improving existing, safe, healthy and inclusive communities. Or don't these rules apply to the Council's own developments?

Finally, as a lifelong Borough resident and former Councillor, it surprises me that the Council is persisting with this CPO against a charitable trust that is holding property for the public good. This, in itself, must be something of a rarity, if not, unprecedented. The Council should revisit the previous planning permission which had none of the negative impact of this scheme.

**David Marlow**