


**From:**   
**To:** [Joanna Vincent](#)  
**Subject:** STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE: FINAL SUBMISSION AGAINST THE COUNCIL'S COMPULSORY ORDER ON  
DIAMOND JUBILEE GARDENS [GATELEY-GHAM.FID85841]  
**Date:** 09 May 2023 00:07:09

---

Twickenham Riverside  
STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE: FINAL SUBMISSION AGAINST THE COUNCIL'S COMPULSORY ORDER  
ON DIAMOND JUBILEE GARDENS [GATELEY-GHAM.FID85841]

TO:  
Joanna Vincent  
Public Inquiry Manager  
for Gateley Hamer

From Berkley Driscoll  
Principal of Twickenham Alive  
Deputy chairman of the Stakeholder Reference Group

I am writing as principal of Twickenham Alive (TA), as a member of the Council's Stakeholder Group and the only organisation to regularly put on public events on Twickenham Riverside, including on the Diamond Jubilee Gardens.

I was a member of the council's (LBRuT) Stakeholder Reference Group, leading up to their appointment of the architects for the riverside development. I was also **deputy chairman of the Stakeholder Reference Group**.

I would like to state my objection to the granting of the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO). This order is wrong and unnecessary. The overall development aims of LBRuT can proceed without the CPO.

The primary aim of LBRuT to provide affordable housing, retail and commercial units can proceed without the granting of the CPO. What is known as the Water Lane part of the proposed development is not dependant on the CPO. To be clear, the provision of affordable housing on the site is not dependent on the CPO and can proceed even if the CPO is not granted.

The only element of LBRuT's development proposal that could not proceed without the grant of the CPO is the building of a block of luxury private flats.

A consideration in the granting of a CPO is how it would affect the overall development. In this case not granting the CPO would still allow the development of a significant area of the site, including the provision of the required affordable housing. The not granting of the CPO does not affect the development/improvement of the Embankment. The vast majority of LBRuT's proposal can proceed even without the CPO.

I would also like to point out, as deputy chairman of the Stakeholder Reference Group (SRG) that little or no regard was taken of the wishes of the SRG. When the design brief was published it showed little of what the SRG had put forward.

What is clear is that LBRuT's proposal and CPO application does not meet the basic requirements.

LBRuT's own design brief and Invitation To tender regarding the Diamond Jubilee Gardens (DJG) state that "Footprint maintain/extend existing surface area of c.2250msq for the benefit of the public, **in a single form.**" The proposal clearly does not provide a new garden in a single form.

Again LBRuT states that the DJG "is positioned so as not to be affected by flooding". Again, clearly not achieved in LBRuT's proposal.

The key issue is that LBRuT are not replacing the DJG with anything at least as good as or better than exists. Also, the majority of the development can proceed even without the CPO being granted.

Yours

Berkley Driscoll  
Twickenham Alive

Deputy chairman of the Stakeholder Reference Group.