

TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE TIMELINE

This details various communications/meetings that took place with the Authority from May 2018 to April 2023.

It is not exhaustive, and it does not relate solely to meetings/communications between the Trust and the Authority.

It also details significant moments in the design development of the Scheme, most notably the introduction of the Wharf Lane Podium in September 2020 and the removal of the cut-through (Water Lane/Wharf Lane) Service Road in November 2020.

KEY to various bodies/organisations mentioned in the Timeline:

RED = Twickenham Riverside Trust (TRT) significant dates

BLUE = Environment Agency (EA)

(FOI re EA material submitted 14.9.2020, FOI response 29.10.2020. No EA correspondence past 26.8.2020 contained therein)

GREEN = Port of London Authority (PLA)

PURPLE = WSP, Hopkins consultant

DP3 = Design Panel 3 (the non-councillor members of the RIBA Design Panel)

NOTE:

There were no in-person meetings between the Authority and the Trust from March 2020 until April 2022.

There has never been an in-person meeting between the Trust and the Authority's architects.

KEY

RED = Twickenham Riverside Trust (TRT) significant dates

BLUE = Environment Agency (EA)

(FOI re EA material submitted 14.9.2020, FOI response 29.10.2020. No EA correspondence past 26.8.2020 contained therein)

GREEN = Port of London Authority (PLA)

PURPLE = WSP, Hopkins consultant

DP3 = Design Panel 3 (the non-councillor members of the RIBA Design Panel)

May 2018 Local elections. Change of administration

10.7.2018 TRT meet with LBRuT officers to discuss in principle inclusion of DJG in plans for Twickenham Riverside redevelopment

10.9.2018 TRT with LBRuT, to include Cllr Gareth Roberts, Leader of the Council (GR). GR outlines plans for RIBA Competition. DJG being included in development site for RIBA Competition is raised.

9.10.2018 TRT Trustees meeting at which it is agreed that the Trust has a duty to consider any proposal

15.10.2018 TRT letter to LBRuT, stating its undertaking to consider, in relation to its objects, all plans proposed by LBRuT

Dec 2018 Stakeholders Reference Group (SRG) meetings start, inputting into RIBA Design Brief. TRT is a member of the SRG. Meetings are held every 3-4 weeks until Feb 2019, and then intermittently after that.

17.12.2018 TRT submits its “Principles for Development” document

Jan 2019 Cllr Crouch announces on Twitter his appointment as a TRT trustee. He tweets that he is “looking forward to [...] ensuring positive engagement with proposals that emerge for the future of the Riverside...”

31.1.2019 Cllr Crouch attends the first part of a Trust Meeting by invitation of the Trust. A trustee references the emerging revised Charity Commission guidelines that recommend against political appointees. Also, the 2014 Agreement between TRT and the Council makes specific mention of a “council officer” as the Council’s representative.

Feb 2019 TRT commissions legal advice, which confirms that Council cannot appoint a councillor as its representative on the trust

6.2.2019 TRT makes written undertaking to the Council confirming “the Trust’s willingness to engage with each stage of the emerging [RIBA] process”

11.2.2019 TRT press release confirming it “wholeheartedly supports the RIBA process”

March 2019 Launch of RIBA Design Competition

June 2019 Stage 2 RIBA Design Brief is published for shortlisted candidates

Sept 2019 Public consultation on designs from 5 shortlisted candidates

TRT confirms Hopkins as its preferred bidder

Matt Maher is appointed as the Council’s representative on the Trust

Nov 2019 Hopkins named as preferred bidder (chosen by the Design Panel)

Pitmans are appointed as TRT legal representatives

Nov 2019 - May 2020 Extensive discussions between the Trust and the Authority re HoTs written terms

31.1.2020 TRT meeting with the Authority, to include legal representatives for both parties. TRT indicates it would be willing to consider reprovision of more than 2600m² situated above and below the 1 in 100 +35% level within the context of the totality of public amenity delivered by any proposal.

Feb 2020 The Authority’s Finance Committee approves the appointment of Hopkins

1.4.2020 WSP (Hopkins’ consultant) submit EIA Screening Request to Richmond LPA

7.5.2020 Richmond LPA confirms to WSP that no EIA will be required.
NOTE: the LPA’s 36-page report contains, on page 36, the EA’s letter (sent to Richmond LPA by Rachel Holmes, EA planning advisor) advising of significant concerns re the location of flood defences and the use of ‘stilts’ on the concept scheme.

22.5.2020 Pitmans (TRT) letter to Ashforths (Authority), submitting revised draft of HoTs. Pitmans to Ashforths on the plan showing the reprovision (in 'notes' on the draft HoTs): "We do not think that the current plan is feasible. We are therefore reluctant to attach this plan. If an alternative plan that is viable can be provided before we exchange we can consider this and attach it."

27.5.2020 Ashforths to Pitmans: "Can you expand on why the current plan is not feasible and what could make an alternative plan viable – we are keen to understand the Trust's position." No reply is sent from the Trust. See 29.9.2020

June 2020 TRT to the Authority: clarification of minimum specification of open space

June-July 2020 Parking Consultation re changes to Zone D

5.6.2020 TRT meets with Hopkins for the 1st time. Scheme shown is as per the competition concept scheme

8.6.2020 Paul Chadwick to TRT: Tone of meeting was "dispiriting". If the plan is "unacceptable", need detailed reasons why. "We will use that note here at the Council to consider our next steps if that were, sadly, to be the case."

12.6.2020 TRT to Paul Chadwick: reiterating Key Requirements of the Design Brief, and that the Authority is unable to demonstrate that its Scheme is compliant with PLA and EA policy or that the proposal addresses Eel Pie Island/Embankment access/servicing requirements (as detailed in the Design Brief)

12.6.2020 PLA (Senior Planning Officer) to Eel Pie Island Association: "I am just writing to confirm that the planning department of the PLA is not currently in discussions with London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames (LBRUT) on this project. [...] If there are more detailed plans available, I would be keen to see and review them [...] It may be useful if we could discuss the proposals?"

24.6.2020 TRT receives a "final offer" from the Authority. Paul Chadwick: "Should your stance remain unchanged [...] the Council will need to fully consider its options"

30.6.2020 The Authority's Project Team contact the EA for the first time. Paul Chadwick to EA Planning/Engagement Manager: "We are again looking to redevelop Twickenham Riverside. [...] Would you please be able to help me arrange a meeting, in the next few weeks, with the relevant officers from the EA? We would like to be clear from the outset what aspects of the emerging design, if any, need areas of focus."

7.7.2020 PLA to the Authority (in response to June/July 2020 CPZ Zone D Parking Consultation): "Whilst the PLA is supportive of any proposal that will regenerate and enhance riverside areas, this must be done with the support and cooperation of all relevant stakeholders, which at this location must include the PLA and the various operators at Eel Pie Island, to ensure that the existing boatyards and services can continue to operate effectively and that access to/from Eel Pie island is enhanced as part these regeneration proposals."

8.7.2020 TRT meet with Hopkins and LDA (landscape architects). TRT raises public realm design in light of Covid, and known unresolved matters with PLA and EPIA. Chair of the Trust: "Once you understand what space you are able to deliver [...] but no-one knows yet what you can do with the buildings and the area."

15.7.2020 TRT email to the Authority: "We both know that you have many hurdles to cross on your plans, not only with the Eel Pie Island residents and businesses, but also with the Port of London Authority and the Environment Agency. Furthermore, throughout the process you have been at pains to point out to all the stakeholders that your 'final offer' plans are indicative only."

24.7.2020 The Authority and Hopkins meet with the EA for the first time. The Authority to EA: "Thank you very much for meeting with us today, a very helpful first meeting."

27.7.2020 EA planning officers to the Authority: "It would be useful to have any drawings, plans and sections you have available as well as any details of potential changes in ground level. It would also be useful to have any details available of the Tidal Flood Defence and how this fits in with the development."

29.7.2020 The Authority sends EA planning officers detailed email, to include “a number of drawings”, and a link to background information/more images. Agenda includes “presentation of the scheme”. There are 5 “Discussions points”: flood data; flood storage area; Thames buffer zone; flood defence; water compatible development

30.7.2020 The Authority/Hopkins meet with EA planning officers for a “technical meeting” (see above for agenda items). Rachel Holmes (EA planning advisor) who had submitted the advice to the Authority’s LPA in April 2020 is present.

5.8.2020 @ 08:42 The Authority to EA planning officers: “As discussed at the meeting, coming to some agreements on the design will need to happen fairly swiftly for us (end of the month) if we are to stick to our programme.”

14.8.2020 The Authority/Hopkins meeting with EA Planning/Engagement Manager: non water compatible elevations built over flood zone 3b; flood defence design/maintenance; increasing biodiversity (river wall structure)

17.8.2020 @ 23:41 Hopkins to the Authority: “Copy of revised scheme attached”

18.8.2020 @ 09.21 The Authority share Hopkins ‘podium’ redesign with EA planning officers

25.8.2020 WSP to Eel Pie Island Association (EPIA), responding to chasing email re responses to concerns previously raised: “We are continuing to develop the design of the riverside area, and at this stage do not have any further plans to share with you”

26.8.2020 @ 2:00-4:00pm The Authority/Hopkins meet with EA to discuss the Scheme’s redesign

26.8.2020 @ 4:00pm Stakeholders Reference Group (SRG) meeting at which the Authority’s Project Team reveals flat plans of the redesigned Scheme, introducing the Wharf Lane Podium (Hopkins are not present). The revised Scheme is presented without using the words “flood defence wall”. No attendees realise that the flat plan is showing a 2.5m wall next to the riverside. A design freeze at the end of September

is announced. The Authority release no visuals relating to the meeting, but images are captured from the presentation.

7.9.2020 TRT Trustees meeting. Minutes: “The Trustees agreed unanimously that these changes to the Wharf Lane Buildings are completely unsatisfactory [...]”

8.9.2020 EPIA to WSP: “I understand that there have been substantial changes to the overall layout and a revised plan was presented during the SRG. [...] Given the many unresolved issues since your last presentation [22.7.2020], the key points of which are summarised in my email below dated 24th July, the EPIA is understandably extremely anxious that its concerns are being overlooked.”

11.9.2020 The three non-Councillor members (the ‘DP3’) - all of whom have an architectural background - of the 7-person RIBA Competition Design Panel submit a “Joint Representation” email to Cllr Roberts (Chair of the Design Panel), detailing why ‘podium scheme’ is unacceptable and suggesting that the Design Panel should reconvene. TRT is a signatory to this letter, as are Eel Pie Island Association (EPIA), Riverside Action Group (RAG), River Thames Society (RTS), Twickenham Society, Twickenham Riverside Village Group. All SRG members are copied in.

18.9.2020 DP3 meeting with the Authority and Hopkins at which concerns are repeated and DP3 suggest that Hopkins should be looking at alternative design iterations

28.9.2020 TRT meeting with the Authority and Hopkins at which a second iteration of the Wharf Lane Podium is shown and a reprovisioned DJG indicated for the 1st time

29.9.2020 Authority to TRT: “We are also aware that the Trust requires a response to the legal drafting, and comments on this will follow. One of the outstanding points is that the Trust had commented that the previous plan was not ‘feasible’ but ‘...if an alternative plan that is viable can be provided before we exchange we can consider this and attach it.’ We are not clear what is meant by ‘viable’ in this sense?”

29.9.2020 EPIA to WSP: “On behalf of the EPIA I am writing following my last email to see when we can expect a new presentation to discuss the latest scheme

layout. [...] There is now significant concern amongst the EPIA that the last presentation on servicing (and to an extent parking) was on 22nd July, and we are now nearly in October.”

29.9.2020 WSP to EPIA: “Apologies for the delay in responding to you and the EPIA; we have continued to be busy developing the masterplan proposals over the past few months, and are still considering various options that may impact the servicing strategy for the Island.”

30.9.2020 SRG meeting with Hopkins presenting Podium #2. Henry Harrison, as SRG representative on the Design Panel (and one of the DP3), repeats the concerns as outlined in the Joint Representation of 11.9.2020 and DP3 meeting with LBRuT of 18.9.2020

3.10.2020 DP3 to Cllr Roberts: “We are unable to condone this approach and we repeat our position of regrettably being on the point of disassociating ourselves from Hopkins proposal for the redevelopment of Twickenham Riverside”

9.10.2020 Cllr Roberts to DP3: “It is important to note that during the competition the schemes were just concepts, designed in eight weeks without Council involvement (as per the procurement process). We were always fully aware that changes would have to be made and this was not hidden from the public. From the Council perspective it is not felt that an urgent review is required.”
Meeting of DP3 with architects is agreed (one of DP3 had contacted Hopkins directly)

12.10.2020 New trustees appointed

13.10.2020 WSP to EPIA/PMA (replying a chasing email): “We are currently working through some further design issues that may impact on the access strategy, and would like to resolve these before presenting the latest scheme proposals to you and the EPIA. We have an internal meeting this afternoon, and I will update you following this with some further suggestions for a meeting time.”

14.10.2020 1st meeting of new TRT Board of Trustees

15.10.2020 DP3 meet with Hopkins (the Authority is not present)

16.10.2020 WSP to EPIA/PMA (replying a chasing email): “We are still working through the access design issues mentioned below. [...] We feel it is important to wait until this issue is addressed before presenting to you and the EPIA to avoid any confusion. Rather than promise and miss another suggested meeting deadline, I will be in touch following our meetings next week to confirm when we will be ready to continue our discussions (hopefully week commencing 26th October).”

19.10.2020 DP3 to Cllr Roberts, reiterating concerns: “We must reiterate that we feel most strongly that the scheme is not at RIBA Stage 2. A practice of the proven calibre of Hopkins Architects must be allowed to do their best work, and not to have a design process compromised by the desire to adhere to a timetable that is clearly working to the detriment of the design process.”

20.10.2020 TRT to LBRuT regarding designs shown at 28.9.2020 meeting: “[...] until a solution has been found to meet the Trust’s key requirement [reprovision of the Trust’s demise], we do not believe that the project can complete RIBA Stage 2, which would set the layout and mass of the proposed buildings in stone, and we were puzzled to read recent Council stakeholder correspondence suggesting that it is preparing to do this shortly given the current issues the project faces and the deep concerns expressed by numerous stakeholder groups.”

22.10.2020 PLA (Senior Planning Officer) to EPIA: “Thank you for your e-mail with regard to this project, yes I’ve been copied in on some of the e-mails with regard to the cancellation of the October meeting. I am on leave in the week beginning the 26th October but by the end of this week I will follow up with my contact at Richmond, Anna Sadler to reiterate our concerns with the works here that could potentially affect the viability of the boatyards, which would be against London Plan planning policy, specifically policy SI15 (Water Transport) of the emerging London Plan. I will also speak to the head of my department (Jim Trimmer) with regard to whether this could also be something we may need to raise at a higher level as well.”

29.10.2020 Paul Chadwick email to TRT saying that it is considering the feasibility of obtaining and using CPO powers to acquire the Trust’s land.

04.11.2020 TRT replies to Paul Chadwick expressing the sincere hope that a CPO should not be necessary “noting ... that such a step would be controversial, would be bound to be challenged, and would inevitably lead to further cost and significant delay irrespective of the outcome”. TRT states that the Authority “misrepresents and/or oversimplifies the Trusts’s position and the negotiations which have gone on to date” and wishes to correct that for the record. It states: “that re-provision of Diamond Jubilee Gardens is fundamentally unacceptable to the Trust” and gives detail as to why “it is not of ‘equivalent amenity value’ and would not further the purposes of the Trust ... nor ... accordingly be acceptable, in our view, to the Charity Commission”.

4.11.2020 LBRuT issue SRG Update, indicating that (a) doing further work to Wharf Lane area of the site and (b) investigating both Wharf Lane and Water Lane becoming fully 2-way. Public consultation to happen by the end of the year if this is possible given the redesign process.

5.11.2020 TRT to the Authority re 29.10.2020 CPO letter. Letter dated 4.11.2020, with a 5.11.2020 postscript acknowledging 4.11.2020 SRG update

5.11.2020 Transport Committee Meeting re changes to parking Zone D and access/servicing Embankment area. Servicing/access to be more fully discussed early 2021. Committee votes to remove parking from the development site. Once planning permission is in place, there will be a 6-month Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) subject to a public consultation.

13.11.2020 TRT meeting with Hopkins. Detailed minutes produced. Nothing new to report regarding the Podium design.

16.11.2020 Finance Committee Meeting re approving funds for CPO of DJG. Decision: CPO against TRT to be considered at January meeting of this committee. In principle CPO against PLA allocated funding to progress.

18.11.2020 EPIA meeting with Authority/WSP/LDA. The service road connecting Water Lane and Wharf Lane has been abandoned. Proposals for 2-way Water Lane and 2-way Wharf Lane, with controlled vehicular access across the Embankment.

Podium has been pulled back away from the riverside slightly, to allow vehicular access along the Embankment.

NOTE: the Authority's Scheme is now no longer 'vehicle-free' along the Embankment. The requirements of both the EA (regarding flood storage) and the PLA (regarding vehicular movement) have meant that the 'cut-through' Service Road is no longer viable. The above has an impact on the reprovisioned open space on the Embankment being offered to TRT.

20.11.2020 Call between Chair of the Trust and the Authority. TRT Team Design and TRT Team Legal established.

Jan 2021 Public Consultation re revised Hopkins scheme

08.02.2021 A trustee makes first approach to LBRUT regarding the status of the Diamond Jubilee Gardens in the context of the Brownfield Land Register (BLR) and queries whether its inclusion in 2017 was erroneous.

16.02.2021 First reply from the Authority states that the Gardens were 'brownfield' and that " 'in planning terms' the Diamond Jubilee Gardens are not designated public open space within the Adopted Local Plan". This is followed by further approaches to the Authority (using FOI requests and through the Trust's chair), without success.

08.04.2021 The trustee emails Paul Chadwick regarding the 'public open space' designation of the Gardens and querying their entry on the BLR – "so that trustees, like myself, can make informed decisions going forward".

28.04.2021 Reply from Paul Chadwick: "What I would like to understand before we can try to help you any more is just what your objectives are against where we are heading with this project in overall terms. At the moment I am at a loss as to understand that and to understand why any more information and clarity than you already have is truly [needed]." The trustee acknowledges receipt expressing regret that the information is not forthcoming, insisting that it is required for her to carry out her duties as a trustee, and stating that she has referred the matter to the Information Ombudsman on 29.04.2021.

April 2021 Most recent version of the Heads of Terms (other than editorial changes), which remain “Subject to contract, Council and Trust approval, & without prejudice”.

27.05.2021 TRT instructs Carter Jonas to produce the Charity-Commission required surveyor’s reports in relation to the proposed Twickenham Riverside development.

June 2021 Council makes available the definitive version of the plan to be attached to the Heads of Terms, showing the area offered to the Trust as a re-provision for the existing Diamond Jubilee Gardens.

28.06.2021 The Authority’s Finance, Policy & Resources Committee agrees to make a CPO on the Diamond Jubilee Gardens and publishes its draft CPO Statement of Reasons.

16.07.2021 Draft Qualified Surveyor’s Report received by the Trust from Carter Jonas.

27.08.2021 The Authority’s planning application for Twickenham Riverside is validated.

20.09.2021 The Authority revises its proposal and grounds in relation to the CPO. As a result, TRT (which was in receipt of a draft second report from Carter Jonas on open space replacement land considerations) is obliged to refer back to Carter Jonas to update.

21.10.2021 The Council initiates the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) process.

11.11.2021 A revised Open Space Land Replacement Report is received by the Trust from Carter Jonas.

18.11.2021 TRT presents two objections – (1) to the CPO itself and (2) to the Acquisition of Public Open Space using Section 19 of the Acquisition of Land Act 1981 – and calls on the Secretary of State to reject the CPO.

02.12.2021 Paul Chadwick email, raising several questions drawing a distinction between action in the CPO context and the ‘negotiated route’, probing the Trust’s intentions, and asking for sight of the Surveyor’s reports.

09.12.2021 TRT reply explaining the Trust’s concerns regarding the issue of public open space, stating that the Trust’s focus is primarily on the re-provision plan offered with the HoTs, which is not acceptable in its present form, and (on advice) holding back on sharing the full Surveyor’s reports in view of the considerable detail available in the two objections.

09.12.2021 Also, TRT email to the Authority correcting inaccuracies in a recent Council press release, suggesting, amongst other things, that terms had already been agreed by the Trust, that the Council was forced to initiate the CPO, and that the Trust had been dragging its heels.

07.01.2022 Paul Chadwick detailed email expressing disappointment and surprise at the Trust’s stance. He urges the Trust to keep “focussed on your own objects and what is best for the people of Twickenham, as we are concerned that the Trust is now straying away from this”.

25.01.2022 TRT response setting out its specific concerns, centred essentially on the loss of equal-amenity-value public open space, and inviting the Authority to “explore in detail with the Trust, with reference to the RIBA Competition Design Brief, how the present design fulfills the various elements of the Brief, indicating how the Council considers that the [present] plans would uphold the Trust’s aims in its capacity as a lease owner”.

28.01.2022 TRT complaint raised at the erroneous inclusion in 2017 of the Diamond Jubilee Gardens on the Brownfield Land Register (as part of the TAAP TW7 site, entered in its entirety) and the failure of the Council to correct this since then – in the light of the clear decisions taken by the Council in 2014 that the Gardens should be designated and remain ‘public open space’.

25.02.2022 Anna Sadler email to TRT, offering observations on three themes taken from the 25.01 email – the failure of the Council offer to compensate for the general loss of safe and optimal space on the Gardens; the negative impact of the Wharf Lane

Building on Twickenham's Riverside; and concern at the removal of the café as a future revenue stream for the Trust.

03.03.2022 Stage I decision rejecting the Trust's BLR complaint communicated to TRT.

28.03.2022 TRT appeal submitted against this decision, on the grounds that it is fundamentally flawed – because it does not take account of all the relevant circumstances and based on a number of misconceptions and errors.

22.4.2022 TRT meeting with the Authority. Any discussion of the Authority's CPO was declared by the Authority as being "off the table."

NOTE: The April 2022 meeting is the first in-person meeting for over two years, and the first meeting since the Trust's Design Team meetings in Spring 2021. The full Trust had not met with the Authority since Autumn 2021.

The next meeting between the Trust and the Authority would take place almost a year later.

During the interim period, the Trust made repeated requests with the Authority to discuss its responses to the Trust's CPO/s19 Objections.

In July 2022, the November 2022 Public Inquiry was adjourned, a matter of days before the Authority was due to publish its Statement of Case.

In July 2022, the Trust also requested a meeting with the Leader of the Council. Cllr Roberts replied: "as we're now in the legal process regarding the CPO it would, I'm afraid, be inadvisable for me to come and meet the Trust. Of course, if the very good deal which is on the table was accepted then the matter would be different, however I understand that the Trust is still inclined not to accept it."

In August 2022, the Trust met with Munira Wilson MP. See slidedeck (attached) that informed the meeting.

21.2.2023 TRT meet with the Authority to discuss the Authority's responses to its CPO/s19 Objections of November 2021

3.3.2023 TRT meet with the Authority to discuss the Authority's responses to its CPO/s19 Obejctions of November 2021