

LBR34/INQ-26

THE LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTIONS 226(1)(a) AND
226(3)(b)**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1976
ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

**THE LONDON BOROUGH OF RICHMOND UPON THAMES (TWICKENHAM
RIVERSIDE) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2021**

AND

**APPLICATION FOR A CERTIFICATE PURSUANT TO SECTION 19 AND
SCHEDULE 3 OF THE ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT 1981**

**REBUTTAL PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF THE
ACQUIRING AUTHORITY**

LBR34/INQ-

IN RESPONSE TO EVIDENCE:

INQ-10 & INQ-16: D MARLOW

1. **INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1. This is a response to evidence (INQ-16) submitted during the Inquiry by D Marlow and raised when presenting to the Inquiry.
- 1.2. The same references and abbreviations as used in the main Proofs of Evidence and Rebuttal Proof of Evidence (LBR07) are used in this document.

2. **RESPONSE**

- 2.1. Mr Marlow submitted extracts from a number of documents submitted during the planning process, with handwritten notes (INQ-16). The documents are not wholly clear, but what is believed to be the key concerns are addressed below. It is important to note that Planning permission for the Scheme has been granted and relevant conditions secured.

Comparison of open space

- 2.2. Mr Marlow makes reference in his handout (INQ-16) to tables on pages 63 and 64 in the Planning report (**CD 3.37**). It is unclear as to the point being raised, but the two tables refer to different areas. Table 2 is a comparison of existing and proposed open space for the whole Scheme while Table 3 is the changes to the Diamond Jubilee Gardens, existing and proposed. Both are in reference to Plan 3 (Proposed open space). These plans and areas are not necessarily the same as those used for the purposes of comparing spaces associated with the CPO and section 19 application, with maps and measurements produced by the Acquiring Authority especially for the Inquiry should be considered.

Wharf Lane two way

- 2.3. In response to this point, concerns about the proposed two-way vehicular traffic on Wharf Lane were raised in part 3.2.1 of the first version of the Stage 1 Road | Safety Audit that was submitted with the first version of the transport assessment (CD 3.14, part 4), particularly at the bell-mouth access junction where Wharf Lane meets King Street. However, the Council will introduce an Experimental Traffic Management Order which will restrict the weight of vehicles travelling between the bell-mouth access junction and the junction where the service road meets Wharf Lane to 7.5 tonnes or below. This will reduce the size of vehicles

turning left from King Street into Wharf Lane and will reduce the risk of collisions between large vehicles.

Safety Audit

- 2.4. Mr Marlow has included an extract from the Designer's Response to the first version of the Stage 1 Road safety Audit that was submitted with the first version of the transport assessment (CD 3.14, part 5). The findings from this version of the Road Safety Audit were considered in detail by Transport, Highways and Planning Officers at the Council with the planning applicant between Autumn of 2021 and October 2022 when an updated Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and Designer's Response was submitted with an updated transport assessment and appendices (CD 4.08, and CD 4.08A-H).

Embankment not a lorry route

- 2.5. This comment on the handout (INQ-16) seems to relate to an image of the current Embankment as seen from Eel Pie Island Bridge. The point being made is unclear, however the current Embankment is used by lorries and, as can be seen in the image, has a large number of parking spaces that blight the riverside. The new scheme will close the Embankment outside the hours of 7am to 10am for the enjoyment of the public, other than in exceptional circumstances. During this window it will be open to allow for servicing, particularly for the largest vehicles.