

Consultation & Engagement (W4.1.1)

- Consultations, planning application comments and petitions show strong support for the removal of car parking and strong disapproval of the Wharf Lane Building
- There is a positive, constructive way forward for Twickenham Riverside. People are telling the Authority what it is
- The Public is being absolutely consistent: They want a Park. Not a Car Park. They want a Park. Not a Wharf Lane Building

2009 Petition to Downing St. (8,650 sigs):

- "Public open space as the predominant feature of any redevelopment scheme"
- "Public open space should be immutable and that any development should have regard to the conservation nature of the area"

2009 Referendum:

"Should public land on Twickenham Riverside be sold to a property development company?"

- 6.5% voted "Yes"
- 93.5% voted "No"

2017 Trust Survey:

- Users value playground, sandpit, café, toilet, open space for free play
- Safe enclosed nature configuration works well for people and needs to be considered in the context of any proposed development plans

2021 Jan Consultation

- Online only
- Authored and analysed In House
- Closed question added
- Misleading use of results

RIBA Competition Consultation

- Young peoples votes and their reasons redacted by the Authority
- No explanation given

2021 Planning Application

- >95% of comments regarding buildings were objections
- 95% of Approval comments don't rely on buildings
- So, increase public approval by removing the Wharf Lane building

2017 #ParkNotCarPark Petition

- Demonstrated the public's desire to see car parking removed and a park put in its place

2022 Nov TRT Petition to remove the Wharf Lane building

(not objecting to Water Lane buildings OR removal of parking)

- >3,000 signatures of support

Negotiation (W4.1.3)

- The Authority has never been truly open to, or encouraged, genuine negotiation on the re-provision plan nor to genuine dialogue about maximising the practical possibilities regarding the Public Open Space on the site
- The sense is that the Authority has been determined to press through its Scheme without adjustment, other than essentially cosmetic changes or as a result of external factors imposed on it

No negotiation on Open Space

- The Authority has not entered into negotiations on the core issue of the loss of public open space resulting from constructing the Wharf Lane building on land held by the Trust

Negotiations were on future management matters only

- The only negotiation has been on future management matters. Not on the open space. Not on the point that is fundamental to this Public Inquiry

2018, Oct: Trust agrees to consider in principle the gardens being included in the scheme

- Would "consider, in relation to its Objects, all plans proposed by LBRUT"

Trust Principles for Development:

- Includes: "adjacent buildings are not overbearing/ towering over DJG and in doing so negatively impact upon the usage and enjoyment thereof"

Trust preference for Hopkins

- Competition was to choose Architect
- Design was Concept only
- Major changes required
- None of the short-listed entries would have complied as brief had omitted EA requirements

CPO Threat from June 2020

- While still a concept scheme and not compliant with EA requirements
- Attempts by the Trust to engage in discussion of the footprint or layout of the Wharf Lane building were closed down

November 2021: The first time the Trust were in possession of the facts

- This was the first time we could prepare for a vote
- Trust voted by majority to object to the CPO

Jan 2022: Trust provides detailed reasons for CPO objection to the Authority

- Trust requested further discussion
- The Authority was not willing to negotiate on the plans

CPO Justification – Wellbeing & Financial Viability (W4.1.2)

- The wellbeings listed in the Statement of Case under all three headings – Economic, Social and Environmental – are often general and misleading
- Some are either wrong or not backed up by evidence which encourages confidence that they would be delivered
- They do not “contribute to the achievement of the promotion or improvement of the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of the area” or therefore satisfy the requirement under Para 106 of the CPO Guidance
- No alternative schemes that would provide comparable wellbeings have been considered

SAVA return of £20m over 30 years not compelling

- Considering the Scheme will cost c£80m over 30 years is this a good investment?

Weak Economic Return

- No quantification of the economic wellbeings resulting from the construction of the Wharf Lane Building
- Yet this is the part of the Scheme disputed by the Trust and most impactful in the CPO

No Social Benefits from Wharf Lane Building

- Affordable housing is to be along Water Lane
- Disadvantages of current gardens can be addressed by removing dereliction & creating a true Riverside Park

Devastating Environmental Impact

- 65/66 mature trees felled
- 200m² canopy lost from Gardens
- Floating Ecosystem a fanciful distraction

Gardens misclassified as Brownfield

- Correction resisted by the Authority throughout planning the scheme
- No reassessment undertaken on the impact of this
- In breach of TAAP

The Trust supports the Affordable Housing

- This is along Water Lane, not in the Wharf Lane building
- The Trust would fully support a scheme which provides both quality affordable housing and quality open space

No evidence that the Wharf Lane building makes the scheme viable or is required in order to meet housing targets

No evidence of any alternatives being considered

- For example removing the Wharf Lane building and Car Parking, building along Water Lane and redesigning the Open space