



CLIVE WREN Architect & Landscape Designer

The Courtyard, Evelyn Road
LONDON W4 5JL

T: +44 (0)20 8742 7944 F: +44 (0)20 8994 2902
e: CliveWren@aol.com

Tom McKevitt, Joint Development Manager PFI & PPP

BY FAX: 020 8891 7501

London Borough of Richmond upon Thames

Regal House

London Road

TWICKENHAM

TW1 3QB

16 January 2003

Dear Mr McKevitt

Twickenham Riverside

These are my comments on the Proposed Resolutions adopted by Cabinet on 10/12/ 2002.

1. I am an architect and landscape designer with 28 years' experience of river and canalside projects around the country. I live in Hammersmith, work from Chiswick and visit Richmond and Twickenham frequently, sometimes by boat. After Ken Hathaway died in July 2001, I was asked a few days before the planning committee meeting to present the scheme for the pool site that he had submitted for planning permission.
2. I had no previous knowledge of the scheme and have not been directly involved in preparing the more detailed proposals since put forward by the Twickenham Riverside Terrace Group (TRTG). However I have been watching them evolve. I objected to the Dawnay Day application and welcomed the Council's decision to withdraw from negotiations.
3. I support the Cabinet's decision to pursue a lower scale long-term scheme and to use enabling development to provide public benefits. Withdrawing the development brief that spawned the Dawnay Day scheme and reviewing what further aspects of UDP Policy T1 could or should be implemented are essential, in my view, to achieve a satisfactory outcome.
4. Welcome too is the Cabinet's decision to invest in a short-term scheme that provides public benefits. However, the proposal to demolish the first floor of the pool building does not make sense when the existing structure could be adapted so easily to provide valuable riverside facilities.
5. Here is an opportunity to create a raised public terrace with magnificent views of the river and extensive embankment level accommodation for a variety of river-related activities, bringing vitality and enhancing the character of Twickenham Riverside. Such facilities are lacking in the area and could be provided at very modest cost, a fraction of the cost of building from new. The report to Cabinet failed to identify these factors in favour of the TRTG scheme.
6. The enabling development of a lower scale long-term scheme is unlikely to be sufficient to provide such facilities from new. Even if it were, once the pool building is demolished, a



subsequent separate proposal to build in that location would amount to development in the flood plain and could be refused planning consent.

7. Retaining the first floor of the pool building would not prejudice a long-term scheme. The structure could either be incorporated into the scheme or demolished later if justified by the benefits the new long-term scheme would bring. Demolition would be premature unless or until such benefits are assured. Conservation Area Consent would be required in any event.

8. Short-term Option B, involving demolition of the pool building, would provide a sitting area set back from the river with worse views than can already be enjoyed from the embankment. Being enclosed on three sides, it would be likely to collect wind-blown litter, and its seclusion gives concern about how the area would be used. It would provide no raised terrace and no accommodation for river-related activities such as boat hire and storage. The estimated cost is £505k, possibly £570k if the rear retaining wall is not self-supporting.

9. In comparison, the estimated cost of implementing parts A and B of the TRTG scheme is £386k. It would provide some 300m² of raised public terrace and a similar amount of accommodation at embankment level, representing excellent value for money. The scheme already has planning permission and does not require Conservation Area Consent. Implementation could start immediately.

10. The report to Cabinet asserts that the cost of implementing the whole TRTG scheme would be £1m rather than £650K. This is based on a consultant's report dated 27 November 2002, which was not made public until the evening of the Cabinet meeting and is being challenged. Even if the consultant's level of costs were correct, the cost of implementing parts A and B of the TRTG scheme would only be £594k. This still represents much better value for money than Short-term Option B by virtue of the public benefits that would be provided.

11. TRTG's detailed scheme was prepared on the assumption that the Council wanted to spend no money and would be prepared to grant a long lease on the site. Clearly this is no longer the case. Nevertheless, the TRTG scheme remains fundamentally valid and it can be implemented incrementally either as a short or as part of a long-term scheme. Rather than throw the baby out with the bath water, I urge Cabinet to pursue parts A and B of the TRTG scheme instead of Short-term Option B.

Yours sincerely

Clive Wren

copies to:

Councillor Tony Arbour

Councillor Nicholas True

Twickenham Riverside Terrace Group

Twickenham Society Group

Twickenham Online