

town planning Inet Email - PLANNING APPLICATIONS. 2007/2970,1&2

---

**From:** "Brian Rusbridge" <brian.rusbridge@homecall.co.uk>  
**To:** <tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk>  
**Date:** 03/03/2008 21:20  
**Subject:** PLANNING APPLICATIONS. 2007/2970,1&2

---

## HAMPTON COURT RESCUE CAMPAIGN.

Brian Rusbridge CBE  
 19 Beauchamp Road,  
 East Molesey. KT8 OPA  
 0208 979 4952  
[brian.rusbridge@homecall.co.uk](mailto:brian.rusbridge@homecall.co.uk)

3 March 2008

Ms. Ann Biggs,  
 Planning Department, Elmbridge Borough Council

PLANNING APPLICATIONS. 2007/2970/2971/2972  
 HAMPTON COURT STATION & JOLLY BOATMAN SITE

Please see the attachment for the SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION . No.1 from the Hampton Court Rescue Campaign referring to the submission made by CBE.

Brian. J. Rusbridge

Please find at

ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL TOWN PLANNING DIVISION		
FILE	TO	REG NO
	AGB	
ACKD	RECEIVED	Re- plied
	- 4 MAR 2008	CA 04/03/2008

## THE HAMPTON COURT RESCUE CAMPAIGN

Joint Co-ordinators:

**Brian J. Rusbridge CBE.** 19 Beauchamp Road, East Molesey, Surrey. KT8 0PA

Phone: 0208 979 4952 email: [brian.rusbridge@homecall.co.uk](mailto:brian.rusbridge@homecall.co.uk)

**Professor Bryan Woodriff,** Blenheim Villa, 40 Priory Road, Hampton on Thames,

Mx. TW12 2PJ email: [bryan@woodriff.co.uk](mailto:bryan@woodriff.co.uk)

Hon. Sec. **Harriet Cullis,** (Mrs.) 20 Vine Road, East Molesey, Surrey.

Phone: 0208 979 2766 email: [harrietc@hcullis.freemove.co.uk](mailto:harrietc@hcullis.freemove.co.uk)

Press & Website. **Mary Brook,** 11 Riverside, Lower Sunbury-on-Thames,

Phone: 01932 789 557 email: [brookmbusiness@googlemail.com](mailto:brookmbusiness@googlemail.com)

Martin Parker Esq., MRTPI.,  
Head of Town Planning,  
Elmbridge Borough Council,  
Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey KT10 9SD

Dear Mr. Parker,

ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL TOWN PLANNING DIVISION		
FILE	TO	REG. No
ACKD	RECEIVED	Re- plied
	- 4 MAR 2008	

### PLANNING APPLICATIONS.

**Number 2007/2970 Demolition & comprehensive redevelopment**

**2007/2971 Conservation area consent**

**2007/2972 Listed Building Consent**

**Hampton Court Station & The Jolly Boatman, Hampton Court Way,  
East Molesey KT8 9AE**

### SUPPLEMENTARY SUBMISSION No. 1

**CABE – Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment**

In our submission of 7 December, 2007 we called for the rejection of all three of the above Planning Applications. We also registered that "a series of supplements will follow dealing, in greater depth and detail, with specific aspects of the Planning Applications and the accompanying Environment Impact Assessment". This is the first supplement dealing with the CABE submission dated 18 December, 2007.

Hampton Court Rescue Campaign urges Elmbridge Council to use great caution when reviewing the CABE submission and to regard it as having only a marginal influence on the Council deliberations. We say this for the following reasons:-

1. No site visit has been made by CABE since November 2004 when it reviewed a previous scheme for the site. (GladeDale Developers were not then the owners of the Jolly Boatman site).
2. CABE, on its own admission, had no meetings, discussions or exchange of emails with Surrey County Council prior to making its submission of 18 December, 2007 in connection with the proposed transport interchange. Thus there is no substance in CABE's statement in Para. 2 of its submission of 18 December that *"The scheme greatly improves the public realm and transport interchange..."*
3. The same Para. 2 states – *"It is heartening to see that flood issues have been resolved intelligently through design...."* In fact the Environmental Impact Assessment produced by GladeDale Developers and Network Rail is open to question on a number of issues (HCRC. will be submitting a further submission on this). The Environment Agency, in its submission to EBC also expresses doubts on this issue. Thus there is no obvious justification for ~~CABE to claim that the flood~~ issues have been resolved.

4. In Paras. 2 & 3 CABE states:-

*"Bearing in mind the setting of the site and its proximity to Hampton Court Palace, we applaud the team's sensitive design for this scheme. We support the mix of uses, the quantum of development and the distribution and massing of the site."*

ELMBRIDGE TOWN PLANNING DIVISION		
FILE	TO	REG No
ACKD	RECEIVED	Re- plied
- 4 MAR 2008		

*"The hotel building on the river front is a key element of the development. We think that its location, form, architectural expression and landscape treatment are of high quality and are appropriate for this prominent position overlooking the river".*

It has to be recognised that this is purely an expression of opinion by a specialised agency. In this instance the subject matter is not amenable to an objective judgement, backed by factual regulations or guidelines, on the suitability of the design and the massing of the proposed development – nor has CABE attempted to find one. CABE'S opinion is not shared by English Heritage; Historic Royal Palaces; Dr. Vincent Cable, MP. for Twickenham & Richmond; Hampton Court Rescue Campaign and many individual members of the community who have written thoughtful and well reasoned letters to Elmbridge Council. (see Elmbridge Council Planning website.) In expressing its opinion on this aspect CABE stands virtually alone.

5. CABE opens Para. 2 with the words:-

*"We welcome the opportunity to review this proposal; the current status of the site, with the low quality station entrance and car park, poor public realm and highways infrastructure, and disused pub site, is clearly unacceptable".*

There is not a single organisation, agency or individual who would disagree with this but it provides no justification for a massive, highly concentrated and intrusive development on the site. The site is in the state it is in because successive owners of both the Jolly Boatman site and the Railway land and buildings have, over many years, deliberately allowed it to become overgrown and derelict – to engender the attitude that "anything is better than this". In fact the owners of the whole of this sensitive site (land and buildings) of major national significance, encompassed by the current planning applications, have a public duty to restore and maintain it in good order entirely independently of any proposals for building development.

6. Also in Para.2 CABE states:-

*"The scheme greatly improves the public realm and transport interchange facilities, and has the potential to be an extremely pleasant place to visit and live."*

This is directly contradicted by the 17 January 2008 memo from the Head of Environmental Health and Licensing, Elmbridge Borough Council, addressed to the Head of Town Planning, Elmbridge BC. which states (in the penultimate para. under "Conclusions"):-

*"Our principal concern is the impact that the development will have in terms of contributing to already elevated levels of nitrogen dioxide. In terms of air quality, we are also quite concerned that a large development will be moving residents into an area with poor air quality. We are especially concerned at the prospect of moving elderly residents into such an area."*

Incidentally the applicant's Environmental Assessment, where it refers to air pollution, is out of date. Since it was submitted, Elmbridge Council has substantially up-graded the provisions for measuring and monitoring air quality in the location of Hampton Court Station and the surrounding areas. The most recent air pollution data, therefore, will not have featured in the CABE submission.

ACKD	RECEIVED	Re-plied
	- 4 MAR 2008	

7. In the penultimate paragraph CABE says:-

*"We are pleased that the design team, as part of their design development, had considered the quality of the space outside the red line boundary of the site to address the wider issues of the public areas on the western side of Hampton Court Way towards the Riverbank in East Molesey." ..... We support the aspirations behind the proposals for these areas, but note they are outside the remit of the client and design team;..."*

This is a highly sensitive area of East Molesey where any changes must be the subject of consultation with the community and study, in depth, by Elmbridge Council. It is impossible to comprehend how CABE, without a site visit and without extensive consultation with all the parties involved, can arrive at a conclusion – without attempting to give reasons – that *"it supports the aspirations behind the proposals for these areas"*. It calls for this section of the CABE submission to be disregarded in its entirety.

-----oOo-----

For all of the above reasons we urge that Elmbridge Council regards the CABE submission of 18 December, 2007 as having little or no significance in the consideration of the above Planning Applications now under review.

Brian J. Rusbridge CBE.

On behalf of the Hampton Court Rescue Campaign

ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL TOWN PLANNING DIVISION		
FILE	TO	REG No
ACKD	RECEIVED	Re-plied
	- 4 MAR 2008	