

## Andrew Roberts

---

**From:** Andrew Roberts  
**Sent:** 15 October 2020 20:04  
**To:** 'Kirkwood Stuart'  
**Cc:** 'Stuart Selleck'; 'Adrian Phillips'; Anthony.green@networkrail.co.uk; Roblane@premcors.com; James.Owens@eu.jll.com; 'Ray Townsend'  
**Subject:** Hampton Court Station Development Meeting 14 October 2020  
**Attachments:** East-Molesey-and-Esher-Division-RFS.pdf; Officer Queries.pdf

Dear Stuart

Many thanks to you both for your time yesterday. I think all parties found the meeting very constructive. Please see below notes of the meeting.

Best regards

Andrew

Attendees:

Stuart Kirkwood (Network Rail)  
Anthony Green (Network Rail)  
Stuart Selleck (Elmbridge Council)  
Adrian Phillips (Historic Royal Palaces)  
Andrew Roberts (Hampton Court Rescue Campaign)

### Network Rail

- The meeting should be treated as in the public domain.
- NR's position is that they have been working with Alexpo for six years and are aware that Alexpo have made a significant investment to get the application to this point. NR's public sector ethos requires that they are transparent and act fairly.
- If planning permission is refused NR will need to take a fresh look at the project.
- There is £1.5m set aside for station refurbishment which will be implemented by the TOC.
- In the current economic climate many schemes, including other NR projects, are struggling. There is a question mark with respect to the viability of the proposed scheme.
- NR's remit is to support the Government agenda to promote housebuilding, but not necessarily affordable housing, and to use surplus rail sites to fund rail infrastructure projects – predominantly in the north.
- The car park does not run at full capacity.
- The scheme provides parking at a ratio of 0.6 per apartment which seems reasonable to NR.
- NR note the significant bulk and mass of the scheme facing Cigarette Island Park.
- Expect the Environment Agency consultation reply this week and committee date soon after.

### Historic Royal Palaces

- Pre-Covid visitor numbers have grown very significantly to circa 1 million per year.
- For many visitors the only option to visit Hampton Court Palace is by car.
- Car parking will always be a significant issue for HCP and the loss of parking will have a negative financial impact.

- Visitors to HCP often drive around East Molesey searching for parking – this creates congestion – it’s easy to spot. This scheme will exacerbate this problem.
- HRP is troubled by the height and mass of the scheme and the negative impact the scheme will have on the setting of HCP.
- HRP would emphatically support a Hampton Court Way only scheme which protected the setting of HCP and retained current parking.

### **Elmbridge Council**

- The Council has a key aim to encourage more housing - ideally affordable housing.
- Affordable housing provision is much too low and not acceptable.
- Successive developers have not listened – including Alexpo.
- Stuart will help make Council planning resource available to review a HCW scheme – assume a quick turn round.
- There are two possible HCW only schemes - as per current plans, or with more residential. Stuart’s preference is for more residential, however in the first instance he would support a scheme with current HCW only elements.
- The 1999 brief (now outdated) included a hotel.
- Parking and congestion is a very significant issue – Stuart also noted that he is a local resident and sees this issue first hand.

### **Hampton Court Rescue Campaign – Residents**

- Appreciated the opportunity to meet NR and the constructive dialogue.
- Understand NR’s position and need to support Alexpo who have made a major investment, but also note “all bets are off” if scheme refused.
- There is a consultation for a blanket East Molesey Controlled Parking Zone scheme (details attached) which reflects a commuter parking problem.
- Hampton Court Station at the end of Zone 6 – if CPZ is implemented it is reasonable to accept that the use of the car park will grow - currently 200-300 plus commuter parkers.
- Assume that the current scheme is unlikely to be viable – hence the meeting to try and find a way forward for a smaller scheme.
- Very strong preference for a HCW only scheme which we would emphatically support.
- Encouraging Alexpo to look at financials of a HCW only scheme and to share these with interested parties with a view to working with Alexpo to implement - if there is a funding gap how do we address it?
- Assessing a HCW only scheme is not an onerous exercise. Seems reasonable to do this.
- Based on the current state of play, planning permission likely to be refused.
- Other large schemes adopt Council policy (DM7) requiring one space per apartment – this is a very clear.
- There is a list of outstanding officer queries (attached) Alexpo hasn’t addressed – not sure why.
- The proposed car park will have a long term negative legacy when compared to the current car park with respect to ongoing costs for lighting, maintenance staffing etc.
- If it can be avoided we assume that Network Rail would have a preference for a scheme that did not necessitate digging a large hole in the ground – NR agreed.
- Don’t support NR’s understanding of residential parking provision.
  - NR assumes 58 permits = 0.6 spaces per apartment.
  - A permit (season ticket) is a low cost way of buying the opportunity to park but does not give the permit holder any rights to park – NR seems to miss this point which conflicts with Council policy. Permits can be bought by anyone!

### **Follow-Up Notes from 15/10/2020 call between Andrew Roberts and James Owens (JLL)**

- Alexpo's position is full steam ahead with current scheme which gives residents and HRP much of what they didn't like with Gladedale scheme – remove hotel from Jolly Boatman site.
- JLL has no view on viability - suggest I speak with Rob.
- Alexpo need to protect their position and would be troubled by a HCW only scheme which would remove their negotiating leverage with NR.

### Suggested Next Steps

- It would help if NR gave Alexpo reassurance that Alexpo's interests would not be prejudiced by a HCW only scheme – HCRC maintain that the current scheme needs to separate the car park entrance and bus stop which will likely require part of the current Jolly Boatman site, but Alexpo are understandably nervous – our view is that this issue is driving the proposed scheme, when it shouldn't.
- Alexpo to provide NR with updated viability numbers on the submitted scheme versus a HCW only scheme.
- Is there a funding gap? If yes, can it realistically be funded?
- NR and Alexpo discuss merits of HCW only scheme versus the submitted scheme:
  - Likelihood of gaining consent.
  - Profitability.
  - Risk.
  - Ease of funding.
  - Time to implement.
  - Legacy (costs of maintaining and operating car park).
  - Impact on congestion
  - Impact on HCP.
  - Risk to Network Rail's reputation.



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)