

Paul Chadwick  
Director of Environment and Community Services  
Email: [paul.chadwick@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk](mailto:paul.chadwick@richmondandwandsworth.gov.uk)

FAO Robert Pollock  
Email: [RPollock@savills.com](mailto:RPollock@savills.com)

Dear Rob

**Former Imperial College Private Ground, Udney Park Road, Teddington, TW11 9BB**

I refer to our previous email exchange on 28 June 2021 and regarding your marketing information for the Former Imperial College Private Ground, Udney Park Road, Teddington.

Following your confirmation that you would be happy to speak to Robert Angus, Head of Development Management, over our concerns with the released marketing information, I note that you subsequently cancelled that meeting. I understand this was on instructions from your client and we've had no contact from you since. This is particularly disappointing in the light of the level of public concern about the future of the site.

Given the lack of engagement prior to, and since, the publication of your current marketing details I have therefore chosen to write to you as a matter of public record and as follows:-

You have made the following statement:

*"The planning inspector commented that the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development were not met. In other circumstances, development of playing fields or urban green space has been justified through the public benefit that such development might enable. Redevelopment of the existing car park and pavilion lots would appear warranted if linked to improvements to the existing facilities, but partial development of the wider property may also be justifiable. Further commercialisation of the existing playing fields would also appear possible."*

I do appreciate that you have stated that interested parties should form their own opinion and take professional advice; however, I want point out the following pertinent information about that statement.

Although the car park is excluded from the Local Green Space (LGS) and Other Open Land of Townscape Importance (OOLTI) designations, the pavilion is not. The Planning Inspector stated in the appeal decision that in the case of OOLTI, if not related to the functional use of the site, future development would be restricted to the replacement of or minor extension to existing built facilities and must not harm the character and openness of the land. This was reinforced by the LGS designation, which requires a similar approach to that for Green Belt land in relation to preserving openness. Whilst this does not rule out some form of development related to the pavilion, in my view it would severely restrict such development.

Both the car park and the pavilion are included in the Asset of Community Value designation, which resists the loss of social or community infrastructure and is underpinned by planning policy. I therefore find it difficult to see how development of the car park and pavilion, which provide the only significant on-site parking and the only changing room facilities for the site, could be justified in relation to the retention of existing social/community infrastructure which serves the local community and, indeed, is very much valued.

The rest of the site is covered by all three designations and what must also be taken into account is the conclusion of the recent appeal decision, which stated that the whole of the appeal site represents a playing field in an area where there is shown to be a deficit against Policy LP 31 of the Local Plan, indicating that playing fields will be protected and where possible enhanced. I therefore consider that your suggestion that partial development of the wider property may be justifiable is unrealistic, to say the least.

It is also relevant to your proposition of the possibility of further commercialisation of the existing playing fields that the Planning Inspector found that the effect of the permanent floodlights as proposed would have a harmful effect on local character. The all-weather pitch and other formal sports uses were found to result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. Mitigation in the form of acoustic barriers, which should be provided, may have reduced these effects for some occupiers, but this would not be possible for all. To avoid adverse effects, the Planning Inspector concluded the end of the operational hours should be brought forward to 2100 hours. The effect of these works and other paraphernalia was viewed as being substantially harmful to the collegiate character of the area. The increased sporting development, including permanent lighting, was also considered to be significantly harmful to protected species, bats and to the overall connectivity between habitats in the area.

The caretaker's flat is not considered to be an independent Class C3 (residential) use, it has always been an ancillary use to the overall site.

I would be grateful if you would, in the interests of openness and transparency, provide this letter to interested parties alongside a copy of the Planning Inspector's decision letter which we regard as being very comprehensive and thorough. In that way there can be no misunderstandings arising in future from any potential buyer claiming that they were unaware of the challenges to any future development of this site.

Regards

Paul

Paul Chadwick  
Director of Environment and Community Services  
London Borough of Richmond-upon-Thames

19 July 2020