

RECEIVED

15 MAY 2018

PLANNING

Dale Jennins
27 Ripley Gardens,
Mortlake,
SW14 8HF.
14th May 2018.

Environment Directorate at:LBRUT,
Civic Centre,
44 York Street,
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

228

RE: Stag Brewery Development Planning Application – Comment and Objection

Dear Sir/Madam,

The follow letter indicates my concerns in regards to the development at the Stag Brewery in Mortlake which is covered by the three planning applications;

Ref 18/0547/FUL

Ref 18/0548/FUL

Ref 18/0549/FUL

My main concerns are not of density of the development as such but the effect on transportation within the area, which is already problematic in terms of traffic congestion and the inadequate public transport system, which will not be able to cope with such a large increase of population and which the development's minimal proposed improvements to such items would appear not to take full account of the existing problems let alone the addition of 667 (or is it 687?) residential units and other facilities proposed on the site.

These concerns fall into three main categories;

- Proposed parking, car numbers and existing residential parking
- Road congestion on the A3003 past the Stag Brewery site towards Chalkers Corner and congestion along Sheen Lane (B351) down towards the mini roundabout and beyond on the A3003.
- Overcrowding and lack of capacity of Mortlake Station. (PT 13)

A lot of my concerns are indicated and highlighted in many of the clauses within the planning documents, particularly the Transport Assessments (TA), some of which are illustrated below.

TA EIA Report (Feb 2018)

- 8.99 States that TfL recommends a maximum walking distance of 640m to bus stops. In the table below this however bus route 209 is indicated, which as shown is 850m away, and therefore should be discounted. By adding the 209 route within this table (even in caveated) is misleading as it represents 14 of the 29 buses within an hour (over 48% of the buses available).
- Table 8.26 This indicates 708 car parking spaces on the development (a reduction from the previous 843), 503 for residential use, for 667 units (in Feb 2018 within the EIA) which represents 0.795 car parking spaces per unit, which is closer to 0.8, than the 0.7 stated which is misleading.

(in another document the number of residential units is set at 687 (in March 2018), this would give a figure closer to the 0.7 quoted (0.73), but is it true that the number of residential units has increased by 20 units between February 2018 and March 2018?

If so, this increases the potential problems as my major concerns are traffic congestion and the effect in terms of the parking situation of existing residents adjacent to the site, which is highlighted in clause 1.13 within TA PT 08.

TA PT 08 (Nov 2016)

1.1.3

(item 2)

The level of parking provided within the development and also the availability of on street parking close to the site. This will be a particularly important factor for the non-residential uses;

Has this been looked at in detail in terms of the effect on existing local residents? It does not appear so. Within the area it is already difficult to park near your own property (we regularly park one street away and occasionally further despite being a one car household). The reduction in on-site parking from 1 car parking space per residential unit to 0.8, although worthy from a transport and environmental point of view, is not currently the reality for car ownership in the area and probably within this development. If residents within the development do possess more than 0.7 cars per residential unit what provisions have been made for mitigating parking problems for existing residents and as a worst case scenario, has a higher figure of vehicle use been used in terms of modelling?

In terms of modelling I would expect full dynamic computer modelling for such a large development, however from reviewing drawings and documents this does not appear to have been undertaken. If it has it would be useful to attach all videos and simulations available to the planning application documents.

3.1.14

This indicates that 8% of pupils will arrive by car. There appears to be no detail on how this drop off will be done safely and/or effect on traffic at peak times I drop off occurs on the A3003.

TA PT 14 (Feb 2018) Tables 3.3 and 3.4 page 15 & 16.

These tables suggest at peak time that only 198 passengers boarding the four trains running between 8am and 9am and more importantly that the development of 667 (or 687) residential properties will only increase that number from 198 to 209 (which actually if you add up the numbers should read 210) an increase of only 11 (or 12) over an hour at only 4 at the time of the busiest train. From personal experience (although not measured) these figures seem low (as does the prediction of only 4 extra passengers between 8am and 8.15am) and also the TA does not fully appreciate how busy those trains already are by the time they reach Mortlake. These figures in particular should be fully interrogated.

TA PT 03 (Feb 2018)

This document only illustrates the level of documentation provided as uncoordinated and not to the standard expected for such a massive development. This document says 'Draft' which should not be acceptable in a final planning

submission and is just one example of the uncoordinated nature of the TA in particular.

As stated early it is not totally clear looking at these docs whether the development is 667 residential units or 687. This is important when predicting traffic movements and the use of buses and trains.

In summary I would like to think that these areas have been fully assessed by the council and other third party reviews by independent transport consultants, which is essential for such a large development, that is bound to have dramatic effect on the local transport infrastructure, despite the ~~some of the conclusions within the TA.~~

This development should not progress at its current density of residential properties. It is disproportional in size to the existing community and more importantly the local transport infrastructure will not be able to cope adequately which will lead to massive disruption and chaos for years to come for existing residents in the area and also any new residents within the proposed development. I therefore object to the current proposal as it stands.

I do not think that local residents should be made to suffer for years to come due to the fact that the developers have obviously over paid for the land and therefore have put forward a scheme unsuitable for Mortlake in scale and impact in order to cover their potential losses due to speculation and/or maximise profit.

I look forward to seeing the TA fully discussed during the Planning Committee meeting.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Dale Jennins

RECEIVED

15 MAY 2018

PLANNING

Dale Jennins
27 Ripley Gardens,
Mortlake,
SW14 8HF.
14th May 2018.

Environment Directorate at:LBRUT,
Civic Centre,
44 York Street,
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

228

RE: Stag Brewery Development Planning Application – Comment and Objection

Dear Sir/Madam,

The follow letter indicates my concerns in regards to the development at the Stag Brewery in Mortlake which is covered by the three planning applications;

Ref 18/0547/FUL

Ref 18/0548/FUL

Ref 18/0549/FUL

My main concerns are not of density of the development as such but the effect on transportation within the area, which is already problematic in terms of traffic congestion and the inadequate public transport system, which will not be able to cope with such a large increase of population and which the development's minimal proposed improvements to such items would appear not to take full account of the existing problems let alone the addition of 667 (or is it 687?) residential units and other facilities proposed on the site.

These concerns fall into three main categories;

- Proposed parking, car numbers and existing residential parking
- Road congestion on the A3003 past the Stag Brewery site towards Chalkers Corner and congestion along Sheen Lane (B351) down towards the mini roundabout and beyond on the A3003.
- Overcrowding and lack of capacity of Mortlake Station. (PT 13)

A lot of my concerns are indicated and highlighted in many of the clauses within the planning documents, particularly the Transport Assessments (TA), some of which are illustrated below.

TA EIA Report (Feb 2018)

- 8.99 States that TfL recommends a maximum walking distance of 640m to bus stops. In the table below this however bus route 209 is indicated, which as shown is 850m away, and therefore should be discounted. By adding the 209 route within this table (even in caveated) is misleading as it represents 14 of the 29 buses within an hour (over 48% of the buses available).
- Table 8.26 This indicates 708 car parking spaces on the development (a reduction from the previous 843), 503 for residential use, for 667 units (in Feb 2018 within the EIA) which represents 0.795 car parking spaces per unit, which is closer to 0.8, than the 0.7 stated which is misleading.

(in another document the number of residential units is set at 687 (in March 2018), this would give a figure closer to the 0.7 quoted (0.73), but is it true that the number of residential units has increased by 20 units between February 2018 and March 2018?

If so, this increases the potential problems as my major concerns are traffic congestion and the effect in terms of the parking situation of existing residents adjacent to the site, which is highlighted in clause 1.13 within TA PT 08.

TA PT 08 (Nov 2016)

1.1.3

(item 2)

The level of parking provided within the development and also the availability of on street parking close to the site. This will be a particularly important factor for the non-residential uses;

Has this been looked at in detail in terms of the effect on existing local residents? It does not appear so. Within the area it is already difficult to park near your own property (we regularly park one street away and occasionally further despite being a one car household). The reduction in on-site parking from 1 car parking space per residential unit to 0.8, although worthy from a transport and environmental point of view, is not currently the reality for car ownership in the area and probably within this development. If residents within the development do possess more than 0.7 cars per residential unit what provisions have been made for mitigating parking problems for existing residents and as a worst case scenario, has a higher figure of vehicle use been used in terms of modelling?

In terms of modelling I would expect full dynamic computer modelling for such a large development, however from reviewing drawings and documents this does not appear to have been undertaken. If it has it would be useful to attach all videos and simulations available to the planning application documents.

3.1.14

This indicates that 8% of pupils will arrive by car. There appears to be no detail on how this drop off will be done safely and/or effect on traffic at peak times I drop off occurs on the A3003.

TA PT 14 (Feb 2018) Tables 3.3 and 3.4 page 15 & 16.

These tables suggest at peak time that only 198 passengers boarding the four trains running between 8am and 9am and more importantly that the development of 667 (or 687) residential properties will only increase that number from 198 to 209 (which actually if you add up the numbers should read 210) an increase of only 11 (or 12) over an hour at only 4 at the time of the busiest train. From personal experience (although not measured) these figures seem low (as does the prediction of only 4 extra passengers between 8am and 8.15am) and also the TA does not fully appreciate how busy those trains already are by the time they reach Mortlake. These figures in particular should be fully interrogated.

TA PT 03 (Feb 2018)

This document only illustrates the level of documentation provided as uncoordinated and not to the standard expected for such a massive development. This document says 'Draft' which should not be acceptable in a final planning

submission and is just one example of the uncoordinated nature of the TA in particular.

As stated early it is not totally clear looking at these docs whether the development is 667 residential units or 687. This is important when predicting traffic movements and the use of buses and trains.

In summary I would like to think that these areas have been fully assessed by the council and other third party reviews by independent transport consultants, which is essential for such a large development, that is bound to have dramatic effect on the local transport infrastructure, despite the ~~some of the conclusions within the TA.~~

This development should not progress at its current density of residential properties. It is disproportional in size to the existing community and more importantly the local transport infrastructure will not be able to cope adequately which will lead to massive disruption and chaos for years to come for existing residents in the area and also any new residents within the proposed development. I therefore object to the current proposal as it stands.

I do not think that local residents should be made to suffer for years to come due to the fact that the developers have obviously over paid for the land and therefore have put forward a scheme unsuitable for Mortlake in scale and impact in order to cover their potential losses due to speculation and/or maximise profit.

I look forward to seeing the TA fully discussed during the Planning Committee meeting.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Dale Jennins.

Dale Jennins