Reference: FS388863116

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 21/3107/FUL

Address: Barnes HospitalSouth Worple WayEast SheenLondonSW14 8SU

Proposal: Drop-in full application to supersede residential development zone of previously approved Outline planning permission 18/3642/OUT. Demolition of existing structures and redevelopment of site including construction of three new buildings comprising 106 residential units of mixed tenure (Use Class C3), alterations and conversion of two existing buildings for 3 residential use (Use Class C3), car and cycle parking, landscaping and associated works.

Comments Made By

Name: Mrs. Andrea Turton

Address: 97 Cowley Road Mortlake London SW14 8QD

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: This application is beyond the limits of outline planning consent and needs to be reconsidered as a new application. The impact of the 3 developments on traffic, pedestrian safety, skyscape and environment can only be understood if they are seen collectively.

1/ Transport and Access

We are taking legal advice on the permissibility of considering the residential component without considering in parallel the impact of the other components.

By only considering residential, the Transport Statement (TS) in no way addresses the risks associated with access, traffic congestion and transport constraints, especially at the dangerous White Hart Lane (WHL) level crossing. There is no analysis of flow of deliveries and people to school and hospital. Impact on the locality is not taken on board. The TS deals with traffic flow am/pm in July 2021. It notes marginal increases in traffic numbers. However, if traffic is at a standstill already, it is not surprising that statically counting cars will not indicate greater numbers. The area is already in gridlock. Where is the analysis of increase congestion times and pollution caused by idling cars on Upper Richmond Road?

When leaving the site eastwards to WHL, the build up of traffic caused by the hourly 32-39 min level crossing down time will mean it is impossible for traffic to turn left onto WHL – cars will not let them in. For those turning right from WHL into SWW there will be no choice but to mount the pavement - there is insufficient width for 2-way traffic. Some cars will leave the site Westwards (turning right to WHL is forbidden). Where is the assessment of the impact on the narrow roads leading up to Upper Richmond Road? More frustration from drivers will lead to people driving dangerously and increase risks to pedestrians (especially school children).

The TS says Stag Brewery and Manor Road developments will not create more traffic. This is wrong. Where is the evidence?

The TS says Hammersmith Bridge is going to be resolved. There is no budget and no plan for this. This is factually wrong.

How is moving from PTAL2 to PTAL 4 justified? The planned footbridge was already considered in outline. With Hammersmith Bridge down this has severely impeded the bus service, more than outweighing any marginal benefit that a new footbridge might offer in terms of accessing the bus stop more quickly. This development should be considered PTAL 2 and no more!

2/ Energy

Since outline consent the London Plan was ratified and adopted with more stringent energy policy. Gas fired boiler systems – aka Communal Heating Systems – should not be used anywhere on this site. Citing CHP as part of their “Be Clean” approach is not acceptable – there is no way that they should be putting in combustion engines. Heat pumps must be used, potentially with electric boiler backup (ie. No gas – this is a major air quality issue, as well as the CO2 considerations).

A consolidated energy system should be obligatory. A small energy centre should be established to service the 3 developments. The justification at outline stage was weak at best: “This is a better solution for the owners of these developments as reliance on heat supply from another entity and plant ownership structure can be sensitive issues.” A single system is required to avoid doubling up of generation equipment. It is unacceptable to miss out on these efficiencies. Continues….

There is no way that the developer should be allowed to get away with putting in gas combustion in London. Under 5.0 in the Energy Statement, Table 5.1 Renewable technologies, there is a cross next to Ground Source Heat Pumps, with the comment “Insufficient Space.” Would this be the case if the entire site were considered?

Saying that GSHP is not compatible with VRG-HR air source systems is a red herring. Some of the best commercial installations of heat pumps in London (cooling and heating) are on heat pumps. Also, they should be going for UFH as op