

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 22/0902/FUL

**Address:** The Stag Brewery Lower Richmond Road Mortlake London SW14 7ET

**Proposal:** Erection of a three-storey building to provide a new secondary school with sixth form; sports pitch with floodlighting, external MUGA and play space; and associated external works including landscaping, car and cycle parking, new access routes and other associated works

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Darryl Evans

**Address:** 73 Cleveland Gardens Barnes London SW13 0AJ

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** What I really struggle with when reading about this development is to work out who amongst residents in the local community, whom the councillors are elected to represent, actually supports this huge disruptive proposal. If anyone does, surely they are vastly outnumbered by those who do not. Personally I know nobody who thinks it is a good idea. So if Councillors are representing their community, how can they support this?

The most obvious objections are:

- 1 The area does not need any more high cost housing for rich people. The only people who benefit of having high cost housing are the developers and that is not in the public interest. If this were a development targeted at predominantly low cost housing which is affordable for essential workers I would be more sympathetic. But it isn't. Any 'affordable' housing appears to be at the minimum level which is necessary for the plans to be approved, and history shows that whatever is proposed ends up being reduced on economic viability grounds anyway.
- 2 There will be a massive impact on traffic and congestion around the site not only during the construction process but in perpetuity. Driving out of the area past the brewery site is already challenging even at non-rush hour times. The road infrastructure simply cannot support a considerable rise in vehicle numbers. Studies and mitigation measures may theoretically suggest otherwise, but we live here.
- 3 It follows that the impact on the already appalling air quality will be disastrous. Children in particular are suffering adverse health impacts because the air quality is so poor. More traffic means more air pollution, more sickness and more deaths. It would be irresponsible to fuel that.
- 4 The proposed secondary school is simply not needed. I am a governor at a primary school within the borough and another in an adjacent one. Both boroughs are seeing reductions in pupil numbers causing concerns at each school over inability to fill places. How can those demographics support a new secondary school as they work their way through the age groups? The additional supply of places might well impact pupil numbers at other local secondary schools, placing them under severe financial pressure.
- 5 As I understand it, the plans will lead to a reduction in the scale of sports field facilities on the site. In the interests of the physical and, particularly, mental, health of residents, especially children and young people, the area needs additional playing field facilities, not less.

I am totally against this development and it is my sincere belief that the overwhelming majority of residents feel the same way. If this is passed I have to assume that our views are ignored by our representatives, which is fundamentally undemocratic, or that for whatever reasons the views of residents who will suffer disruption and adverse health, with no material advantages at all, are irrelevant.