

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 22/3004/FUL

Address: Kneller Hall Royal Military School Of Music Kneller Road Twickenham TW2 7DU

Proposal: The demolition of existing modern buildings on the site and the conversion of and extensions to Kneller Hall and other ancillary buildings associated with the former royal military music school to a day school (Use Class F1), together with the construction of associated new purpose-built buildings including teaching space, indoor sports facilities, sporting pavilion and forest school building. Alterations to the existing playing fields, to include an all weather pitch with fencing, flood lighting to existing tennis courts, sustainability measures and re-turfing. Provision of a new access from Whitton Dene, and other ancillary works including parking areas, hard and soft landscaping, lighting, access alterations and energy centre. Internal and external alterations to Kneller Hall and the curtilage listed buildings to facilitate the day school use, including demolition and rebuilding of single storey extension to the west wing of Kneller Hall, extension to the Band Practice Hall and re-opening of Whitton Dene site entrance.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Stephen Jones

Address: 62 KNELLER GARDENS ISLEWORTH TW7 7NW

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I am a resident of Kneller Gardens which bounds Kneller Hall and also a Transport Planning professional with nearly 30 years' experience of assessing and producing TA's and Travel Plans for development proposals such as this. My objection results from reading the transport documents submitted in support of the development. I have significant reservations with some of the content including derivation of data sets, trip generation and assessment of the impacts presented and the conclusions in the TA. I will present a fuller response to the points below in a separate letter to LBRuT. Firstly I am very surprised that a 2013 survey for the mode splits has been utilised as a baseline for the trip generation and subsequent assessment of the development. This data is far too old to be relevant to a 2022 decant of existing pupils from a current school site and cannot be relied upon to give accurate information on the situation that prevails at the school now. I would expect that a 2022 survey be presented to show the actual up to date trip generation and mode splits as per the current school. This is wholly appropriate as the school is currently operational and represents good practice. The data set from 2013 is flawed as there are no pupils from that survey left at the school. This may lead to an underestimate of either the car / drop off trips, staff and pupil driving trips or the trips allocated to public transport and may not show the full and true impact of the development proposals and mitigation for the school.

Secondly, the opening of the access onto Whitton Dene for traffic should be treated as a wholly new access as it has been closed for such a long time. Within the SPD for the site this access was only to be utilised as a pedestrian and cycle access. The proposal has not been fully assessed on current patterns of use across the access as currently this route is used by a significant number of parents who walk their children to other schools in Whitton. The access has also been poorly designed with no pedestrian visibility splays which could lead to pedestrian accidents. I am surprised that a Stage 1/2 Road Safety Audit was not presented with the proposals.

Thirdly, there is no regard for the local residents within the proposals in respect of parking within Zone R. The TA actually seems to encourage overspill parking in local roads. Neither the TA nor the travel plan's identify significant or workable measures to prevent additional staff or older pupils driving to the area and parking in local roads. This is not aligned with the SPD which includes reference to the fact that the development should "not place additional pressure on on-street parking within the vicinity of the site..."

By allowing overspill parking (driving to the area) on local roads the trip impacts presented in the TA would have been

significantly underestimated - it has not been included in the trip generation figures presented. Also any mitigation strategy is going to be underestimated as these trips would not have been modelled. The proposed mode splits presented in the travel plans are not going to be achieved if overspill occurs which may lead to a breach of any planning condition.

Finally, any mitigation strategy should be transparent. LBRuT have suggested that a new pedestrian crossing is warranted to mitigate the development. Rather than offering a contribution - if this or other measures of mitigation are required to offset the impacts of the development (including those of the highway network and public transport networks) these should be covered in full and paid for by the developer to mitigate the proposals.

Based on the above there is too much uncertainty / lack of detail to agree with the TA conclusions and to be able to approve this application. More work needs to be undertaken to assess this development with up to date data sets and mitigation proposals.