

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 21/3107/FUL

**Address:** Barnes Hospital South Worples Way East Sheen London SW14 8SU

**Proposal:** 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:** Mr. Peter Foggin

**Address:** 7 Fitzgerald Avenue London SW14 8SZ

### Comments

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

**Comment:** I object to proposal 21/3107/FUL (for 106 residential units) which should be seen together with proposal 22/3758/FUL (for SEN school and health centre) involving the total development of the former Barnes Hospital (which I will refer to as "The Site"), since the two together are too big and dense, and will have significant traffic and road access problems.

I would like to focus on two significant points:

- 1) Layout and density of building (which is not in keeping with the area), and
- 2) Traffic generation and Road access.

1) Re density of building, in addition to 106 residential units, I learnt at the Public Consultation at Mortlake Hall on 28th November 2022 that the London River Academy (the SEN school) is expected to have 90 pupils and 50 staff.

In addition, the Mental Health Facility is expected to add 60 people.

In addition to residents in the 106 residential units (with approx 2.25 residents per unit), that means that a total of  $90 + 50 + 60 + 240 = 440$  people will live or visit or work at The Site.

If I look at the square meterage of The Site, and apply the same square meterage to anywhere else nearby, then I see a maximum of 120 units (probably houses) in the same meterage anywhere else.

Using the same residents per unit, I expect to see 270 people living in the surrounding area in the same square meterage.

That means that the two proposals for The Site will increase the population density in The Site by over 60% compared to the same space anywhere else in the Site Location Plan, resulting from the density of building.

This increase in building and population density "is not in keeping with the area".

2) Traffic generation and Road access will be a huge problem since access to The Site is only possible via South Worples Way (SWW) which is so narrow, and is a single track road both east and west of The Site.

The other significant problem is that the east end of SWW reaches White Hart Lane, just beside a level crossing over the railway. This junction is already dangerous, and the risk of adding construction vehicles and then increased traffic to and/or from The Site through this junction must be considered in detail.

I was told that the students at the Academy will not be resident but will need car or van transport to and from the Academy on every visit. This is in significant contrast to people living nearby, many of whom will be walking or cycling to work, bus or train transport or school.

The development and subsequent use of The Site will generate a lot more traffic, and Road access is already very limited and at times dangerous, and cannot be increased or improved.

We understand that 22/3758/FUL for healthcare will be funded by Central Government, and that the proceeds from the sale of the property to developers of the residential units will be used by NHS to fund a building or development elsewhere. It is totally unreasonable for those living near to The Site that we will suffer (as detailed above) from the construction of the residential units in addition to the SEN School, simply so that money can be raised to be spent elsewhere.

It is not realistic or safe or reasonable to those living near The Site if both proposals are approved as currently drafted.

The Traffic generation and Road access problems MUST be addressed in greater detail, and since the building resulting from the two proposals would result in a significant increase in the density of buildings and population, I would like to see a significant reduction in the size and resulting number of people living in the residential units currently proposed in 21/3107/FUL.