



56 Gilpin Avenue
London SW14 8QY

6 March 2023

Director of Planning
LB Richmond upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

For the attention of Grace Edwards

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning Application 21/3107/FUL
Barnes Hospital Redevelopment – housing component**

I refer to your letter of 20 February 2023 publicising the amendments you received on 17 February and I am sending you our comments by letter on your deadline of 6 March as it is not possible for us to upload them with their attachments onto your website.

Our main concerns are two-fold:

1. Building heights and overlooking. We were expecting to see some redistribution of floorspace in order to reduce the impact on the backs of Grosvenor Avenue but instead all we find are slight alterations to the roof slopes and dormers. This is not going to make much difference (see illustration attached). We were also expecting a Design Review Panel (DRP) to be involved – such a panel was involved for all three components (housing, medical and SEN school) at the outline stage and for the latter two at the detailed stage. So how come there has been no DRP for the detailed plan for the housing?
2. Access from South Worple Way. The concerns raised in our previous letter have not been addressed by the applicant. However, we are aware that the Council is now undertaking a study of traffic problems in this road as well as in North Worple Way and is producing options for the better management of traffic on both these roads later this month. We urge the Council not to take any decision on this application, nor the concurrent application for the Mental Health Clinic and SEN School on the eastern part of the same site until a satisfactory traffic management solution has been accepted and trialled.


I am also attaching our comments on the previous submission for the record. In our covering letter we listed 8 issues that needed to be addressed. We are disappointed to see that none of these issues has been addressed and we are accordingly objecting to this application again.

Yours faithfully


Tim Catchpole, Chair

South Elevation of Blocks B and C


Existing south elevation
- 2 storeys with roof set
back



Proposed south elevation
- 4 storeys including roof set
back on top floor



Revised south elevation
- same as proposed but
without the shadows cast by
the dormers



Proposed west elevation
of Block B showing
dormers facing south to
the right



Revised west elevation
of Block B showing
dormers facing south to
the right – essentially
very little change from
the proposed





10 East Sheen Avenue
London SW14 8AS

29 Dec 2021

Director of Planning
LB Richmond upon Thames
Civic Centre
44 York Street
Twickenham TW1 3BZ

For the attention of Grace Edwards

Dear Sir/Madam

Planning Application 21/3107/FUL
Barnes Hospital Redevelopment – housing component

The attached comments were uploaded onto your website today but it was not possible to upload the visuals, so these are coming to you together with the comments by post. There are a number of issues that need to be addressed before proceeding further with this application, vis.

- A visualisation of the impact of the development on the backgardens of Grosvenor Avenue (north side);
- A study of the impact of overlooking on these same backgardens;
- Consideration of a massing option of pyramidal form sloping down from 4 storeys in the centre to 2 storeys on the edges (similar to that proposed in the Planning Brief for the east end of the Brewery development);
- A more honest description of South Worple Way
- Further surveys of traffic in South Worple Way where traffic is known to have increased since the applicant's survey was undertaken in July this year;
- Consideration of South West Railway's plan to reduce services and an update on the local bus services;
- Consideration of the cumulative impact of traffic from all three developments on the site;
- Assurance that all three developments will be constructed at the same time so that local residents are inconvenienced only once.

We look forward to hearing from you on these matters. If we do not hear from you, we will be objecting to the application.

Yours faithfully

Alison Bennett-Coles
Vice-Chair

Barnes Hospital

Redevelopment of western part of site to provide three blocks of 106 housing units plus renovation of existing gateway buildings to provide 3 units

MESS Comments

The Mortlake with East Sheen Society Committee has reviewed the documentation accompanying this application. We note that the housing quantum has increased from 83 units approved in 2019 to 109. Whilst we are aware of the Council's need to meet housing targets imposed on it by the Mayor, we maintain that the more important need is for development to be sustainable, i.e. it must be within acceptable limits dictated by both environmental and access considerations. Our comments on the new application are made under these two headings:

Environmental considerations including density, height and massing

Recognising the Council's need to provide more housing – including an affordable component – we did not object to the 3-storey development in the previous outline application but we regarded this as the upper limit. We note that Blocks B and C are now rising to 4 storeys and that the applicant, in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) has drawn attention to the existence of other 4-storey developments within the neighbourhood as well as to the hospital itself where the Administrative Block built in the 1980s is essentially of that height, albeit with not that number of storeys. The applicant has also produced visualisations of the impact of this increase in height on local views. Our comments on this are:

- The other 4-storey developments in the neighbourhood include (within 300m as stated in Section 7.1 of the DAS) the Willoughbys and Brook Court on Priest's Bridge and Ashleigh House on Mortlake High Street. These buildings, which date back to the 1930s, are located on the main road system which has spatial advantage whereas the Barnes Hospital site is in the hinterland with comparatively poor accessibility. The existing Administrative Block on the Barnes Hospital site rises to the same height as these buildings but is only two storeys plus large sloping roof.
- The applicant has selected views from within the public domain (see below) and has shown no interest or concern about the impact on views from within the private domain, notably from the backs of Grosvenor Avenue (north side). There is no elevation drawing showing Blocks B and C together and we have had to produce one to show the overall effect on the backs of Grosvenor Avenue where the 2-storey Administrative Block with large roof and no dormers is replaced by a 4-storey block including dormers in its roof (see below).
- In addition to the DAS we have looked at the Heritage and Townscape Statement, the Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing report, the Arboricultural Report and the Landscape Statement but could find no reference to the impact of overlooking onto the backgardens of Grosvenor Avenue. Whilst there is a belt of trees on the southern edge of the development, some of them evergreen, there is still every possibility that residents of the proposed development will catch glimpses between the branches into these backgardens. We insist that such a report is produced before this application proceeds further.
- We note in the DAS that massing options were considered and we wonder why no thought was given to a pyramidal option with 4 storeys in the centre of the site dropping to 2 storeys at the edges, similar to that given in the Planning Brief for the east end of the Brewery site?

We insist that the Council gives serious consideration to such an option before this application proceeds further.

Access considerations including parking

In our comments on the previous outline application we expressed concern about the access issue. Shortly after we made our comments the Council introduced double yellow lines along South Worple Way in order to improve accessibility. However, we still have comments as follows:

- The applicant's Transport Statement (TS) describes South Worple Way as running parallel with the railway line but, despite the introduction of double yellow lines, makes no mention of its highly substandard width, particularly at the east end towards White Hart Lane. It makes no mention of drivers having to mount the pedestrian footway in order to avoid hitting vehicles coming in the opposite direction (see photos below). This was not an issue 30 years ago but the width of vehicles since then has significantly increased.
- The TS mentions the traffic survey undertaken in July 2021. We must argue that this survey would not have been useful. The holiday period will have already started and many would-be drivers would still have been working at home. By September, with the re-opening of schools and the return of commuting traffic, the numbers were on the increase and we are aware of many complaints about South Worple Way being used as a bypass for those stranded on the congested South Circular. We insist that further traffic surveys are carried out at a more appropriate time before this application proceeds further.
- The TS mentions the accessibility by rail and bus but makes no mention of South West Railway's plans to continue reducing train services from Mortlake and Barnes Bridge during the off-peak, nor that some of the local bus routes have been introduced only in reaction to the closure of Hammersmith Bridge, i.e. the PTAL is currently 4 but could conceivably reduce to 3 or 2. This should surely be addressed?
- As for the parking, we are pleased that the basement carpark has been moved away from the southern edge and that access to it has moved further north. We note there is a minimal increase in parking to serve the increase in the housing units but there is no consideration of the cumulative impact on traffic resulting from the redevelopment of the rest of the site. We also note that the parking survey undertaken on 2-3 Feb 2021 covered an area within a 200m walking distance of the site – but that the map of the area in Appendix E includes the Grosvenor Avenue enclave which, whilst within 200m as the crow flies, is more like 600m on foot. Be that as it may, residents on the development site will realise that they will not be eligible to gain access to controlled parking in these nearby streets.

Construction

- Finally, we would like to raise concern about the impacts during construction. It is important that all three sites – the housing, medical unit and SEN school – are developed at the same time so that local residents are inconvenienced by the construction activity only once and not at three separate times. It is imperative that the planning applications for all three sites are handled at the same time and we urge the Council to do what it can to expedite the other two.

We urge the Council to consider the above points before proceeding further with this application.

8.2 TOWNSCAPE VIEWS



The applicant's selection of views

Note that they are all in the public domain. No consideration of the private domain of Grosvenor Avenue (north side)


South Elevations existing and proposed

Existing south elevation seen from Grosvenor Ave
- 2 storeys and large sloping roof



Proposed south elevation seen from Grosvenor Ave
- 4 storeys including one in sloping roof.

There are several mature trees, some evergreen, in front of this elevation but there is still every possibility that residents of the proposed development will catch glimpses between the branches into these backgardens.





Oncoming car on footway obstructed by pedestrian.

Note dotted white lines on road surface and footway in foreground denoting former parking space.

Note also traffic counter on road surface in foreground.



Head to head confrontation caused by pedestrian and dog!

South Worple Way

South Worple Way (cont.)



Realistically there is only enough room for one car and a cyclist.



Note dotted white lines on road surface (erased) and footway denoting former parking spaces.