

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 21/3107/FUL

Address: Barnes Hospital South Worple Way East Sheen London SW14 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. Sarah Travers

Address: 166 Sheen Lane East Sheen London SW14 8LZ

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: The Transport statement for this development contains several points which should be challenged. The impact of Hammersmith Bridge being closed to traffic, Mortlake Brewery and Manor Road developments has been dismissed, in the case of the developments apparently on the grounds that these developments (Mortlake recently turned down by the Mayor, Manor Road still subject to an extended consultation) did not extend their impact assessments to the Barnes Hospital development. This is a weak reason, and the reality is that the developments will impact on each other, being as they are within 2 miles of each other and sharing the same road and rail transport links. The Transport statement rejects the Transport for London PTAL for the site of 2 and proposes a recalculated PTAL of 4 based on a train frequency to Waterloo from Barnes and Mortlake of 4 trains per hour. In fact, South Western trains proposes to reduce off peak services to Waterloo from Barnes and Mortlake to two per hour. Will the applicant recalculate the PTAL to reflect what will be the reality for the site and acknowledge the site's PTAL is less favourable than they state? There appear to be no acknowledgement that the train services from the closest train stations to this development are highly likely to be cut by 50% for much of the day. The Transport statement assessment of modes of transport for trips in and out of the development proposes 30% of trips will be by train. Does this take into account the likely reduced train availability South Western rail is trying to push through? The Transport statement is 91 pages long, and whilst I have read through as carefully as I can I can find no reference to the fact the the only vehicle access to the site, South Worple Way, is unusually narrow on the section between the site and White Hart Lane, with an unusually narrow pavement. It is effectively a single track, and wide vehicles, including the large SUVs which are favoured by many Londoners, completely fill the roadway. Introducing the possibility that 50 such vehicles (for the 50 parking spaces) would be regularly using this narrow road would affect the safety of pedestrians and impact the quality of life of homeowners on this narrow stretch. The alternative route west on South Worple Way is also not designed to take significant traffic and, like North Worple Way, is used as a rat run by drivers seeking to avoid the Upper Richmond Road. Traffic surveys for the report were undertaken in July 2021, ie pre ULEZ and during the summer holidays. I would argue that with the October 2021 adoption of ULEZ traffic levels on South Worple Way have risen as drivers try to avoid the Upper Richmond Road at peak times. As, with ULEZ and Hammersmith Bridge down, the traffic situation on the URR is unlikely to improve, this development's proposal of 50 parking spaces and overall level of density places an unacceptable burden on the existing infrastructure and residents and should be turned down.