

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: Ms. Ann Maria Sheehan

Address: 57 Grosvenor Avenue East Sheen London SW14 8BU

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: 1/2

1. Transport and access: As has been mentioned by many objectors both to the Outline Planning application in 2018 and in response to this application, access to this site is extremely challenged in both directions on South Worple Way. The challenges of this location so close to the White Hart Lane railway barrier have been well documented by myself and others at the Outline Planning meeting in 2018 and objections made then on the planning portal, since removed. The developer's answer in this application is to create an animation of the existing access and post Marshalls to manage the construction traffic. That exercise simply records current flows. While posting Marshalls may help during construction, it does nothing to manage South Worple Way when the site is fully operational across the three functions and users types. Recent changes to parking on South Worple Way demonstrate the lack of understanding of the flow of vehicles on this road, as has been continuously pointed out by locals. Local residents are not interested in political point scoring in relation to South Worple Way, but in resolving this access in a way that genuinely consults and engages residents as opposed to enforcing restrictions by stealth and deceptive means (ie. the recent removal of parking on SWW near Queens Bridge by the Council at the behest of Network Rail, creating an even faster rat run. This endangers users who are used to using both the road and footpath for buggies, some with young children on bicycles and walking, given the width of the footpath.) Many residents have repeatedly described that SWW while two way, is in reality a single track road, again evidenced by both photographic and video footage in 2018. The difference between 2018 and now is increased delivery drivers and faster traffic facilitated by the removal of resident parking. Vehicular access to and from this site must be analysed across all three functions simultaneously and for this reason judging this application on its own, without consideration of the Health Hub and SEMH school should not be considered. Indeed, at Outline Planning 2018, it was agreed by the Council that all three uses of the site would be considered together.

2. The core aspirations for this site ie. the Health Hub and SEMH school are not being considered alongside the residential element, the proceeds of which contributed towards the Trust's projects outside this local area. This consideration of all three elements together was agreed at Outline planning consent. Remember the SEMH school is funded by Central Government, not the sale of the residential side of the plot, which some local groups have not understood, thereby splitting responses in support of and objection to the Outline planning in 2018. This Drop-in application facilitates the developer's element alone, denying locals the opportunity to comment on the proposals for this site as a whole, across all aspects from architectural, to massing to sustainability, to include crucially critical analysis of energy provision for the whole site. Had the developer gone the route of a Section 73 Variation of Condition Application rather than the quicker, cheaper Drop-in Application, the timeline may have aligned better with The Trust's elements, allowing critical analysis of the entire site as a whole at the same time. Locals have yet to see what the Health Hub and SEMH school will look like, beyond volumetric shapes alongside the residential proposals. If this application is considered on its own merits, it facilitates the developer only. Should this element be given precedence over the Health Hub and SEMH school? These two elements embody the original vision for the site and should be championed and protected over

and above the residential.