

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: Mr. Ben Crosland

Address: 4 Lodge Avenue East Sheen London SW14 8PQ

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Firstly, it is astonishing that residents are being asked to respond to this submission over a public and religious holiday and, notwithstanding the curious timing of the consultation, residents are also given a very short window to review, consider and respond to such a large scheme and associated 'evidence'.

On a more substantive footing, these new representations fall considerably short of what is acceptable to submit to residents to consider, as information or evidence is either completely lacking/unsuitable or has been deliberately left out of the consultation. It is impossible to consider just the residential elements of the development proposal without knowing the fuller impacts of the other parts of the development. In short, residents are being asked to review half of the plans with incomplete information about how it will interact with the other half on the same site. It is an unacceptable interpretation of due process.

The most troubling aspect of this proposal is the lack of significant data gathering and responsible recognition of the dangerous traffic conditions on the intersection of South Worple Way and White Hart Lane around the level crossing and associated junctions. This specific area and the single pavement provision for pedestrians but insistence that the roadway has suitable provision for two lanes of road traffic produces very dangerous conditions for local pedestrians and residents. This development, during construction phase with steady flow of large trucks, and on completion with a significant uplift of car and delivery traffic, will make this situation much worse. It is an unacceptable and insufficiently evidenced position that developing a considerable residential scheme with over 100 units, with associated parking, as well as the development of other aspects of the site (details NOT provided for consultation), will only marginally increase traffic burden on this junction and the narrow sections of South Worple Way directly adjacent to the proposed development. The significant concern of actual local residents, accompanied by photographic evidence of the dangerous driving this junction forces, isn't being taken seriously enough. The easy and convenient route, which is obviously being taken in this circumstance, is to provide a flimsy data set and simply consider the issue addressed. It is not sufficiently addressed. It is dangerous and residents concerns about this are real and reasonable.

Finally, this proposal is suffering from enormous development creep. While previous proposals were setting out a 83 unit development, we're now being confronted with a 103 unit development with the increase being accommodated by multi-story buildings set in Victorian residential environs. It is absurd that existing residents' dwellings adjacent or in the locale of the proposed development are subject to conservation area building controls or Article 4 directives, yet oversized, ill-fitting, multi-storey site development dwarfing these buildings is considered acceptable. This is purely to satisfy a developer who has no concern to the aftermath on existing residents.

This development under current plans and with current approach to local traffic access is unacceptable. Railroad

residents into this situation ignoring serious concerns to seek a solution to the site is not an acceptable way for the local council to proceed.