

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 21/3107/FUL

Address: Barnes Hospital South Worples 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. Ruth Donaldson

Address: 77 Grosvenor Avenue East Sheen London SW14 8BU

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: The changes to this redevelopment should be subject to full planning consultation with local residents as the changes are very significant. I also object to the site being considered in parts when the original development considered the residential buildings, SEN school etc as one development. That should continue to be the case.

In relation to my own property at 77 Grosvenor Avenue, I note that residential building block C is now higher than previously planned. The previous and current drawings are confusing - it looks like the new plans expect the roof to be 18.68m whereas the current building is 16.76m at roof line - so c. 2 metres of additional height overlooking my property and garden. What impact will that have on the daylight in my property? The daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report states that only properties at 57-75 (odd) Grosvenor Avenue will be impacted. This is clearly not the case - as evidenced by the site plan at page 9 of the report and other elevations which clearly show block C will be adjacent to my property but this was excluded from the report. Why so? (I note the previous daylight report covered properties up to 103 Grosvenor Avenue).

Finally, carrying out a traffic survey in July 2021 during the holiday period appears disingenuous. Furthermore, stating that "no further consideration of the closure of Hammersmith Bridge is required" is not a reasonable conclusion. There is currently no agreed plan for the repair or full reopening of the bridge. The traffic report indicates there was an additional 1,300 cars on Upper Richmond Road (comparing pre and post closure of Hammersmith Bridge) - this does not account for local residents who have given up using their cars due to the horrendous traffic caused by Hammersmith Bridge closure. The conclusion to ignore Hammersmith Bridge closure in the traffic report is convenient for the report writer and developer but bears no resemblance to reality.