

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. Glyn Wallis-Jones

Address: 38A Upper Richmond Road West East Sheen London SW14 8DD

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Form 2 of 2

A consolidated energy system should be obligatory. A small energy centre should be established to service the 3 developments. The justification at outline stage was weak at best: "This is a better solution for the owners of these developments as reliance on heat supply from another entity and plant ownership structure can be sensitive issues." A single system is required to avoid doubling up of generation equipment. It is unacceptable to miss out on these efficiencies.

There is no way that the developer should be allowed to get away with putting in gas combustion in London. Under 5.0 in the Energy Statement, Table 5.1 Renewable technologies, there is a cross next to Ground Source Heat Pumps, with the comment "Insufficient Space." Would this be the case if the entire site were considered?

Saying that GSHP is not compatible with VRG-HR air source systems is a red herring. Some of the best commercial installations of heat pumps in London (cooling and heating) are on heat pumps. Also, they should be going for UFH as opposed to radiators. With regards to the heat pumps being proposed (air source) are condenser units put outside? There must be noise attenuation and it is critical that the cold flow from these doesn't go onto footpaths (potential freezing and slip risk) or adjacent buildings.

3/ Proposed Blocks

The impact of the mass of the proposed build will be significantly detrimental to adjacent housing. Increased number of units from 83 to 109 (23%) is beyond the limits of outline consent. There is no strong argument for increasing the height of Block B. There is only a tiny reference point for the site and nothing of this height in the area. Balconies on Block A, 1st floor (West elevation) and Block B, 1st and 2nd floor (West elevation) will overlook existing residential. Facades facing South are severe and completely out of character with the area.