

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 December 2021 13:21
To: RMC
Subject: FW: 21/3107/FUL

Official

Could you please upload objection onto the planning page.

From: Avon, Paul (Cllr) <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 29 December 2021 18:33
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 21/3107/FUL

Official

Robert,

Could the following objection be added to the above application please in the absence of Grace?

I wish to object to 21/3107/FUL – the residential development associated with Barnes Hospital.

I will focus my attention on the transport statement associated with the above application. I would ask that officers at LBRuT closely scrutinise this statement. Some of the statements and assertions contained within bear absolutely no resemblance to reality on the ground. For example, it asserts:

“5.31 The analysis has demonstrated that the development will not result in a material change in vehicle trips associated with the site in comparison with either the existing lawful use of the site or the consented use of the site. On that basis the development will not have a material effect on the highway network local to the site.

5.32 Given the accessible location of the site, any additional person trips will be distributed across a variety of routes and sustainable transport opportunities including rail, bus, cycling and walking. On that basis, it is evident that the change in total person movements associated with the proposed development will not result in a material effect on the operation of the highway and transport networks in the vicinity of the site. No further assessment of the effect of movements associated with the development proposals is considered necessary.”

The above statements are astonishing. Anybody living in the area would tell you that the area is already stressed with traffic on White Hart Lane/Upper Richmond Road/Priests Bridge, etc. The applicant has increased the number of units by 32% and provided zero mitigation. We simply do not have the infrastructure to support this increase in population.

Just common sense would suggest that 109 units will attract a huge volume of traffic in terms of deliveries, trades, etc. particularly given the events of the past two years. It breezily suggests that 109 units would attract just 14 servicing vehicles per day. This cannot be taken seriously (5.29) and that the 32% increase in residential units would equate to “one additional vehicle movement every 15 minutes in the morning peak hour and one additional vehicle movement every 20 minutes in the evening peak hour.” Astonishingly it conveniently increases the PTAL rating to 4 from 2 via a “manual PTAL assessment.” How? What has changed in the local infrastructure to justify this? Absolutely nothing!

Train services are being reduced from Mortlake (to Waterloo) and Hammersmith Bridge is closed to vehicular traffic. Whilst it is open to pedestrians/cyclists this is by no means guaranteed and the TfL ferry services (which the report refers to) have been ditched. Based on this sort of evidence, this report cannot be taken seriously. It lacks credibility.

Its basic premise is that the development will have no impact at all, and that the infrastructure can easily cope with the increase in population which I would strenuously deny.

The simple fact is that this development is in a very inaccessible location, down a one-way road next to a very busy and potentially dangerous level crossing. Any residential development should reflect this simple fact of geography. This area is at crisis point in terms of our local infrastructure. Please listen!

Kind Regards
Paul

Councillor Paul Avon
Councillor for Mortlake & Barnes Common
London Borough of Richmond upon Thames
E: [REDACTED]
Twitter: @paulavon_barnes

For further information about how Councillors collect, use and retain personal data see the Council Privacy Notice

