



Rt Hon Sadiq Khan MP
House of Commons, London
SW1A 0AA
t: 020 7219 6967
f: 020 7219 6477
e: sadiqkhanmp@parliament.uk
w: www.sadiqkhan.org.uk



Andrew Simpson
Springfield Programme Director
Estates & Regeneration
1st Floor, Building 14
Springfield University Hospital
61 Glenburnie Road
London
SW17 7DJ

3rd September 2010

Dear Andrew,

Re: Springfield Hospital development

I write further to my letter of the 30th July 2010, where I outlined a number of concerns I have regarding the plans Springfield Hospital intend to submit to Wandsworth Council shortly.

I appreciate the efforts you have taken recently to meet with local residents and communicate the detail of these plans, and the changes and guarantees you have offered to some residents to address their concerns.

However, I still have serious misgivings about a number of issues, and cannot support the planning application if these are not addressed fully and urgently – ideally before the plans are submitted to Wandsworth Council on 7th September.

Hebdon Road, Lingwell Road & Ansell Road

While I appreciate the efforts you have made to reduce the number of units proposed at this access point from 80 to 27, I remain unconvinced that a vehicular access point is necessary at all at Hebdon Road. I am firmly behind the residents of Hebdon Road, Lingwell Road and Ansell Road, who you are well aware overwhelmingly reject these plans.

As I outlined in my letter of 30th July there are strong planning grounds on which to oppose the new access point, which I am sure Wandsworth Borough Council's planning officers will pay heed to when they recognise the groundswell of local opposition.

A vehicular access point on Hebdon Road will be detrimental to character of the area, the environment and road safety, and would result in:

- Increased air and noise pollution
- Increased through-traffic and congestion
- An increased risk of road-traffic accidents (in breach of local planning policies).

While the amended plans indicate that this access point would only allow access to the 27 units proposed for the southern edge of the site, residents still have legitimate concerns that this may later be connected to the rest of the site's road network, expanding access and greatly increasing the number of vehicles using the Hebdon Road gate to access Upper Tooting Road.

In our meetings you indicated there would be a maximum of 7 cars/hour using this access point at the peak AM time, and 3 cars/hour in the peak PM time. I remain unconvinced that such a low volume of traffic will be so detrimental to traffic flows at the existing Glenburnie Road and Burntwood Lane entrances that you can justify completely disrupting the lives of Hebdon Road, Ansell Road and Lingwell Road residents in this way.

Additional issues

In addition to the issue of access, residents also have concerns about the the height, location and character of new housing and proposed playground, its impact on light, visual amenity, security and privacy; the scale and density of the development and its impact on local services, infrastructure and amenities; the impact on traffic, parking and transport, particularly at weekends; pedestrian access to Streatham Cemetery and its impact on security, privacy and the peaceful character of the area; and the lack of pro-active and timely consultation of local residents and effective communication.

As you are well aware, Hedon Road, Lingwell Road and Ansell Road residents are currently willing to object enmasse to this application. If the access point remains in the plans and the other issues are not addressed to the majority of residents' satisfaction, I will have no choice but to support the objections of local residents and help see these plans rejected by the Planning Application Committee.

College Gardens

Despite assurances about the treatment of the boundary between College Gardens and Springfield Hospital, and the agreement to rule-out any kind of access to the site via College Gardens, residents are still deeply unhappy with a number of issues.

These include a consultation process that was not well advertised or particularly inclusive (once again there were delivery issues with relation to the planning brochure and invitations to visit the exhibitions), the loss of visual amenity, proximity of buildings to the boundary, heights of adjacent buildings, the actual boundary condition, loss of light, and overshadowing.

While verbal assurances have been made that these issues will be addressed, residents would have preferred a more thorough consultation that allowed these issues to be aired publically at an earlier date, and included in the plans before they are submitted to Wandsworth Council.

In its current configuration, and without binding conditions that ensure their concerns will be addressed, College Gardens residents feel that they will strongly oppose the planning application.

Burntwood Lane, Openview, Fieldview, Tilehurst Road etc

Residents living on Burntwood Lane, Openview, Fieldview, Tilehurst Road, Godley Road and Ellerton Road have contacted me and indicated they did not receive the Trust's planning brochure - which raises the now familiar complaints about lack of effective consultation of residents.

Parking and traffic are a serious concern for residents living on Burntwood Lane and the adjoining streets. There is some scepticism of the travel plan and its predicted impact on parking and traffic, with particular concerns about the overflow of parking from the site onto roads adjoining Burntwood Lane, that do not have Controlled Parking Zones. Many residents simply do not accept that this development will not place a huge burden on local parking provision, particularly on roads where residents have chosen not to have controlled parking zones.

Residents living on Burntwood Lane with a view of the site also have concerns about loss of visual amenity, specifically with relation to the taller buildings (4 storeys) that will be constructed on this side of the site.

Conclusions

There is a common theme running through the objections I have received from local residents living on all sides of the site: that the consultation process has not been inclusive enough, that information has been poorly distributed and communicated; and that the concerns that have been raised in the past have not been addressed adequately.

Unless these issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the wider local community, I am afraid I will remain opposed to the plans and ensure that strong objections are raised throughout the statutory consultation process and at the Planning Application Committee.

At such a late stage, I would suggest it is in the Trust's best interests, and the interests of the local community, to urgently address these issues and gain the support of the local community in this application.

I look forward to receiving your comments.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Sadiq', with a long horizontal flourish underneath.

Rt. Hon. Sadiq Khan MP

CC. Judy Wilson, Chief Executive, South-West London and St George's Mental Health Trust