

PLANNING APPLICATION PUBLIC COMMENT

Application number: PP/20/04812
Site Address: 19 Mallord Street, LONDON, SW3 6AP
Proposal: Change of use of basement, ground and three upper storeys from former telephone exchange (Sui Generis) to new health and fitness club; creation of small single storey rear extension at basement level; excavation for a swimming pool at basement level; alterations to entrances and external paving; and other works and improvements to building.

Comment received: SUBJECT: OBJECTIONS TO 19 MALLORD STREET APPLICATION

Dear Mr Woodhead,

I live in on Mallord Street and write to express numerous objections to the specifics of the proposal that must call for formal conditions to be articulated and imposed, so that the statements made in the proposal are formalized as commitments, should there be a next step to this project. Please refer this project for a review by the planning committee to ensure that, should this project materialize, it is duly respectful of the neighborhood in which it may sit.

My objections are:

No consideration of air quality OUTSIDE the facility. Given the very high moisture content of the pool environment and the workout spaces, and the current acute focus on microdroplets as a pathway for transmission of airborne diseases, the proposal's focus on the air quality inside the facility is insufficient. It will be critical that this facility ensure there is state-of-the-art filtration for all ventilation to the exterior so that any concentrated air flow from the ventilation is clean and vented in a manner directed away from all neighbors, as well as noise abatement for the fans that carry the moisture outside.

Understated safety issues: When aggregated (see next objection), the frequency of servicing vehicles amounts to multiple daily large vehicles parked at the facility at a place almost directly across from a school with small children. That school has coaches, strollers, and gleeful small children running to and from school - it seems extremely dismissive simply to assert with no further assessment that the heavy flow of servicing traffic will not pose a safety risk. When taken with the impact of this servicing, the safety issues call for very specific parameters to be placed on this project re the flow of good trucks.

Understated disruption associated with servicing: The description of

the servicing breaks the impact into multiple pieces and does not present an aggregated picture of the cumulative impact on the neighborhood. When aggregated, the proposal describes a potential impact of: Twice daily deliveries that may total 40 minutes of on-street waiting time; PLUS daily garbage pickups; PLUS once a week equipment servicing; PLUS twice a week additional supplies on top of the daily supplies. When assessed as a cumulative matter, this makes very clear that the impact of servicing must be revisited to scale back the impact, and also made very specific in commitments for any potential approvals.

In addition, the garbage pickup description incorrectly notes that this will pose no change to the current circumstance; this is untrue. Currently, there is garbage pickup twice a week, but the proposal contemplates increasing this to daily pickups. This adds five additional days of garbage trucks to the street and doubles the garbage truck impact on two of those days. Certainly the proposal can make allowances that there would be no pickup on weekends, and they can avoid doubling the impact of the existing pickup schedule.

Understated impact on parking: I was present on Mallord Street for the parking stress testing that was done for the 2019 parking study - conveniently, it was done at half-term, and thus must understate the parking stresses on the street. For example, the half-term timing ensured that there was there zero parking impact associated with pick-up and drop-off for the Cameron House School, so the "morning peak hour" mentioned in the study of 745 hours presents an incomplete picture of the actual stresses. This must be reconsidered to ensure a true view.

Uncertainty re asbestos abatement: As one of the plans notes, there is a lift basement room with an asbestos warning sign posted. I have noted (some time ago) an asbestos abatement vehicle stationed outside the facility and simply wonder whether the disclosures adequately addressed the abatement and potentially the risks, both to the users and to those near the ventilation.

Understated impact on traffic: On a daily basis, traffic on the Vale that seeks to enter the Kings Road is heavily congested. Adding the service trips described above seems clearly to pose residual cumulative impacts on the immediate road network that would be severe.

Date of Comment:
Comment type:

Thank you for your consideration,
05/10/2020
Objection