



St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum

95 Highlever Road. London W106PW
email info@stqw.org
0207 460 1743
www.stqw.org

Barry Valentine
RBKC Planning Department
Town Hall
Hornton Street
London W8 7NX

October 17th 2014

Dear Mr Valentine,

Planning application PP/14/06751 Proposed underpass at 301 Latimer Road

We are writing with comments on the above application, submitted by Imperial College. The St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum is a body designated by RBKC for the purpose of neighbourhood planning, with a membership of 360 residents and businesses.

The Forum, and its sister organisation the St Helens Residents Association has supported the principle of a pedestrian cycle underpass at this location since it was first proposed in 2011. Our support is based on a consultation exercise amongst our membership, carried out at that time, and more recent discussions at open meetings of the StQW Forum earlier this summer.

We had a an agreement with Imperial College and the Westway Trust that there would be some informal consultation on the detailed plans for the underpass and a presentation at one of our open meetings in April. This event was delayed while the plans were re-worked at the request of Network Rail. We are disappointed that no further information was provided to us before the planning application was validated and published.

We have communicated separately with our views on the lack of neighbour notification of the application. The new underpass will have a significant impact on the surrounding area, in providing a connection between the northern parts of LBHF and RBKC at a location where the railway line has been a physical barrier for 150 years.

Support for the new underpass is by no means universal in the neighbourhood. We estimate from past consultations, and more recent discussions and votes at public meetings that there is a 2:1 majority in favour, leaving a significant number of people who would prefer the status quo to remain and for the underpass not to be built. The reasons for this view relate to concerns over additional pedestrian/cycle traffic along Oxford Gardens, community safety issues, and impact of residents parking.

A greater number of residents support the proposal, because of the additional connectivity and reduced walking times that will result, especially to the Central Line and White City station.

The Draft StQW Neighbourhood Plan promoted the case for an additional Overground station, adjacent to the underpass, as proposed by the West London Line Group. This is seen as an essential requirement to redcuing traffic pressures on Wood Lane/Scrubs Lane and improving PTAL levels in

in an area for which a whole series of major developments are planned and/or approved in White City East and the Old Oak Opportunity Area.

In terms of the detail of the planning application, our comments are as follows:

1. None of the documentation appears to give a figure for the length of the subway, making it hard to assess what levels of natural light there will be and to what extent it may feel threatening to pedestrians.
2. The application documents do not include a longitudinal section of the underpass, which we would have thought was a very basic requirement for a project of this kind. The Transport Study notes that no such document is available, making it hard to assess changes of level within the underpass. This in turn makes it hard to judge the likely speed of cyclists.
3. The Forum's management committee has discussed the merits of a non-segregated underpass, with nothing more than different surface treatments to separate cyclists from pedestrians. On balance and given the 6m proposed width, we consider this aspect acceptable but would wish any planning approval to include a condition that non-segregation is **reviewed after 6 months** in case it proves that there are pedestrian/cycle conflicts and accidents. We note that the Safety Audit recommends *'the design engineers should seek to provide a departure from standards to provide a segregated pedestrian/cycleway through the underpass'*. Neither the Planning Statement nor the Transport Statement explain why this recommendation has not been followed.
4. We would welcome the Council considering a requirement for 'sun pipes' (e.g. the Sunportal system) as used in European cities to provide natural light to the underpass and improve its ambience.
5. The Planning Statement refers to 5 CCTV cameras being installed along the length of the underpass. Local residents view CCTV and security monitoring as a crucial element of the proposals. **It is not clear who will be monitoring these cameras, Imperial College or the Council?** If the College, there is concern that this body will take more interest in coverage of their own site, on the Wood Lane side, as compared with Latimer Road. If the Council, our understanding is that RBKC CCTV monitoring covers only the hours of 3pm to 1am. The southern end of Latimer Road is currently a location with for security and Safety issues, with the business premises in the area experiencing frequent burglaries. An Increase in street crime at this location would very swiftly result in a growing body of residents wishing that the underpass had never been proposed. **Hence planning conditions on CCTV coverage are essential, requiring 24/7 coverage of the Latimer Road entrance and the section of Latimer Road south to Stable Way.**

We trust that the Council will take these comments into account when deciding the application, and are copying this letter to the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.

Regards

Henry Peterson, Chair St Quintin and Woodlands Neighbourhood Forum.