



Friends of St. James's Park and The Green Park

39 Westminster Mansions Great Smith Street London SW1P 3BP Telephone (020) 7222 2449

John Walker Esq.,
Operational Director
Development Planning
Westminster City Hall
64 Victoria Street
London SW1E 6QP

By email southplanningteam@westminster.gov.uk

For the attention of Rupert Handley

21st May 2012

Dear Mr. Handley

Ref 12/033338/FULL and 12/03341/FULL
10 Rochester Row, London SW1 - Options 1 & 2
Use of ground floor retail unit 1 for food retail use. Alterations to
Greencoat Place frontage including the formation of a new
service door and a new refuse store door (Servicing option 1)

Thank you for forwarding a copy of the above applications, along with your letter dated 25th April 2012. We have examined the drawings, and the reports attached to it. We find it very odd that there is no mention of the possible impact of the large retail Sainsbury retail unit on Emanuel House which is above it. The likely noise transfer to the floors above could be most disturbing given the intended hours of opening !

As the applications fall within our geographical area of interest we have taken into account a number of the views of the local residential community. We consider that their concerns are extremely relevant to the understanding and appreciation of the issues raised. The two applications are similar in the basic reasons for our objections.

However we were not able to ascertain what exists and what is proposed on the ground floor of the premises fronting on to Greencoat Street. In Option One the elevation Dwg P-3772-210 indicates that there is no change to that which exists. But according to the relevant Plan, the possible use seems not to agree with that. We were lead to understand that the ground floor here was residential and maybe social housing. The details need to be clarified for both Options as to what are the consequences of one against two, and the respective revised ground floor elevations

It would be disingenuous of the Local Authority to dismiss the prime issues of the local community. It is known from other examples in the area that the servicing of even modest retail food stores causes disturbance and nuisance invariably due to the 'anti social' hours when such servicing routinely occurs. In these applications the retail store is proposed to remain open for trade from early morning to late at night. Based on other similar premises it may start from 5 am onwards.

It is not only the delivery times that are of concern. After the premises are closed at the end of trading there is invariably a period of an hour or so in moving and stacking the refuse - in and outside of the shop. There is also the inevitable cleaning of the entry etc. This is inevitably likely to be disturbing and a subsequent nuisance when people are trying to sleep or in fact sleeping. In some instances collection and or deliveries have also been witnessed at extreme times. And of course the size and weight of the delivery trucks is a matter of concern given the relative narrowness of Greencoat Place.

It has been reported to us that there is an earlier 'condition' which stated that "the premises were not to be used for retail purposes". Even if it were now held that that condition no longer was 'relevant', it nonetheless indicates that the original intention was not to permit the kind of use with its peripheral noise nuisance that would most definitely come into being should either of the proposals be granted consent. This is particularly the case with the size and nature of the proposed Sainsbury store.

We wonder why there should be support for this sized retail floor space in this location, given the number of environmental disadvantages. It is particularly surprising since the new 10 Rochester Row building is prime residential accommodation: and it is not as though the area was without retail facilities.

While it might have seemed an opportunity to reposition the Sainsbury facility which had been in Kingsgate House, and which has now been demolished; the location should have been rejected in the first instance because of the reasons of the objections - as valid then as now. On the other hand if it was considered that a replacement site in the vicinity of Victoria Street was required, then the opportune location would appear to be the site of Selborne House. A conflict with residential use would be far less of an issue - especially since the planning application for Selborne House specifically excluded any residential use. And since 'habit' is a strong factor in retail success, a new relocation only a few meters away from the old location would have greater potential when contrasted with Rochester Row. From a retail sales point of view that makes more sense.

The Society considers the proposals to be unacceptable both in principle and in fact, and recommends that the applications be turned down. We look to the Local Authority to take heed of the local residential community, and its objections. We trust our observations and comments will be of assistance and ask that our comments be made known to the Planning Committee and the full Council.

Yours Sincerely
for and on behalf of the Thorney Island Society

PP Tom Ball

June A Stubbs
Chairman



Greencoat Place - narrow street



Rochester Row - Emmaus House and 10 Rochester Row

Considerations for Planning Applications
for a Sainsbury retail outlet

7 June 2012

