

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 19/0646/FUL

Address: GreggsGould RoadTwickenhamTW2 6RT

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings (with retention of single dwelling) and redevelopment of the site to provide up to 116 residential units and 175sq.m commercial floorspace; landscaped areas; with associated parking and highways works and other works associated with the development.

Comments Made By

Name: Ms Cara Tetlow

Address: 6 Gould Road Twickenham TW2 6RS

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: PLEASE NOTE THAT OUR OBJECTIONS HAVE ALSO BEEN SUBMITTED IN A LETTER FROM FIONA JONES of CAMERON JONES PLANNING on behalf of 4, 6 ,8, 10 & 12 GOULD ROAD, sent by email on 5 April 2019 – the content of which is copied in our online submissions.

PART 9/10

Highways/parking issues (cont.)

Further, the proposed garages within the houses on block D are sub-standard in size (they should be 3m in width and are less than that) and therefore are unlikely to be used for the parking of cars and would put more pressure on the surrounding roads for cars to find spaces to park. Further, there is no space for visitors to park.

Overall, the parking situation is poor and would result in a severe impact on the local road network contrary to the NPPF and policy LP44 of the Local Plan and should be refused on this ground.

Lack of public benefits

The Planning Statement provides a list of the 'public benefits'. However, it fails to acknowledge or comment on the following:

1. No highway improvement to Gould & Crane Roads – and there would be a detrimental impact to these roads. There were no HGVs at this point, and the traffic volume in and out of the site would significantly increase;
2. Inadequate opening up of access and poor pedestrian access to the site;
3. Insufficient play space proposed for the number of houses and adults/children – especially as the proposed gardens are so small (out of keeping) and thus open space would be even more of a requirement for the future residents.
4. There has been a failure to properly open up the River Crane Corridor, or add connections to the long-distance footpath. The Local plan policies LP15 and LP18 set out that it is a “key priority to protect & enhance river corridors, promote biodiversity in and around the borough’s rivers including the River Crane” and “Development adjacent to the river corridors will be expected to contribute to improvements and enhancements to the river environment”. Therefore, the development on the Greggs site should provide through site links to the riverside to enable public access and facilitate links to long distance footpath.

5. It is noted that the safeguarded area for potential future bridge link also uses up a lot of the only publicly accessible open space on site.
6. The majority of “amenity & play space” is on semi-private roof terraces which overlook neighbouring properties and their gardens. SPD for Small & Medium Housing Sites (4.2) states that “successful shared garden space will also need to bear in mind the orientation of the layout and effect of shade, favouring a southward facing aspect.”
7. There is only a token gesture of public realm space which is also the play space in a north-facing corner of the site which will be overshadowed, not open or welcoming. The proposed boardwalk is only 1.5m wide and would be difficult to access as it would involve crossing a two way single lane road, with no separate pavement. Much of the boardwalk will be overshadowed for much of the year due to the scale of buildings to its south.
8. The play spaces the applicants reference are shown with distances that are misleading and assume direct walking routes and not needing to cross the river and railway. The only equipped play space within 10 minutes walking distance of site is at Kneller Gardens. Twickenham Green is an inappropriate play space given its location between two busy main roads and with no facilities.