

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: Mr Robert Heslop

Address: 28 Warwick Road Twickenham TW2 6SW

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: 1. There is too much parking. The applicant's own assessment shows that there is more parking proposed than the average car ownership for the area. It also says that 30% of households do not have access to a car. In particular, every flat does not need a parking space.

The applicant states that by providing more parking on site means there will be no overspill. However, they also say that residents will not be eligible for parking permits so there will be no overspill! The majority of residents in this area do not drive to work, you only need to look at the difference between daytime and nighttime parking levels.

2. Access to the river is laughable. There is a boardwalk but it is in a car park - not very attractive. Added to which cars parked in the nearest parking spaces would over-run the area getting into or out of parking spaces. If this administration is to right the car dominated wrongs of the previous one then starting with reducing parking to promote a better environment for pedestrians and families must be top of the list. The area adjacent to the river is NOT a shared space, it is a car park. Cars should be removed from this area making it a pedestrian priority area.

How would a bridge be made to work bearing in mind that it would land in a car park? Why can't this site be made to work with only one vehicular access to Edwin Road, making the Gould Road access for pedestrians only? Has this ever been promoted by officers in pre-application talks and if not why not?

3. Cycle parking. The applicant states that the cycle parking provision meets London Plan standards. However, the houses on the western side of the site each have 1 cycle parking "space" at the back of a garage. These are family houses so in reality are likely to have more than one bike so this cannot be acceptable.

The cycle parking "space" provided in these garages cannot be accessed if a car is parked in the garage. It also assumes that no other items will be stored in the garage - very unlikely in a family home. Proper, easily accessible and dedicated cycle storage must be provided if this administration is serious about promoting active and healthy travel.

Do the garages meet recommended minimum internal dimensions for cycle storage? There should be a proper gap between a car and the garage wall to allow a bike to be wheeled in and out. This does not appear to be the case.

This council has been approving inadequate and/or unusable cycle parking spaces for too long - this must change. However, the applicant seems to think that 92 cycle parking spaces for the flats can fit into a store the length of 4 car parking spaces - 10m. Even if this is possible the spaces are likely to be unusable and unused. This appears to have been designed by someone who does not understand cycle parking and presumably has never cycled. Officers should ensure the cycle parking is fit for purpose.

4. There does not appear to be a Healthy Streets assessment as required by TfL.

This site should be designed so that the people living there have a good quality of life, it promotes active travel, and is not just a car park. It clearly does not do this. I would question whether the applicant understands what such a development would look like, and it is disappointing that officers do not appear to have been able to persuade them to come up with a suitable development.