

## 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 Stuart Wilson

**Address:** 41 Crane Road Twickenham TW2 6RX

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** I object to these proposals on the grounds that it is an overly dense urban development in an area where local services are already close to capacity. All the schools in the area are over-subscribed. At the busy periods of every working day, public transport is at capacity. Local healthcare provisions are stretched. It is simply too dense.

I am concerned about the increase in vehicle traffic caused by this proposal.

The solution to this is not to simply reduce the number of parking spaces. The only real solution is to reduce the number of houses on the site.

People will have cars.

Even though some might say it's better for fewer people to have cars, the fact is people have cars in Twickenham. If the argument is environmental, I have an electric car which I need it to get to work. It is still a car. You can't build 116 homes, some with 4 bedrooms, and only provide 100 parking spaces.

Can you build into the plans a guaranteed discrimination against car owners for the life of the property?

People will have cars and to provide them with no place to park is irresponsible.

The neighbouring streets have only recently gained residents parking control. Before we had this, all the cars from the surrounding area parked here. Cars from the new proposal will have to go and find the next unrestricted area or deal with private parking operatives who could spring up.

In a development of this size, there will also be vans which will need to park, otherwise they will park illegally in neighbouring streets which would be unsafe, could lead to more traffic accidents and cause disruption.

There should be a number of parking spaces allocated for visiting delivery vans, utilities vans, tradesmans' vans etc because, realistically there will be these vehicles needing to park there.

The amended proposal now says they have allowed for visitor parking.

I do not see how this is true. The number of spaces being made has been reduced by 15 and the only difference is that among the reduced number of spaces, the description has been changed to say there is visitor parking - this would only be if some of the residents moved their cars elsewhere!

It seems like this is just so London Square PR can say they have given consideration to the concern that there is inadequate parking for visiting vans.

If there is a genuine concern about an increase in vehicles and that, or any other ecological spin, is the motivation for reducing the number of parking spaces, this should be better addressed by cramming fewer residential units into this site. This is the only solution to this issue.

The area cannot sustain this number of new residents.

Traffic in most of the surrounding roads is already single-file so someone always has to back up. An increase of 100 cars in the area would lead to an increase in reversing between parked cars which is dangerous. The increase in associated delivery and utility vans will reduce road-safety, with more blind spots for children and other pedestrians as well as cyclists.

There is no question that this area is predominantly two-storey houses. To build a 5 storey development is completely out of character for the neighbourhood. This is not at all sympathetic to the existing architecture.

The proposed development looming over the corner of Crane and Gould would have a negative impact on the visual amenity and would be inescapably dominant.

It would change the character of the area in a way that is unwelcome.

There would be issues of overlooking all the way along Crane Road and putting up screens which would block light is not a solution.

Building a development of this height and density will take away light from existing residents.

The solution is to have a two storey development with fewer units.

This development would have a negative effect on the visual amenity for the thousands of users of the Nature Parks and Crane Riverside which should be protected.

There is insufficient play space for children.