

## 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:** Mrs Sarah Khan

**Address:** 27 May Road Twickenham TW2 6RJ

### Comments

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

**Comment:** The new proposal still has 5 storey blocks which is out of character for this area and will tower too high and be an eyesore, overlooking other houses and creating a loss of light. The development is also far too dense for the area's current infrastructure. The proposal needs to decrease the height and density. It will create too much pressure on local public transport and services.

There is not enough parking allocated for the numbers in the development. What happens when these houses employ suppliers such as electricians etc who will need to park within the allocation as well as the residents (some of whom may have 2 cars) - parking allocation isn't sufficient. Can it be promised that parking will never be allowed in the surrounding areas? - if not then the likelihood is that in time they will be allowed to park in surrounding areas. We pay for a permit because we'd had problems with parking previously - if in the long run we still have parking problems because there is an influx of houses in the area being allowed to park in the road then we are not getting what we agreed and are paying for currently. If sufficient parking was allowed on the development at this stage this wouldn't be as great a concern.

Also the amount of traffic in this area will increase to an area which already, on match days in particular, is a problem area around the green. There is a concern for highway safety and road access.

The public play space proposal also seems to fail to open up the River Crane corridor. When working out the amount of designated play space it shouldn't include the wider riverside walkway as this is not what people call play space. Where do children 11+ or 6+ play too?