

RE: Planning ref 19/0646/FUL : Greggs Redevelopment

18 November 2019 16:36

Subject	RE: Planning ref 19/0646/FUL : Greggs Redevelopment
From	planning@richmond.gov.uk
To	charlottepiper222@gmail.com; Faherty, Thomas
Sent	18 November 2019 16:27

Dear Charlotte Piper,

Thank you for your email which has been forwarded to Thomas Faherty who will add your comments onto the case file. All comments are made available for public viewing on our website. If you wish to view the current progress of this application please click on the following link:

http://www2.richmond.gov.uk/PlanData2/Planning_Search.aspx

Please be aware the Council can only take into account 'material planning considerations' when looking at your comments. The most common of these are shown in the link below:

http://www.richmond.gov.uk/what_is_a_valid_objection_to_a_planning_application

Where an application is to be decided by the Planning Committee a summary of all representations are included in the report to them.

We are conducting a Customer Experience Survey to gather customer feedback to help improve our services. The survey only takes 5 minutes and can be completed by using the link below.

www.richmond.gov.uk/customer_feedback

Kind regards
Dan Nugent

Corporate Customer Services
Serving Richmond and Wandsworth Councils
Tel: 0208 891 1411
www.richmond.gov.uk / www.wandsworth.gov.uk

You can also follow us on Twitter for up to date information and news: Twitter @LBRUT_help

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 17/November/2019 16:43 (GMT)
To: envprotection@richmond.gov.uk
Subject: Planning ref 19/0646/FUL : Greggs Redevelopment

dear Sirs

I'm writing to express my disappointment in the amended plans for the above development. These barely address the main concerns:

1. The height of most of the development is still 5-storeys, comprising 116 residential units. Twickenham Green 'village' comprises mainly of two-storey, 19th and early 20th century houses. Such a concentrated, high development is wholly out of keeping and will impact on neighbouring residences, reducing privacy.
2. There is inadequate parking and no official parking spaces (I understand) for visitors. In fact, the re-submitted plans actually reduce the amount of parking spaces. While less car pollution is welcome, the overall increase in volume of traffic will add to what already is pretty tight. In such a confined area as this 'village', ANY increase in car pollution will be noticeable. Please note there is a primary school nearby, in Colne Road.
3. Presumably children would be living in the new development. Whatever their ages, they need areas for play and to 'let off steam'.

I'm wondering if members of the Planning department have had the opportunity to walk around the Twickenham Green 'village' a few times, to get a feel for the area. The proposed development can't be adequately supported, on any level. The amenities will be overstretched. I've lived within a stone's throw of the Gregg's site for over 20 years and have seen how much stress two-car families have put on the area. A further 100+ residences will place an intolerable burden. I realise there is a housing shortage, but the kind of residences proposed are not social housing (in the true sense). We are told there'll be some Affordable Housing available, but the man I spoke to wasn't able to be specific. Affordable to whom? what price level? 'Affordable housing' is a very questionable and woolly phrase, usually used to help get a planning application approved.

I hope the Planning Department will look again, very critically, at the proposed development itself and its relationship with the surrounding area.

Regards
Charlotte