

## 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 David McGeachie

**Address:** 28 Colne Road Twickenham TW2 6QE

### Comments

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

**Comment:** I oppose the development as currently presented because of:

Height of development. To place 5 story towers in the middle of these quiet residential backstreets is ridiculous and has no empathy for the current environment. This is higher than the highest buildings on the high street and is only cynically concerned with developer yields.

Materials - the towers will look completely alien to their surroundings.

Density. 'Needing' 5 storey blocks shows that the developers are packing in as many units as they can get. I suggest anything over ground, 1st and 2nd floor is removed from the plan.

I note some parking has been removed. This is mad. And there is also no visitors' parking which is completely unrealistic. This project should not impinge whatsoever on surrounding streets' parking and yet if even 20% of residents have visitors on a sunday that will be 32 extra cars! Where will they go? On our streets, that's where.

Impact on traffic in adjacent streets. I live very close to the junction of Colne Road and Heath Road and surely this will become a bottleneck. I know what will happen - within 2 years you will end up inconveniencing us all by closing streets and making some one way, 'to ease traffic congestion' - caused by the new development you allowed.

n.b. I had not followed the development as I thought it was all houses and we do need housing. However i was shocked when I finally saw the height, ugliness and incongruity of the buildings suggested.