

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 Rob Heslop

Address: 28 Warwick Road Twickenham TW2 6SW

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Whilst I support the removal of 15 parking spaces, supported by the inability of residents to obtain parking permits, it does not go far enough.

The site is still dominated by car parking to the detriment of decent amenity areas alongside the river. More parking for the flats needs to be removed so that the site is in accordance with the new national design guide. This prioritises walking and cycling over cars and requires that new developments are not dominated by parking or prioritise this over pedestrians which is exactly what this development does not do. As a pedestrian you would be dodging traffic all the time.

The vehicle tracking seems to show larger vehicles over-running the front of properties - I'm not sure that would be welcomed by residents. All of the tracking is very tight and paints a picture of a development that would not be very safe or welcoming for pedestrians.

How would parking be prevented within the site? It would be very easy for people to park especially at the rear of the site where the amenity area is supposed to be. That part of the development really needs to be a car free area otherwise it will just be turned into another car park. A car parking management plan is not an appropriate solution unless the council is prepared to enforce it.

The cycle parking for the new family houses is still totally inadequate - especially those in the garages. In many cases a resident would have to drive their car out of their garage to get to their bike - this is not designed to get people out of their cars and reduce traffic generation! The provision of 1 cycle parking space for a family house is also wholly inadequate and not in accordance with the London Plan. Expecting people to wheel wet and muddy bikes through their houses is not appropriate for a new development - a further barrier to promoting active travel and reducing traffic generation.

I was hoping that a change of administration would lead to much better cycle provision for new developments but this does not appear to be the case.

The linear amenity area along the river is wholly inadequate. There needs to be decent provision within the site for children to play given the small size of the gardens. Provision of amenity space and reduction in parking/traffic is also supported by the health profession in trying to improve air quality and therefore health particularly of children..

I was particularly intrigued by the alternative use assessment which seems to be contradicted by the marketing report which dismisses the potential of commercial use on this site.

I assume there will be a Construction Logistics Plan and a Construction Environmental Management Plan required by

condition? Given the number of children going to local schools in the morning there must be a ban on large vehicles accessing the site at school peak times as well as standard traffic peak times.