

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 22/2204/FUL

**Address:** St Clare Business Park And7 - 11 Windmill RoadHampton Hill

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 1no. mixed use building between three and five storeys plus basement in height, comprising 98no. residential flats (Class C3) and 1,172sq.m of commercial floorspace (Class E); 1no. three storey building comprising 893sq.m of commercial floorspace (Class E); 14no. residential houses (Class C3); and, associated access, external landscaping and car parking.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mrs. Sarah and John Webb

**Address:** 3 Holly Road Hampton Hill TW12 1QF

### Comments

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

**Comment:** We object to this proposal as it is insufficiently different or reduced from the previously refused application which the Planning Committee debated and expressed clearly the view that it was inter alia too big and too high. It is incompatible with the character of the village of Hampton Hill in general and especially immediately neighbouring homes most of which are two storeys, a few 3 storeys.

There are 7 BTMs adjacent to the points of access and in the visual vicinity of the 5 storey development block and proposed office building. Six terraced houses in Holly Road and the former library in Windmill Road. The development will compromise their site and setting.

Policy LP1 of the Local Plan states that new development must be inclusive, respect local and contribute positively to its surroundings based on a thorough understanding of the site and its context.

The application does not show a thorough understanding of or respect and strengthen the setting. On the contrary as has been stated it intends to develop its own sense of place ignoring the character in general and BTMs in particular.

LP2 explicitly requires new buildings to respect and strengthen the setting of the borough's townscapes and landscapes, through appropriate building heights.

Policy LP39 requires that all infill development must reflect the character of the surrounding area as well as building heights.

That it is out of character was acknowledged by the Planning Officer presenting the case saying it would however create its own or a new sense of place. An argument put in a similar application in Arlington Road, Twickenham but rejected by the Inspector who Dismissed that appeal.

To continue to propose this is quite wrong and should not be allowed.

Further it was acknowledged that both accesses were below required standards:

To Holly Road the access should have a consistent carriageway width of 4.8m in accordance with guidance set out in the Manual for Streets and should have a footway width of 1.5m. However, the maximum footway width that can be provided is 1.2m.

To Windmill Road there will be a carriageway width of 4.1m. This is not enough to allow a car to pass a refuse vehicle in accordance with guidance set out in Manual for Streets. It will have to rely on bays, which consist of a car club bay, a bay for use by employees at the B1 land use, and a servicing bay not being in use at all times of the day to provide refuge for vehicles needing to give way to oncoming traffic, they could obstruct forward visibility for motorists travelling northwards and exiting the development. At the junction with Windmill Road it relies on a 'bell mouth' waiting point which could result in a back up of more than one vehicle thus obstructing the Road carriageway.

'not being in use at all times of the day' means in effect never used, ie unusable!

A similar deficiency of access/egress was a reason for refusing a recent application for just 3 houses behind the former Windmill Pub – also in Windmill Road. To approve this proposal with access off the same road and the another off the very similarly constrained Holly Road with very much greater traffic use would be inconsistent or – to use a term favoured

by a leading Councillor at other Planning Committee Meetings – ‘capricious.’

Other Policy contraventions are:

LP40 and LP42 which require the retention and state that there is a presumption against loss of industrial land in all parts of the borough which has a very limited supply of industrial floorspace and demand for this type of land is high. It is asserted that the Council will protect, and enhance, the existing stock. The Mayor of London's Land for Industry and Transport SPG (2012) states that the Council should ensure a 'restrictive' approach towards the transfer of industrial land to other uses until 2031, which means that industrial land should not be released for other uses.

The key word is 'land'. Developed properly would provide more employment space.