

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: Mr. Greg Palmer

Address: 9 Myrtle Road Hampton Hill TW12 1QE

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I find it difficult to comprehend how a Planning Officer advised the Planning committee that Height Mass and Scale were not legitimate criteria on which to evaluate the original proposal from Notting Hill Home Ownership. The Local Plan and The London Plan have many references to these criteria.

Height

Planning Application 22/2204/FUL, St Clare's Business Park proposes to place a huge 5-storey block of flats right in the heart of this area with no reference to the context of building types locally. The taller buildings proposed are over double the height of neighbouring buildings

The proposal is out of character for Hampton Hill. The height, massing, proportions, form and detailing are completely alien to its context. [Planning policy LP1] · Hampton Hill has a village character comprising a predominance of 2-2 ½ storey Victorian and Edwardian cottages with narrow streets · Hampton Hill has village status in the Local Plan · There are a number of houses that have "Building of Townscape Merit- status", so should receive special protection. 6 of them are in of Holly Road opposite the site entrance and Windmill Road has the most prominent, the former Library and fire station. All these properties are small in scale with narrow frontages.

In Supplementary Planning Document Residential Development Standards Adopted March 2010 (RUTC) section 5.19 "Suburban or urban setting with a medium to high public transport accessibility, outside a town centre settlement area. Mortlake, St Margarets, Strawberry Hill, Hampton Hill, Hampton Wick, Barnes 35-120 u/ha Taller buildings will be inappropriate in general."

Amenity and Living Conditions

The space at the boundaries between the proposal and Holly Road, Windmill Road and Penny Farthing Mews is the absolute minimum to preserve light and privacy for 2-storey development - this has an overbearing impact and loss of light and privacy (exacerbated by the proliferation of balconies at high level.) · Relatively open views from surrounding properties in Windmill Road, Holly Road, School Road and Penny Farthing Mews would be severely curtailed by the scheme. (criterion 8 of Planning policy LP39) · There's very little support locally (previously over 200 objections)

Not only is the proposed development 'out of character' for Hampton Hill on the basis of height it is not appropriate for the character assets of Hampton Hill village contrary to Planning policy LP2 · The proposal will not make a positive contribution to Hampton Hill village and does not preserve the area's heritage assets and their settings. For example, the former Library is dominated by the massive commercial building. · The proposal does not respect the local character in scale, height, mass, urban pattern, development grain, streetscape. · The buildings would effectively turn into a local 'landmark eyesore, which is contrary to this planning policy. It purports to create a landmark entrance to Windmill Road, a practice specifically prohibited by LP2 (5).

Infrastructure. The proposed development will put additional strains on sewage transfer and treatment, school and nursery places and Doctor's surgeries. The attendant costs both economic and social have not been factored into the proposal. It

would also appear from the plans that the outside play space for children is allocated rather more to the 'Market' houses at the expense of children in the 'London affordable rent' or 'shared ownership'. So much for social integration and the values and mission of the developer.

Conclusion: yes the site can be used for social/affordable housing but not on such a vast scale; too many, too high, too ugly