

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: Miss Janet Williams

Address: 21A Windmill Road Hampton Hill TW12 1RF

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I have opposed this development in a previous comment. There are many many pages of this development application of which I have read only a few. These are observations and questions I have on the design and various other aspects of the development, that would affect me personally or that I would like to query.

The Northern Terrace

Design Access Statement - Executive Summary 3534990 4th line: NHG have misleadingly described our established block as a terrace "with back gardens adjoining and the rear and sides of neighbouring dwellings over-looking the site" – when in fact it is our front gardens and the front of our houses that looks onto the site.

Design Access Statement Plan 2.3 3534990pdf and Design Access Statement 2, 4.4 3534991pdf plus others: Regarding our small terrace, 15-23b Windmill Road, the drawings/plans misleadingly show an apex on the roofs and a bin storage on the Windmill Road side of the houses and not on the St Clare side. This intonates that our homes have a back and a front. Where, in fact, they are small back- to-back houses with only one aspect and my FRONT garden FACES the Northern Terrace back garden/house. Asked by a councillor, in the Planning Committee Meeting 2020, if there should be a greater distance between buildings if the original building has only one aspect, the disappointing answer was "I don't think so" – no reason was given.

Design Access Statement 3534993pdf 6.8: talking of borders. What is the blue line that is the border between 21, 21a, 23, 23a and 23b Windmill Road and the Northern Terrace? I fail to find what the border would be or if the current fence would stay, as it isn't mentioned in the key or anywhere else.

The Northern Terrace houses would have north-facing back gardens over shadowed by the height of their own building. And to the front they would face the overbearing 5-Storey block of flats, which is only 14.7m away (window to window) and be over looked by the obtrusive balconies that sit proud of the building. A good example of squeezing as many homes in as possible without the consideration of the people who will be living there.

The 5-Storey Building

Why are the balconies sticking out from the main building and not integral? They would be far less obtrusive if they were flush to the walls of the building.

The Commercial Building

Design Access Statement of the Commercial Building 5.71, 3534991pdf: the artist's impression of the front (Windmill Road entrance) of the site is misleading. The way in which the artist has drawn the Old Library next to the Commercial building makes them appear the same height. This cannot be true as the old Library is only 1-Storey high and the Commercial building stands a storey higher than a normal 3 -Storey building.

Design Access Statement, 3534992pdf: talks of the 3-Storey Terrace designed to break the elevations. Why hasn't the

same design been done for the Commercial building? Standing as high as a 4-Story building (13.47m) there is no break in the elevations from the 1-storey buildings currently in situ and less than 20m from it. (NB: the ground floor is 3.75m high, the first floor is 3.15m high, the second floor that goes into the roof cavity is 6.43m high). The overall height is 13.47 only 3.17m shorter than the 5-Storey building!