

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: Ms. Catherine James

Address: 19 Wolsey Road Hampton Hill TW12 1QP

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: We support the concept of redeveloping the site, in principle, as the current run-down site is desperately in need of investment. However, the proposed plans are completely inappropriate for the location in terms of design, size and impact on the local area. We feel that this application contravenes the Supplementary Planning Document for Richmond Council and certainly doesn't meet with the Hampton Hill Village Planning Guidance and has elements of non-compliance with Local Development Framework Core Strategy. There have been over 100 objections to these proposals lodged on the planning department website which highlights the fears of Hampton Hill residents. Our principal concerns are as follows:

1) Density: Non-compliance with Local Development Framework Core Strategy The development comprises of 112 dwellings and is spread over a 0.8 hectare site giving a density of 140 dwellings per hectare. In the context of Hampton Hill which is mostly terraced and semi-detached housing stock I think it is fair to say that this would be considered a much higher density development than the existing low-density surrounding area. According to the London Borough of Richmond Upon Thames Local Development Core strategy section 3 – “The Local Development Framework Vision” - Theme 2 - “Protecting Local Character” of which Point 3 is extracted below: “3. MEETING PEOPLE'S NEEDS New development, Higher density and larger commercial schemes will as far as possible be concentrated in the 5 town centres, enabling people to walk to shops and services or use public transport. There will continue to be opportunities outside these centres and the area of most change is likely to be to the north and west of Twickenham, where there will be opportunities to put sustainability principles into practice.” The 5 town centres mentioned above are defined in the same document in Point 2 “Richmond town centre will continue to be the largest centre with district centres at Twickenham, Whitton, Teddington and East Sheen. These centres are the most accessible and will continue to be the location for larger shops, offices and leisure uses. There will be a very high quality environment well linked by sustainable forms of transport, where people choose not to travel by car.” As per the above policy I believe that Hampton Hill is not one of the 5 town centres and therefore not a good site for a development of this density. The scheme would surely exaggerate the already considerable pressure on local school admissions in particular as well as other local amenities. The area is designated as Hampton Hill Village; in the HHV planning guidance it states " Holly Rd ...has a number of high quality examples of cohesive terraces which have maintained their original features and character" How can the heights and scale of these proposed buildings be appropriate to the local area and its village atmosphere and Victorian architecture, or be commensurate with the planning guidance/ development plan. 112 dwellings, 3 storey houses and 5 storey apartment block do not fit in with the predominantly Victorian 2 storey dwellings of the surrounding roads, nor does the density. The site which is behind the above-mentioned roads is therefore defined as a “back land site”. Within Richmond Planning department's adopted Development Management Plan – Policy DM HO 3 – BackLand Development - Point 4 states: “4. Mass and scale of development – development on back land sites must be more intimate in scale and lower than frontage properties” Therefore according to Policy DM HO 3 the proposed development is definitely non-compliant with this policy. Note than planning application 16/4553/FUL – High Street Hampton Hill is already providing 35 flats and 6 houses

in the immediate vicinity of this site. When you combine the 2 applications this is far more than the village can accommodate

Second form to follow