

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 Jamed

Address: 19 Wolsey Road Hampton Hill TW12 1QP

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: A development of this density would also put extreme pressure on car parking in the local vicinity. The Richmond Planning departments "Village Plan for Hampton Hill area" states "Any new development, including the use of land within a built-up area for further construction (infill) will be expected to be well designed and provide sufficient car parking." This proposal's parking diagram details one allocated car parking space for each of the 98 flats and the 14 houses. The car parking provisions proposed in this development are inadequate based on the following points.

According to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in 2018 43% households of 2 adults and one child (average for this development) have at least 2 cars. Therefore, this development would need an extra 48 car spaces as per the ONS to provide sufficient car parking as per the village plan. When you also consider the PTAL (Public Transport accessibility Level) rating for this site is 2 (poor) and that it has been proven in research and studies that the level of car ownership goes up in areas of poor PTAL ratings. Likewise the level of car ownership also goes up in more affluent areas such as Richmond borough – this is a finding of Transport for London's – Residential Parking Provision in New Developments report. The proposed development does not offer any visitor parking either which will surely lead to further pressure on the surrounding roads which are already at maximum capacity. The submitted parking surveys are purposefully misleading. Including further afield roads such as St James Avenue/Cross Street/ Chelsea Close with their off-street parking capabilities and therefore lower capacities (54-63%) is intentionally misleading. Any local residents will tell you that there is already acute overcrowding - an overall score nearer to 95% would be a truer reflection.

We are strongly against the plans as they currently stand and we would urge the local planning officers to reject the current application, particularly the 98 flat and 3 storey commercial block. Smaller, lower, more discrete residential properties with more landscaping, car parking and appropriate commercial buildings would elicit less opposition from local residents. The eventual redevelopment should be in keeping with the existing local properties, minimise the impact on local residents and their quiet enjoyment of their properties and should not place undue additional stress on existing creaking infrastructure