# 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. Janet Webb

Address: 14 Windmill Road Hampton Hill Hampton TW12 1RH

### Comments

### Type of comment: Object to the proposal

**Comment:** As a resident of Windmill Road I am strongly objecting to the proposal on the following basis: Road Access - I object to the proposal for the main access road to the development to be created next to the Old Library on Windmill Road. This new road will have a highly detrimental and significant impact on road access and highway safety in Windmill Road. The road is already hazardous due to congestion and speeding traffic and lack of parking spaces resulting in cars parking on pavements. Access from other roads eg Angel Close, opposite the Old Library, is already significantly restricted by parked cars and speeding traffic.

Additional traffic - I object to the proposal on the basis that the additional traffic that will use the access road and the proposed development will add to traffic generation and further congestion in Windmill Road. The proposal for the development does not allow for sufficient parking for residents and those working in the proposed workspaces. Inadequate consideration has been given to the the parking, turning and loading of commercial vehicles that will access the workshps and residential homes in the proposed development, Additional traffic will also impact on the high number of pedestrians who use the pavements along Windmill Road including a significant number of school children attending Hampton Hill Junior School and also families and older people who live locally and walk along Windmill Road to reach the High Street.

Layout and density of buildings - I object to the proposed layout and density of the buildings. Too many buildings have been included and they are too high in certain areas within the proposed development. The type of buildings are not appropriate for the area. I object to the fact that the current proposal do not include enough homes for rent, or shared ownership and that workspaces are proposed when there are already many empty commercial spaces within the local Hampton HIII area. Original plans for the development (around 10 years ago) included a medical centre ple a care home for older peoand other community buildings. No such buildings are now planned although they are needed. and the site should be a community asset not a development of predominantly high cost housing sold for profit.

Previous planning decisions - I object to this planning application being submitted again with very little substantive changes to the previous proposal for the development which was turned down by the Council and went to appeal. From the recent webinar organised by the developers it was clear that there are no significant changes to the proposed development. Over 200 residents have already objected to the proposal. The developers should not be allowed to resubmit an application with a plan that is so similar to the one that was turned down by the Council when it is clear that local residents living in Holly Road and Windmill Road who will be directly impacted by the development do not want it to go ahead. I object to the waste of Council time and money involved in allowing this further application to be submitted and I am concerned that the timing of the application with the consultation with residents taking place in August will mean that many people are away and may not have the opportunity to respond or raise objections.

Councillors on the Planning Committee should turn down this proposal and consult directly with residents to develop a new plan for the future use of this important site within the local community.