

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: The Hampton Hill Association Mx. - -

Address: The Hampton Hill Association - - Hampton Hill TW12

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: The Hampton Hill Association objects to this application which is essentially the same as the previous one against which our then Chairman, Nigel Jackson spoke at the Committee on 9th December 2020.

We posted the Observation that 'The Hampton Hill Association would be prepared to facilitate further engagement between interested parties, local residents and the developer if this were considered helpful before a final planning decision is made.'

The site has been in 'industrial' and/or employment use for well over 50 years. It is designated as important employment land. Policy LP42 Requires that it be retained in employment use. It could remain undeveloped, return to use as in recent years providing space for numerous successful smaller businesses and start-ups maintaining the current character of the Village.

The Authority has identified that it has or can achieve and exceed its housing target/s but there is a shortfall of employment space.

The previous application was refused - Reason U0091658 - for loss of employment land. In this application NHHO have increased the employment space to 2,065 sq m - which is below its existing area of 3,142 sq m by more than 1,000 sq m (ie 33% less) and the potential for more if developed sensitively.

A patently obvious loss of actual and potential space. With the identified need for space in the borough that remains contrary to Reason U0091658 and Policy LP42.

The housing element has been adjusted but minimally; it does not properly address Reason U0091659 (a)

This application should be refused for failing to respect the identified contrasting 'needs' for employment space, for housing and for failing to address adequately both of these Reasons.

Although there had been 'Public Consultations' the main and fundamental concerns expressed have not been incorporated into the proposal contrary to the Localism Act 2011 Sn 122 61X which places a duty on applicants to not only consult with local residents but 'have regard to any responses....received.'

Any regard has been imperceptibly scant.

This lack of regard is not only to the views expressed

a. in the pre application consultations prior to application 19/3201/FUL,

b. objections posted on the planning application web page repeating concerns over height, loss of privacy and effect on the character of the village

c. more importantly those of Councillors at the committee who clearly said that it was inappropriate and contrary to policies.

Councillors refused the previous application for clear Policy breaches. This application remains basically unchanged so should be refused.

The site could be developed with a hybrid solution to provide homes and additional employment space conducive to the character of the village and relevant to the needs of people and the site agreed between landowner, the community,

councillors and local Authority.

Further meaningful engagement complying with the requirements of the Localism Act, between interested parties, local residents and the developer would achieve this with a scheme which retains and enhances the employment opportunities – primarily on the site but secondarily by bringing more daytime custom to the High Street - Policy compliant realistically priced, low rise in scale homes for people.

If this application is considered as it stands it should be rejected. Alternatively it could be deferred pending both the Appeal and positive community engagement.