

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: Mr. Erik Peterson

Address: 13 Holly Road Hampton Hill TW12 1QF

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: "7.7 Summary"

"7.7.1 The development proposals are expected to result in a net decrease in vehicle using Holly Road, and a negligible increase in vehicles using Windmill Road when compared to the existing site."

Is it a net increase of 4 vehicles as stated in 7.2.5, or a net decrease as stated here?

"7.7.2 In terms of sustainable modes of transport, it is assumed that those using rail or London Underground services will either take the bus or cycle to stations first."

The site has a PTAL rating of between 1a and 2. Occupiers are more likely to use cars to get to stations.

"8.1.4 The site will be accessed via two points; the first from Windmill Road and the second via the existing Holly Road access. Windmill Road will provide access to the northern section of the site, seven houses, the commercial space and associated parking. The access on Holly Road will be used as a secondary access and will be used to access the undercroft car park, seven houses and associated parking."

And only an increase of 4 cars in Holly Rd and 12 two way movements in Windmill Rd? Unbelievable.

"8.1.12 The development proposals are expected to result in a negligible changes in total two-way vehicle flows during peak periods when compared to what the site could generate under its existing permission. This is not anticipated to result in a material effect on the surrounding road network."

What this means is that if the business park was fully used, there could be lots of traffic. In this proposal, there will be lots of traffic. This is a net loss for the local residents.

"8.2 Conclusion"

"8.2.2 This document has demonstrated that the Proposed Development will not have a significant adverse impact on the operation of the highway, public transport or pedestrian and cycle networks in the vicinity of the site."

I disagree. This document contains many errors, and differing conclusions. It is inaccurate.

“St Clare Business Park currently provide approximately 3,142sq.m (GIA) of commercial floorspace,”

“6.22 The revised proposals will provide an additional 391sq.m of Class E commercial floorspace, in addition to the 1,494sq.m provided within the previously refused scheme (1,885sq.m total). This reduces the net loss of the existing employment provision on the site to just 1,257sq.m.”

This proposal provides a net loss of commercial floorspace of 1,257m², and should be refused.

“Affordable Housing”

“7.49 London Plan Policy GG4 requires developments to support the strategic target of providing 50% of all new housing as affordable”

“7.50 London Plan Policy H4 states that the strategic target is for 50% off all new homes delivered across London to be genuinely affordable.”

“7.51 London Plan Policy H5 outlines that the threshold level of affordable housing on gross residential development is initially set at 50% for Locally Significant Industrial Sites and Non-Designated Industrial Sites appropriate for residential uses.”

“7.56 The proposed development has been revised, to provide 35% affordable housing,”

“7.57 The applicant has revised the scheme to address the Inspector’s comments by reducing the building height which has resulted in the reduction of residential units (from 112 to 100 units) and parking spaces. The updated Viability Assessment shows that as a result of the reduction in size of the proposed scheme, and at a time of increased construction costs, the proposed development will result in a financial deficit. The applicant is committed to delivering 35% affordable homes...”

Because the proposal was for too many dwellings this proposal reduces the number of affordable housing to 35%, to save the developer money.