

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 23/2401/FUL

Address: Land At Junction Of Roseleigh Close And Cambridge ParkCambridge ParkTwickenham

Proposal: Proposed development of 3no. maisonettes on land at Junction Of Roseleigh Close And Cambridge Park, Cambridge Park, East Twickenham

Comments Made By

Name: Mrs. Amy Du Rand

Address: 3 Roseleigh Close Twickenham TW1 2JT

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Objection to the proposed plan at the corner of Roseleigh Close (REF 23/2401/FUL)

The proposed development of the corner plot into 3 maisonettes will severely impact the existing Estate in a number of detrimental ways:

1) Severe Loss of Privacy for the residents of Roseleigh Close and 34 Cambridge Park, with specific impact on the blocks immediately next to and immediately opposite the site (Numbers 1-6 Roseleigh Close) and No.1, 34 Cambridge Park. In addition, the proposed open-sided top floor 'Terrace' that NONE of the surrounding buildings on the ENTIRE Estate have. This particular design feature brings with it noise, furniture and other unwanted disturbances to a very peaceful, and quiet and protected part of Twickenham.

2) Total lack of any Consideration of the Current Aesthetic Aspect of the Estate - The Architect has not taken into account ANY of the features of the surrounding properties ('brown bricks' is the only mention of any nod to what already exists), nor the style of any of the properties which surround it. He proposes large windows, roof terrace, off street parking, bin/bike storage...NONE of these exist on the current estate it wants to slot into. The use of solar panel roof tiles/Green Roof and a 'Living Wall' as well as 'Heat Pumps' are at best only a gesture to a more 'sustainable' view of development - but are unworkable in such a small space and maintenance of such infrastructure is hugely costly and will become ignored and thence look horrendous.

3) Size of the plot v the number of people that will potentially inhabit the small space. 2 storey dwellings (none of the current properties have both an 'upstairs AND downstairs). The three and two bed Maisonettes which are proposed have a potential for 4, 5 or even 6 inhabitants as a single dwelling. These would put significant pressure on an already busy Estate area. The development of 'service routes' has not been shown - but likely to be via Roseleigh Close - which will have HUGE impact on how the road will be accessed as new pipes/cables/infrastructure is laid - and having massive impact on the existing Residents quality of life during such building time.

4) With space for 3 cars on 'off street parking', this will considerably impact the visual aspect of Roseleigh Close. There is no provision for any occupants of the proposed Maisonettes having a second vehicle and the impact that will have on the Close. Using 'small' cars in the submissions to make it appear workable is laughable.

4) Disruption to an existing wildlife haven with mature Horse Chestnuts. The natural view of this entire area is enhanced hugely by these significant, mature trees and any construction around the roots will be detrimental and destructive. The Applicant claims that his building works will not affect these trees...but this is nonsense. The professional who carried out the 'Tree Survey' did so only at Ground Level and so the habitat of birds, bats and other wildlife has NOT been

significantly checked. The presence of Pipistrelle Bats in the area MUST be taken into consideration. In addition, the extensive root network under the site will be unknown and therefore the impact on the mature Horse Chestnut trees is currently unquantifiable.

5) Building work timeline: 18 months of absolute destruction/noise/dust and disturbance (at a minimum). Many of the residents work from home, or are housebound and this puts a huge amount of stress and pressure on these people.

6) The Applicant also 'doorstepped' the entire Estate prior to seeking support for his latest submission and put undue pressure on many residents and has also made certain incorrect false claims about the past history and future development of the plot.

We reject the proposals in the strongest possible terms.