

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: Mr. Ron Sharpe

Address: 37 OLD CHARLTON ROAD SHEPPERTON TW17 8AZ

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: I am the Leaseholder of a Maisonette in Roseleigh Close. My objections fall into two categories: First, I object to any form of development on this site. Previous Applications, two in 1981, one in 1986 and two in 2004 were all Refused; the reasons for which are a matter of record. In essence the Refusals upheld the Council's predecessor authority's concept that the site "would remain as an open space with trees" and "as an adjunct to the Estate". For many years it was a maintained, lawned, area and was used for individual and ad-hoc & planned community recreational gatherings by the Estate's population. In more recent years, the owner secured the site with fencing and allowed it to become overgrown but the original principle applies and must be maintained. The current proposals would supersede the natural appearance of the space by a large building, household waste provision and off-street parking. There have been two Applications to reduce the five mature Horse Chestnut trees at the southern end of the site, in 2019 and in 2022. Both were refused in cognisance of the exceptional and irreplaceable value that they, with others, bring to the Estate and to the approach to the Cambridge Footpath to the Thames at the end of Cambridge Park road. It is claimed that the building work would not in any way damage these trees but such must be a huge risk that could eventually lead to their demise, especially as the proposal seems to be based on out-of-date information on the trees themselves.

Secondly, I object to the form and design of the proposals. The only information on the building itself is from line drawings and computer-generated images. The photograph shown as Fig1, on page 3 of the Design and Access Statement shows the bulk of the five chestnut trees, including what would be their dominance over the southern face of the block: these trees are now even larger than when the picture was taken.

Likewise, Figs 2 & 3, on page 4, do not accurately indicate the current size of these trees. Severe pruning would be necessary and yet such is not mentioned in the Application. The computer images, at Figs 7 & 8, on pages 6 & 7 - and all subsequent images and drawings show stylised trees of much reduced bulk and not the actuality of the situation.

A lack of details and specification hinders further comment on the proposed building. Some elements of the stated design seem to be at variance with the actual drawings and illustrations. The terms used e.g, 'matching bricks' and 'matching roof' are open to wide interpretation. What can be said is that the bulk of the building, the solar panels on the roofs, the huge full height glazed areas and the first floor Terrace are completely incongruous on the Cambridge Park Estate.