

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. Paul Nockolds

Address: 10 Roseleigh Close Twickenham TW1 2JT

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Name: Mr Paul Nockolds

Address: 10 Roseleigh Close Twickenham TW1 2JT

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

I am the owner of 10 Roseleigh Close

I object to the planning Proposal for the following reasons:-

1) Canvassing of local residents to sign consenting documents and give over personal details without GDPR considerations including soliciting minors to sign without any concern or parental consent.

2) Different residents appear to have been shown differing plans for what he proposes. Submitted plans do not adhere to the aesthetics of the area or fall in line with existing property development styles. It is not even close and would stand out like a sore thumb. Proposals of roof top terraces and/or balconies which no other property has present a major privacy violation with direct views down into neighbouring properties.

A proposal of a basement level (drawing # 19.001_P1) does not fall in line with existing properties as again no other property has one.

Proposal of front of house recycle bin store areas presents an eye sore to the area and every other resident who has one has it at the back of their property out of sight (drawing # 19.001_P2EL)

Submitted drawings do not correlate with each other - for example drawing # 19.001_3D3 shows no wildlife pond or 'native british wild flower meadow area' as proposed on drawing # 19.001_P2EL.

The depicted areas in multiple submitted drawings surrounding the proposed new build do not accurately exist and appear to be there to enhance the look of the proposal and make it look as though it fits in. Some trees in the drawings do not exist in the places they are depicted and appear to be there just to enhance the aesthetics (drawing # 19.001_3D5 for example)

In drawing # 19.001_3D1 showing a more aerial view you can easily see how the new proposal looks entirely different to every other surrounding property.

Drawing # 19.001_P3 appears to show the addition of two new native trees which is not allowed on the estate as stated recently by the freeholder of the estate who recently requested the removal of any newly planted ones by residents. Has the area freeholder even been consulted?

3) Huge impact on mature Horse Chestnut trees next to building area that are so large they must have a huge underground root network which would most likely be destroyed and as stated in the tree survey no underground assessment work has been carried out to ascertain the impact on these. These I believe have tree preservation orders on them and it would possibly result in their destruction. Submitted plans do not convey the actual size and maturity of the trees at all accurately, they are in fact farcically smaller in the submitted drawings. In an environmentally friendly climate these trees should not be in any way impacted. Claims by Mr Lombard that these trees would not be impacted is nonsensical.

4) Many local residents work from home, are retired or housebound. The proposed timeline with the additional noise and

pollution it would bring would make the area unbearable for these people and apply huge stress to their situations and health.

5) Multiple previous planning applications for this site have all been refused and are on record.

6) There are already not enough parking bays in the street to accommodate all residents with many having to park in neighbouring streets and the impact of further residents would present further issue and congestion.

We reject the proposals in the strongest possible terms.