

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. T Moore

Address: 1 Roseleigh Close Twickenham TW1 2JT

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: We live directly opposite this plot and are intimately familiar with it. Two of the four lived-in rooms in our property directly face the plot through large (2m wide) windows.

We believe this application should not be permitted, because: this proposed design does not positively add to or fit within the existing neighbourhood buildings; it overstates how many new residences can be fitted onto the available building space; the construction proposed will irreversibly degrade and partially destroy an established (over 70 years) local green natural space; it lacks adequate safeguards for the established protected trees alongside, the likes of which literally underpin the value of the area.

Despite the volume of documentation included with this application, many critical details are not included (e.g. measurements, or specifications of where digging will occur so as to prevent risk of damage to established protected trees, etc.) and some representations are inaccurate (describing the land 'brownfield', the proportion of land area such a building would necessarily cover, extent of privacy loss and light loss, etc.).

This application does not present a design that is sympathetic with any buildings in the area. The visualisations and drawings show wildly inaccurate proportions. An unambiguous plan that credibly demonstrates how green space and in particular the trees on and around the plot could be safeguarded, is not presented.

Below are several specific objections we have.

Loss of light:

Morning-to-midday sun currently brings natural light into 2 of the 4 liveable rooms in our home from over and across this land, which we will suffer the loss of if a building of the type, size and height proposed in this application is constructed.

Overlooking/loss of privacy:

Any resident of the proposed building, from the new ground floor windows, to the 1st floor windows and 2nd floor balcony, when looking out of their windows will be gazing directly into our living room/kitchen and our front bedroom. Currently, every existing building in Roseleigh and Cambridge Park that we can see when looking out of our windows is set back at a distance that does not block light, and each and every facing window is both small and fitted with obscured glass, an intentional aspect of the estate's overall design.

Visual amenity, risk of tree loss, nature conservation, loss of residential garden land, build on garden land:

The application calls the plot 'brownfield' – this is a disingenuous statement. This land has been residentially-used garden space since Roseleigh Close was built in 1959. It has been established plot, maintained by communal contributions of the neighbouring leaseholders for more than half a century. Since bought by the applicant, the plot delineated by a low fence has naturally re-wilded and hosts trees, blackberry bushes, long grass and wildflowers such as bluebells. It is adjacent to 4 large, established, tall trees, each of which is over double the height of the surrounding buildings. The plot is literally a small green nature reserve. It is inconceivable the space can be considered 'brownfield'.

Trees established over decades, provide signature appeal to the area and entire borough. If damaged they are irreplaceable within any reasonable human timescale. We are concerned this application fails to clarify how trees on and adjacent to the plot can possibly be safeguarded if the proposed building was constructed. Proposed building measurements and distances from trees are vague at best and wildly misleading at worst. Routes of services connected to proposed buildings are not specified; the attached Arboricultural report cannot conclude if works would cause damage or not. The risk when digging foundations, let alone excavating to the level of proposed deep basements under the residences, so close to established protected trees, is inadequately mitigated. To simply say digging will be done by hand means little.