Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 23/3232/FUL

Address: 84 Lower Mortlake RoadRichmondTW9 2HS

Proposal: Change of use of building from Class E 'Commercial, Business and Service' to Class C3 'Residential' together with rooftop alterations and extensions to provide 21no. residential properties. Refurbishment of facade, to include the installation of balconies together with associated amenities, parking and landscaping.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Craig Strong

Address: 3 Sheendale Road Richmond TW9 2JJ

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Richmond upon Thames, distinguished for its historical and architectural significance, is a conservation area that necessitates careful consideration of any development to preserve its unique character. The area is renowned for its serene residential ambiance, which is now under threat from the proposed development. This redevelopment must be scrutinised in light of the area's conservation status, ensuring that any changes are sympathetic to its historical and community values.

This objection is grounded in the legal framework provided by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Human Rights Act 1998, particularly concerning the right to privacy (Article 8). Moreover, the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan offers specific guidance on development within conservation areas, emphasising the protection of residential amenities and the character of the area. These documents collectively form a basis for challenging developments that adversely affect residents' quality of life and privacy. The proposed development, by introducing extensive glazing and balconies, directly contravenes these principles, leading to an unacceptable invasion of privacy for existing residents.

The proposed development, with its increased glazing and balconies, will result in a direct and unacceptable invasion of privacy for my family and our neighbours. The overlooking balconies and extensive use of glass will allow unobstructed views into our private gardens and living spaces, which is particularly concerning given the presence of young children. This invasion of privacy is not only a breach of the NPPF guidelines, which advocate for the safeguarding of residents' privacy, but also a potential infringement of our rights under the Human Rights Act 1998. In several precedents, developments have been modified or rejected due to similar privacy concerns. The proposed design, therefore, requires significant revision to adhere to these legal and planning standards.

The proposed development's parking plan, offering few spaces for 21 flats, is grossly inadequate and will exacerbate existing parking pressures within our community. This inadequacy contravenes the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, which mandates sufficient parking provisions for new developments to avoid undue stress on existing infrastructures. The existing area already experiences parking challenges; introducing a high-density residential block without adequate parking facilities will only intensify these issues, affecting the quality of life for current residents. Past planning decisions within the borough have highlighted parking as a critical factor in the evaluation of new developments, leading to modifications or rejections of plans where parking provisions were deemed insufficient.

The cumulative impact of the loss of privacy and increased parking pressures will severely diminish the quality of life for the families residing in this conservation area. The increased traffic and parking congestion pose safety risks, particularly for children, and will erode the peaceful character of our neighborhood. This degradation of living conditions is contrary to the objectives of local planning policies, which aim to preserve and enhance the quality of life in residential areas.

In conclusion, this objection, grounded in the principles of the NPPF, the Human Rights Act 1998, and the Richmond upon Thames Local Plan, urges the planning authority to consider the severe negative impacts of the proposed development on privacy and parking. It is incumbent upon the planning authority to uphold the standards set forth in these legal and planning frameworks to protect the interests and rights of existing residents. Therefore, I strongly recommend that this planning application be either significantly revised or outright rejected to preserve the integrity of our conservation area and the well-being of its residents.