

Response to OBJECTIONS Made on Application 24/0693/FUL - Land Between 18 - 20 Vicarage Road, Hampton Wick

<u>Address and Comments</u>	<u>Applicant Response</u>
<p>22 Vicarage Road Hampton Wick</p> <p>We have already objected to this application on the grounds of overdevelopment, overlooking all neighbouring gardens. The plans show a property being built well beyond the back of any other house in the road. This would affect our privacy as well as both neighbouring properties. Blocking sunlight (ancient light) , and digging down into a large basement. Not to mention the lack of parking in vicarage Road as it is. We have also noted that the applicant builds properties and then dissolves his company on completion meaning it will be very difficult to contact in the event of possible future problems. Both house owners either side are worried about subsidence and as we are attached to one side that is also a concern to us</p>	<p>This application is a re-submission of the previously refused scheme, following the refusal at appeal on the sole ground of not having a legal agreement to secure the car free development. it should be noted that during the appeal the Applicant was seeking to secure this by a Unilateral Undertaking but it was the Council that wanted to secure this by a planning condition, but the Inspector did not consider this suitable.</p> <p>All matters objected to were assessed independently by the Inspector as part of appeal reference APP/L5810/W/23/3324372, for which a site visit was also undertaken.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded (as did the Officer’s Report for the previous application) that the Proposed Development would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking.</p>
<p>FLAT 3 EISENHOWER HOUSE 12 VICARAGE ROAD</p>	<p>All matters objected to were assessed independently by the Inspector as part of appeal reference APP/L5810/W/23/3324372, for which a site visit was also undertaken.</p> <p>The Inspector concluded (as did the Officer’s Report for the previous application) that the Proposed Development would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking, and did not raise any objections for a car free development (which was required by the Council).</p>
<p>18 Vicarage Road - Representations made by Bell Cornwell LLP</p>	<p>This application is a re-submission of the previously refused scheme, following the refusal at appeal on the sole ground of not having a legal agreement to secure the car free development. it should be noted that during the appeal the Applicant was seeking to secure this by a Unilateral Undertaking but it was the Council that wanted to secure this by a planning condition, but the Inspector did not consider this suitable.</p>

	<p>The Applicant has not submitted a UU as the Council have not provided any template or draft wording for securing the car free development. The Applicant has requested from the Council the draft wording for this following the validation of the application.</p> <p>We do not consider the additional condition regarding the flat roof necessary as this is a sedum roof for biodiversity, so is not suitable to be used for anything else.</p> <p>Again we do not consider the need for the conditions on boundary treatment as no objections were raised by the Inspector on fence heights or land levels (and the Inspector undertook a full site visit).</p> <p>Refused application 22/1268/FUL did not have any reasons for refusal with regards to the impact of the Proposed Development on the character of the street or the local area or street scene. The Inspector also made no comments or raised any additional concerns on this matter. At appeal, an Inspector can look at other matters not set out in the reasons for refusal should they considered these to be material and add additional reasons for dismissing an appeal.</p> <p>With regards to parking, it was the Council that objected to the creation of a driveway due to the impact on the character, and wanted the Proposed Development to be car free. Again the Inspector did not raise any concerns to a car free scheme.</p>
<p>20 Vicarage Road</p> <p>There is a large element of flat roof area on the proposed development, which could be used as a sitting area. This would overlook neighbouring space to an unacceptable degree. If permission is granted, we request a condition is imposed which states the following: 'The flat roof area on the drawings shall not be used as amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall not be used other than an essential maintenance or repair or escape in a</p>	<p>This application is a re-submission of the previously refused scheme, following the refusal at appeal on the sole ground of not having a legal agreement to secure the car free development. it should be noted that during the appeal the Applicant was seeking to secure this by a Unilateral Undertaking but it was the Council that wanted to secure this by a planning condition, but the Inspector did not consider this suitable.</p>

case of emergency. This is to prevent undue overlooking of the neighbouring outdoor amenity spaces and habitable room windows.’ In terms of the impact on the character of the area and street scene assessment, the development must Retain plots of sufficient width for adequate separation between dwellings and that Retain similar spacing between new buildings to any established spacing. At best, the application site is 6m wide. Whilst properties along Vicarage Road are relatively close to each other, there is no other example with a combined 2.2m space around it to the neighbouring properties. This is a clear example of cramped overdevelopment which is out of character with the street scene and the wider area. In other words, there would be insufficient width and separation between buildings.

All matters objected to were assessed independently by the Inspector as part of appeal reference APP/L5810/W/23/3324372 , for which a site visit was also undertaken.

The Inspector concluded (as did the Officer’s Report for the previous application) that the Proposed Development would not result in a loss of privacy or overlooking.