

## Comment on a planning application

### Application Details

**Application:** 24/1662/FUL

**Address:** Sion Court Sion Road Twickenham

**Proposal:** Demolition of 20 derelict garages and one bed flat and redevelopment of the site to provide 2, 1-bedroom and 3, 2-bedroom dwellings, associated private amenity space, communal amenity space, accessible parking space, cycle parking and refuse.

### Comments Made By

**Name:** Mr. Matthew Johnson

**Address:** 19 Lebanon Park Twickenham TW1 3DF

### Comments

**Type of comment:** Object to the proposal

**Comment:** Dear Sir/ Madam we are writing to object to the new planning application 24/1662/FUL.

The fundamental issues that we have raised in objection to multiple iterations of this proposal (Planning Appeal APP/L5810/w/23/3315130, 22/1757/FUL, 21/3730/FUL) still stand and we find it extremely distasteful that the applicant is making a new application that is materially the same as the multiple previous application despite all its shortcomings. The applicant seems to be engaging in a war of attrition by regularly submitting applications in the hope that residents fail to notice and raise the obvious shortcomings of the scheme.

The comments below are based on feedback from GL Hearn a leading UK real estate consultancy that provides trusted commercial real estate and planning advice to developers, investors and occupiers.

In summary the main comments are:

- The accommodation is substandard. They have had to introduce rooflights to the scheme to make it 'work', which although improve Sunlight / Daylight levels, don't offer any outlook.
- The private amenity space is a front garden, which is overlooked and not private at all.
- The whole scheme has been designed to cram the development in. It's an over development of a site which results in a poor standard of accommodation.
- Has any kind of overheating analysis been carried out? This is now a big issue in the London Plan.
- The development will cause significant overshadowing to our property from what we enjoy now, this may be acceptable in BRE terms, but coupled with the increased height and massing, the increased sense of enclosure we and our neighbours will experience as a result of this development it will have a material adverse impact on our amenity.
- The scheme represents overdevelopment of a backland, constrained site and as a result the standard of accommodation created is poor. The scheme will materially adversely impact neighbouring residential properties and the scheme should therefore be refused.

Additionally we would be happy for the planning officer to view the site from our property as we will be severely impacted by the proposed scheme and are keen for you to see how the proposal is unfortunately inappropriate for the site.

We will also submit this information via the Richmond Planning Portal.

For information we include below emails and notes that we have previously submitted that provide more detail on the reasons to reject the application. Additionally we have attached a detailed report from GL Hearn on an earlier version of the application that is not materially different from the current application.

From: Matthew  
Sent: Sunday, August 6, 2023 6:17 PM  
To: west2@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Subject: APP/L5810/w/23/3315130

FAO Cassandra Low – Sion Court Tw1 3dd

We are writing to request that the Inspector for the review of the Planning Appeal APP/L5810/w/23/3315130 view the site from our property as we will be severely impacted by the proposed scheme and are keen for you to see the extent to which we will be impacted and how the proposal is unfortunately inappropriate for the site.

Our address is; 19 Lebanon Park, Twickenham, Tw1 2df.

In addition we would like to understand the reason for the sunlight / daylight has been dropped from the list of reasons for refusal. We understand that many Council's now don't have anyone qualified review these kinds of technical reports, which essentially means that they are taking the applicants word for it – is this what has happened in this case? We are currently in discussions with a consultancy that are reviewing the report and they have some initial concerns with it, including with overheating. Unfortunately there is a chance that we will not receive their report prior to the 8th of August due to the