

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: PART 2 of comment...

The comment we have submitted to the appeals website on the 16th July 2023 was that we had requested feedback from GL Hearn a leading UK real estate consultancy that provides trusted commercial real estate and planning advice to developers, investors and occupiers. Matthew Black and Associate Director at GL Hearn reviewed the wording of the appeal and has drawn the following conclusions:

"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 units are all single aspect, 2 out of the 4 have no windows to primary living space and are instead reliant solely on rooflights to deliver sunlight /daylight to the deeper recesses of the floorplan. There is no outlook at the rear of these properties, so the kitchen / dining space is not served by a window, with all windows at the front.

The private amenity space is a front garden, which is overlooked and not private at all.

The officers report and the reasons for refusal could, in my opinion, have been stronger here. I think 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. I would argue that it is highly unusual for 2 storey houses having to be single aspect, anywhere. You might get a few single aspect flats in new build blocks (on larger developments), but you don't normally get houses.

They said they have submitted an amended sunlight / daylight report with the appeal, however this is not on the website, so people who objected on that ground can't see it.

I would also be interested to see any kind of overheating analysis which is now a big issue in the London Plan. I can't see that referenced anywhere in the application, except it says its in Appendix D of the Energy Report but Appendix D is not there.

All in all, my thoughts are the same. Poor design, poor standard of accommodation, sunlight /daylight is poor, outlook is terrible and there are key bits of missing information from the Councils website in relation to sunlight / daylight and overheating. All of this is a symptom of the proposed scheme representing an overdevelopment of the site."

In addition our previous comments submitted in June 2022 still apply to this scheme, namely

"Dear Sir/ Madam we are writing to object to the new planning application 22/1757/FUL. All the arguments that we used to object to the previous version of this application (21/3730/FUL) still stand and we find it extremely distasteful that the applicant is making a new application that materially the same as the 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. I am attaching the detailed review of the application GL Hearn (Planning Consultants) carried out previously. We have been guided by GL Hearn to re-attach the same letter as the Consultant gave this opinion of the new scheme;

“its still a poor scheme and the fundamental issues we raised last time out have not been addressed.

All units are essentially single aspect units, even those that aren't only have a very restricted outlook from the 'secondary' aspect i.e. into a lightwell, facing a brick wall etc. The vast majority of the habitable space is served by one window at the front of the property and / or a rooflight. This standard of accommodation is appalling and symptomatic of overdevelopment of a site. In my view, the developer is trying to squeeze units onto the site, hence a terraced arrangement, however due to its proximity to your boundary wall, they can't have windows in the rear elevation at either ground or first floor. As such, they are solely reliant on the front windows for outlook and rooflights for light (which don't provide