

## 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:** PART3 of comment

As such, they are solely reliant on the front windows for outlook and rooflights for light (which don't provide outlook). The sunlight / daylight report submitted with the scheme only addresses impacts on neighbouring dwellings but does not address the standard of accommodation being created, perhaps because the developer knows it will fail (we raised this last time). I also think the report seems carefully worded i.e. it would pass BRE guidelines, but it doesn't seem to explicitly state what the impact is i.e. it will cause significant overshadowing to your property from what you enjoy now, this may be acceptable in BRE terms, but coupled with the increased height and massing, the increased sense of enclosure yourself and your neighbours will experience as a result of this development will have a material adverse impact on your amenity. There is a cumulative effect that will adversely impact from this development. In short, I think the scheme still proposes a terrible standard of accommodation. The proposed changes have done nothing to address the comments we made in the last application. The internal sunlight / daylight levels are poor, hence why they have not included them in the application, there will be an increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties as a result of the increased height and massing and this, coupled with the impact on overshadowing of gardens and living spaces will have a material adverse impact on your amenity, that in my view warrants a refusal. 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."

Please reject this scheme"

Finally, we note that there has been a new change to the scheme whereby a two-storey bicycle store has been moved as part of the new scheme and is now against the front of our boundary close to our bedroom which we are concerned will generate significant noise disturbance

2. Feedback Provided on 16th July 2023 to the scheme

I 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 d