

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: Lebanon and Sion Courts residents Association LASCRA Mr. Jack Watts

Address: 21 Sion Court Sion Road Twickenham TW1 3DD

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: PART 5

LP 16 Trees, Woodlands and Landscape

The dominant feature of the Sion Court back garden is a much-loved mature Sycamore tree. It is now over twenty metres tall. On 1st April 2019 an agent of the Applicant applied to have the tree felled after concerns from the Freeholder that it was damaging the garages next to it. These are the garages that were already derelict through neglect. The Council rightly rejected the Application (19/TO276/TCA) and on 13th May 2019 placed a preservation order (T1030) on the tree. The Applicant's Arboricultural Report dated 19th June 2014 (Survey date 13th January 2023) shows welcome protection for the sycamore. It is, however, difficult to believe that having demolition and construction work going on for over one year under the tree would not damage its roots and threaten its survival.

The Affordable Housing Statement Page 17 6.16 states:

'Within this report pruning of the protected tree is proposed. As it is acknowledged that pruning of the protected tree may adversely impact on residential amenity and local character. As a result substantial replacement planting, including provision of semi-mature trees, are proposed to mitigate against the proposed pruning.'

The Arboricultural Impact Assessment gives very clear regulations as to how this pruning is carried out to avoid any unnecessary mitigation or loss of the tree. It also gives very clear regulations about how this must be fenced off with 'No construction activity whatsoever, including routing of underground services, storage of materials or on-site parking, must be allowed within Root Protection Areas'.

This report also mentions important 'Hand Dig Areas' to protect the roots of this protected tree. The existing Monkey Puzzle Tree is seen to be 'out of keeping' by the applicant. This is to be replaced by a 25-30cm girth, Golden Rain Tree, Koelruteria paniculate. This suggests that the protected Sycamore Tree is in jeopardy and is also indicative of the lack of consultation. This deciduous tree is poisonous; the flowers and seed pods are attractive to children who will be playing in this area. This tree is also known to be brittle – this risks damage to Sion Court and its residents from fallen branches or the whole tree in a strong wind. Consultation with residents would have also voiced concerns about the additional gardening time and costs in raking up the leaves, flowers and pods when residents pay on average £600 per month in Service Charges – this is another indicator that the effects of this proposal for the residents of Sion Court have not been considered.

LP 24 - Waste Management

Currently general dry waste from both Sion Court and its sister block, Lebanon Court, is taken for collection every Monday to Saturday by the site's management to a storage area at the back of Lebanon Court. Items for recycling - paper and board, glass, plastic and metal - are taken by residents themselves to separate bins in the same storage area. In the Application no secure provision is made for dry waste from the new dwellings but it said that it would also be taken by the site's management on a daily basis to the existing storage area. There are two problems with this proposal. Leaving thin plastic general waste bags outside the front doors every day would encourage vermin – rats, crows, foxes and squirrels. It

should be noted that any new residents would have to pay for this service together with gardening costs etc. The applicant expects the 2/2 units to be sold for £776,698 but the service charge will deter buyers and reduce this. This proposal admits that these units are not affordable housing.

Richmond needs to consider whether any additional housing is needed on this site and who it is going to benefit.