

## 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:** Mrs. Julie Protheroe

**Address:** 17 Old Deer Park Gardens Richmond TW9 2TN

### Comments

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

**Comment:** I have been a leaseholder in Sion Court for 11 years and object to the proposal on the following grounds:

1. Adequacy of parking/ loading - For 90 years parking was allowed at the rear of Sion Court for residents. Indeed, this provision was probably part of the original planning permission granted in 1930 so as to minimise the effect of parking/loading on the surrounding Lebanon Park area. After the lock-up garages ceased to be used for modern vehicles, there was still informal parking by residents for approx 20 cars. There was usually space for contractors and residents to park. For a block of over 30 flats this has been an essential amenity and especially useful in these days of increasing deliveries. To the consternation of all residents, in 2020 the freeholder without warning erected barriers to prevent residents access to the rear of the Court, so taking away all the parking. The claim therefore in the plans that there were zero existing car parking spaces is intentionally misleading. The pressure on the local area to find parking spaces for all the flats, their guests and contractors is excessive. Parking at the rear of Sion Court should be reinstated.
2. Legal right of tenants to vehicular access to the grounds. Our leases stipulate that tenants be granted "the full and free liberty...to go pass and repass whether with or without vehicles...along and across roadways drives and forecourts forming the curtilage of the blocks of flats". Therefore, the current proposal may not even be legal. The freeholder should be developing a proposal, like the one granted planning permission in 2014, which respects these rights.
3. Layout and density of building - the building of five dwellings in such a small area is vastly overdeveloped.
4. Design, appearance and materials - in order to keep the building sufficiently low, the developer has used flat roofs. This is not in keeping with the area, where roofs are generally pitched - even the electricity sub-station. The plan tries to pass this design feature off as being for environmental, green reasons - the flat roofs are to be covered in grass - but this is merely 'greenwashing' and before long the roofs would look a mess, leak and probably need replacing.
4. Effect on conservation area - Sion Court lies within Twickenham Riverside conservation area. See above point regarding flat roofs. Also, the loss of so much residents parking should be borne in mind.
5. Road access for emergency services - With such overdevelopment, the emergency services would be unable to access the fire escapes at the back of the flats. This is potentially unsafe and needs serious consideration.

The freeholder seems to be submitting barely amended proposals in the hope that planners and residents will at some point be worn down and give in. Richmond Council need to support local residents, reject this proposal and advise the freeholder not to keep wasting everybody's time.