

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. Kathrin Kelleher

Address: 25 Ferry Road Twickenham TW1 3DW

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: We are the joint owners of 25 Ferry Road Twickenham TW1 3DW. We ask for our comments and objections to be taken into consideration concerning this clearly flawed, re-hash application that is so similar to that which has already been rejected by the Planning Authority and the Inspectorate as to make no difference.

We have had the benefit of reading many meticulous and articulate objections raised by our neighbours, a councillor and others with which we whole heartedly agree but should like to re-iterate our own previously held objections to highlight the adverse impact that the obvious over development of this site would have on us.

It has been mentioned in the past by the Planning Authorities insinuating that the impact would be to a lesser extent on this property as a proposed development overlooks the garden, but the whole property: home and garden, is our peaceful living area over which we have a right to privacy and this should not be intrusively invaded.

The proposed new building extending towards the boundary of 9 Ferry Road and therefore also towards our home and living area is an invasion of our privacy. It is overbearing and intrusive with an inevitable loss of light, and will overshadow our garden. Noise and disturbance will inevitably be generated by squeezing at least 16 more people living close to the boundary wall to our property and that of 9 Ferry Road and 19 Lebanon Park. Unit 1 even has a garden beside our end of the boundary wall with the back door access to it looking directly over the wall into our property. There is also a balcony on the side of Unit 2 which will look out towards 9 Ferry Road and over our garden which, despite a glass privacy screen, will be intrusive and noisy.

There is also a new window, not proposed in previous schemes, only part of which is in obscure glass, that looks directly onto our property creating an obvious additional loss to our privacy.

The building layout is so cramped that doors and windows will be left open, especially in the summer months, resulting in noise disturbance, smells and emissions. This will be exacerbated by air sourced heat pumps, although not shown on the plans, and their associated noise, flues and extractor fans.

It is surely naive to think that potential new owners will not have access to cars adding detrimentally to the current parking issues and additional traffic generation already highlighted by others.

The green rooves will very quickly become unsightly and unkempt. It is a sad inevitability that a fox and cat litter will develop here. Access to the rooves for the maintenance of the 'green' area will again impact on our privacy.

Along the full length of the boundary of our property beside the proposed development there is the ancient wall, well over 150 years old. We have great concerns for any demolition of the existing structures that abut this wall or building works close to it that would affect its stability especially as a similar wall in Lebanon Park collapsed.

We echo the grave concerns already expressed with respect to the removal of asbestos on the derelict garage rooves (the area would surely have to be evacuated and appropriate long term insurance cover would need to be in place) as well as the general disruption, disturbance and pollution that the development would have on the neighbourhood in this special conservation area especially during any building works. This aspect appears to have been ignored.

We ask for our comments to be considered seriously and not simply ignored or dismissed out of hand, as we feel that our concerns have not been considered in the very recent past by the Planning Authority concerning another intrusive over development of a cottage adjoining the other side of our property as highlighted by another objector to this application from 53 Lebanon Park.