

Comment on a planning application

Application Details

Application: 21/2758/FUL

Address: 1-1C King Street, 2-4 Water Lane, The Embankment And River Wall, Water Lane, Wharf Lane And The Diamond Jubilee Gardens, Twickenham

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and structures and redevelopment of the site comprising 45 residential units (Use Class C3), ground floor commercial/retail/cafe (Use Class E), public house (Sui Generis), boathouse locker storage, floating pontoon and floating ecosystems with associated landscaping, reprovision of Diamond Jubilee Gardens, alterations to highway layout and parking provision and other relevant works.

Comments Made By

Name: Mr. Paul Velluet

Address: 9 Bridge Road Twickenham TW1 1RE

Comments

Type of comment: Object to the proposal

Comment: Comment continued - Instead, we have the prospect of the redistribution of the lost public open space of the Diamond Jubilee Gardens into an incoherent series lawns, petanque pitches and a children's play area at high level, separated into parts by a non-pedestrian-friendly diagonally-aligned cycle route; and the creation of a vast area of unrelieved, hard-paving at riverside level, with some fragmentary, unmanageable areas of grass – the proposed, floodable Town Square - with no indication about how moving vehicles, cycles and pedestrians are to be kept safely apart – and the creation of a tiered events-area which will require extensive metal balustrading to make it safe for the public. No way is this 'a riverside park' that justifies the massive cost of its creation, nor bears comparison with the character and delights of the riverside parts of York House Gardens, Orleans Gardens or Marble Hill Park further downstream, or Radnor Gardens further upstream.

Perhaps the only positive aspects of the present proposals are the involvement of the deservedly and highly regarded Hopkins Architects in the design of the buildings – hopefully to be retained throughout the development process right up until completion – and the development of a block of shops and a café with twenty-one affordable housing units above extending down the south-western side of Water Lane – but compromised sadly, by the entirely unjustified widening of Water Lane to take two-way vehicular traffic, rather than being primarily dedicated for pedestrian movement down to the river. Indeed, if the Council wished to reduce risk and costs, it would limit redevelopment to the south-western side of Water Lane alone, and simply enhance the remaining and greater part of the site at no risk and modest cost.

Quite disgracefully, the twelve, existing and proposed views of the development from different positions around the site contained in Section 6 of Icen Projects' Heritage, townscape and visual assessment would appear to be highly deceptive and may not be relied upon in providing sound impressions of the potential impacts of the proposals. Indeed, this is reflected in paragraph 6.3 of the document where there is a health warning: 'It was agreed with LBRuT that the CGIs (Computer Generated Images) did not need to be produced as Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs), which are verified for accuracy. Little wonder then, that little reliance can be placed on sections 7 and 8 ('Assessment of effects' and 'Conclusions') of Icen Projects' Heritage, townscape and visual assessment.

Sadly, this is a fundamentally flawed project and should be withdrawn, reconsidered and redesigned. Only then will an 'exciting, energising and inspiring' solution that really rises to the occasion be secured - one which will merit the support of the entire Twickenham community.