

~~FWA~~  
**FIRST DRAFT - SEPTEMBER 17<sup>TH</sup> 2021**

John Clinch ~~met acieob~~

Submitted via e mail: - Sept. 22<sup>nd</sup> 2021 ✓  
Resident: No. 80 Thames Eyot [Main Block]  
Cross Deep TWICKENHAM TW1 4QL  
J

COMMENTS/OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSALS FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE RE-DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWICKENHAM RIVERSIDE JUBILEE GARDENS SITE: LBRUT REF: 21/2758/FUL

General:

Disappointed at the loss of the Jubilee gardens, incorporating a community café and children's play area which can be viewed from café also the loss of mature/healthy trees and "usable" amenity/event spaces. LBRUT [council tax payers] have expended considerable funds to create the Jubilee Gardens

I OBJECT TO:

1  
Loss of Jubilee Gardens for reasons given above

2  
Removal of parking spaces and adequate access/servicing and turning drop off areas for disabled visitors and for residents of Eel Pie Island . The reconfigured Access to the site via Wharf Lane and Water Lane is ill thought out and the two way traffic proposal at the ICELAND area would be potentially dangerous

3  
The built forms to the South West of the site are still to high/massive and out of context and the proposal for yet another Pub [sui generis] would cause serious harm to the amenity and quiet enjoyment of the residents of Eyot Lodge which is less than 20 metres from the Pub raised deck area [ patrons of the pub would spill out onto the Terrace especially on Rugby days  
Why do we need another pub [apart from possibly the sheme viability] when we have at least 20 pubs within walking distance of the site

4  
Why [again probably for viability/value reasons] do we need more empty retail units?

5  
The provision/tenure mix of "affordable" housing is not clear form the application details and my concern is that the affordable housing content [truly affordable not shared ownership - 50%] would in practice be secured  
This would need core condition and possibly a section 106 agreement requirement[ not sure how 106 requirement would work when Applicant and Local authority are one and the same?] to ensure that the agreed level of affordable housing is delivered

The affordable/social housing provision is not integrated with the open market housing. The proposal should be "tenure blind" ie the social housing and open market housing should appear of a similar standard of appearance

Resistor with LBRUT Clerk to Planning Committee  
K. [unclear] [unclear] 30 mins [unclear] presentation

Parking [contrary to local/national policies/London Plan] is required for essential workers who have to be available and travel 24 hours – these residents will in all probability occupy the social/affordable housing

6

The proposed "amenity space" is indicated on the site plan within a flood plain area/zone and would not be useable for much of the time [ The environment agency should carry out a realistic assessment and make recommendations as a consultee]

7

The Town square proposal is a preposterous concept and would not work in practice. The vistas of the riverside from King Street along Water Lane would also not be achieved due to the built forms which would infill the corner/end of the King Street block. The reconfigured road layout would also result in the loss of the community seating and would bring the road close to the listed telephone box [currently repurposed as a coffee vending unit]

8

Of the 60 or so letters of support for this current proposal I could see only one address which is in close proximity to the site [Church St.] and these comments of support should not be given as much weight as those submitted by immediate neighbour stakeholders

9.

**I should appreciate it if the above comments/objections could be included, without edit, in the councils on line list of comments/objections**

I would strongly recommend that the planning sub- committee refuse the application in its current form

9. Should the Planning committee be minded to approve this proposal a ~~core~~ condition requiring that the contractors, including Demolition/Piling contractors and main contractors are signed up to the considerate contractors scheme.