



Rebuttal Statement

Planning

Fiona Dyson

Site: Arlington Works, 23 - 27 Arlington Road, Twickenham, TW1 2BB

LPA reference:18/2714/FUL

Appeal PINs reference: APP/L5810/W/20/3249153

Response to the proof of evidence supplied by Mr Villars

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This rebuttal has been prepared in response to the evidence of Mr Villars on planning issues.

2.0 EXAMPLE CASES

2.1 Mr Villar's lists a number of examples of schemes in the Borough from para. 3.16 onwards, which are stated as being similar in the approach that the appellant has taken. The Council will respond to each one in turn below:

20/1025/FUL – Hampton Delivery Office

2.2 This is not considered to be comparable. The Site is allocated as a development site within the adopted Local Plan (2018) and this allocation supports a range of uses in principle including employment, social and community uses, and residential.

14/0157/FUL – Lorkcorp House

2.3 Page 87, paras. 19 and 20 of Mr Villar's proof bundle explain why this case was considered acceptable. Marketing was undertaken, and whilst the sequential approach wasn't followed, the scheme complied with (c) of DM EM 2 and was therefore policy compliant.

17/1033/FUL – Lorkcorp House

2.4 This case had an extant permission for residential on the site, therefore this was a material consideration in the determination of the application scheme.

2.5 Furthermore, the Inspector for the subsequent appeal determined that student housing use met an identified need and outweighed the retention of the employment site.

19/2789/FUL – Lorkcorp House

2.6 Page 129 of Mr Villar's proof bundle refers to the officer's report where it states that full marketing was carried out. This case also had an extant permission for residential on the site, therefore this was a material consideration in the determination.

18/2649/FUL – Land at 1 High Street/ Myrtle Road

2.7 This site had been marketed since 2017 and had also been granted prior approval to residential, therefore this was a material consideration in the determination of the application.

10/1447/FUL – 14 Elm Tree Road

2.8 On page 187 of Mr Villar's proof bundle, the Planning Inspector clearly accepts the marketing for this scheme.

18/3804/FUL – 139-143 Station Road

2.9 This scheme was located in an Area of Mixed Use, and the proposal resulted in no loss of employment land as set out on Page 208 para. 25 of Mr Villar's proof bundle.

18/1808/FUL – 12-14 Church Lane

2.10 The scheme is not considered comparable, the site had a planning resolution for housing which was a material consideration. Furthermore, and due to specific circumstances on the site, the scheme was considered as an exception.

3.0 CONCLUSION

3.1 The Council would reiterate that each case is assessed on its own merits and site specifics. The comparisons above do not justify the lack of marketing and carrying out the sequential approach for the appeal scheme or justify a departure from policy.