

Mr Robert Shepherd comments

Page: [Policy H2 Small sites](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The apparently low housing density in Richmond is largely the result of the large proportion of protected open space and the river. The existing housing is relatively dense and a high proportion of special character that justifies conservation area status. It should not be forced to infill to increase density at the expense of its existing character. Gardens should not be regarded as "brownfield" sites; they are not. The whole notion that London should plan for unfettered expansion seems deeply flawed. National policy should aim to persuade people and economic activity to relocate to less prosperous areas of the country and limiting the expansion of London can help with this.

Page: [Policy HC3 Strategic and Local Views](#)

Section: [N/A](#)

The policy omits the view from Richmond Hill, which was the subject of the earliest campaign to save it at the beginning of the 20th century. This is possibly the most painted view in London and has largely survived, although somewhat compromised by some large buildings in Twickenham such as Regal House. It is important that this view should receive full protection and particularly that buildings in Twickenham, Petersham and Ham that would impact the view should not be permitted.