

Our ref: COM1390972

Application number: 2017/0445

Application Address: Riverside, Church Walk, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 8JT

Name: Ms Rae

Address: 4 Camden Cottages, Church Walk, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 8JT, , ,

Comment type: object

Date of comment: 06 Mar 2017

Comment: The residential development as proposed is neither harmonious nor in keeping with the streetscene, aesthetics, or character of the area, it's adjoining or neighbouring buildings.

1. The Location Plan excludes Building 3 from the drawings – however, the project as advertised describes the area known as Building 3 for development as two, 2br houses (<http://www.joelproperties.co.uk/weybridge/>). As all areas at the site share access, parking, grounds, gardens, flood risk, rubbish, etc, difficult to ask residents to assess the impact of proposed Buildings 1 and 2 without full disclosure of what is intended for the entire development especially if larger than described.
2. The single story extension overwhelms the smaller 2/3br cottages adjacent and opposite, and dominates in proportion to the size of the existing structure. Greenbelt regs state 10% of existing to develop, this extension is more like 30-40%. From the pedestrian walkway on Church Walk, the side of the proposed would be seen as a very large 2+ story, solid brick wall, absent of windows, with a single, grey, aluminium door at ground level its only feature. That is not in keeping with the character of the village style setting which includes 2 listed bridges. The extension removes original architectural features from the original electric substation, an historic, Victorian landmark.
3. Car park on the premises (at the end of a one-way, no-through street) is both inadequate and badly designed. The layout restricted to just 3 medium sized cars requires them to exit the premises by dangerously reversing onto a busy pedestrian walkway frequented by children, cyclists and pets. Furthermore, the application states “0 car parking spaces - original”, which is inaccurate as 10-12 cars parked here when a commercial building. Historically, cars always entered and exited facing forward and this should be an obvious requirement for a new residential development at this location and with traffic presenting at all hours. The parking space for No1 Portmore Cottages is absent from the plans and would be encroached by turning cars. Also missing is the gate on Church Walk marking this as a private road. As drawn, cars from The Riverside appear to not only be reversing onto private land but also directly into the gate.
4. Flood defense plan appears incomplete and not current (does not include flood report from 2014 when levels highest in 40 years). The flood assessment cited relates to previous application when the single story extension was proposed as a garage. The newly proposed, being part of a residence and specifically in Flood Zone 3, suggests a larger 8m boundary between building and river be required.
5. Trees and Hedges, Gardens. Disappointingly, see no plan for new trees, shrubs or plantings to provide screening or natural landscaping on this Greenbelt development. This would soften the impact of the proposed into a setting previously belonging to a commercial building and seems essential for transitioning the development to residential. Trees removed from the property soon after purchasing could be re-established and form a riparian buffer to help support the bank, prevent erosion and absorb water as a natural flood defense. An established hedge (in plain sight and located on the boundary line with the path) is curiously absent both from the plans and application. Whether it stays or goes impacts on both natural and artificial lighting, most specifically the privacy for closely situated Portmore Cottages.
6. Mooring platforms are a hazard as they exacerbate water dispersal during flooding. Moorings proposed from the Whittets Ait's

turned down in previous years for this reason. Width of river here also extremely narrow and a serious consideration.

7. Materials. If exposed brick, London Stocks should be required to match existing to avoid any bad bonding of brickwork between adjacent buildings. Needs to present in a more unified appearance than drawn.

8. Windows should match existing in size. From front aspect particularly, windows of Building 1 and 2 appear to be disproportionately elongated. For privacy considerations, windows should also not be fully glazed floor to ceiling (if intended). Proposed dormer windows are large, boxlike, and dominating, restricting sunlight to an already light-deprived street affecting of Camden Cottages 1,2,3,4 opposite. Removal of fan window features and the large semi circular window facing Jessamy Rd, disappointing to see, as destroys any historical relevance to the original building.