

Our ref: COM1393225

Application number: 2017/0445

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

Name: Dr Shattock

Address: 6 Portmore Cottages, Church Walk, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 8JT, , ,

**Comment type:** object

Date of comment: 12 Mar 2017

**Comment:** To whom it may concern,

The current plans do not in any way enhance or preserve the Victorian industrial heritage of the existing building, and such changes would result in a much reduced character and view enjoyed by local residents and the many groups of visiting walkers who use the Thames Pathway. In particular the proposed side extension does not sit well with the original building or the local built environment, with the same applying to the alteration of both the arched windows (front and back) and the removal of the Victorian arched windows on the side elevation of the main building.

The planning for the single floor extension goes against the permission granted for change of use (from commercial to residential), which was based on the existing footprint. The flood risk assessment submitted is based on a site with a 2 car garage extension and not a residential side extension.

On purchase of the property – but before planning permission was sought the trees and shrubs in place along the riverbank of the property were cut down, potentially increasing the risk of the bank becoming more unstable. The boundary opposite Portmore Cottages has also become overgrown in height. This has reduced the light available to the pathway and to Portmore Cottages.

Contrary to the application, which states there is no parking, if you look at the existing site as a whole there is plenty parking for up to 10 cars or more. This existing parking thereby allows any cars to turn around without having to carry out the risky manoeuvre of reversing blindly onto the busy walkway/public footpath outside the proposed No 1 & 2 Camden Cottages. This is a key risk, with hundreds of children, adults and older people walking and cycling along this pathway every day. Such reversing would also require being able to use and access the private road of Camden Cottages (the gate of which is often closed, making such a reversing manoeuvre impossible on such days). Maintaining the car park in its existing area would solve this problem.

There is no detail concerning the proposed entrance, i.e. whether there will be a gate; how the parking area will be separated from the garden of No. 2, or where the rubbish bins will be stored (from view) or placed on collection day (considering the small space at this entrance point for the existing pedestrian pathway as it goes past Portmore Cottages).

With regard to No. 3 on the site map (also known as The Studio), then clearly the development of the site needs to be considered as a whole. With this in mind, then No. 3 is directly opposite my own property. Any development of this building into a larger or two story property would have a huge impact on my view of the river and beyond, the natural light into my property (with it's small, single window), as well as my downstairs window and front garden, and also my privacy (with my 2nd floor bedroom being at the front of my property). Indeed, the Local Government's Planning Policy Statements and Supplementary Planning Guidance PPS 7 (Addendum) on 'Residential Extensions and Alterations Annex A: Residential Amenity: Overshadowing/ Loss of Light' states the following:

- A33 Where an extension is poorly sited or badly designed it can cast a shadow that may reduce a neighbour's daylight and adversely affect their amenity to an unacceptable level. It is important, therefore, that every effort should be made to avoid or minimise the potential for overshadowing to a neighbour when drawing up plans for an extension.

- A34 In terms of daylighting, the effect on all rooms, apart from halls, landings, bathrooms and utility rooms will be considered. Where an extension would be likely to reduce the amount of light entering the window of a room, other than those indicated above, to an unreasonable degree, planning permission is likely to be refused.

It is my strong opinion therefore that any development of the No. 3 property would be against these planning regulations and should in no way be allowed.

Ends