

**From:** Miles Macleod [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 22 May 2017 10:56  
**To:** Town Planning  
**Subject:** 2017/0445 - PPDRA Urgent Late Representation re 1&2 Riverside Church Walk Weybridge  
**Attachments:** 2017 0445 - PPDRA Late Representation re Riverside Church Walk Weybridge....pdf  
**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Please see the attached pdf document for a formatted version.

## PORTMORE PARK & DISTRICT RESIDENTS ASSOCIATION

# URGENT LATE REPRESENTATION

22 May 2017

Dear Councillors and EBC Town Planning

Re: 2017/0445 - Units 1&2 Riverside, Church Walk, Weybridge, KT13 8JT

Unfortunately, a number of inaccuracies and omissions have become apparent in the 2017/0445 Design and Access statement, the EL/17/0445 SCC 'Development Affecting Roads' report, and the EBC 2017/0445 Officer Report.

Some of these may have had a material effect on the officer's recommendation to permit. We would urge councillors to consider the merits of this application only in the light of verified facts.

Hence we are submitting this late representation giving details of inaccuracies and omissions, in addition to our previous PPDRA letter of objection.

The most significant apparent inaccuracies, omissions and areas of confusion concern the impact of highway safety, access and parking (SCC EL/17/0445 and summary in EBC 2017/0445 Officer Report para 23) and the access diagram.

Primarily, the following statements appear to be factually inaccurate or are contested:

1. 'The development would use an existing vehicular access'
2. 'The building currently uses the private land fronting the site for parking'
3. [This] 'would still be available for parking and turning after construction of the extension'

The 2017/0445 access diagram (vehicle turning overlay) omits some key factors affecting safe access and the difficulty of turning a vehicle before going back up Beales Lane:

4. It omits to show that vehicles would have to reverse blind across Public Footpath 18 (mention of this footpath is also omitted from the EL/17/0445 SCC 'Development Affecting Roads' report)

5. It omits the disabled parking space, which would be in the way when reversing
6. It fails to demonstrate any right to reverse into the gated Camden Cottages private land opposite 1&2 Riverside (an essential for the proposed means of turning)

(Detailed reasons are set out below.)

The result is that drivers leaving the proposed new development would have difficulty reversing their vehicles safely out of the proposed three parking spaces and across Footpath 18. They would have to continue reversing up the narrow section of Beales Lane towards Thames Street and St George's Junior School, unless they can find someone's private driveway to use to turn around. The need to reverse back up Beales Lane is a serious problem particularly at school pickup time, and exposes children and others to risk.

Increasing the need to reverse up Beales Lane would be dangerous and surely unacceptable for any planning authority to permit.

Hence residents trust that Elmbridge will refuse consent for 2017/0445.

As previously observed, many residents are especially concerned about the impact of the proposed single storey extension in removing essential on-site turning space, and that it would also have a negative impact on the street scene, looking out of place and necessitating the 'regrettable' loss of the prominent and attractive fanlight windows in the existing gable end.

A more suitable proposal is needed. A proposal without the single storey 'side extension' could solve the issues.

Yours sincerely

Miles Macleod  
Chair, Portmore Park & District Residents Association  
3 Clinton Close, Weybridge, KT13 8NU

## Detailed reasons

1. The 2017/0445 Officer Report paragraph 23, summarising SCC/EL/17/0445, states: *"the development would use an existing vehicular access"*.

REALITY: In fact the proposed vehicular access is sited further north to accommodate the proposed side extension (with some overlap with existing). It is closer to the front of 1 Portmore Cottages, and has poorer visibility of people approaching southbound on Public Footpath 18.

- 2 & 3. The 2017/0445 Officer Report paragraph 23 continues:

*"The building currently uses the private land fronting the site for parking. Although this area has not been included in the site as outlined in the location plan, it would still be available for parking and turning after construction of the extension"*.

This is disputed by local residents and landowners.

AMBIGUITY: What is meant by 'private land fronting the site'?

REALITY 1: If it means the 1 metre wide strip of land between 1&2 Riverside and SCC Footpath 18, in the years of Riverside being used as offices, the occupants (latterly Trinity Environmental) did not park on that strip of land / Public Footpath 18, and insisted other residents should not to park there as it would block their emergency fire door.

REALITY 2: If it means the private gated land attached to Camden Cottages (on the other side of Footpath 18), that land is clearly signed as private, and owners of the houses in question contest the right of 1&2 Riverside occupants to park or turn there.

REALITY 3: If it means the current car parking land adjacent to / in front of Unit 3 Riverside, it would be impossible to reverse into that private land out of any of the three proposed parking spaces.

CONFUSION: What is meant by '*The building currently uses*'?

We understand that the building has been empty since 7 Jan 2014, and this was the stated basis for granting the 2016/1274 Certificate of Lawful Development. Previously the occupants of the offices parked and turned vehicles in their own Riverside car park.

7. The 2017/0445 Design and Access statement and SCC EL/17/0445 describe Church Walk as 'a residential cul-de-sac'.

More accurately, Church Walk is principally a public footpath (SCC FP18), and a number of homes in Church Walk have only pedestrian access.

Vehicles are only able to access the '1&2 Riverside' application site via Beales Lane (a residential cul-de-sac), then crossing the Church Walk footpath in the final metres to gain access to the 1,2&3 Riverside car park.

Quite separately there is private vehicular access to Camden Cottages in Church Walk via a short length of gated private surfaced roadway created from parts of the front gardens of 1-5 Camden Cottages.

8. The application talks of a 'side extension', but it is attached to what is locally often called the front of the building.

The gabled face of Riverside Studios with its prominent fanlight windows and doorway fronting the parking area has previously been referred to as the front of the building, even in historic planning applications.

The gabled face currently contains the main entrance into 1&2 Riverside, which has for many years been used as a single suite of offices.

9. The 2017/0445 Design and Access statement repeatedly talks of 1&2 Riverside as 'The two separate properties'. It refers to the 2016/1274 Certificate of Lawful Development.

1&2 Riverside was used as a single office property for many years.

The 2016/1274 Officer report refers to 1&2 Riverside as “A single storey end of terrace building with accommodation in the roof space.”

The 2016/1274 Officer report explicitly casts doubt on the veracity of the applicant’s statement about the building being used as two separate properties (from a site visit).

---

Miles Macleod  
Chair, Portmore Park & District Residents Association  
3 Clinton Close, Weybridge, Surrey, KT13 8NU

This message has been analyzed and no issues were discovered.  
Click [here](#) to report this email as spam

## URGENT LATE REPRESENTATION

22 May 2017

Dear Councillors and EBC Town Planning

Re: 2017/0445 - Units 1&2 Riverside, Church Walk, Weybridge, KT13 8JT

Unfortunately, a number of inaccuracies and omissions have become apparent in the 2017/0445 Design and Access statement, the EL/17/0445 SCC 'Development Affecting Roads' report, and the EBC 2017/0445 Officer Report.

Some of these may have had a material effect on the officer's recommendation to permit. We would urge councillors to consider the merits of this application only in the light of verified facts.

Hence we are submitting this late representation giving details of inaccuracies and omissions, in addition to our previous PPDRA letter of objection.

The most significant apparent inaccuracies, omissions and areas of confusion concern the impact of highway safety, access and parking (SCC EL/17/0445 and summary in EBC 2017/0445 Officer Report para 23) and the access diagram.

Primarily, the following statements appear to be factually inaccurate or are contested:

1. 'The development would use an existing vehicular access'
2. 'The building currently uses the private land fronting the site for parking'
3. [This] 'would still be available for parking and turning after construction of the extension'

The 2017/0445 access diagram (vehicle turning overlay) omits some key factors affecting safe access and the difficulty of turning a vehicle before going back up Beales Lane:

4. It omits to show that vehicles would have to reverse blind across Public Footpath 18 (mention of this footpath is also omitted from the EL/17/0445 SCC 'Development Affecting Roads' report)
5. It omits the disabled parking space, which would be in the way when reversing
6. It fails to demonstrate any right to reverse into the gated Camden Cottages private land opposite 1&2 Riverside (an essential for the proposed means of turning)

(Detailed reasons are set out below.)

The result is that drivers leaving the proposed new development would have difficulty reversing their vehicles safely out of the proposed three parking spaces and across Footpath 18. They would have to continue reversing up the narrow section of Beales Lane towards Thames Street and St George's Junior School, unless they can find someone's private driveway to use to turn around. The need to reverse back up Beales Lane is a serious problem particularly at school pickup time, and exposes children and others to risk.

Increasing the need to reverse up Beales Lane would be dangerous and surely unacceptable for any planning authority to permit.

Hence residents trust that Elmbridge will refuse consent for 2017/0445.

As previously observed, many residents are especially concerned about the impact of the proposed single storey extension in removing essential on-site turning space, and that it would also have a negative impact on the street scene, looking out of place and necessitating the 'regrettable' loss of the prominent and attractive fanlight windows in the existing gable end.

A more suitable proposal is needed. A proposal without the single storey 'side extension' could solve the issues.

Yours sincerely

Miles Macleod  
Chair, Portmore Park & District Residents Association  
3 Clinton Close, Weybridge, KT13 8NU

## Detailed reasons

1. The 2017/0445 Officer Report paragraph 23, summarising SCC/EL/17/0445, states: *"the development would use an existing vehicular access"*.  
REALITY: In fact the proposed vehicular access is sited further north to accommodate the proposed side extension (with some overlap with existing). It is closer to the front of 1 Portmore Cottages, and has poorer visibility of people approaching southbound on Public Footpath 18.

- 2 & 3. The 2017/0445 Officer Report paragraph 23 continues:

*"The building currently uses the private land fronting the site for parking. Although this area has not been included in the site as outlined in the location plan, it would still be available for parking and turning after construction of the extension"*.

This is disputed by local residents and landowners.

AMBIGUITY: What is meant by 'private land fronting the site'?

REALITY 1: If it means the 1 metre wide strip of land between 1&2 Riverside and SCC Footpath 18, in the years of Riverside being used as offices, the occupants (latterly Trinity Environmental) did not park on that strip of land / Public Footpath 18, and insisted other residents should not to park there as it would block their emergency fire door.

REALITY 2: If it means the private gated land attached to Camden Cottages (on the other side of Footpath 18), that land is clearly signed as private, and owners of the houses in question contest the right of 1&2 Riverside occupants to park or turn there.

REALITY 3: If it means the current car parking land adjacent to / in front of Unit 3 Riverside, it would be impossible to reverse into that private land out of any of the three proposed parking spaces.

CONFUSION: What is meant by 'The building currently uses'?

We understand that the building has been empty since 7 Jan 2014, and this was the stated basis for granting the 2016/1274 Certificate of Lawful Development. Previously the occupants of the offices parked and turned vehicles in their own Riverside car park.

7. The 2017/0445 Design and Access statement and SCC EL/17/0445 describe Church Walk as 'a residential cul-de-sac'.

More accurately, Church Walk is principally a public footpath (SCC FP18), and a number of homes in Church Walk have only pedestrian access.

Vehicles are only able to access the '1&2 Riverside' application site via Beales Lane (a residential cul-de-sac), then crossing the Church Walk footpath in the final metres to gain access to the 1,2&3 Riverside car park.

Quite separately there is private vehicular access to Camden Cottages in Church Walk via a short length of gated private surfaced roadway created from parts of the front gardens of 1-5 Camden Cottages.

8. The application talks of a 'side extension', but it is attached to what is locally often called the front of the building.

The gabled face of Riverside Studios with its prominent fanlight windows and doorway fronting the parking area has previously been referred to as the front of the building, even in historic planning applications.

The gabled face currently contains the main entrance into 1&2 Riverside, which has for many years been used as a single suite of offices.

9. The 2017/0445 Design and Access statement repeatedly talks of 1&2 Riverside as 'The two separate properties'. It refers to the 2016/1274 Certificate of Lawful Development.

1&2 Riverside was used as a single office property for many years.

The 2016/1274 Officer report refers to 1&2 Riverside as "A single storey end of terrace building with accommodation in the roof space."

The 2016/1274 Officer report explicitly casts doubt on the veracity of the applicant's statement about the building being used as two separate properties (from a site visit).