

The proposed development site is to the rear of our property and we would share a boundary. Having looked through the planning application we have found numerous issues that clearly contravene Elmbridge Borough Council's Local Plan (2015). We therefore strongly object to the proposal.

The main buildings A and C of the proposed development will be only 7.8 and 6.9 metres respectively from our boundary. They will significantly overlook our garden and rooms at the back of our house (see figure 1). We would lose all privacy and these buildings would dominate our outlook. These issues contravene points DM2e and DM2b of the Local Plan. Block A will take sky during the day and we would lose the evening sun. Block C will block the sun from early afternoon in winter months. The proposed buildings are in complete contrast to what we have behind us at the moment – a single storey building with only roofs visible from the ground floor of our property (see figure 1). We are not currently overlooked at all.

The placement of balconies overlooking, and so close to, private residential gardens also goes against point DM2e of the Local Plan. Although the balconies are not directly above our property, residents on these balconies will be able to see into our garden.



Figure 1. The current outlook, and then with the proposed development, taken from the garden patio of 72 Ember Farm Way (see \* for methodology). The windows overlooking us in Block A are in open-plan dining/living areas.

The proposed development is on a scale and density like nothing else in the surrounding area, contravening point DM2b of the Local Plan. The elevations of the building are totally out of keeping with neighbouring properties and will look completely out of place on the outskirts of Cow Common and river walkways. Blocks A and C will tower over neighbouring houses, including ours. This is a clear case of overdevelopment – 74 apartments and a large underground car park on 0.75Ha of land in a reasonably lightly populated residential area. The aesthetics of the development are also out of keeping with the local houses and woodland setting – it will be an eyesore from the banks of the river.

The street scene of Ember Farm Way will be changed significantly for the worse and dominated by Blocks A and C, but a street scene for Ember Farm Way is missing from the application. Instead, one has been provided for Orchard Lane, which would be largely unchanged by the development.

The basement car park will be only 1.6 metres from our boundary, garden outbuilding, mature silver birch tree and our children's playhouse. The proximity is unacceptable and causing us great anxiety. This large basement car park is also to be built within a floodplain. Basements have been widely recognised as a problem in terms of local flooding, groundwater flow and ground movement. There is no mention of these problems in the application, nor any form of risk assessment covering these aspects. A Basement Impact Statement has not been provided, which I believe is compulsory for many other Greater London boroughs.

There are currently only a few cars at most parked at the Horticultural Centre (currently behind our garden) in working hours only. The proposed new road leading to the underground car park will be located to the rear of our garden. If every car in the basement car park leaves once a day, we will have 110 cars travelling within metres of our boundary. At night headlights will be shining directly towards our rear windows. We will experience significant noise, light and air pollution from these cars, not to mention delivery vehicles and refuse lorries on bin collection days. Furthermore, the use of traffic lights on this road, to control movement of cars in and out of the car park, will mean we have cars idling at the rear of our garden, adding to the pollution.

The substations and air pumps are situated at the end of our garden, again only 1.6m from our boundary. These will cause noise and possible vibrations heard and felt on our property. The air pumps will cause air pollution. The substation is so large it is taller than our rear fence. The mature Silver Birch tree in our garden (named T18 on developers plans) has been identified to have its roots trimmed to accommodate the air pumps. We have had no prior communication about this and this will put our tree at risk. The removal of tree roots also contravenes point DM6e of the Local Plan. We question why the substations and air pumps have been placed so close to neighbouring residents premises, when there is plenty of other space on site to use for this purpose.

We will have significant light pollution from windows of both buildings A and C (as seen in figure 1). The Lighting Impact Assessment states that balconies will have external lights visible from my home – both the side and eastern façade of Block A. In addition to this, the plans within the indicative lighting strategy shows a streetlight has been put on the road at the rear of our garden. The light over-spills into our garden (as seen on the diagram) and there are another three streetlights in the car park beyond.

The close proximity of the buildings, substation, air pumps and basement car park to our boundary all go against point DM2b of the Local Plan, which specifies that the separation distances to plot boundaries should be taken into account.

Since the building of the Cala Homes development on Orchard Lane, residents have experienced many problems with their sewage drains, namely odour and an overflow of sewage. This proposed development will only add to these problems. The statement from Thames Water has not given me any confidence – they themselves say it is poor practice to build within 20m of a sewage pump.

Soil drainage tests were performed during a heatwave and draught (the hottest and driest summer for 40 years). I question if the tests need to be performed during a wet winter. We've lived here for over 10 years and regularly have waterlogged soil and poor drainage during wet weather.

The movement of the mains water pipe will result in damage to green belt land which has been untouched for many years. Many mature trees are to be removed for this purpose – this is unacceptable at a time when more trees should be planted, not removed. The removal of these mature trees, plus many more on the site, contravenes point DM6 of the Local Plan.

The construction and presence of this development, not to mention the removal of trees, will detrimentally affect the wildlife in the area. Our garden has regular visits from Herons and Lesser-spotted Woodpeckers. We also see bats flying over the area in the summer (I believe they live on site). After reading the bat survey I question its validity – it clearly states not all areas of the current buildings could be inspected due to Covid-19 and that another survey should be carried out. We hear Owls calling, particularly in winter months, which indicates they are close by. I also regularly see Kingfishers in the vicinity of the river adjacent with the Molesey Venture Site and priority woodland – Kingfishers are protected under schedule 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. This risk to, and loss of, wildlife goes against point DM21 of the Local Plan.

The visitor parking on the proposed site is insufficient, and does not meet point DM7 of the Local Plan. There will be daily visits from nurses, cleaners, family and friends, care providers and staff. Asking visitors to park on neighbouring roads is not good enough. It is already difficult to drive down Ember Farm Way and Orchard Lane due to parked cars. Orchard Lane is a small residential cul-de-sac that could not cope with more traffic. Furthermore, the Wilderness is a hive of activity, with dog walkers, fishermen and Molesey Juniors FC. Lots of families walk down Orchard Lane to access the Wilderness and Molesey Heath – the heavy traffic resulting from this development would sadly make the road unsafe for pedestrians.

A two-year build of this size will negatively affect our quality of life; two years of noise, dust and building traffic. The building site will be adjoining the gardens of Orchard Lane and Ember Farm Way properties. The construction hours have been set as between 08.00 and 18.00 hours. I propose an earlier stoppage time so that neighbouring residents have some time to enjoy our homes.

The development shows a lack of consideration for elderly residents. The route through Cow Common and along the rivers to the shops on Walton Road is known to be muddy and slippery after wet weather - certainly not suitable for elderly residents to walk. Furthermore, the bus 514, which stops on Esher Road, is not an hourly service as stated in the application. The nearest bus stops for regular routes to Kingston or Walton are on Walton Road/Bridge Road or Embercourt Road. The residents will need to rely on cars or taxis to get around.

There has been no mention of additional GP surgeries or local infrastructure for a possible 148 residents moving to the area. At the moment it is difficult, near impossible, for current residents to see a GP, without this additional burden.

We also have concerns about the individuals who use the Horticultural Day Centre. The Centre is currently open (as of January 2023) and has daily visitors. There are no plans to move its location or provide alternative facilities for the local community. At a time when demand for Mental Health care provision is high, I question why such a facility is being closed down. Current vulnerable residents are being treated unfairly and are not being supported in finding new accommodation. I find this very distasteful and would like to know what role the charity, Sons of the Divine Providence, are taking on this.

\* With access to detailed plans and eastern elevations of the proposed development we used the spot height's available and mapped those positions with a professional drone. With a light-marker attached to the aircraft we flew various accurate courses at 19m to mark the top edge of the third storey – 18m to view from the eyeline of someone standing in one of the multitude of bedrooms and lounges. Finally moving west by 15 metres and up to 22m to mark the roof height and eastern edge. Multiple photographic images were captured with drones marker light visible and the developer's plan of the eastern elevations overlaid and perspectives corrected.