

**Our reference:** COM478366716

**Application number:** 2022/3525

**Application address:** The Molesey Venture Sundial House Orchard Lane East Molesey Surrey  
KT8 0BN

**Name:** Mr A Butler

**Address:** 71 Ember Farm Way, East Molesey, Surrey, KT8 0BH

**Comment type:** You object to the planning application

**Date of comment:** 13 Jan 2023

**Comment:** I strongly object to this planning application.

The proposed plans are disproportionate in scale when comparing them to the neighbouring properties. Erecting 3 and 4 storey blocks of flats in immediate proximity to neighbours will be an invasion on any reasonable amount of privacy. The excessive height, overbearing stature and unattractive architectural style, is completely out of character with other buildings in the surrounding area. There are no buildings of similar mass and height in the area, developments of this size and style are more accustomed to cities, not a quiet village and at the end of a cul-de-sac.

The majority of properties in this area are detached and semi-detached homes where the 1st floors usually consist of bedrooms. However, Blocks A & C are apartments, the residents in these apartments will spend the majority of their time in their apartment as it is their main living space. The outlook for a large proportion of these apartments will be the neighbouring properties on Ember Farm Way. The residents in these apartments will be spectating the domestic lives of the neighbouring families in Ember Farm Way as a form of entertainment.

The use of mansard roofs and roof terraces is unprecedented in this area and the development should not be allowed to proceed with these features. The mansard roofs contribute to the overbearing stature of the development. The roof terraces, full height windows and balconies are also inconsiderate to neighbouring properties' privacy. The development is not in keeping with the area and it states in the document Design and Access Statement - Part 1 section 2.9 paragraph 2 that "There is no common architectural style, although pitched roofs and gable ends are a dominant feature in most cases". The buildings throughout this area consist of 2 storey pitched roofs with loft conversions and dormer windows. New developments should follow suit to be in keeping with the locality.

The scale of this development should be drastically reduced, the development of Block C is in breach of the 45 degree rule and it should be enforced that the development be reconfigured based upon this legislation.

The flood risk of the site should be reassessed, the document provided is rife with contradictions and errors. It states in the "flood risk assessment" document section 3.10 paragraph 2 that "No below surface infrastructure and buildings are located or are proposed for the site", which is incorrect when considering the underground carpark. The maps provided by the environmental agency are flipped when the boundary for the proposed site has not been, calculations made

capturing the incorrect piece of land should be reassessed. The groundwater tests were carried out during the height of the summer drought, which was one of the biggest droughts in the UK's history. Neighbouring properties to the site frequently experience excessive amounts of surface water when it rains. Considering the amount of earth that will be excavated for the underground carpark and excessive amount of land that will be cemented over, all on a floodplain, I am not convinced the rainwater attenuation tank will deter the flooding of the site and neighbouring properties. When the basement eventually floods, the 55 cars that will be parked in the basement will be moved and further congest the streets causing mayhem.

The plans note that there are 74 residential parking spaces giving a ratio of 1:1, this is an inadequate amount of parking to facilitate the density of the development. 74 residential properties doesn't necessarily equate to 74 residents when considering the development includes 3 bedroom 6 person units. The whole development could house 264 people at its maximum capacity when calculating how many people can live in each unit. Although the maximum capacity of 264 is unlikely, it's reasonable to assume that visitors, staff, nurses, delivery drivers and maintenance workers will park in adjacent residential roads, especially when residents in this development won't have enough parking for themselves. This will contribute to the already congested/stressed neighbouring streets and the increase of CO2 emissions. Congestion will be intensified when the developers realise that people over the age of 65 have less need for 3 bedroom 6 person units. A sensible assumption is that retrospective planning applications would be made to reduce these units to 1 bedroom, increasing the likelihood of cars spilling onto residential streets. Not to mention there are no allocated visitor parking spaces.

It's apparent from the unit density that the proposed plans were put together with an overwhelming amount of greed in mind. No developer should be allowed to inconsiderately build something so profound, and in such close proximity to neighbouring properties, that they would significantly affect the mental wellbeing of residents in said properties.