13th Jan 2023

Dear Mr Trendall,

Objection to Application 2022/3525 submitted by Lifestyle Residents and Sons of the Divine Providence for the Molesey Venture Site, Orchard Lane, East Molesey, KT8 0BN

I would like raise an objection to this planning application because the plans and statements the Applicant has submitted to support the application are incorrect in relation to our property, 70 Ember Farm Way. The main area we are concerned with is that incorrect separation distances have been quoted between our habitable rooms and the proposed development. Our property and amenity are considerably impacted by this proposal and so these distances are a material consideration. As such, we would like to see these updated and published before the assessment of the planning application.

The plans submitted by the Applicant do not accurately reflect our property. The plans submitted do not show our ground floor rear extension completed in May 2021. The plans are based on the previous footprint of our property pre-extension. Note that the Elmbridge Council planning map does correctly show our extension.

The separation distance quoted by the Applicant between block A and the nearest habitable rooms on Ember Farm Way is incorrect. In their Planning Statement dated Nov 2022 para 6.46 they say 'we would emphasise that the shortest distance between the proposed residential units and the rear elevation of existing properties in Ember Farm Way will be at least 30 metres'. The distance to our nearest habitable room is circa. 25.8m (our garden length from nearest habitable room to the boundary is 18.92m and we estimate the distance from the boundary to building A at 6.9m).

The sunlight and daylight analysis report provided by the Applicant is therefore also incorrect for our property. The 25 degree analysis is not based on our nearest habitable room to block A.

I would request that the planning team ask the Applicant to provide the information below:-

- Confirm the shortest distance from our rear boundary to building A. Based on the plans submitted we estimate this to be around 6.9m. The distance we would like to know is shown by the red arrow on the plan below.
- Repeat the Sunlight and Daylight Assessment and the 25 degree test for our property based on the correct property layout and separation distances.

Furthermore, the arboricultural reports are also incorrect for our property. The reports do not record a mature Arelia tree in our garden at the boundary. There is no tree protection plan for this tree and its roots. Given the proposal is to build a basement car park close to our boundary this tree needs to be protected in the plans.

As a result I would also request that the planning team ask the Applicant to:-

- Update the Arboricultural site survey to accurately record this tree
- Update the Arboricultural site survey
- Update the Arboricultual Method Statement to reflect this tree in the Tree Survey Schedule in appendix 1 and detail a root protection plan for this tree during any potential construction.



Yours Sincerely

Katherine Le Clerc and Jeff Wemyss