Our reference: COM525416736

**Application number: 2022/3525** 

Application address: The Molesey Venture, Orchard Lane, East Molesey, KT8 0BN

Name: Mr Selleck

Address: 2 St Johns Road, East Molesey, Surrey, KT8 9JH

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

Date of comment: 20 Jun 2023

**Comment:** I am objecting to this application on a personal basis and as Chairman of the Molesey Residents Association.

From the new plans and documents the applicant has tried to show that they have listened to the objections and amended their plans accordingly. This is incorrect and misleading.

Removing balconies and improving some landscaping is welcome but the fundamental reasons for refusal remain the same.

Building A has been marginally reduced in size and moved west by a similar proportion from the boundaries of the gardens along Ember Farm Way. It's size as a four storey building still stands at 75 feet and has consequently an overbearing mass. This continues to be out of all proportion to the surrounding houses and will continue to have a detrimental effect on the local residents.

The minor revisions to Building C of fenestration and internal layout does not resolve the fact that at its closet point the new building will be still only 1.1m from the boundary of 18 Orchard Lane. The new building will continue along the side of the garden still making it an overbearing structure along the boundary. The applicant argues that these changes will reduce the perception of overlooking the garden is hardly a planning argument.

One again has to question whether this type of "luxury senior living "is wanted or needed in Elmbridge where there is an overcapacity already. Pre - application advice was sought by a developer prior to the existing applicant in 2020 from the Council.

38 units were proposed 50 % affordable with the existing care facilities re provided which would have produced a density of 63 dwellings per hectare. Comfortably above the required level in 2/3 storey accommodation.

These proposals are for 74 units with therefore a commensurate much higher density which is not sustainable on this site.

Again nothing has been done to increase parking capacity nor provision for visitors, tradesman and deliveries.

The amended planning application should be refused as it is still too high ,has too much mass and still too close to the boundaries of the surrounding properties.