

**Lesley Johnson**  
**71 Ember Farm Way,**  
**East Molesey, KT8 0BH**

## **Molesey Venture Site Planning Application 2022/3525**

Despite raising concerns about the lack of privacy for my in-ground swimming pool and garden, the developers have not adequately addressed the issue and, instead, have added full height oriel windows to Block C facing mine and multiple other gardens on Ember Farm Way. To reiterate my original objection - our garden frequently hosts relatives, friends, and their young children who come to enjoy the pool. However, Block C poses a significant threat to this privacy. It is only natural to feel uncomfortable about the intrusion of privacy to this amenity, especially considering the vulnerability of some of our visitors. The developers' decision to overlook these concerns and proceed with the placement of these windows demonstrates a lack of consideration for the well-being and enjoyment of the residents affected by this development and their guests. It is crucial that the developers reconsider their choices and find a solution that preserves a reasonable amount of privacy for our outdoor space.

The proposed development fails to provide adequate privacy, both within the site itself and in relation to neighbouring properties. According to section 5.84 of Elmbridge's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it is recommended to maintain a minimum distance of approximately 4 meters between a parked car and a living room window, with the inclusion of a dense hedge acting as a privacy barrier. However, in the case of Block C, two ground floor units have parking bays situated within 2 meters of the units. This close proximity allows for easy visibility into three bedrooms and one living room, enabling motorists who park their cars there to have clear views into these private spaces.

The positioning of the ground source heat pump behind the permanent structure at the end of my garden poses a significant concern. This placement leaves my home entirely exposed by the development and offers no opportunity for the developer to plant trees between my boundary and Building C to enhance privacy. I politely request that the ground source heat pump, and any other plant related building, be relocated away from the boundaries of Ember Farm Way and trees that retain their foliage throughout the winter be planted between all properties and the development to address the privacy issue.

This developer is already referencing other developments/planning applications by other developers to justify their plans. The proposed development far exceeds any other approved or outstanding applications in the area in terms of density, being out of character and generally being an unsuitable development for the site on all aspects. The Elmbridge Design and Character SPD document notes that "Elmbridge is known for its abundance of trees and high quality green spaces" and if this application is approved, the development will set a precedent for other developers to reference. This will pave the way for overbearing, dominating and out of character buildings being built on completely unsuitable sites and Elmbridge will no longer be known for its abundance of trees and green spaces.

According to section 5.42 of Elmbridge's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it is recommended to explore the potential for reusing existing buildings and structures on the site before considering demolition. However, I am unable to find any planning documents that indicate whether this option has been thoroughly explored in this case. It is important to note that demolition activities contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions, accounting for approximately 25% of all such emissions in the UK. Therefore, it is crucial to prioritise retrofitting and reusing the current buildings on the site, not only to mitigate carbon emissions but also to safeguard the well-being of vulnerable individuals that currently live there.

As specified in Elmbridge's Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), section 5.56, "Where gardens are included within residential development, they should be of an appropriate size to provide amenity space for occupiers. The size of the garden may also be key to enhancing the setting of a building, particularly larger flatted developments. In some instances, a minimum garden depth of 11 meters should be provided, which is a dimension that Elmbridge has often required." Block C's garden only has a depth of 6 meters at its largest point, despite comprising 20 units and potentially housing up to 43 people. This limited garden space is insufficient and does not meet the reasonable standards required for accommodating this number of units.

It is important to note that the developers have combined Willow and Rivercroft cottages under the label of Block C, allowing them to make statements such as "The majority of houses within the area are 2 storeys with roof accommodation, this matches both buildings B and C in our proposals", which is misleading. It is evident that the majority of Block C does not align with the existing houses in the area which does not consist of 2 storeys with roof accommodation. This is a deceiving attempt by the developer which raises concerns about their intentions and their commitment to transparency. In reality, the design of development is far from being in keeping with neighbouring properties.

The comparison the developers make between the proposed development site and Mulberry Court in the plans is inadequate, particularly in terms of location. The assumption that cars won't be used based on data of the Mulberry development is not sufficient. The elderly residents at Mulberry Court enjoy a significantly stronger connection to public transport, as they are within walking distance of Kingston town centre. In contrast, the proposed development site's location is desolate and lacking in comparison.

The revised plans have introduced a large ventilation grill behind 72 Ember Farm, located in close proximity to my garden. There is a concern that these vents will allow fumes from the basement car park to escape, leading to an increase in CO2 emissions within my garden area further rendering my garden unusable, especially when also considering the lack of privacy that this development imposes.

As stated in the joint waste solutions document, "it is important to highlight that the waste collection crews have encountered difficulties in accessing the site due to parked vehicles on the public highway, obstructing their ability to make the necessary turns into the site." This issue will be an ever increasing occurrence when taking into consideration the lack of adequate parking that facilitates the development. This raises concerns regarding the practicality and feasibility of the waste collection operations in relation to the proposed development.

According to Elmbridge's Flood Risk SPD, section 2.1.15 Table 8, it explicitly states that "Self-contained residential basements and bedrooms at basement level are not permitted. All other basements, basement extensions, and basement conversions may be considered. Regard will be had to whether the site is also affected by groundwater flooding." Given that the proposed site falls within flood zone 2 and, along with neighbouring residents, has a history of groundwater issues, it would be inappropriate for this development to include a basement car park.

The amended attenuation tank will not be enough to prevent flooding in the local area when heavy rain is expected. They have limited storage capacity, which means they can fill up quickly during heavy rainfall events, potentially leading to overflow and flooding. Regular maintenance is required to prevent sediment and debris accumulation that can reduce their efficiency. The site and neighbouring properties already experience severe groundwater flooding during the mildest of rainy conditions. The amount of earth excavated for the basement car park will be too substantial for the attenuation tank to be a sufficient replacement, this will lead to further flooding in the area and push neighbouring properties, who are not currently in flood zones, into the flood zone.

The presence of a bat roost in Building B2 on the proposed development site, as confirmed by a bat survey, invokes legal protection under the UK Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. These laws prohibit the disturbance or destruction of bat roosts and emphasise the need for developers to consider the ecological impact of their projects. The absence of bat roosts in other buildings on the site does not negate the responsibility to safeguard bat populations. Compliance with these regulations is crucial, it is necessary to reject the development proposal and uphold the conservation of bats within the area.

According to the "Land Quality Assessment" document, the presence of asbestos has been identified in the existing made ground. The report highlights the potential for disturbance of asbestos-containing materials during the proposed construction activities, leading to the release of airborne fibres. This concern is compounded by the previous experience of dust accumulation on vehicles in Ember Farm Way during the construction of the Cala Homes development on Orchard Lane. The airborne asbestos fibres or dust generated from the construction of the proposed development pose a serious health hazard to individuals in close proximity. It is crucial to address and mitigate this risk to safeguard the well-being of the community and the current plans do not do so sufficiently enough.

The proposed site lighting plan document lacks information regarding the placement and potential luminance effects of the red/green signal control system lights responsible for managing traffic entering and exiting the basement car park. The absence of such details raises concerns about the visibility and potential impact of these lights on the surroundings.

My family and I have resided at 71 Ember Farm Way for over three decades. There are a magnitude of reasons why this application should be rejected, but to witness a development of such immense scale and density so close to our home that it will significantly compromise any reasonable amount of privacy, will truly be the most heart-breaking. I strongly request that this application be rejected.