

**Our reference:** COM572986296

**Application number:** 2023/2889

**Application address:** Land Off Anyards Road and Copse Road Cobham Surrey KT11 2LH

**Name:** Mr Webb

**Address:** 10 Leigh Road, Cobham, Surrey, KT11 2LD

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

**Date of comment:** 30 Dec 2023

**Comment:** I object to the scale of this development and I additionally have very real concerns that some aspects of the site have been ignored or not addressed seriously. My objections are summarised as follows:

- 1) Density of housing, which is not consistent with the area.
- 2) Inadequate provision of parking on the site. Using the developer's figures (26 units containing 49 bedrooms) and car ownership figures from the Elmbridge Development Plan it is reasonable to assume that full occupancy of the site will result in at least 60 additional cars/vans. In fact, this is a conservative estimate and, as the DMP points out, "one of the key findings of this group is the amount of car and vans that people own, which is often more than 3". As such I think it's reasonable to assume that the actual car/van ownership may well exceed the provision of 41 proposed places by at least 20 - 25. (Although I note that the Residential Travel Plan gives the total spaces to be created as 39 and not 41 as stated in the application form). Many of the existing garages due for demolition had been rented by local residents who are now parking on very busy local streets. There is currently no capacity for additional street parking and dangerous, antisocial parking on street corners, across driveways and access roads and across pavements is a common, daily occurrence in the area. Traffic queues are increasingly common on the A307 (Portsmouth Road) due to the heavy traffic (especially at peak times) and dense street parking on Copse Road in particular. The small, local car park provided for users of the Anyards Road Recreation Ground is frequently unavailable for that purpose since it is used as an overflow car park when the surrounding streets are full. The proposed development will lead to a significant and dangerous worsening of the existing traffic and parking problems.
- 3) It is known locally that the site suffers repeatedly from a degree of groundwater flooding, the cause of which is not entirely clear, although there is reported to be an underground stream close to or under the site in question. This issue does not seem to have been addressed adequately in the planning documents.
- 4) Local streets suffer from low water pressure which, in many properties, barely meets the statutory minimum pressure. Recent work on the water supply in the area has had little or no impact on the problem. I see no assurance that this significant extra demand on water supply can be met safely.
- 5) The proposed development on plots 19-26, in particular, makes no concessions at all to the surrounding area and changes the character of its surroundings, which consists largely of smaller, Victorian properties.

6) Access from site into Anyards Road is very close to the road junction and is highly likely to increase the risk of collisions given the often excessive speed of vehicles turning off the A307 (Portsmouth Road). I would also suggest that visibility from this access road will remain considerably less clear than suggested in the planning documents.

7) Loss of trees. The tree survey in the current application seems to be based upon the fact that no MORE trees will be felled. However, this is not the first application of this type for this site and the tree survey submitted as part of application 2021/3243 shows 2 trees which had “been felled prior to application” and goes on to state that “other trees and shrubs have been felled prior to survey”. This implies to me that, after the site was fenced off by the developers, trees had already been felled without reference to any interested parties. In other words, there is apparently no or minimal loss of trees because they have already been quietly felled. This is both bizarre and troubling logic, particularly on a site where, as noted in point 3 above, groundwater flooding is a known issue.