

**Our reference:** COM616390011

**Application number:** 2023/2889

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

**Name:** Mr Barber

**Address:** 27 Copse Road, Cobham, Surrey, KT11 2TN

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

**Date of comment:** 21 May 2024

**Comment:** Comment: We have reviewed the amended and additional documentation provided by Shanly Homes in support of their original application 2023/2889. However, we are disappointed to find that the amendments and additions do little, if anything, to address the objections we and many other local residents have to this original proposal. We believe it still falls well short of the standards embodied in the Elmbridge Development Management Plan (EDMP), Supporting Design & Character SPD and other related Elmbridge documented policies, as follows:

1. Overdevelopment

Unchanged. The revised proposal is still proposing 57.8 dwellings per hectare (dph) – nearly 45% higher than Elmbridge's target of 40 dph, as specified in the EDMP and supporting Design & Character SPD and compared to 41 dph, for existing properties, based on 65 residential properties spread over an area of approximately 1.6 hectares. As proposed, the scheme does not 'protect the unique character of the borough or enhance the high quality of the built, historic and natural environment', which (as paragraph 2.2 of the EDMP states), is one of the key objectives of the borough's Core Strategy.

2. Overshadowing:

Unchanged. With the height of buildings on Plots 1 to 8 at 9.5 metres; our property will be overshadowed by the buildings on plots 1&2. Currently, there is only a bungalow on the Glenelm site, which does not overshadow any of the surrounding properties.

We note that blocks 19 – 26 (facing Anyards Road) have been reduced to two storeys without 'roof-space accommodation', reducing the overall height of these blocks by a full 1.5 metres and now 0.5 metres lower than Blocks 1 to 8.

Why can't the same reduction be made to Blocks 1 to 8, where more properties are affected by overshadowing and to a greater extent?

3. Loss of Privacy:

Unchanged. The proposed development is changing from a site occupied by a single bungalow which does not overlook any of the surrounding properties, to three levels of accommodation, the top two levels of which will give us no privacy at all.

Block 1, as planned, will directly overlook our kitchen/dining area and outdoor area at the rear of our property and will face directly into our master bedroom at first floor level.

As for item 2 above, this issue has been at least partially addressed for blocks 19 to 26 - why can't the same reduction be made to Blocks 1 to 8.

4. Ridge Heights of the New Buildings:

Unchanged: With the exception of blocks 19 to 26; but this makes no improvement for the residents of Copse Road and the other blocks are still 'out of keeping' with the local environment.

#### 5. Transport:

Unchanged: Superficial changes to the width of Anyards Road will make no difference to traffic congestion in the area. Copse Road and surrounding roads are severely congested at various times of the day and night, particularly when there are problems on the M25/A3. The increased density of traffic due to overdevelopment (Item 1 above) will only make this worse.

#### 6. Garden Size and Space

Unchanged: The existing site comprises 1970 square metres of landscaped/grassed areas. The proposed development will reduce this to 12 small gardens, total approximately 600-650 square metres of green (not including patios, etc).

#### 7. Construction Standards

Unchanged: Additionally, we are concerned with various reviews of the developer, not in keeping with the standards we would expect of such a development in Cobham.

#### 8. Loss of Biodiversity

We note that the 'Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment' prepared by Ecology Partnership issued 31 March 2024 indicates under Section 6.0 'Conclusions', subsection 6.1:

'The baseline condition of habitats on site is considered to be low, given the dominance of low value vegetated garden and hardstanding.'

However, Surrey Wildlife's document 168405/NW/001 dated 05 February 2024 queries, under 'Requirement to Demonstrate a Measurable Biodiversity Net Gain', the ecologist's assessment of the area being 'vegetated garden', given that Google aerial imagery indicates shows several trees 'which appear to have been felled'.

Local residents will confirm that there were indeed numerous trees on the property, which were felled over a week-long period (or longer) in 2021.

Therefore, we question the baseline used for the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment.

There appears to be no evidence to suggest that Surrey Wildlife's recommendation (page 5 of their document) that 'LPA seeks further justification from the ecologist for estimating the baseline of the recently cleared habitats as vegetated garden given the apparent loss of trees' has been taken into account.