

**Our reference:** COM616466993

**Application number:** 2023/2889

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

**Name:** Ms Little

**Address:** 128 Portsmouth Road, Cobham, Surrey, KT11 1HX

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

**Date of comment:** 22 May 2024

**Comment:** Part Two

The proposed Shanly homes buildings would be of a different style, material and an additional story higher than the majority of the surrounding buildings. All the surrounding existing properties have large gardens. The average existing garden is 135-165 square meters. The proposed properties have no gardens at all or very small gardens of only 120 m<sup>2</sup>. This does not provide adequate green space, for the new occupants. In addition, the much higher density housing and considerably smaller gardens would alter the character of the local area. Especially considering that Copse Road, Anyards Road and Portsmouth Road neighbouring house have smaller gardens than almost all the other neighbouring houses, this development does not satisfy the preservation of local character.

7. Lack of Biodiversity - Suboptimal assessment undertaken of the impact on the local wildlife with zero consideration for the soprano and common pipistrelle bat populations that have been lodging in the bungalow and foraging in what used to be mature gardens surrounding Glenelm. There is also a breeding pair of Kestrels which fly locally and use Glenelm as a feeding ground due to the number of field mice.

8. Affordable housing

An independent assessment of the viability of affordable housing, given the under-estimation of profit to be derived by the developers.

9. Sustainability

The National planning policy framework aims to foster the delivery of sustainable development in order to “meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” This development is neither fit for purpose nor sustainable and does not pass muster, in particular in aspects of reducing ecological footprint and mitigating climate change. I would urge the planners to seriously consider the addition of green roofs and green living walls to the proposal, to make it more ecologically sound.

I would ask that the committee reject the current proposal, until a more suitable development, sensitive to local needs and future issues is received. As important as it is to optimise the footprint of any new development in line with housing planning targets, the balance on the Glenelm proposal has clearly swung in favour of maximising profit for the developers. This proposal will not create a sustainable development but it could with a reduced number of dwellings per hectare, that better reflects the local character and design (with maximum 2 storeys per dwelling) and includes aspects of sustainability such as underground car parking. Cobham needs affordable 2 and 3 bedroom

homes, but not at the expense of all communal green amenity spaces and wildlife habitat.

The current development does not integrate into its surroundings and only adds to Elmbridge's ecological footprint, reduces local character and will reduce existing as well as future residents' quality of life, with zero environmental benefits and devastate existing irreplaceable wildlife habitats including those of protected species. It has already resulted in the deliberate destruction of mature/veteran trees and shrubs, which were removed without proper authority.

#### 10. Reduction of Amenity - impact on Daylight and sunlight.

My property is North facing and only potentially receives sunlight into the front of the property just before dusk. I am reliant on receiving natural light from the rear of my property to penetrate into the ground floor of the property to minimise usage of electricity both due to cost as a single parent and of course, environmental concerns. The proposed development, in particular plots 7 and 8 which border the southern end of my property, stands at over 8/9 metres high - completely obscuring light from my garden for 6 months of the year from October to March as per [suncalc.org](http://suncalc.org) and significantly reducing the amount of light entering the rear of my property in winter. On the shortest day of the year in December no light will reach my property between sunrise and sunset with zero light or warmth reaching the back of my property at all during the day due to the shadow cast by Plot 7

Thus rendering more than half (10-11m) of my garden unusable for amenity, gardening, and play for 6 months of the year. Even at the height of summer when the sun is at its highest, 5-6 metres will be completely engulfed in shadow. This has a significant impact on my young children's ability to utilise the full extent of our garden for play and on me for mental health and relaxation purposes, not to mention that nothing will grow in complete shadow! Surely it's important to protect all existing natural habitat and hedgerow for insects and bees not remove it entirely? I would ask that the developers consider sustainable green solutions such as living green plant walls which have been shown to reduce the negative impact of the obstruction of natural views by brick

#### 11. Lack of time to object - given less than two weeks to submit complaints