Dear Sirs and Madam, in advance of the meeting of the Surbiton Neighbourhood Committee (the “Committee”) on Wed 13 June 2018 regarding the above planning application, I wish to table additional material for consideration by Planning Officers and the Committee members. I would ask that this letter is passed to the Committee for their consideration in advance of the meeting.

1. Images of site and surrounds

Please see enclosed in exhibits containing images of the development and surrounds including comments to highlight concerns raised by various objectors:

Exhibit 1 - is the CGI image uploaded by the Applicant. It important to note that this is not an accurate representation of the site as it shows a large expanse of green grass in front of the lane which does not exist.
Exhibits 2 and 3 provide a true representation of the lane and demonstrating how the development will clearly change the nature of lane, imposing a new dominant building line on the narrow lane, removing a significant number of trees and putting at risk various protected trees on the left of the picture:

(a) Exhibit 2 shows the TPO Horse Chestnut whose canopy and therefore route system extends far over the development site.

(b) Exhibit 3 shows 7-8 protected Lime Trees bordering the lane the protection of which is not considered in the development proposals or proposed approval. Any lane widening could clearly damage these trees.

Exhibits 4 and 5 show the extent of the trunk and route system of the Horse Chestnut which are actually on the lane and at great risk of ongoing damage from lane widening, construction
works or new traffic on the lane. The Leyland Cyprus on the left of the picture are refer to as 1 hedge in the tree reports - this is actually a row of 19 large trees to be wholly removed.

Exhibit 4 - Proposed area of Lane widening - Horse Chestnut (T15) on right whose canopy and route system clearly extend into development site and at risk for damage for any lane widening

Exhibit 5 - The trunk of the large horse chestnut (T15) is actually protruding onto the lane. It is not clear how and lane widening would be possible without damaging this TPO tree
Exhibits 6 and 7 demonstrate the narrowness of the lane in sections that will not be possible to widen. It is hard to see how the safety of pedestrians will not be compromised by significant increase in traffic.

Exhibit 6 - Un-widened portion of lane and protected lime trees on left of image

Exhibit 7 - Small car on lane entry to demonstrate narrowness. With increase traffic safety will be compromised as widening is not possible. Large trucks on construction will clearly cause potential damage to trees and structures
Exhibit 8 and 8b - shows an image of Southborough Road which is a wide avenue that can accommodate large houses like those in the proposed development. The houses are well set back from the large avenue and have significant larger land plots. Using Southborough Rd (or Ditton Rd) as a justification for the scale of the houses on the development site is not comparable.

Exhibit 8 - View of Southborough Lane. A wide avenue that can accommodate large houses like in the proposed development - unlike the lane. The street scape of Southborough Rd should not be used as a justification for the development.

Exhibit 8b - houses on Southborough Road
Exhibits 9 and 10 show houses on Malcolm Drive and Dunton Close which are more comparable to the Lane - smaller 4 bed houses over 2 floors. The proposed development given its sheer size is also incongruent with the houses on these smaller roads.

As exhibit 10 shows the Lane is about half the width of Dunton Close.

Exhibit 9 - Smaller house sizes on Malcolm Drive close more comparable to the lane

Exhibit 10 - A view down Dunton close showing smaller 4 bed 2 storey houses. At the middle of the picture the Lane can be seen which is half the width of Dunton Close which demonstrates what an imposing impact the development will have on the street scape of the Lane
2. Additional planning considerations

Policy Guidance 7 and 8 of the Residential Design SPD 2013

The development does not appear consistent with Policy Guidance 7 and 8 of the Residential Design SPD 2013 and therefore we ask the Planning Officers and Committee members to consider this in their deliberations.

a) Removal of trees - RPD PG7 says:

“Generally there will be a presumption against the loss of trees - regardless of whether they are protected by virtue of a tree preservation order or with respect to their location within a designated conservation area.

Where a development proposal involves the removal of a tree on site, the applicant will be expected to demonstrate that ...(b) 2 replacement trees can be planted on-site.”

This policy is repeated in DM10 of the RBK Core Strategy adopted in April 2012 which says where trees are to be removed the council will require “two specimens for each tree lost”.

29 of 33 trees (14 large trees identified on site plus the 19 large Leyland Cypress referred to as one hedge in the report) are proposed to be removed from the site and there is no clear provision for the replacement for these. In addition legal agreements actually prevent tree replacement on the rear of the block as detailed in section 3 of this letter.

Policy Guidance 8 - Garden Development

It is not clear how the proposed development is consistent with PG8 as detailed by my comments below in red in brackets:

PG 8 says - "New residential development on garden land which is out of character with the existing form of development and urban grain will be resisted. Comprehensive developments that create a sense of place in themselves will be considered subject to the criteria below:

- (a) Development proposals must incorporate existing landscape features and harmonise with the character and setting of area.

[Comment - The exhibited pictures demonstrate, in my opinion, the development does not harmonise with the rural lane on which it is located nor with the properties on comparable lanes or indeed Southborough Road. In 2006 the Inspector who rejected a similar 2 house development on the same site noted the same saying:

“In my opinion, the informality, and an associated sense of undeveloped space, contribute to the setting of the large houses, and more generally, to the distinctive character of the conservation area.”]

- (b) Development proposals should broadly accord with the existing plot ratio of the site, e.g. ratio of built floor space to undeveloped land.

[Comment - The plot ratio is approximately 0.5 which is out of keeping with both properties surrounding it both immediately and in Southborough. A plot ratio of 0.5 is more akin to semi-detached Victorian terrace houses in Surbiton.]

- (c) There should be no net loss of trees on site.

[Comment - There will be a significant loss of trees 29 of 33 trees to be removed. By way of comparison the existing single house development approved on the same involved the loss of only 3 of 33 trees with shows how over-development can impact a site]

- (d) Established building lines should be maintained.

[Comment - the new development will significantly change the building line on the Lane]
- (e) **Safe and suitably landscaped** [vehicular] access to a site will be a prerequisite. Private and communal open space should be incorporated to the standards listed below under Movement and Amenity.

[Comment - the narrowness of Lane and increased proposed traffic of 6 new cars and deliveries will compromise the safety of users which includes elderly and schoolchildren who regularly use it to access hook road and bus routes. The lane cannot be widened in various parts]

- (f) Threats to the amenity of existing neighbouring dwellings should not be introduced for example through overlooking from new windows or overshadowing from new buildings.

[Comment - the third storey windows will lead to serious overlooking of houses on both Southborough Road (in particular number 8 and 10) and Ditton Road (in particular No 86-90).

In addition the occupiers of neighbouring property Glenmore have submitted concerns that the rear building line (South facing) of the proposed house on Plot 1 (adjacent to Glenmore) extends far beyond the rear building line of Glenmore which will block light to both the front and rear of Glenmore.]

- (g) Any car parking lost through redevelopment should be re-provided on-site with care taken to ensure car parking does not dominate the site.”

(a) **CS8 and DM10 of the Councils Core Strategy 2012**

CS8 states that developments in the conservation zone must “have regard to the historical and natural environment” and “relate well to its surroundings”

It is clear from the images submitted that the development will completely change the nature of the lane (as recognised by the Inspector in 2006) and will neither relate well to properties on the lane (or surrounding lanes or indeed the beautiful Edwardian properties located on Southborough Road in terms of style or plot ratio.

DM10 states that the development must consider the “prevailing development typology, including house types, sizes and occupancy” consider the “prevailing density of the surrounding area” and “space between building” and have regard to “the amenities of neighbours including privacy outlook, sunlight and visual intrusion”.

The typology of the proposed developments does not match any of the surrounding properties, the plot ratio at 50% is out of keeping with properties on the lane and (wider conservation area), the building line and spaces between buildings will be fundamentally changed by the development and as noted above the development will have both light and intrusion impacts on multiple neighbours given the nature of of its location. It is therefore not clear how the identified areas of CS8 or DM10 are satisfied.

### 3. Legal Agreements

The planning and tree proposals do not make reference to the covenant contained over the proposed site which **prevents planting of any trees in advance of the border of 88 Ditton Road** which is proposed in the development to offset the loss of trees elsewhere.

As a recent purchaser of 88 Ditton Road this covenant provided comfort that the existing tree line (Trees T5-T8) would be protected and privacy and green outlook would be maintained. Privacy will be significantly impacted if these trees are removed especially by third storey windows. As previously submitted the large trees on the plot contribute greatly to the setting of the surrounding houses on the lane, Ditton Road and Soutborough Road and therefore to the conservation area by creating a feeling of open undeveloped green space.

I note the points submitted in this letter are in addition to the various objections we and other neighbours have already submitted.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.
Yours faithfully

Mr D Barton and Ms A Ren
88 Ditton Rd, Surbiton
barton.da@gmail.com