

Our reference: COM567511999

Application number: 2023/2860

Application address: Land at 12 and Land West of 10 to 26 Claygate Lane Esher Surrey KT10 0AQ

Name: Mr Moylett

Address: 22 Giggs Hill Gardens, Thames Ditton, Surrey, KT7 0AT

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 06 Dec 2023

Comment: Having lived on Chesterfield Drive and the surrounding area for over 25 years, I object to the application on the following grounds:

Safety, security and traffic:

The entrance/exit from the proposed site is opposite Hinchley Wood School on Claygate Lane which has in the region of 1800 pupils attending across the Primary and Secondary schools, supported by teaching staff, other support workers etc. In short, it's a busy road. All of the surrounding roads are already largely impassable during normal drop-off and pick-up times. Any suggestion that this is a quiet residential road at all times is implausible.

The addition of construction traffic to the area over a prolonged period is likely to completely shut Claygate Lane at various times each working day and consequently completely clog up the surrounding roads. This significantly increases the likelihood of accidents, damage to cars parked on the surrounding roads, making it impossible to access and leave residential driveways, inability for council lorries (refuse collection etc.) and delivery drivers to navigate etc.

Finally, importantly, the location of the site introduces the potential for access to the rear gardens of numerous properties on Claygate Lane, Chesterfield Drive and Cumberland Drive, which currently can only be accessed from the front 'in plain sight'. This creates a new security risk for many of the surrounding properties.

Flood risk:

As reported in the application, Claygate Lane is in an area "at risk of flooding". The addition of the planned nine dwellings plus the removal of mature trees and their roots increases this risk. Perhaps unsurprisingly, I couldn't locate any plans/offers for the developers to pick up the cost of future flooding, insurance cover etc. despite acknowledging this dynamic.

Biodiversity, ecology and environmental:

The woodland and surrounding area is populated and visited by a range of birds and mammals including bats (which AEWC didn't appear to evidence despite acknowledging "the building having high potential to support roosting bats".) Additionally, a significant number of mature trees used by the local wildlife are planned to be removed which is appalling.

There is likely to be increase in light and noise pollution both during construction and subsequently, given the communal nature of the gardens.

I would also point out that the layout of the properties on the site is totally out of keeping with the surrounding area in terms of layout, design, communal gardens etc.

Other:

For all the fluffy language contained in the plans, there is no provision for affordable housing in the development so my conclusion is that the project is entirely focused on profit generation.