

**Our reference:** COM567513597

**Application number:** 2023/2860

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

**Name:** Mr Mackenzie

**Address:** 24 Claygate Lane, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0AQ

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

**Date of comment:** 06 Dec 2023

**Comment:** I would like to object to the application by Wynngate to develop the land at 12 and land west of 10-26 Claygate Lane, Esher, for the following reasons and in no particular order.

#### Noise

The peace and tranquillity of the environs will be disturbed by shoeorning properties into the woodland that backs up against our gardens, changing the character and view currently afforded by our gardens. The noise, if any, from across the opposite gardens are currently absorbed by the trees in the woodland lying between them. Removing them and then adding cars and people in between will greatly contribute to the disturbance of the peace and quiet.

#### Security

At the moment, the back gardens of all the properties surrounding this proposed development are protected by the enclosed nature of the woodlands, that lay between them. By introducing a new road into the woodland, it will not only allow anyone to have easy access to the back garden's fence of the properties around the proposed development, but also allows for a quick get away. This is just unacceptable.

#### Loss of Biodiversity

Wildlife thrives in the peace, serenity and shelter provided by the woodlands, as evidenced by the mammals and birds that frequent our gardens. This will be completely destroyed, by the development on the woodland and contrary to Elmbridge Biodiversity strategy set out in Policy CS15, DM21. The fact, that the developer has chosen not to provide a habitat survey or ecological appraisal and has provided only severely limited bat and reptile surveys, shows they intend to downplay the loss of biodiversity engendered by their development, as there is no way this development could ever preserve, maintain or improve on the biodiversity.

#### Light Pollution

At the moment the back of the garden overlooks a serene woodland and no one would know that there were houses beyond that view. The introduction of street and property lighting, due to the development, would destroy this aspect of the gardens outlook and completely change the character of our gardens.

#### Out of Character Development

The development is completely out of character with all the properties surrounding it. They do not align with the layout of the surrounding properties, nor do they provide any amenities. There is nothing to recommend this development. The properties will overlook our gardens, where there

were none, reducing our privacy. There is nothing in this development that preserves, let alone enhances the character of the area.

#### Flooding

The run off from the roads, hard standing and pavement in the development would increase the risk of flooding on to Claygate Lane and potentially affect the entrance to the school for staff and pupils. Not only that, but the removal of 35 to 40 trees, that absorbs the rainfall and improves the drainage, would also cause an increase in the risk of flooding.

#### Traffic on the Road

Claygate Lane, is an already busy road that results in gridlock during school opening and closing times and also because it connects to the Kingston bypass. The addition of an entrance to the planned cul-de-sac on this stretch of the road, will only increase the risk of accidents to cars and pedestrians harming the area even more.

#### Destruction of Elmbridge Local Heritage Asset

In Elmbridge's list of local heritage assets, it describes the property at The Woodlands, 112 Manor Road North as a RARITY which unusually retains a long narrow plot and gives it a criterion of A. The long narrow plot being the woodland between our gardens. In its Foreword, it states that "As a Regulatory Planning Authority and landowner the Council has a duty to care for its historic environment and the assets it contains". It goes on to say under the heading Planning for our heritage "In doing so, they should recognise that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. The presumption is to deliver sustainable development and conserving and harnessing the heritage should play an important part in this process". I would suggest that the unusually long narrow plot is part of that heritage and therefore in order to conserve it, it has to be left undeveloped, as required by Elmbridge's own policies.

In conclusion, all this development offers, is a loss of biodiversity, loss to the character of the area, loss of a part of a Heritage Asset, loss to the security of the residents, loss to the peace and tranquillity of the area and loss of privacy. There is just harm and no gain for any of the residents and the development should be rejected in its entirety.