

Our reference: COM567806631

Application number: 2023/2860

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

Name: Mrs Thompson

Address: 43 Harefield, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9TG

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 07 Dec 2023

Comment: Traffic, safety and security

Claygate Lane is already an extremely busy road particularly at peak times of the day. New parking restrictions were introduced in the last two years or so to cope with on-going congestion. The proposed development will only serve to increase congestion. The site entrance, opposite Hinchley Wood School, is narrow with no 'swing' room for large heavy trucks carrying bulk materials during the building phase and post building, weekly refuse collection, delivery/removal vans, utilities etc. There is not enough provision for parking in the finished development nor for the many 'site workers' during the site construction. All this creates a huge risk to the children, parents and residents as well as months of disruption and further frustration for residents and those who work at the schools and nurseries nearby.

We have recently lived through the disruption, noise and inconvenience of another development in the immediate area across the road in Manor Road North.

Woodland and Biodiversity

The site is a natural woodland, with 6 TPO's. It provides a haven for wildlife, flora and fauna alike as well as a quiet, green enclave for residents backing on to it. The presence of trees maintains air quality and provides a cooling effect to the surrounding areas during increasingly hotter summers. The destruction of such a natural 'protector' is unfathomable.

Construction alone would seriously damage and most likely destroy the natural root structures of many existing trees, mature hedges, shrubs etc. including the TPO trees.

Security would also become an increased risk to local residents with easier access to the rear gardens of adjoining properties.

Hinchley Wood continues to see back land developments which do not improve residents' quality of life; furthermore, there is no corresponding improvement of services and amenities.

The continual development of green space and gardens is increasing the density of housing and placing yet more demand on schools, health provision and utilities as well as changing the character of the area. For the reasons outlined above I oppose the application.