

**Our reference:** COM602708393

**Application number:** 2023/2860

**Application address:** Land West Of 10 To 26 And Land At 12 Claygate Lane Esher Surrey KT10 0AQ

**Name:** Mrs Robertson

**Address:** 13 Cumberland Drive, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0BG

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

**Date of comment:** 04 Apr 2024

**Comment:** We continue to strongly object to this proposed development for the numerous reasons outlined in our objection to the original proposal which we submitted on 4/12/2023.

This revised plan does not address any of the issues raised in the original proposal and so remains unacceptable. To reiterate our objection, semi mature trees and boundary treatments are unspecified, therefore we are unable to assess the direct impact to our outlook. However from the plans it is clear that our privacy will be significantly impacted due to the imposing building of plots 6&7 which will front directly onto our garden, home office at the rear of our garden, patio and our main family room/kitchen. We will be significantly overlooked and this loss of privacy remains completely unacceptable, which is compounded by the loss of screening due to the construction of the access road. From the plans it is clear that the access road is not of sufficient width to comfortably accommodate the heavy duty vehicles which will service the development and will be positioned directly behind the rear border of our property presenting a significant concern in terms of noise, security, privacy, light pollution and risk given the road width. In addition it is also clear that the foundations of the road will need to be of significant depth, which will damage the roots of already established trees on our and neighbours boundaries. There are 2 well established Silver Birch trees in our garden and an Oak tree in the neighbouring garden, as well as the foundations for our garden room close to the boundary. This revised plan continues to significantly impact our privacy, security and outlook in a way that is completely unacceptable. Therefore we feel this development should be rejected.