

Our reference: COM602841814

Application number: 2023/2860

Application address: Land West Of 10 To 26 And Land At 12 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: 04 Apr 2024

Comment: The revised plans that have been submitted, still do not address several of the problems that have been pointed out, over the previous submission. Even the few problems that have been addressed have been inadequate. This is symptomatic of a poorly thought out attempt to shoe horn an unviable development on the Land West Of 10 To 26 And Land At 12 Claygate Lane Esher Surrey KT10 0AQ.

The narrow width of the access road and carriageway will still create a problem for traffic on Claygate Lane and for heavy vehicles, such as Fire Engines and Refuse trucks trying to reach the properties in the plan, especially at end of the new carriageway, where they will have to negotiate a 5 point turn to return back to the access road entrance. It will be difficult enough trying to ensure that other vehicles on their drives in the plan, won't be hit inadvertently on a good day, but just imagine it when the weather creates poor visibility or icy conditions. Both Surrey Fire and Rescue and Joint Waste Solutions, should be consulted again, as required by the "Health Streets for Surrey" document, as it doesn't comply with their minimum requirements.

The safety of pedestrians is also of concern, particularly during the morning and afternoon school run. The ability to park along Claygate Lane to pick and drop off children will be reduced, causing more hazards for children going to and from school.

The reptile survey carried out by Animal Ecology & Wildlife Consultants, clearly states that the majority of the habitat area on site, would be negatively affected by this development. They state that a large proportion of the western side of the site, could not be accessed due to dense scrub and so weren't investigated, even though they would be suitable for use by reptiles. I contend that a much more thorough investigation should be done, as I have had frogs appear in my garden, indicating the presence of reptiles in areas that weren't covered by the survey.

As has been said before, there are no benefits to anyone in the neighbourhood from this development, only increased hazards, noise, traffic, damage to trees, reduced biodiversity, light pollution, scarring of the character of the area an increased risk of flooding and newly added access to people's back gardens, with concomitant increase in risk to the security of their properties surrounding the development.

I wholly object to the development.