

Our reference: COM602920038

Application number: 2023/2860

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

Name: Mr Seeney

Address: 23 Cumberland Drive, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0BG

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 05 Apr 2024

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed development.

Preservation of biodiversity is a crucial aspect that cannot be overlooked. The site in question harbours a diverse ecosystem, playing host to various wildlife species such as slow worms and bats. These creatures are not only integral components of the local ecosystem but also serve as indicators of environmental health. Slow worms, for instance, are considered protected species due to their declining populations, and their presence indicates a healthy habitat. Similarly, bats play a vital role in maintaining insect populations, thereby contributing to natural pest control and ecosystem balance. Failure to protect this site not only risks disrupting the delicate balance of the local ecosystem but also undermines broader conservation efforts aimed at safeguarding biodiversity for future generations.

The updated proposal misrepresents the actual trees and shrubs on-site. Particularly concerning is the underplaying of the significance of the sixth TPO tree situated behind plot 8, and the lack of clarity regarding the placement of proposed semi-mature trees or shrubs.

Upon overlaying the retained and newly planted flora onto the latest plan, it becomes evident that the already constrained development is severely compromised. The proposed carriageway, already insufficient for accommodating vehicular and pedestrian safety, is further encumbered by the presence of retained trees and shrubs, exacerbating spatial constraints.

The feedback from Joint Waste Solutions highlights the inadequacy of the access road, necessitating a minimum width of 4 meters and caution against assuming forward and reverse gears for exiting the proposed development. Furthermore, the Arboricultural Report's stipulation of a 4-meter minimum height requirement hasn't been addressed.

Consultation with local fire authorities is imperative when considering carriageway widths below 3.7 meters, especially given the proposed shared usage by pedestrians and vehicles. The recommended width of 6 meters for shared carriageways, as per the 'Healthy Streets for Surrey' document, emphasizes the gravity of this safety concern.

Boundary treatments raise additional concerns, as adjacent homeowners' needs have been disregarded. The cramped nature of the site necessitates development up to the boundary, potentially resulting in the destruction of mature trees and the need for substantial excavation and foundation installation, posing a threat to existing flora and structures.

Bin storage accessibility is hindered by car spaces, insufficient in number, and incompatible with the waste disposal needs of Elmbridge residents.

Parking arrangements at Plot 8 further underscore design compromises, requiring sequential movement of vehicles due to spatial limitations.

Regarding the Viability Assessment, Andrew Shiels Architectural Design's report questions the economic feasibility of the development. In the developer's documentation, it's noted that the achieved return falls below the targeted 20% in the majority of scenarios, indicating a high-risk venture.

Granting permission under such circumstances would be counterproductive for all parties involved.