

Our reference: COM603215363

Application number: 2023/2860

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

Name: Mrs Nair

Address: 112 Manor Road North, Esher, Surrey, KT10 0AG

Comment type: You object to the planning application

Date of comment: 05 Apr 2024

Comment: In addition to our objection to the original planning application submitted previously, we strongly object to the revised plans.

The majority of both our and others' objections have not been addressed and those which have are wholly inadequate.

The width of the road running through the site is still insufficient for emergency vehicles and refuse collection vehicles. The access to the site remains dangerous for children, many of whom are unaccompanied on their way to/from either of the two schools. Traffic and parking on Claygate Lane is horrendous at times, frequently gridlocked and a further access road with more dwellings requiring services will only exacerbate an extremely difficult situation. The effect on wildlife/biodiversity is immeasurable and the total lack of care shown by the developers was evident from the bat report they commissioned which was limited solely to 12 Claygate Lane, when it clearly should have focussed on the land and outbuildings on the entire development site - we and our neighbours regularly see bats which most certainly live in the proposed site, along with many other species of animals and birds. Increased risk of flooding has not been addressed and this will surely follow if the green area and the majority of its trees are replaced by concrete and tarmac. Noise and light pollution are a major issue for all surrounding houses which in addition will suffer a huge lack of privacy - the very reason that many of us chose to live here - with consequent safety concerns as our back gardens (previously inaccessible) would be accessible from the proposed site. The revised plans do not now show the trees on the boundary. On the original plans, the RPA of one of the trees at the end of our garden would clearly have been compromised by the foundations of Plots 3,4,5. Similarly, there are trees in neighbours' gardens which would be compromised by the removal of trees on the development side of the boundary. The loss of the trees on the development site would be hugely detrimental to us all and to the wildlife which live there but the consequent loss of mature trees in our gardens because their roots are intertwined with trees being removed from the development site would be unforgivable, also with consequent further loss of natural screening/privacy.

In short, this is a very constrained greenfield site and the proposed development is simply not viable.