

## Site Allocations objections

Gary Keaney [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 July 2015 15:58

To: Planning Policy

Hello there,

I have been researching the various development proposals to the West Byfleet area, and believe this is the correct address to send them to? Unfortunately I didn't attend the local meeting so I'm relying on my interpretation from reading it myself but I have outlined my concerns below;

GB15 – massive concern here, this is a substantial size of greenbelt area being destroyed. Appreciate the need to provide more housing is a general aim, but surely not at such a high cost. This is an exceptionally beautiful area for the community, enjoyed by a large amount of people. Destroying such an area would have a massive impact on the community. Something which has made West Byfleet what it is.

GB16 – similar reasons as above but this is not having such a larger impact (size wise) and also not on the areas in frequent use. I would say providing research premises would help diversify the area, almost justifying the removal of the green belt area even if this vague and I imagine hard to ensure. General office space also doesn't seem required, as there is still vacant office in the community that should be put to better use. Also with several retirement homes in and around the area, is there a need to introduce more & the expense of green belt areas?

Ultimately the above 2 areas should be improved as green belt areas, this is where investment should focus, this is what the land was designated as green belt for, not offices & houses.

UA50 – Agree with using a small area for commercial use but encroaching into the car park area and sticking residential properties above them seems like shoehorning a use in rather than using a sensible opportunity. I would argue the car park is required, with the area in general having very tight parking restrictions to try address this. For example I live 10 minutes' walk from the station, without a designated car park space and my whole street is pay & display so clearly there is a need for a car park whilst also another reason to reduce more residents & vehicles so close to central West Byfleet.

UA51 – again, why not stick to modernising what's there, improving the happy community we have without still shoehorning in more properties.

UA52 – what does 're-provisioning' entail? Sounds like moving away elements that's beneficial to the community, sporting clubs and recreational clubs for the local youth.

Facilities we should focus on developing, improving & expanding, not impacting to squeeze in more homes wherever. This is also a very narrow section of the street, any issues residents here have with traffic, and the nearby school, will only be increased with more residents.

I have tried to itemise the areas for each proposal, but ultimately the bottom line is there is no justification for more residents at the expense of areas that are core to the community. We should be striving to build & improve the local community, encroaching on green belt areas, basically natural boundaries, between various communities will simply remove our sense of identity. These are reasons I saved as much as I could to buy a property in such a well-established community, which I hoped to be part of for the foreseeable future without the fear of having my home changed beyond recognition.

It's a very sensitive area, and the balance of transport (vehicles & train) will be massive damaged with the addition of so many more people. Then we have the services in place, which is suitable for such a sized community and none of the plans highlight things like;

New or expanded health centre

New school

Widened roads

Increased parking

Rail link service expansion

Alternative greenery areas for communal enjoyment

The above concerns have not been addressed in these proposals, I don't believe West Byfleet can sustain such an expansion and neither should we lose our only readily accessible green belt area.

My details if required;

Gary Keaney

Flat 7 Century House

23 Rosemount Avenue

West Byfleet

KT14 6LB

[Redacted]

Regards,

Gary Keaney

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

|

[Redacted]