

Green belt review -GB10 - OBJECTION

Sarah Ellis [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 July 2015 22:09

To: Planning Policy

Cc: [REDACTED]

Sarah Plastow
11 Saunders Lane
Mayford
Woking
Surrey

29 July 2015

Dear Woking Borough Council

One of the few things in life you can choose is where you live, I have been lucky enough to live in Mayford for 9 years, chosen for the space around and low volume of housing. If I had wanted to live in on a housing estate I would have saved myself money and moved to goldsworth park!!!!!!

I completely object to the removal of green belt status for Mayford in particular GB10 for the following reasons. (Listed in no particular order)

There is no mention of where these extra people will go to school, the schools are already at breaking point. No mention of doctors or dentist, you can't actually get a doctors appointment now!! No mention of increasing St Peters hospital to accommodate the new residents, last winter st peters's was at breaking point...so let's stretch it further and risk even more peoples lives!!

There is no mention of how W B C plan to deal with the increase in car volume, it already takes me 30 min on a good morning to get into Woking to work. With the new development in woking town centre and chaos to traffic this will no doubt be made much longer anyway but add on a further 600 hundred cars trying to get out of Mayford alone it will be impossible it will also raise pollution and noise levels in the areas. There isn't even a decent bus service to use, I can't get a parking space at worpolsden station either...

There is no mention of the pressure all these new homes will have on the utilities, can the sewers cope, will I still have water?? The previous winter there was a minor leak in Westfield and I had no water for nearly a day...my guess is no, the utilities won't cope, requiring further upheaval in digging up roads to try fix the problem. More disruption, noise etc!!!!!!

The site of GB10 is prone to flooding and causes flooding of Saunders Lane, I see no mention of how this will be dealt with. The storm ditches and drains don't cope now in the winter.

The field opposite is contaminated, no mention of what with...will the building work if approved cause a further risk to our healths, I have two small children as I live opposite If it is Asbestos, then probably!!

In fact the Home Secretary on radio 4 the other day in an interview said that brownfield sites are always the preferred option when looking at new

housing schemes because a green belt scheme usually entails a high volume of houses and a substantial investment in new infrastructure is always needed alongside these type of housing, I see no evidence of any thought of investment into any new infrastructure plans. The A320 is at bursting point now!!!!!!!

You are committing a terrible injustice to the people of Mayford who have chosen to live in a semi rural location, we all paid to live there. It was our choice....and what you are proposing to do, takes the choice away and creates a housing estate of a tremendous scale and with devastating effects on the people of Mayford by making it over run with people and houses. The cost to me will be immense in devaluing my house (as confirmed by all local estate agents!!!!) risking my health with contamination and pressure on hospitals and doctors. It will also devastate the local wildlife.

I was also informed when we bought the house that the land opposite my house was not only green belt land the trees are also all protected as they are valuable oak trees and the field was also part of the Farnborough airfield safety zone....does this not count anymore??

It's just a money making scheme for the council to get more council tax and the developers a big fat profit with no thought to the current residents.

I look forward to your response

Sarah Plastow

Sent from my iPad