

## **Objection to Proposals to develop 400+ houses in Pyrford**

Antony Williams [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 July 2015 15:55

To: Planning Policy

Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam,

I write to express my sincere concerns on the matter of the proposal to develop over 400 houses in Pyrford either side of Upshot Lane. The specific reasons for objecting are as follows:-

As a village, Pyrford provides relatively unspoilt countryside for many residents and visitors to enjoy. It is the rural feel of the village which attracts walkers, nature lovers, cyclists, canoeists, barge owners and many more visitors to spend their leisure time in Pyrford. It is also precisely these attractive features which make Pyrford a desirable and peaceful place to live. The wealth of heritage sites, St Nicholas Church, Ladyplace Barns, Wheeler Farm, Pyrford Place, Newark Priory and many more are currently able to survive, albeit precariously at certain times of day, in a relatively peaceful setting. Further development of the scale planned and at the proposed location would have a drastic impact on these precious heritage assets.

In recent years there has been increasing strain put on the road system with highways frequently becoming congested through the village, particularly at school drop off and pick up times. Only a few months ago a child was knocked down near the school at collection time.

Our Village is a community where people want to live and much of this revolves about the pleasant environment. Safety is of paramount importance and the character of the village and its wide blend of facilities is something which once destroyed cannot readily be re-created.

It would be unrealistic not to concede that some change and development must occur in order for Pyrford to continue being a thriving community now and for the future. That said, a wholesale change to the character of the village through building 433 new houses in a location as planned will undoubtedly present a host of infrastructure issues, namely; traffic congestion and road safety, water supply and sewerage, lack of school and nursery places, need for a larger church, children's recreational area and so on.

I suggest it would be far more prudent to focus upon the supply of suitable downsizing apartments for mature citizens who want to stay in the area but cannot find a suitable new home, thereby releasing larger houses for growing families. Also, at the other end of the age scale we could encourage some affordable homes which are currently lacking in Pyrford. My point is to say that I do accept some need for further expansion of housing stock but it should be in keeping with the village as it stands and enhance its beauty and facilities rather than placing colossal strain on an already overburdened infrastructure. If Pyrford is to accommodate some housing of the type mentioned above it occurs to me that discrete and modest developments on either Pyford Road or near Shey Copse would be a far better choice of site than on Upshot Lane.

I do hope that you will give deep thought and consideration to the above comments, together with those expressed by the many other Pyrford residents who feel very strongly about preserving the essence of this lovely village which was listed in the domesday book and has thrived ever since.

Thank you,

Yours faithfully,

Antony G Williams  
25, Hamilton Avenue  
Pyrford, Surrey, GU22 8RS

---

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  
[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)