

Objection to the proposal to set aside land for development in Pyrford on sites GB12 and GB13

Sent: 12 July 2015 13:19

To: Planning Policy

Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to object to the proposal to set aside land for development in Pyrford, specifically the areas identified in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document as Sites GB12 and GB13.

Here are my reasons.

1. We moved into Pyrford because it was a friendly, supportive community, it is quiet and charming with a village feel and has good access to green belt land for walking and enjoying the wildlife. Adding 400 houses (and therefore around another 1000+ people, around 20% of the current population) will, in my view, have a negative impact on the character of the village and its ambience in the green belt.
2. Adding 400+ houses (and therefore I imagine around 1500+ people) will increase the population of Pyrford by around 20%. This is a massive increase and is bound to put strain on the local infrastructure. Even now the main road through Pyrford gets busy, especially at certain times during the day and week. There is little scope for widening this road and putting additional traffic on it will, at best, cause much more congestion (and possibly gridlock at peak times), pollution and at worst increase the likelihood of an accident (there was an accident involving a child recently and more traffic = more probability of this). It will also create more traffic cutting through Engliff and Boltons lane (for access to the A3) creating more noise, pollution and danger to children where I live.
3. Where will the children go to school? The existing primary school is being rebuilt, but will still only be a 2 form entry. 400 houses = approx. 600 children which, over say 20 years is 30 per year. This is enough for an additional form, so where will they go?
4. Adding 400 new houses on these particular fields will spoil the countryside. One of the main reasons I chose to live here was the access to the countryside. I enjoy the walk up Sandy Lane as do many others and this development will spoil the views and the open feel on both sides of Sandy Lane. These developments will also have an adverse impact on the many houses that back onto these fields.

5. Additionally, the community came together to plant 1000 new trees along Sandy Lane. What will happen to these trees? If you leave them they will impact the houses just the other side and frankly if you try to remove them you will completely undermine the effort of the community members who planted them.
6. Why do you need to build on green belt anyway? Who exactly is pushing for this and why, when as recently as 10th July this year, Business Secretary Sajid Javid, supported by George Osborne, announced new plans to ease the planning regulations for brown field sites stating that there was "no need" to build on green belt land to meet the government's targets. He said "The green belt can be rightly protected. There is plenty of land which is not green belt that we can build on and which is suitable for housing and we need to get on with it. We need to find new ways to encourage it."
7. In addition to the point above, this government also introduced the localism act which allows local communities to develop their own plans. We in Pyrford have a strong Neighbourhood Forum who recently received over 500 completed questionnaires of which over 98% were in support of a draft plan that explicitly states that the green belt be preserved (including these 2 fields). I believe that the PNF have made representations to you raising concerns about the proposals and that you have, so far, not responded to these concerns. How can you possibly proceed with a development that flies in the face of the democratic wishes of the majority of Pyrford's constituents, especially in an environment where the elected government have introduced legislation (i.e. the Localism Act) that encourages the local community to take ownership of development decisions.
8. Drawing the above two points together: the Government state that housing needs can be met through developing brown field with no need to develop green field, and that the local community have demonstrated they don't want this development, I really can't see how this can proceed without completely undermining the communities belief in the democratic process. I feel quite strong that even submitting the proposal is a waste of taxpayers money and the communities time.

Steve Wright
9 Boltons Lane
Pyrford, GU22 8TL