



Email: [info@ottershawforum.com](mailto:info@ottershawforum.com) Website: [www.ottershawforum.com](http://www.ottershawforum.com)

5<sup>th</sup> October 2021

Runnymede Borough Council Planning Dept  
Addlestone  
Surrey  
KT15 2AH  
via e-mail

**Planning Application RU.21/1067, (Travis Perkins Site), 66 Brox Road, Ottershaw – ONF Comments**

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the above Planning Application.

1. The following represent the endorsed comments, observations and objections of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum Steering Committee on behalf of its membership.
2. Please note that one current member of the ONF Steering Committee, Carl Mann, who is a Runnymede Borough Councillor and is also involved with the RBC Planning Committee has abstained from comment or voting on this application due to his declared conflict of interest.

**General**

3. Broadly speaking our view is that this appears to be a well constructed application which has taken note of the planning officers comments, in particular reducing the development to 2 storeys and avoiding any negative impact to the local historical building located on the site.
4. It should be noted that the addition of a third convenience outlet in the village is considered to be unsustainable in the medium to long term and places at risk the other 2 similar outlets in the village centre. Whilst the loss of one of these would not be considered critical, it also places at risk that of the Post office, a critical asset which is integrated with one of these. This is a vital asset for our whole community and critical for the large proportion of elderly within our area.

**Design & Character**

5. The proposed development now appears to be well proportioned and broadly in character with surrounding area which appears to improve the visible elevation/street scene views. On-site parking and waste stores are all partly or completely masked from the road elevation. The TPO oak is retained.
6. The proposed front elevation is however of 'industrial' appearance with metal roof and without any depth of facia. Much is made of the compatibility with adjoining property gables and street scene. Whilst the proposed roof pitch is shallower than

adjoining buildings, this is probably acceptable to keep the roof height compatible with adjoining buildings. However, a gable fascia of similar depth to the adjoining would diminish the 'industrial' appearance which is exacerbated by the metal staircase and balconies. This would give more of a 'residential' design harmony in a residential setting. **DEFER/REFUSE: Pending redesign of front elevation gabling to better match the local street scene.**

7. Although the development is away from the village centre it is our view that this is somewhat mitigated by the far better off-street site configuration. This will also reduce the already problematic on road parking issues in the village centre.

#### **Site Ingress & Egress**

8. Although it is appreciated that the site entrance/exit is retained there are a number of concerns that we would wish to be addressed given the intended change of use:
  - a. The increased activity frequency at this location compared to previous will render it dangerous for cars, cycles and pedestrians. It is noted that the traffic survey was conducted at an off-peak time, as such many of the issues will not have been seen. Of particular issue are:
    - i. Vehicles wishing to turn right when exiting the development as this is a blind corner. It should also be noted that much of the traffic to and from the site is likely to occur in the dark thus increasing safety risks.
    - ii. Traffic generation/entry/egress on this corner of Brox road is dangerous. Constant vehicle movements to and from the local shops will be dangerous. Restrictions should be imposed requiring that no reversing of vehicles onto Brox Road should be allowed.
    - iii. A sight line should be provided for greater visibility of vehicles coming out of the access to the right giving greater visibility around the corner.
    - iv. Consider whether a pedestrian crossing (precise location TBD) would mitigate some of the pedestrian safety risk of increased volume accessing the new development.

#### **DEFER/REFUSE:**

- a. **Until a peak time traffic/pedestrian survey has been conducted, this should be timed early in the morning when the schools are opening with the 2 surveys informing the solution.**
- b. **Provide traffic management solution(s) (including speed restrictions to 20mph & reversing restrictions) around the development location.**
- c. **Consider access point redesign including providing an improved sight line on exit to the right.**
- d. **Consider whether a pedestrian crossing (precise location TBD) would mitigate some of the pedestrian safety risk.**

#### **Parking Provision**

9. There is no off-street parking provision evident for the adjoining detached dwelling which we believe is part of the same overall scheme. At least 2 off street spaces are required. **DEFER/REFUSE: Until 2 additional off-street parking spaces are included in the proposed solution.**
10. There are currently 4 car parking spaces for the 3 one-bedroom flats proposed. Whilst this is acceptable for occupants it does not make any provision for visitors. For this, one additional car parking space should be provided.

**DEFER/REFUSE: Pending provision of one further car parking space for visitors.**

11. There appear to be only 2 uncovered cycle stands provided for the retail space. Whilst this meets policy requirements it is our view this is underprovision given the amount of vehicle parking provided and the drive towards sustainable transport. **DEFER: Consider additional cycle parking provision (+2?) and whether some form of cover is provided.**

**Other Issues**

12. The plans suggest there may be an overlooking issue between the new flats at their front and rear of 64 Brox Road. **DEFER: Pending investigation and clarification of potential overlooking issue.**
13. Although there is a comprehensive lighting survey and this is welcomed, there does not appear to be any provision of CCTV for the development. Given the increase in ASB in our local area and the somewhat "hidden" nature of the development from the road it is recommended that CCTV is provided across the development. **DEFER/REFUSE: Pending study and inclusion of CCTV into the solution.**

Signed electronically

*ROliver*

Bob Oliver  
Treasurer/Project Manager – ONF  
On behalf of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum