



Email: info@ottershawforum.com Website: www.ottershawforum.com

26th May 2023

Runnymede Borough Council Planning Dept

Addlestone

Surrey KT15 2AH

via e-mail

Planning Application RU.23/0518 - Land adjacent to Sunnyside, Stonehill Rd, Ottershaw – ONF Comments

Dear Planning,

We refer to the above Planning Application which we recommend should be **REFUSED** for the following reasons. The first issue we consider should prevent this application proceeding for planning consideration until it is resolved.

General

The application is very sparse in detail, in our opinion the information provided is similar to an outline application.

Tree Removal

1. The site owner or agent thereof has seen fit to remove the vast majority of the trees on the site, which resides in the Green Belt without consulting the appropriate authorities. The trees are a mix of TPO protected and mature pine forest. The locations of many of these trees did not have any adverse effect upon the proposed development. It is our view that none of this development should therefore be permitted until this issue is satisfactorily resolved.

REFUSE: The application should not be considered by the planning committee until the illegal tree removal issue is satisfactorily resolved with a full reinstatement plan.

2. The Arboricultural Report only notes evidence of one tree possibly being felled recently. The complete lack of information regarding what was present on the site until it transferred ownership recently should not be permitted.
3. The report should include the full range and location of all TPO and non-TPO trees which were present on site at this point. The recommendations should then address

reinstatement in terms of quantity and location, taking into account the proposed development.

4. The planning application should include the proposed reinstatement of trees at the site. The locations should be in the closest reasonable proximity to those removed.

REFUSE. If the application is passed without this action, it should be included as a CONDITION of development.

5. The permeable access track has no specific details of its surface and subsurface composition. Additionally, its boundary dimensions are not clearly specified. This must be clarified given the likely heavy vehicles accessing the site either to transport animals or remove waste.
6. The sub base for the stable block is not specified. This should be stated to provide assurance that the structure meets regulations.
7. There is an implied hard standing area to the rear of the stable block however its composition and dimensions are not specified. This should be clarified.
8. The plans show a standalone below ground effluent tank. The following should be clarified in the application:
 - a. The proposed purpose/contents of the tank.
 - b. The proposed method for flushing/emptying the tank.
 - c. Confirmation that there is no intent to connect any other services into the tank.
 - d. The dimensions of the tank.
 - e. The depth to which the tank will be sunk.
 - f. To what British Standards or other criteria the tank complies.

Without the above information in our opinion the suitability of the proposal cannot be gauged.

9. The proposed elevation plans state that all dimensions are approximate and verification must be sought prior to build. It is unclear whether that this is therefore sufficiently detailed for a planning application. Could the dimensions of the build be increased post approval or indeed the whole design amended. This appears far too vague.
10. The planning application states “reinstatement of menage (part retrospective)”. There is no evidence provided as to what this applies to or what the scope is. There is no historical evidence on the portal, as such the validity and scope of this statement and its role in the planning consideration process is unknown. In our view this should be clearly stated with the planning history.

Signed electronically:

ROliver

Bob Oliver

Treasurer/Project Manager – ONF

For and on behalf of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum