



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

28th August 2022

Runnymede Borough Council Planning Dept

Addlestone

Surrey KT15 2AH

via e-mail

Planning Application RU.22/1139, 64 Brox Road, Ottershaw – ONF Comments

Dear Sirs,

I refer to the above Planning Application.

Our opinion is that it should be **Refused** on the following grounds.

1. The applicant is requesting the retention of the store and shop unit previously used as a separate self-contained unit to service the Travis Perkins site at 66 Brox Road. The retention of this unit and its integration into the existing 64 Brox Road results in the following issues which may be considered to contravene policy and guidance:
 - a. The amenity space of the rear garden which will be towards the centre of the property/site is very small and completely out of character with all the other properties on the road as it runs towards the village centre. It leaves no space for garden storage/cycle store etc.
 - b. The proximity of the rear of the proposed property to any proposed new development on 66 Brox Road results in overlooking into the proposed residential accommodation. It should be noted that both proposed applications for 66 Brox Road include residential units.
 - c. The proximity of the proposed converted unit to 62 Brox Road will result in overlooking issues with this property.
 - d. The proposed design of the ground floor accommodation places 2 bedrooms and a bathroom at the rear of the property, in our opinion an illogical layout.
 - e. In our humble opinion the most practical solution for the site would be to remove the store/shop unit and return the property to its original 3bed detached form. This would ensure it was properly integrated with the rest of

the street, had adequate amenity space (still less than adjacent properties) and did not exacerbate any other issues such as overlooking and parking (see comments at 2 below)

2. The applicant states that no parking is provided for the site.
 - a. The site is located in close proximity to a busy blind corner close to the local schools and with further carriageway constraints (keep left signs) in the road. As such for safety reasons on street parking must be carefully managed and kept to a sensible minimum. This clearly cannot be achieved with a 5-bed property potentially placing 3-4 vehicles on the street. The new RBC draft Parking SPD indicates that a minimum of 3 spaces is required for a property of this size.
 - b. There is no alternative space on this section of road for parking. Virtually all properties have one space at front which they use.
 - c. The TP building (office and storage) previously had its parking allocation provided on the TP site at 66 Brox Road. This allocation of approx 4 spaces has now been lost. As such, given that 3 further bedrooms are proposed in this space, this should not be permitted.
 - d. We would suggest that the maximum allowable vehicle requirement for 64 Brox should typically be 2 cars given the space available and the bedroom capacity of the original property less the extension. This could be realised by converting the front garden to angled parking for one car leaving one car on the street. Reference the RBC draft Parking SPD, this would suggest a property of no more than 3 bedrooms.
3. The proposed application should be carefully considered against the 2 extant applications for the adjacent site. In our opinion the site at 66 Brox should take precedence given its proposed use(s), location and size.

Should RBC approve the subject planning application, it is recommended the following CONDITIONS should be applied:

4. The property should remain a single coherent residential unit and should not be further subdivided into separate, self-contained living units. This will ensure that many of the issues referred to above are not further exacerbated.

Signed electronically:

ROliver

Bob Oliver

Treasurer/Project Manager – ONF

For and on behalf of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum