



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

23<sup>rd</sup> June 2023

Runnymede Borough Council Planning Dept

Addlestone

Surrey KT15 2AH

via e-mail

## **Planning Application RU.23/0802 – 24 Brox Rd, Ottershaw – ONF Comments**

Dear Planning,

1. We refer to the above Planning Application which we recommend should be **REFUSED** for the following reasons.

### **General**

2. The proposal appears significantly lacking in definitive detail, more akin to that usually presented for an outline proposal. In our opinion this is insufficient to guarantee a quality design and therefore not compliant with RBC policy EE1. The ensuing paragraphs cover this issue in more detail.
3. The provision of 4 houses on this site in our opinion is too dense for the location for the following reasons:
  - a. The parking provision of 1 vehicle per unit is inadequate and will generate overspill onto Brox Road which cannot be accommodated at or near this location.
  - b. The ambient lighting of at least one of the properties living areas is very poor.

### **Character & Styling of Residential Units**

4. It should be noted that, contrary to what is stated in the planning application, the current property on this site retains a number of architectural features which are unique to the area. Whilst it is accepted that this has been largely spoiled through the recent introduction of an unsightly dormer on the façade the sculpted slate roof and ridge merit some mention. It is therefore hoped that some effort and expense is spared to ensure a quality replacement.

5. The proposed design of the properties however is stark, bland and featureless and at odds with the streetscene. In addition, the materials and detailed architectural features are not clearly specified and only examples provided in the design and access statement. At present there is a risk that the build could result in a poor design with low quality materials. We would therefore recommend the following is considered:
  - a. A clear specification of proposed styling and the primary materials to be used to be provided.
  - b. A clear specification demonstrating a "Fabric First" approach.
  - c. Some detailing to be added to the brickwork in order to break up the façade and side/rear elevations with particular attention to the corners, soffit/gutter and between floor levels.
  - d. Improvement to the gabling/fascia boards around the properties.

### **Parking**

6. The current offering of 4 spaces for parking is insufficient at this location. Only one space per unit has been allocated and whilst this meets this part of the RBC Parking SPD standard there is no provision at all for visitors. It is worthy of note that the current parking provision for the two units is at least 7 vehicles thus avoiding any overspill. It is imperative there is no overspill onto the road at this location as there is no residential parking provision and all current space is allocated to the local retail outlets. In our opinion there should be at least one visitor space.
7. All parking spaces should have EV provision as per the RBC Parking SPD, this has not been specified.

### **Bin & Cycle Stores**

8. It is not clear if the stores are secure. This is essential to comply with the RBC Parking SPD and ensure Secure By Design and compliance with insurance requirements.
9. All cycle stores should have power and light to facilitate access and E-Cycle charging.
10. Whilst the RBC SPD Standard has been followed, the SPD clearly states that neither a minimum nor maximum has been stated. At this location, provision for storing more than one cycle would be preferred given this is the only logical place in the development to store them.

### **Solar PV**

11. No layout, size, design or capacity has been specified. Its compliance with RBC Policy SD8 cannot therefore be gauged. This should be clearly stated. It is hoped that provision is maximised and not limited by budget.

### **Services and Heating**

12. The services and heating solutions are not specified and should be. In order to future proof these properties it is recommended that:
  - a. There is no gas provision to the properties.
  - b. The heating provision is either air source heat pump (dependent upon noise & budget) or electric.

### **Internal Light**

13. Only the 2 ground floor rear properties have French doors, the front two properties have only very small windows to the front and side. 24B with its side adjacent 22A is the most compromised. In our opinion the light levels in this property should be investigated and may not meet the required levels.

### **Wildlife & Ecology**

14. There is no indication of any consideration for any wildlife in the proposal. Given its proximity to the Chaworth Copse SANG it is recommended that the following are considered.
  - a. Boundary treatment. Some proportion of soft/vegetated boundary is encouraged and as a minimum, corridors in fencing to allow small animals to traverse.
  - b. A “bird friendly” design incorporating swift boxes/bricks or similar around soffit level.
  - c. Preservation wherever possible of all existing trees and their associated Root Protection Areas (RPAs) on the site as per BS 5837-2012.

Signed electronically:

*ROliver*

Bob Oliver

Treasurer/Project Manager – ONF

For and on behalf of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum