[ Insert date of writing here ]

Runnymede Borough Council

planning@runnymede.gov.uk

Dear Sirs,

**Objection to amended application RU.22/0454 Ottershaw East.**

I am a resident adjacent to the proposed development known as Ottershaw East. I am writing to you to object to the amended plan RU.22/0454 on grounds set out below.

**Density too high**

The net density of the development will be 37dph which is even higher than the nearby Brox End Nursery which was already high at 36dph. The Site Capacity Analysis showed 3 acceptable scenarios and we feel that the lowest of these 3 is the most appropriate for the village since it is bordering greenbelt and away from the village centre. “The appropriate density will result from context” (Runnymede SPD Para 66p19). Although the NPPF encourages efficient use of land, paragraph 124 (d) also applies which states that development must maintain an area’s prevailing character and setting

**Insufficient green space and Housing Mix**

The entire proposed development is sorely lacking in green spaces and in particular lacks a provision for space to grow trees. I strongly oppose building new housing in our modern age without the inclusion of a generous provision of greenery either from open areas or from stands of trees or ideally for both. Refer to your own Policy SS4.

This issue can be solved by looking at the proposed housing mix. I object to the number of detached larger houses proposed to be built as opposed to smaller houses and flats which is, furthermore, out of step with the Housing Needs Assessment carried out by AECOM. To achieve the provision of 167 dwellings to comply with the Assessment and accommodate more green space, the balance of larger to smaller dwellings should be changed.

Ottershaw has an oversupply of 4+ bed houses and an undersupply of 1 and 2 bed dwellings. Changing the mix has the following benefits.

* The amount of land built on for the same number of dwellings is reduced.
* The land freed up can be used for green spaces and trees.
* Local people will be able to move to affordable accommodation in their own village to free up larger properties for growing families.

However, I will strongly object if these smaller dwellings are not positioned sensitively in order to ensure they do not encroach on the surrounding detached existing low-density housing. This is in accordance with Surrey’s own Design Guide and the National Design Guide (pp40).

**Conclusion**

While I very reluctantly accept that housing on this site will go ahead, I believe that the design of this development in its current iteration fails the test of a being a high-quality design. It is not for RBC to enable the applicant by compromising on policies and guidelines. It is entirely the applicant’s responsibility to create a scheme that complies with policies and guidance as set out within the Local plan, policy EE1 and the Runnymede Design SPD, the NPPF and the National Design Guide.

Yours faithfully,

[Name

Address]