**Objection to RU.22/0454 Housing Development Ottershaw East**

[Date Insert]

I write to object to this development

Policy SL12 only allows this increase in density with a high-quality design. A high-quality design should stand out, be above the mediocre, over-perform the minimum requirements of RBC’s policies, enhance the village, set an example. This design is just another volume boilerplate development which ignores the local context and pays little attention to the sustainability needs of the future.

This allocation in SL12 is very high density at net 37dph. It is even higher than that at neighbouring Brox End Nursery at 36dph which had the advantage of a TPO to mitigate the impact and make it look less dense. Not only is it made dense by the number of dwellings but also by the fact that the applicant inflates the number of bedrooms. It has more 3+ bed houses particularly 5 bed houses than was set out in the housing mix for SL12. It also uses a lower proportion of flats for a development this size. This increases the total volume of build exacerbating the built footprint and density problems. This does not align with the needs of Ottershaw as stated in Ottershaw’s recent housing needs assessment report by AECOM. Over 60% of the site will be build or hard surface. This does not align with the context of Ottershaw as required by the NPPF.

The density of proposed new housing is particularly apparent against existing properties but not within the main site contrary to the requirement to respond to context. This is obviously to maximise the sales value of the new properties at the expense of existing dwellings.

This packing of housing adjacent to existing dwellings is contrary to multiple national and local design guides which all state that new housing should relate to the context and respond to the existing built form.

National Design Guide

***Well-designed places are integrated into to their surroundings, so they relate well***

***Influenced by and influence their context positively***

Runnymede SPD

***Well-designed new development is integrated into its wider surroundings, physically, socially and visually"***

***Plots should be configured so that new development relates well to its neighbours.***

***Development must respond to the plot and building rhythm within the local context***

***Attention should be paid to the impact of the development within the streetscape (e.g., form, massing, building line and space between buildings (Runnymede SPD p31-32)***

***All development proposals will be expected to achieve high quality and inclusive design which responds to the local context including the built, natural, and historic character of the area (Policy EE1)***

Since there are apartment blocks, terraced housing and parking courts all backing onto existing detached and semi-detached housing, no right-thinking opinion could consider those relationships are in context or respond to the existing built form or integrate physically socially or visually.

It is of course interesting that within the main development care is taken so that this does not occur. The new housing is by and large related with detached housing and semi-detached housing grouped together. Plot rhythm is maintained. The applicant is wilfully ignoring the current built form around the NW/SW periphery of the site. The applicant should incorporate placemaking. Higher densities would be better within the main site and so appropriate new contextual relationships can be formed for example along the primary road along with apartment blocks so that it is clear a new place is being made that is distinctive.

Parking courts are inappropriate behind existing properties. This is a clear contravention of the Runnymede policy of back-to-back arrangement of new dwelling. There is no technical excuse for it, and it does not seem to appear within the main site but almost exclusively adjacent to existing dwellings.

Surrey CC design policy states that parking courts in residential areas should be

* ***Relatively small scale to avoid visual dominance and nuisance***
* ***Maximise security through surveillance and/or gates within a street block***
* ***Aim to create attractive places***

*Surrey CC Design policy 6.4*

Proposed parking courts are up to 12 bays, so not small in scale. There is little landscaping. They do not have all active frontages and are open to the street leaving the rear of the existing houses exposed.

A high-quality design would be incorporating the most up-to-date thinking on sustainability. In 2025, gas and oil boilers will be banned in new-build homes. This would seem to be the first opportunity in the local area to offer electric only across the site and avoid the risk of people retrofitting gas boilers. The proposal offers an individual, non-integrated Solar PV solution for each property in order to exceed an out-of-date policy requirement of 11% (by a mere 1%). The solution offered appears “bolt-on”, has a severe negative impact upon the appearance of the site whilst introducing a maintenance overhead at the individual building level. On its own this offering appears both inappropriate and inadequate. This is **not high quality.**

Contrary to NPPF, which states that all new roads are tree lined, only the main avenue is tree lined. All other roads have only occasional small trees some have just one or 2, some have none.

Contrary to policy SS4 which states that landscaping should be sympathetic to the wider pattern of settlement, promote local tree species such as oak, birch and Scots pine and should reflect the local landscape, the site is so dense that this is not attainable. There are no green corridors around the site such as those which are designed into the much better proposal at nearby Green Lane by Taylor Wimpey.

In Summary

* Poor contextual relationships (terraced housing blocks backing onto detached housing). Does not integrate with existing settlement on the NW and SW edge.
* Does not align with the village character and more in line with urban townscape.
* Parking courts back onto the rear of existing dwellings contrary to policy requiring back-to-back arrangements (The new housing is spared of course!)
* Minimum garden distances so tight build tolerances. Risk of gardens being undersized, no margin for error
* No green edge around the north and south-western borders. Insufficient trees within development. 60% of the site will be build, hardstanding or tarmac and up to 70% when garden patios added
* Identikit housing estate, character areas poor and indistinctive. No landmarks, no placemaking.
* Intensification next to existing dwellings only but not within the main site. Therefore, does not integrate
* A common-sense obvious loss of biodiversity despite a remote desktop calculation
* An overly dense development due to net density of 37dph and inflating the number of bedrooms per dwelling contrary to that set within policy SL12.
* Even waste disposal collection is concerned at how concentrated the proposed housing is.
* Inadequate infrastructure. Problems with foul waste capacity which require major upheaval for the village to rectify. New A320 roundabout will not help improve local traffic flow as no widening of road between roundabout and McClarens.

Policy SL12 stated clearly that the increased densities were only permissible with a high-quality design. The current application is not a high-quality design as it fails to comply with the Surrey Design SPD, policy SS4, SD7, B&GIpolicy, Surrey cc Design guide, the National Design guide and the NPPF. Vistry have not consulted the residents on the design as recommended in the NPPF. In contrast, Berkley Homes which has the unallocated site to the north of the village are building relationships which will likely lead to a result with better acceptance in contrast to this application.

[Name & Address]