Insert date

Insert your name

Insert you address

(These details will be redacted when published on the planning portal)

**Re: Objection for Planning Application RU.22/0454 and RU.22/0479**

I am writing to object to the amended plans submitted for the planned development called Ottershaw East as allocated in the 2030 Local Plan as SL12.

I believe the key issues which still need to be addressed:

⦁ This site is still too dense and not in keeping with the immediate local surroundings

⦁ It lacks green infrastructure and any place-making within the development

⦁ The design of dwellings is not in keeping with the rest of the village

⦁ The layout fails to comply with Runnymede’s own policies.

⦁ The sewage system is not adequate to accommodate 186 new dwellings and therefore any such upgrades would cause more upheaval to the local area

⦁ A complete disregard for the displacement to existing wildlife that live and forage across the development area and wooded area which will be created into an accessible space – the SANG.

**DENSITY**

**The calculated available land for development is NOT accurate**

The capacity was set by the Site Capacity Analysis addendum 2018. This clearly states that the area available is 6.54ha. The Field Nursery (0.92ha) which was part of the SCA calculation did not come forward, thereby reducing the available land. Revised area available taking out the field nursery is 6.54 – 0.92 = 5.62ha

The applicant includes the SUDS as part of the residential area to come up with its overall developable area but also in the allocation for SANG land (RU.22/0479). It is not right to include the land accounted for in both applications.

The applicant has finally come to the correct conclusion that the net dph will be 37 dwellings per hectare, not 27.8dph they previously tried to claim in the now [superseded Design and Access Statement](https://docs.runnymede.gov.uk/PublicAccess_Live/Document/ViewDocument?id=7A225496D0F94E45AFFA42DF75709D85). This proposed 37dph is still considerably higher than the existing surrounding area at 11-26dph as highlighted in the Site Capacity Analysis.

I would request that the density should be the lowest possible of the scenarios within the Site Capacity Analysis as this site is at the edge of the village bordering greenbelt.

**Therefore, a maximum of 170 dwellings on this site would be more in keeping with the local vernacular.**

**PARKING**

**The residential parking provided by Vistry is NOT adequate.**

In Vistrys Design and Access statement, they have shown a total of 366 spaces are needed to meet the parking needs of this site as it is currently designed. Of these 366, Vistry have provided 330 parking spaces and 39 garage spaces.  The garages are 3.05m wide and are only allocated for 4+ bedroom dwellings.  It is reasonable to assume these 4+ bedroom homes will be occupied by families which will use vehicles considered ‘family’ cars such as those commonly used below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vehicle** | **Width** |
| Kia Sportage | 1.86m |
| Nissan Qashqui | 1.36m |
| Honda CR-V | 1.85m |
| Land Rover | 1.99m |
| Average = 1.76m wide | |

With an average width of 1.76m, this leaves approximately 0.6m either side of the car to get in and out which is not enough to open a car door on any of the vehicles mentioned above.  Garages are not designed in this day to house the ever-growing size of modern cars.  It is highly unlikely that the garages will not be used to park cars.  Therefore, 330 actual parking spaces is not adequate for this site.

Vistry have stated a further 35 spaces have been provided for visitor parking.  It is likely these spaces will be used by residents, leaving none left for visitors of residents and also those visitors to the SANG travelling by car, of which no parking provision has been provided.

If this is not rectified now, it will have a significant impact on the development and the surrounding roads outside the development.

**135A BROX ROAD**

**The proximity of the development to this property is unlike anywhere else on the site and as it is currently designed, cannot be entertained or passed as acceptable by Runnymede Council.**

It is notable that separation distances are more generous within the main site which therefore appears less dense compared to the edge of the development on the NW/SW borders. Separation distances range from 12-20M for back to side on relationships for the new development.

This is in stark contrast to the treatment of 135A Brox Road which is noted to be a vulnerable property and yet separation distances are reduced:

I would like to refer you to relevant planning policy comments on these points:

"Well-designed new development is integrated into its wider surroundings, physically, socially and visually" (Runnymede SPD)

“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)

**REPETATIVE HOUSING LAYOUT**

**The four-character areas show little real variation and do not reflect the diverse housing in Ottershaw village.**

The design of Ottershaw East has:

⦁ Little variety

⦁ No landmark buildings

⦁ Little distinction between so called “character areas”

⦁ Identikit housing estate

⦁ Ability for Vistry to bulk buying of materials nationally for all sites with little consideration for the village it sits within

**GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE**

**The design submitted does not comply with Policy SS4/SD7/ G&BISPD**

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, (NPPF)

⦁ Only 1 street is tree lined

⦁ Secondary streets have occasional small trees

⦁ 3 streets have **no trees**

⦁ No green corridor around the site

⦁ No large trees within development (cooling/sustainability Policy SD7, B&GI policy)

⦁ Only 1 hedgerow behind 135A and enhancement of hedgerow behind 2 houses Southwood.

* Centre of site no tree cover (cooling)

⦁ No green open space within centre of the development

⦁ Trees should be larger than ridge heights to provide shade

⦁ Hardscaping is 60% of the site. Will increase with sheds, and patios

⦁ With climate change the development will have a very hot microclimate. Small trees risk dying

SS4 states that planting should enhance existing and new development and be sympathetic to the wider pattern of settlement. It also states that the design should promote the use of local tree species such as oak, birch and Scots pine. It should be noted, not a single Scots pine or oak tree is offered and only 5 small birch trees.

It should also be noted that on the visual Masterplans, Vistry have taken to using bordering existing property trees in their images which gives a misleading representation of what they, as the developer are adding to the existing borders. These should be removed from their visual aids.

**The design STILL lacks green infrastructure and areas for place-making**

It is clearly stated within both the National Design guide and the National Planning Policy Framework that new developments should include a variety of green open spaces in a variety of sizes and locations. It is not enough for the designers of Ottershaw East to divert the whole of this requirement onto the SANG. There is no evidence of a provision for sports facilities which is considered essential by the Runnymede Infrastructure Analysis.

Page 25 of Vistrys Design and Access statement mentions the development proposals consists of 2no. LAPs at 100sqm each. The LAP which is included in the design next to the GP surgery, at the entrance of the site, is too near the entrance, not safely enclosed and it is only about 70sqm, not 100sqm (they appear to be including the side road.)

A LAP is described as: “A small area of open space specifically designated and primarily laid out for very young children to play close to where they live i.e. within one minute's walking time. LAPs are designed to allow for **ease of informal observation** and supervision and primarily function to encourage informal play and social interaction for toddlers. The LAP requires no play equipment as such, relying more on demonstrative features indicating that play is positively encouraged.”

The LAP by the GP Surgery **does not** meet the "ease of observation criteria. There are very few residential properties overlooking this LAP and therefore it is not ideally located.

The second LAP situated in the far North East corner does not seem to be accessible by pathway so young children and **toddlers will need to walk along the verge or road** to get to it. It is tucked away in the corner and could be prone to use for antisocial behaviour as there is little natural surveillance.

**A Biodiversity net gain has only been achieved by adding in the SuDS and a Hedgerow into the SANG which are not part of the housing development allocated land.**

The development will displace larger creatures, badger, deer, fox, small mammals, reptiles, and circling raptors. These wild animals will be displaced by people, dogs, domestic cats. Anyone who knows this site, truly, will know that the development will lead to a biodiversity loss – you don’t need desktop surveys to tell you that. Offsetting it through a hybrid application to the SANG (which is currently inaccessible and undisturbed land anyway) plays into the developers' hands – so they can show numbers to suit them.

**IN SUMMARY**

**I object to this application on the grounds of the following:**

* Poor contextual relationships (terraced housing blocks backing onto detached housing).
* Does not integrate with existing settlement on the NW and SW edge (EE1 and Design SPD).
* Housing density doubles and quadruples against existing properties
* Does not align with the village character and more in line with urban townscape.
* Multiple examples where parking courts back onto the rear of existing dwellings contrary to policy requiring back-to-back arrangements causing security issues/easy access to the rear of existing properties (Design SPD)
* Minimum garden distances therefore tight build tolerances. Risk of gardens being undersized as no margin for error
* No soft green edge around the north and south-western borders. Minimal trees within development. 60% of the site will be build, hardstanding or tarmac and up to 70% when garden patios added leading to future overheating contrary to NPPF, SS4 and B&GI policy
* No integrated green social space within the centre of the development. (National Design Guide, Runnymede Design SPD)
* Identikit housing estate, character areas poor and indistinctive. No landmarks, no placemaking. Could be anywhere in the country.
* Bulky high-volume housing close to existing dwellings leading to intrusion due to bulk and mass, overlooking, overshadowing. Severe loss of amenity to existing resident’s contrary to EE1
* 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 refuse collection are 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.

**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, which this scheme as submitted, DOES NOT**.

I will be looking to the council to uphold their own policies and stick to guidelines.

Many thanks for your consideration in these important matters,

Insert your name.