



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

RBC Planning Dept

Via e-mail

27th April 2024

RU.23/1403 – 66 Brox Road, Ottershaw Planning Application – ONF Comments

Dear RBC Planning,

1. Please see below the comments of the Ottershaw Neighbourhood Forum for RU.23/1403..
2. Whilst we remain of the opinion that the application should be **REFUSED** we do appreciate the planning constraints which apply to a site of this kind with a history of some 80years as a builders merchants.
3. Rather than repeat our previous objection we would like to point out the following which we believe should carry some weight when considering this application.
4. It should be noted that the swept path analysis shown for a 16.5m lorry **is not feasible** as it would be compromised by the existence of parked cars in front of nos 62 and 64 Brox Rd. See attached diagram.
5. It should also be noted that no 64 has no off road parking. Additionally, it is normal for house owners to have 2 vehicles so the presence of parked cars at this location should be considered normal.
6. The 12m and 16.5m swept path analysis for both vehicles **compromises the safety of operation of the Bus Stop** opposite and close to the site entrance. See attached diagram.
7. The use of this stop will increase significantly with the introduction of the 51 unit C3 Extracare facility opposite.
8. Whilst we note the comments throughout about the site it should be noted that at no point was "*the site*" exclusive of No64 Brox Road. Throughout its history as a

builder's merchants this building was utilised as a combined office and shop (downstairs) and shop store (upstairs). This allowed to site to safely function throughout its life and for the yard area to be uncrowded and safe for customers, operatives and vehicles alike.

9. We understand that No64 has now been purchased by the site owners. Whilst we are unclear of their intent it would seem logical for operations management and WC to be housed in the ground floor of this building thus mirroring previous operations and reducing or even removing the requirement for unsightly and impractical temporary portacabins and temporary style WCs on the site. We also note the Redwood Partnership letter RE HGV Swept Paths dated 24th Apr 24 recognises the "*compact nature of the site*". It is our understanding that at least a part of 64 is already categorised as for non-residential use.
10. The history quoted in the above RP letter, whilst being a true historical record in the limited information it provides, the authority should recognise that:
 - a. 3 of the Schools and the GP surgery were not at their current locations close to this site years ago. The location was quiet and relatively traffic free and without pedestrian "peaks".
 - b. Within the next few years this junction will become a black spot with increased school traffic from new local developments, a large uplift in GP patients through the Chertsey South developments (the vast majority travelling by car) and overspill from the new Brockhurst site opposite for which parking is woefully underprovisioned.
11. The RP letter states "*We understand that historically, no dedicated car parking was provided by previous occupiers of the site.*". This statement is untrue. As a TP operation there were approx 5 car parking spaces for customers adjacent to the office/shop. These are not present in the new configuration, the space being taken up mainly by one of the proposed portacabins together with piles of material..
12. I attach our previous objection from October for the record.

Signed electronically

R Oliver
Treasurer/Project Manager –
ONF

On behalf of the Ottershaw
Neighbourhood Forum

