

To: RBC Planning Dept, fao Ailsa Pack Re: Application RU.24/0002 (2, Egham Hill)

The Egham Residents' Association objects to the planning application RU.24/0002 (2, Egham Hill) for Change of Use from Restaurant to Mixed Use Restaurant with Takeaway etc.

The application's proposal appears minor – a change from restaurant to mixed use restaurant with takeaway – but this is a plan for a 'high-volume and takeaway dominated' fast-food business, entirely different from the previous sit-down dining venue. The proposals would position a traffic hub, concentrating car/motor-bike ingress and egress (the applicant estimates 27 two-way site visits per hour at peak), in immediate juxtaposition with the busy Egham Hill A30 roundabout which accumulates traffic from 5 entry/exit points. This site, at the bottom of Egham Hill, has a strategic significance as one of the main entry points to Egham. Historically, the Eclipse Pub was the visual and social focal point; traffic was light. But many decades ago the site was developed as the major roundabout linking the dual-carriageways of Egham bypass and A30 Egham Hill and connecting them to Egham High Street, with local Tite Hill and Sweeps Lane / Milton Road traffic also being sucked in. The Egham Hill roundabout with its virtually constant traffic became the overwhelmingly dominant feature. The recent Prezzo restaurant valiantly managed as a substitute for The Eclipse, but this part of Egham is now a major traffic hub, not suitable for a social venue and not suitable for the additional concentration of people and traffic that the proposal aims to encourage.

We object on the grounds of:

- 1) The additional traffic accumulation described above.
- 2) Parking exacerbation in this traffic-sensitive location.
- 3) Danger for pedestrian access.
- 4) Environmental unsustainability.

Parking exacerbation: No additional parking is proposed (the existing 10 spaces include 2 disabled spaces). The claim is that a change to allow Takeaway (remember: a high-volume, takeaway dominated, fast-food business) will have 'limited' impact. We find this pie in the sky. There are no expected numbers given for seated customers, yet the application promotes the idea that it will be *"a space where families can spend time together away from home"*. Those families will come by car. How many? They will compete with the Takeaway customers (27 two-way traffic visits per hour at peak) and the other takeaway customers (for the Cheeky Chicken) on the opposite side of the roundabout. The Cheeky Chicken is already a source of multiple parking offences and egregious environmental complaints. It's inconceivable that the existing parking at the applicant's 'Prezzo' site is sufficient for the new use proposed. So of course, many will park as close as possible nearby, adding to parking exacerbation, and will walk to the takeaway/restaurant. Walking to the applicant's Prezzo site is already very dangerous (people don't do it – they drive).

Dangerous pedestrian/cycle access: The two relatively safe pedestrian routes to the site are down Tite Hill and down the NW side of Egham Hill. Pedestrians/cyclists from Egham will need to cross the High Street at its roundabout entrance point, OR to cross both the A30 Egham Hill dual-carriageways. These routes are extremely dangerous. Pedestrians/cyclists from Royal Holloway will need to cross the A30 dual-carriageways from SE to NW, and the only completely safe option is far up Egham hill. Many pedestrian/bike journeys would be at night. The hazards would be compounded by the concentration of car/motor-bike ingress and egress at the site entry point itself (27 two-way site visits per hour at peak).

Environmental impacts: The application asserts it is *"sustainable"*. It makes a case for the economic component of sustainability but is silent on environmental sustainability. What is the applicant hiding? The site is outside the town centre and is inconvenient/dangerous for pedestrians/cyclists. Quite obviously, the majority of customers will travel by car. The Council should encourage social/dining/community developments within the town – where access by train/bus/bike/foot is practical and safe. The application site is at a major dual-carriageway roundabout beyond the town centre and a busy, high-volume takeaway business is inappropriate here. Is the applicant's multi-car-journey business plan compatible with RBC's vision for C-emission reductions? Our answer is *"no"*.

We urge the Council to consider these implications of the proposal and to reject the application.

Sincerely, William Burgess, Chair: Egham Residents' Association (ERA, c/o 35 Crown Street, Egham, Surrey)