

Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way
EPSOM Surrey
KT18 7QZ

18 November 2014

Mr Mark Berry BA(Hons) MRTPI DMS
Head of Planning and Building Control
Town Hall
EPSOM
KT18 5BY

Dear Mr Berry

PLANNING APPLICATION 14/01034/FUL
ROSEBERY HOUSE, 55 EAST STREET
REVISED SCHEME FOR CONVERSION AND EXTENSION

The previous application for this property was refused for the reasons that (1) the overdevelopment of the site and the erection of additional utilitarian structures and the loss of existing trees would have an adverse impact on visual amenity and on the appearance and setting of the adjacent conservation area (2) the intensification and overdevelopment of the site means that inadequate on-site parking and manoeuvring facilities would be provided for the retail element, having a harmful impact on the highway system (3) commercial vehicles would be caused to manoeuvre within the narrow residential roads, would affect effective use of highway and disturb the quiet amenity of the residential area. We had ourselves objected on the grounds of retail use, height, size and parking provision and effect on the conservation area.

The revised application attempts to deal with these matters by changing the ground floor use from retail to B1 offices and retaining parking in the undercroft instead of residential infill thus reducing the residential units from 32 to 30. The clutter of the lift parking stacks is removed and 30 residential parking places plus 4 (instead of 5) for visitors provided at ground level. But no parking is provided for the offices or for disabled, whereas the earlier scheme included 5 for retail and 2 for disabled. The total number of spaces is therefore reduced from 42 to 34 which is quite inadequate for 30 residential units and three offices. It is stated that there is provision to increase the number if required, but it is difficult to see where this this could be.

The page headed Appearance in the Design and Access Statement compares the existing building with the proposed with the addition of the suggested top floor. The present effect is neat and quite pleasant but the additional floor detracts from the appearance and creates a heavy and undesirable effect.

Overall we welcome the removal of the retail which stretches this use too far along East Street to the detriment of the town centre and for which there is likely to be little demand, and also the removal of the parking stacker and the retention of the trees. However, the parking provision is quite inadequate and we are unhappy about the appearance of the additional floor. We therefore consider that the amendments are insufficient and that this application should also be refused.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS
Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors