

# Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way  
EPSOM Surrey  
KT18 7QZ

31 May 2017

Mr Mark Berry BA(Hons) MRTPI DMS  
Head of Place Development  
Town Hall  
EPSOM  
KT18 5BY

Dear Mr Berry

PLANNING APPLICATION 17/00256/FUL  
5 ALEXANDRA ROAD, EPSOM  
DEMOLITION AND REDEVELOPMENT

This application offers a revised design intended to deal with the reasons for the refusal of the earlier proposal (15/01770/FUL). The appeal against that refusal was dismissed, but the Inspector did not accept reasons (4) and (5), about affordable housing and housing mix, and we are therefore considering only the character and appearance of the development and the loss of the rear garden land.

In the Design and Access Statement, the applicant has described, in great detail, how he has dealt with the criticisms in the refusal, the Inspector's report and the pre-app meetings. The result, described as a more modern approach taking note of the contemporary design of No 3, has set the building back further into the site, taken off the pitched roofs, and partly sunk the ground floor with some parking at the lower level but most in the front garden. We said of the previous application that we would prefer to see something with more architectural character. Regrettably the design now presented has even less.

There is confusion in the DA Statement, possibly by not carrying amendments forward into all relevant sections, but the application is for eight 2-bed flats and two 3-bed flats, totalling the same as before. Car parking standards therefore require 11 spaces against the 10 provided. They have been moved from the rear garden to the front of the house, 4 in the lower ground floor (a move towards No3's style) and six in front of the house. This does not improve the street scene even with landscaping behind the pavement. As even standard parking is never sufficient, more than 10 should be provided.

In terms of landscaping, seven trees are to be removed, including three in front of the building. This area would be occupied mainly by car parking, the new landscaping would be very limited and little space would be available for replacement trees,

In conclusion therefore, this redesign is not satisfactory. The front, as shown on the online drawings, has little character and is made worse by the car parking and lack of adequate landscaping. The rear building is a large structure and does still give the impression of overdevelopment. The site is larger than the adjoining ones, but we have come to the view that 10 flats is more that it can accommodate. For these reasons, and those given above, we are unable to support the grant of planning permission in this case.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS  
Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors