

# Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way  
EPSOM Surrey  
KT18 7QZ

25 July 2017

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

Dear Mr Berry

PLANNING APPLICATION 17/00429/FUL  
NESCOT HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PHASE 2

Following the withdrawal of the proposed Dementia Care Home, we welcome the proposal that the land should be developed as the second phase of the housing site now known as Sycamore Gardens. This is the logical use and will provide a valuable contribution to the housing target, provided it is built to satisfactory standards and complies appropriate planning policies.

There has been much local criticism a large part based on the density and the belief that the local infrastructure, physical and social, would not to be able to cope. Our support would be subject to consultations demonstrating that such concerns are unfounded.

It is unfortunate that the two phases appear as separate entities and are not more closely joined up, but such difficulties clearly arise from the late availability of the second phase site. It would seem possible to have continued housing along the main road frontage although this would involve the noisy traffic at the roundabout and there are likely to be practical problems.

Policy DM11 states that housing density will in most cases not exceed 40 dwellings per hectare, although exceptions are mentioned. Phase 1 of Sycamore Gardens was a low density scheme of 91 houses on 3.7h representing only 25dph. The site for Phase 2 on the other hand has an area of 1.55h and the proposed 88 units would amount to 57dph. A case could be made for continuing the same low density layout, which would mean omitting the flats. Overall the whole estate as now proposed would be equivalent to 34dph. Whilst Phase 2 is tighter and denser than we would wish, the overall density is not unreasonable and we do not make a major issue of this .

The proposed 29 affordable units represent only 33% of the total 88. This is unsatisfactory and a minimum of the full 40% should be required. In terms of viability we have in mind the recent decision in Islington; in the present instance the applicants were fully aware of the affordable housing requirements when they purchased the land and we cannot accept that costs prevent the provision of the proper amount as defined in Policy CS9.

In conclusion we support the principle of extending Sycamore Gardens into the Phase 2 site, subject to the issues mentioned above. This would provide a substantial amount towards the housing requirements of the Borough. We would have preferred lower density but in each case a balance must be struck.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS  
Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors