

Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way
EPSOM Surrey
KT18 7QZ

7 May 2018

Mr Viv Evans Dip TP, MRTPI, FRGS, FRSA
Interim Head of Planning and Building Control
Town Hall
EPSOM
KT18 5BY

Dear Mr Evans

PLANNING APPLICATION 18/00052/OUT
2 PINE HILL, EPSOM
CHANGE OF USE, EXTENSION AND ALTERATION

2 Pine Hill is a large prominent house at the entrance to the Woodcote Estate, which has a consistent character of high quality two-storey detached houses on private well-maintained roads. An Environmental Character Study recommends that its character should be retained and enhanced. In its present ownership the house has deteriorated into a 10-bedroom House in Multiple Occupation, which is causing great concern in the area. An earlier proposal (17/00678/OUT) gave rise to much objection, including our own, and was withdrawn.

The present application seeks permission for the addition of a new upper eaves floor to create eight 2- and 3-bedroom flats on three floors. The sketches of the proposed elevations give no indication of the appearance of the building and, although at this stage that is a reserved matter, the dotted lines on the drawing of the existing front elevation shows the overall effect, which is totally unacceptable. This increase in the bulk of the building is even more important than any increase in footprint. It is also close to 6 Pine Hill and the proposed extension would be overbearing. The proposed enlargement of the building would change a well-designed house into a solid block, which would be entirely out of keeping with the character of the Woodcote Estate.

The Planning Statement suggests that the house is already different in style and character from other houses in the estate and that the proposal would be better than the present HMO. Neither argument can justify the changes now proposed to what was once, and should be again, a very desirable single residence.

The present amended proposal would still be contrary to policies CS5 in that it does not reinforce or complement the attractive characteristics of the Borough, DM5 in that trees and landscape would not be protected or enhanced, DM9 in that it would not be compatible with local character and DM10 because it would not contribute to any of the listed aspects of local distinctiveness.

We consider that the changes compared with the earlier proposal are not satisfactory and that the present application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS
Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors