

# Epsom Civic Society

**shaping the future, safeguarding the past**

2 Leighton Way  
EPSOM Surrey  
KT18 7QZ

7 August 2018

Neil Devereux  
The Planning Inspectorate  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
BRISTOL  
BS1 6PN

Dear Mr Devereux

PLANNING APPEAL APP/P3610/W/18/3196610  
55 CHRIST CHURCH MOUNT, EPSOM  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND ERECTION OF NEW DWELLING

This Society is the local amenity society for Epsom, founded in 1959 and with a current membership approaching 2000. Our aims include the protection of the environment and the encouragement of high standards in planning and development.

This Appeal relates to the construction of a new dwelling on the site of the existing house at 55 Christ Church Mount. The design (application 17/00334/FUL) is a revision of that for a previous application (16/01074/FUL) which had been refused on the main grounds that “the dwelling in terms of its design, bulk, scale, siting and layout would be clearly at odds with the prevailing dwelling typology in the immediate and wider area, and would appear as an incongruous element in the street scene”. The current application was refused on grounds that “the proposal due to a combination of its eaves height proximity to the flank boundaries, depth in relation its neighbours and the disposition of the proposed windows would have an adverse impact on the street scene and on the amenities of the neighbouring properties”.

This Society’s letters on the subject will be with your papers, but I wish to emphasise the reasons for our objection to the proposal set out in the final paragraph of my letter dated 20 July 2017. This had been omitted from the quotation in the officers’ report but at our request was read to the Planning Committee by the Head of Planning, as demonstrated in the transcription attached to the Grounds of Appeal. These are:

“In our opinion, the current proposal, although providing an elevation adapted to suit local typology, retains the bulk, scale and layout for which it was refused previously. It is therefore contrary to policies CS5, DM9 and DM10, and does not comply with the principles of neighbourliness embodied in the Supplementary Guidance Notes. We cannot support the grant of planning permission unless these outstanding issues are satisfactorily dealt with, and failing this, permission should be refused.”

In the Grounds for Appeal we note that a main argument depends on regarding the earlier refusal decision as a material consideration and claiming that reasons for refusal not then expressed could not now be introduced. We cannot understand the reasoning behind this as the principle reason for refusal quoted earlier in this letter was sufficient in itself and other reasons were therefore unnecessary. The present application was quite rightly dealt with on its own merits, regardless of the earlier decision.

In all the circumstances we support the decision to refuse the application and believe that this Appeal should be dismissed.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS  
Vice Chairman