

# Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way  
EPSOM Surrey  
KT18 7QZ

4 August 2018

Ruth Ormella  
Head of Planning  
Town Hall  
EPSOM  
KT18 5BY

Dear Ruth

PLANNING APPLICATION 18/00315/FUL  
KINGS ARMS PH, 144 EAST STREET, EPSOM  
DEMOLITION AND ERECTION OF 3-STOREY BUILDING OF 16 APARTMENTS

This application follows the refusal of an earlier proposal (17/01209/FUL) for the erection of a building on only part of this site, and we are pleased to see that the whole of the site is now included in a single comprehensive development.

The Kings Arms is locally listed and has in the past been a successful local public house but it has been empty for some time. We have noted the Built Heritage Statement and the report on the licensed premises market by Fleurets. and are satisfied that the heritage value of the building is low and that it is unmarketable in its present form. We also support the development of the land for housing purposes, particularly in view of the present need to find such sites.

In design terms, East Street is very mixed and many recent buildings are flat roofed and with little individual architectural character. The proposed 3-storey building appears from the drawings to be within the height requirements of Policy DM25 but is higher than the existing premises and would have a solid appearance in this location. We would greatly prefer to see a pitched roof elevation in order to provide a more satisfactory street scene. The suggested materials are interesting but the brick colours would be better with less contrast, and the white concrete balconies would be too prominent. The retention of the sycamore tree and the provision of other landscaping is important, and more green area at the street frontage would be desirable.

16 apartments (4x3bed, 6x2bed, 6x1bed) are proposed housing up to 50 people and parking standards require a minimum of 18 spaces. The proposed 16 spaces are therefore quite inadequate and must be substantially increased.

It is said that the development could not viably support any on-site affordable housing but we are always cynical about such claims and this and the suggestion of a financial contribution must be carefully checked.

In conclusion we agree in principle with the development of this site for housing purposes but cannot support the detailed application unless the matters described are satisfactorily resolved.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS  
Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors