Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way EPSOM Surrey KT18 7QZ

4 October 2018

Ruth Ormella Head of Planning Town Hall EPSOM KT18 5BY

Dear Ruth

PLANNING APPLICATION 18/00271/FUL LAND AT MILL ROAD, EPSOM RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF 31 UNITS

This land, a mainly overgrown long narrow strip between Mill Road and the railway cutting, has been the subject of several previous applications for residential use. Permission was granted for housing in October 2013 and for student accommodation in November 2015, neither of which has been implemented. We have always felt that the development of this land would be very unfortunate but recognise that the past permissions may be material considerations and that land for residential development is now urgently required. We therefore reluctantly accept the principle of housing development, but this must be subject to very careful consideration being given to its extent and design and to the land near the railway bridge being kept as a wildlife reserve.

The present application is for 31 units in six buildings ranging from one to four floors in height, comprising 8 one-bed flats, 22 two-bed flats and 1 two-bed house, with parking for 34 cars arranged in spaces between the buildings. There is a suitably sized wildlife area, but we have seen no assurances that this land will be transferred to a local group together with a sum to cover the cost of setting up the site as provided previously, and we consider that this should be required.

In terms of design we do not consider that the proposals satisfy the requirements of Policies C5 or DM9 and 10 in terms of local distinctiveness, townscape, visual character, or other key features. In particular any new development should provide a suitable street scene which maintains or improves the local environment and respects the setting of the houses on the opposite side of Mill Road. We believe the submitted designs lack sufficient architectural interest and are very crowded on the site. The three and four storey buildings should be reduced in height by a floor. We are also concerned that the removal of trees, including two TPO specimens, would impair the outlook from the existing houses.



The layout of the car parking would have an unfortunate effect on the street scene. The number of spaces seems to satisfy the parking standards SPD but as usual these minimum numbers would be insufficient in an area where further roadside parking would be difficult and undesirable. These and our other comments suggest that the proposed level of layout would amount to overdevelopment.

In conclusion, we recognise the need for opportunities to be taken to increase the provision of new housing but feel that the quality of this proposal is inadequate and consider that the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS Vice Chairman

cc Ward Councillors