



NEWSLETTER No - 166 – SPRING 2021

CHAIR'S COMMENTARY

Dear Members,

The Society's first newsletter of the year prompts me to look back to last Spring's newsletter and reflect upon the extent of progress since our January 2020 open meeting, when we encouraged as many of you as possible to get involved and have your say in the draft Local Plan process so that policies in the new Local Plan, when adopted, reflect community priorities in shaping the future of the Borough. We highlighted the significant planning challenges and constraints we face and flagged up at the meeting several planning applications giving serious cause for concern. We could not have foreseen the nature and extent of central government's planning reform agenda nor the impact of the pandemic on us all. Where are we now?

More Planning Reform

On 3 December 2020, the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government launched a consultation (its third in 2020 on planning reform), 'Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure' seeking views on proposals for:

- A new national permitted development right for the change of use from the Commercial, Business and Service use class (Class E, introduced in September 2020) to residential (Class C3) to increase delivery of new homes (without the need to go through the full planning application process).
- Measures to provide public service infrastructure (schools, colleges and universities, hospitals and prisons, young offenders' institutions, and other criminal justice accommodation) more quickly through expanded permitted development rights and a streamlined planning application process.
- The approach to simplifying and consolidating existing permitted development rights following changes to the Use Classes Order.

[Supporting housing delivery and public service infrastructure - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/supporting-housing-delivery-and-public-service-infrastructure)

Broadly, the Society felt that it was premature for the Government to plough on with the changes set out, given that they have yet to respond to the concerns raised by the Society and many others (44,000

responses in total) about the basis and practicality of the earlier reform proposals set out in the ‘Planning for the Future’ consultation document (August 2020).

In summary, our view is that these latest proposals (as with the earlier consultation) are:

- Thinly researched in terms of evidence of the nature and cause of problems.
- Fail to consider the wider context in terms of the role of town centres, the lack of resources within local authorities to speed up the planning process, the shortage of funding for public sector building projects.
- Exclude local people from planning approval decisions in their own areas.
- An almost ‘Soviet style’ centralisation of control towards national government which does not sit well in terms of either efficiency or effectiveness (nor the liberal, democratic tradition of this country).

The Society’s full response, together with our responses to the government’s two planning reform consultations published in August 2020, is available on our website: [Planning Consultations – Epsom Civic Society](#)

The consultation has national as well as local implications, and we encourage members to share our response with friends and family and to engage their own councils and MPs.

A fourth consultation, regarding proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework and create a National Model Design Code, was published at the end of January 2021: [National Planning Policy Framework and National Model Design Code: consultation proposals - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#) We intend to respond to these proposals, some of which appear to conflict directly with what has been proposed above.

Local Plan and Housing Numbers

From the latest information available, it is likely that the Council’s Licensing and Planning Policy Committee will approve the final **timetable for the draft Local Plan** at their meeting in March, aiming for a Regulation 18 (public) consultation in September 2021 and an estimated date for adoption of the Plan in December 2023 (the government deadline). This is one year later than previously set out in the Local Plan Programme 2020. If the consultation does go ahead in September, that’s an opportunity for you to have your say. Register for updates on the Local Plan’s progress and the launch of the consultation by emailing your details to: localplan@epsom-ewell.gov.uk

On 19 January 2021 the government released the **Housing Delivery Test** figures 2020: [Housing Delivery Test: 2020 measurement - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#). We were right to anticipate that the results would not be good for the Borough: the second worst deliverer of new housing in England at 34% of target over a three-year period (only Eastbourne is lower on 29%). Perhaps of more significance was **Housing Minister** Christopher Pincher’s **letter** (also 19 January) to local council leaders urging them to ensure their Local Plan is up-to-date: *“I will consider contacting those authorities where delays to plan-making have occurred to discuss the reasons why this has happened, and to explore what support my Department can offer.”* The combination of delivering less than three-quarters of local housing need plus a Local

Plan that is more than five years old brings Epsom and Ewell Borough Council clearly into the Minister's sights, raising the possibility of central government intervention.

Last year's consultation and debates over local authority housing numbers and the subsequent revisions to the **Standard Method for assessing local housing need** (recalculation of the 'mutant algorithm') have made no meaningful difference here, with the Borough's indicative housing need coming in at 577 dwellings a year (reduced to 529 for 2019/2020 in recognition of initial lockdown disruption and based on 11, not 12 months for the year).

In his written Ministerial Statement to Parliament (16 December 2020), Secretary of State Robert Jenrick advised:

"...the standard method does not present a 'target' in plan-making, but instead provides a starting point for determining the level of need for housing in an area. It is only after consideration of this, alongside what constraints areas face, such as the Green Belt, and the land that is actually available for development, that the decision on how many homes should be planned for is made."

[Written statements - Written questions, answers and statements - UK Parliament](#)

Considering the impact of local constraints, and in the absence of a draft Local Plan that satisfies the Planning Inspector, we cannot at this stage say with any certainty what a realistic, deliverable annual housing figure for the Borough would be.

Stoneleigh and Auriol Neighbourhood Forum (SANF)

I was very pleased to have an initial meeting in February with Keith Tutton, SANF Chairman and some of his fellow committee members to discuss opportunities for the Society and SANF to work together and support each other in matters of common interest. The Forum is in the early stages of creating a Neighbourhood Plan. If you would like to find out more and get involved, do get in touch via their website: [Stoneleigh and Auriol Neighbourhood Forum \(sanf.org.uk\)](http://sanf.org.uk)

The Wells Community Centre

The Society has long been a supporter of retaining and re-opening the existing Wells Community Centre to restore an asset of enormous social value to residents. Epsom Wells Community Association's website is now operational: catch up on their latest news, including funding plans and their interview on Radio Jackie here: [News – Epsom Wells Community Association](#) Take their survey and find out how you can help: [Get Involved – Epsom Wells Community Association](#)



Emily Davison Statue

Installation of the Emily Davison statue in the marketplace, originally scheduled for 8 March 2021 has been postponed until June 2021, date to be notified.

Friends of Horton Cemetery

The Society has been advising the Friends of Horton Cemetery whose vision is for this neglected 5-acre site to be transformed into a public garden-arboretum-nature reserve, for calm walks, meditation and reading, with a suitable memorial to all those buried there. The officers for Horton cemetery are recommending to the Council Committee that the cemetery be added to the list of local heritage assets. Check out their website for more information: [Epsom's Forgotten Cemetery - Friends of Horton Cemetery](#)

Draft Planning Enforcement Plan: Public Consultation

If you have views on planning enforcement that you'd like to share with the Council, you will be interested to know that at their January meeting, the Council's Licensing and Planning Policy Committee approved a **6-week public consultation period** for the Draft Planning Enforcement Plan, details currently in Appendix 1 of the agenda papers: [\(Public Pack\)Agenda Document for Licensing and Planning Policy Committee, 21/01/2021 19:00 \(epsom-ewell.gov.uk\)](#) At the time of writing, no date has been published for the commencement of the consultation period, so please check the Council's website for updates and how to respond.

Local Heritage Listing:



Two items of good news, firstly the publication in January 2021 of Historic England's comprehensive guide to developing **local heritage lists**, based on examples of good practice from around the country. The guide will be useful to anyone with an interest in raising the profile of local heritage assets and promoting their area's local character and distinctiveness. Find out more: [Local Listing | Historic England](#) Secondly, the announcement in February that Surrey councils have been successful in their joint bid for central government funding to develop new or update their existing local heritage lists:

[Local heritage list campaign: announcement of successful areas - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](#)

Margaret Hollins

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following are recent or revised applications:

Holland House Mospey Crescent (21/00110/FLH): This application is to erect a 1.8m high steel Saxon type fence to the front garden at the back of pavement with side returns to next door and to Burgh Heath Road frontage. Also incorporated is a proposed double-width gate to a widened drive entrance in the same material.

The property abuts the Burgh Heath Road Conservation Area with the proposed fence commencing within 25m of that boundary. The Society has written in objection to



this application which is considered alien and inappropriate to this location. We have advanced policy conditions for refusal of DM10 - requiring development of good design and contributing to the character and local distinctiveness and CS 5 - development to integrate well into existing neighbourhoods, as reasons for refusal. Additionally, in support of refusal, NPPF 130 states that "permission should be refused for development of poor design and fails to take opportunities to improve the character..."

The Environmental Character study 2007 is a widely adopted 'Planning Tool' and is seen as relevant for grounds for refusal. It specifically refers to Mospey Crescent and states as follows:

"A characteristic of this area is front gardens without boundaries which gives an open feel and merges private and public space ... At Mospey Crescent and Burghfield this is particularly successful where well ordered and large front plots extend into the streetscape with street trees (ornamental) and shrubs form a positive and varied street element....The area east of Burgh Heath Road (Mospey Crescent and Burghfield) is of a higher quality in terms of build, materials, individuality and has a medium-high townscape quality".

The following are ongoing applications:

Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP) for Hospital Site (20/00249/FUL): Further design amendments have been recently submitted for this application for a six-storey car park on the Epsom Hospital site. If anything the amendments are even worse than the originally submitted scheme with areas of brickwork now substituted by pre-cast concrete facings and galvanised steel grills. The Society will be again objecting to the proposed external material changes having objected to the initial submission last year on various grounds including bulk, mass and utilitarian appearance being harmful to the character of the surrounding Woodcote Conservation Area and adjacent Sports Club and nearby heritage assets.

Guild Living residential home, Epsom Hospital site, Woodcote Green Road (21/00252/FUL):

Following refusal of the previous application a revised proposal has been submitted comprising no fewer than 177 documents. ECS is reviewing these documents and will respond accordingly.

22/24 Dorking Road (19/01365/FUL): An appeal has been lodged against the refusal of the Council to allow the demolition of two houses and redevelop with 20 flats with underground car parking. The Council's case is that the proposal is non-compliant by its density, scale and massing; being deficient in car parking requirements;

causing harm to the impact on the settings of nearby heritage assets particularly grade II* Hylands House opposite the site.



The Epsom Hospital site showing the sorry state of the roof which has been destroyed. The application for its redevelopment into a retirement home was refused and a new proposal has been submitted. (Photo: Margaret Hollins)

Clayhill Lodge & Allonby in West Hill (20/000031/FUL): This application for 14 flats and 9 houses is still under consideration one year on from the application being lodged.

The Lodge West Street Ewell (19/01604/FUL): We wrote in the Spring 2020 newsletter that this application was complicated within this Ewell Village Conservation Area site. This has since become compounded as the Planning Committee refused the application to demolish the former park keeper's house and build two houses and three flats on half of the total original curtilage of the lodge but with the other half having previously received approval for three houses. This decision to refuse went against the

officers' recommendation to approve the application. Then the decision notice issued following the meeting said the application was APPROVED! This error was quickly spotted and an amended and correct decision letter was issued. The applicant nevertheless appealed against the second letter saying that approval had been given. EEBC has issued a revocation notice to withdraw the incorrect decision letter. The matter has now gone to the planning inspectorate but it is not a normal type of appeal. The latest we hear is that the matter is going for a Judicial Review. Depending upon that outcome, the whole matter of the application may be opened up before a Planning Inspector at a public inquiry (or Webinar if Covid-19 restrictions apply), possibly set for May 2021.

107-111 East Street (20/00797/FUL): The Society has written twice objecting to the proposal for a large overbearing development at the corner of Kiln Lane. This application still awaits a Council decision.

65 London Road (20/01079/FUL): This is the application for the construction of a three to six storey building comprising 45 flats on the site of the former Organ & Dragon public house. There has been local opposition to the extensive bulk and mass with problems for highway access close to complex nearby road junctions. There appear to be seemingly protracted negotiations with no date known when this will be considered at the planning committee.

39 Manor Green Road (20/00525/FUL): The Society wrote to the Planning Inspectorate supporting the Council's refusal to allow an outbuilding in the rear garden to be granted permission of change of use into a separate residential building fronting Hamilton Close. A decision is awaited from the Inspectorate.

Chalk Lane Hotel (20/01185/LBA): No new update to report since our last newsletter with a decision still awaited.

Church Street Police and Ambulance Station sites (19/01589/FUL): This McCarthy and Stone application for 60 Extra Care Units for occupation by persons aged 70 or over was withdrawn on 19 February, over a year since the proposal was validated. No reason was given for the withdrawal. There was substantial local opposition, and the Society's own letter recommended refusal of the application on several grounds, including height and density, the adverse impact on the adjacent Church Street Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings.

113 Longdown Lane South (20/00545/CLP): This property has been the subject of a very long succession of no fewer than 14 planning applications, dating back to 1988. Most have been refused or withdrawn, but in 2003 permission was granted for the conversion of a stable block to provide two staff flats; in 2006 permission was granted for a 2-storey extension; and in 2010 permission was granted for the conversion of a detached garage to create a granny annexe. The application which is currently outstanding and awaiting a decision from the Council was made in April 2020 and seeks permission for the extension of existing outbuildings. Meanwhile, neighbours allege that the old stable block building is being used not as a granny annexe but as a separate dwelling with multiple occupancy and that an enforcement order issued by the Council to prevent this use is being ignored. The owner has appealed to the Secretary of State against the enforcement order and your Society has joined College Ward Residents' Association and neighbours in writing to the Secretary of State, opposing the appeal.

Michael Arthur

Contributors **John Mumford** and **Ian Muirhead**

CONSERVATION AND HERITAGE

Whilst our lives have been changed over the last year it has given us the opportunity to appreciate what our green and pleasant Borough has to offer. I have just returned from walking the dogs over the Downs and Langley Vale Wood and it is glorious to see the onset of spring and how the current mild weather gives everyone you meet a big smile. A key issue over the last year has been the protection of the Green Belt. The fundamental aim of the Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Our local Green Belt is being continually challenged by planning applications.

Langley Bottom Farm Buildings (20/00475/FUL): This application was recently refused by the Planning Committee. The proposed scheme was for the demolition of the farm buildings and the construction of 20 new houses, all located on the Green Belt. There was a previous S106 discharge application for the removal of the agricultural occupancy obligation. This was refused by the Council but is now the subject of an Appeal. Well done to Bernice Froud and all the objectors.

Other planning applications of general concern are:

6 The Grove (20/01855/FUL): We reported in our Winter Newsletter that the applicant had chosen to appeal against the Council's refusal to application 20/00313/FUL, which was for a three-storey block of flats with a basement car park. The appeal was refused by the Planning Inspectorate. However, in the meantime, the applicant has submitted a further application (20/01855/FUL) for a very similar three-storey block but now with surface parking. The ECS continues to strongly support the residents in their objections to this latest scheme.

Friars Garth Offices and Affordable Housing (20/01229/FUL): This application has recently been withdrawn. We were concerned that an initial scheme for the demolition of Friars Garth house and the new build of a three-storey block of flats into a bland block covering the whole footprint of the site would be permitted. The Society strongly objected to this poorly designed scheme which would have destroyed the character of The Parade. Well done to the local residents and the detail of their objections.

1 Burgh Heath Road (21/00031/FUL): This current application is for the closure of the Nursing Home and the extension of the property to form nine flats. The property is situated at the north end of the Burgh Heath Road Conservation Area. Perhaps it is a sign of our present times that nursing homes are facing a difficult future. We welcome the additional flats, but we remain concerned by the impact of the proposed design on the neighbours' amenities and the negative impact on the Conservation Area. The application includes felling the tree (pictured).



24/28 West Street (19/01021/FUL): An amended application was submitted for a block of 25 flats eight storeys high and with commercial space at ground floor. The proposal has continued to trouble us. The original proposal for a 13 storey tower block at the junction of West Street and Station Approach was understandably strongly objected to by all parties. The Council had previously assisted the applicant in the preparation of its proposal. While the new drawings reduce the height to 7/8 storeys, the Society has objected to this latest scheme and supports the recommendations of Historic England. They suggest further height reductions and design changes to the roof and upper floors. These amendments are encouraged to prevent this scheme from dominating the town centre landscape and adversely affecting the character of the adjacent Stamford Green CA.

Bob Hollis

THE DOWNS

Epsom Downs are owned by Epsom Downs Racecourse and are not common land. However, the general public has a right of access under the Epsom & Walton Downs Regulation Act 1984, which safeguards the interests of the public from the development of the Downs for horse racing and training purposes.

The management of the Downs is the responsibility of the Downs Conservators, whose principal role is to facilitate the training of racehorses, which use the gallops and have priority over other users until noon each day (and 09.30 on Sundays). They also have a duty “*to preserve the Downs as far as possible in their natural state of beauty*”. The Conservators meet quarterly and comprise Borough Councillors, representatives of Jockey Club Racecourses and the Horserace Betting Levy Board. Members of the public can attend these meetings, but are not entitled to participate.

Downskeepers are employed by the Conservators and their white Council vehicles can be seen policing the Downs when racehorse training activity is taking place, to ensure the safety both of the horses and their jockeys and to protect the general public.

The Downs Consultative Committee works alongside the Conservators and represents the interests of other users of the Downs, including hack riders, cyclists, model aircraft enthusiasts and local Residents’ Associations. By invitation, representatives of Epsom Civic Society and local Residents’ Associations attend sittings of the Committee, which meets twice annually.



Damage by vehicles to Epsom Downs and the surrounding Golf course led the Conservators to build embankments or ‘bunds’ (pictured right) to prevent access.

During the past year, vehicular access to the racecourse area of the Downs has been prohibited, in order to prevent vehicles driving and parking around the course in a way which it was considered had been detrimentally affecting “the natural state of beauty” of the Downs, and potentially endangering both riders and walkers. Visitors to the Downs might also have noticed that embankments of earth (known as “bunds”) have been built alongside some of the roads both within and outside the area of the racecourse. This work was undertaken by Epsom Golf Club, whose course lies within the defined area of the Downs between Burgh Heath Road and the Grandstand and which was concerned at the damage caused by vehicles being driven onto the course.



The Club sought permission from the Conservators to install or reinstate the ‘bunds’ on the verges of the roads surrounding the course, and at their December 2020 meeting the Conservators granted the necessary permission in principle and delegated to the Clerk of the Conservators responsibility for approving the extent and nature of the works.



Downs House stables are being refurbished. The stables were famous for training the racehorse Eclipse, depicted here by George Stubbs.

In a separate development, building works are now underway at the site of Downs House, which is situated among the trees on the South side of the Downs. The Downs House stables are believed to date back to the 1780s and are Grade II listed. The property has had an illustrious racing history, having been the training yard for Eclipse, a thoroughbred from which 80% of today's bloodstock is believed to be descended.

Until the 1980s Downs House had for many years been the site of Philip Mitchell's racing stables, but when the stables closed the buildings were abandoned and fell into disrepair.

In 2015, the house and stables were bought by their present owners, Eclipse Barn Racing, and Equine Planning Solutions was commissioned to redesign the existing yard, working closely with both the site owner and Jockey Club Estates to produce a scheme which would allow this historic racing site to be brought back into everyday use. In 2018, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council gave the go-ahead for the resulting proposal, which was subsequently ratified by the Secretary of State as an approved green belt development. The plans involve the demolition of the stables, the erection of new American barns and the refurbishment of the listed granary/store. The development will incorporate an advanced racehorse training yard with stabling for up to 80 horses, a 55m x 30m outdoor arena, a 250m all weather oval gallop, horse walker and associated grooms and trainers' accommodation.

The ground works are now well advanced, and the Society welcomes this first initiative of its kind for many years, which portends well for the future of Epsom racing.

Ian Muirhead

JOIN OUR TREE PLANTING SCHEME

Last autumn volunteers (pictured right) from Epsom & Ewell Tree Advisory Board (EETAB) and a local church group spent a few hours planting out over one hundred new young trees donated to us by the Woodland Trust. This is the second round of planting that we have completed on this land at Horton Lane turning a neglected site into a new woodland and nature reserve with more than two hundred new trees now in the ground. Planting for the future, planting for Epsom!



Kevin at work at the Bridle Road allotment preparing to store young trees for planting.

EETAB volunteers have taken over the use of two plots at Bridle Road allotments. They are a bit overgrown at the moment but we are swiftly working towards turning them into tree nurseries. We will store new young trees, many planted from seed by our members, and grow them on for planting around the Borough. If you feel like a 'Tree Champion' and would like to help us keep Epsom 'Green' then please contact us: epsomandewelltab@gmail.com

Kevin Greening

CLIMATE CHANGE AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

How our choice of windows influences our built heritage and the environment.

A recent article about uPVC windows resulted in a number of letters to us and so we hope that this feature article might help inform decisions and thinking about windows.

When designing, refurbishing or maintaining a building the role of windows can sometimes be overlooked. Individually, windows form highly technical components of a building, can hold significant historic value and the range of options and environmental considerations (including home comfort, maintenance and replacement) can be a daunting prospect for homeowners. As the topic of windows is extensive and technical, a summary of key items to consider as well as some suggested further information resources are briefly summarized in the table below.

Advantages and disadvantages of main window construction types:

The choice of a window should ideally consider three elements, namely: frame material; glazing type (and gas filler) and opening mechanism. These three components will have an overall impact on longevity, thermal performance, environmental footprint (construction, maintenance and disposal) and aesthetics of the home.

Material	Advantages	Disadvantages
Wood	<p>Wood is a renewable material which can be FSC certified</p> <p>Reduced environmental footprint</p> <p>Design life of windows can be in excess of 100 years in particular if heartwood is used in manufacture</p> <p>Suited to period properties and refurbishments</p> <p>Can be repaired.</p>	<p>Needs some maintenance such as repainting.</p> <p>Initial cost outlay can be higher than uPVC.</p>
Aluminum/ metal	<p>Lightweight</p> <p>Slender profiles</p> <p>Wide range of colour options and coatings</p>	<p>High carbon footprint in manufacture</p> <p>Thermal bridging and conductivity through metal (corrosion, condensation).</p> <p>Coatings may make them un-recyclable</p>
uPVC	<p>Cheaper to produce.</p> <p>Quick to install</p> <p>Most commonly offered by window suppliers.</p>	<p>Degrades over time (design life of 25 years approximately)</p> <p>Repair difficult so full replacement generally required.</p>

		<p>Difficult to recycle</p> <p>Restricted slender profile types and glazing bar options to match historic equivalents.</p> <p>Less suited to period properties (although wood effect uPVC now available).</p> <p>High carbon footprint (derived from fossil fuels)</p>
--	--	--

Environmental implications associated with our choice of windows:

Generally, windows in new dwellings and replacement windows need to be Building Regulations compliant (Part F ventilation, Part L Energy and Part M access). Most often this means a requirement for double glazing with a low emissivity coating. The coating is a thin layer of metal on the outer surface of the inner pane which reduces heat transfer across the pane, with the space in between filled with Argon gas, further reducing heat loss. Triple glazed windows are generally specified for Passivhaus type buildings and in this case Krypton may be used as a space filler but this leads to a significant cost increase. Window opening mechanisms typically attract less attention but can have an important impact on air leakage rates and hence overall thermal efficiency - generally casement and hinged windows have better performance than sash or sliding equivalents.

Thermal efficiency of windows is of importance when considering either replacement windows to an existing property or designing new homes or extensions. In the latter two cases the potential impact of Solar Heat Gain (SHG) also needs to be considered. SHG is an effective form of passive heating in the form of radiation which is able to pass through the glazing and heat the internal fabric of the building. However, long wave radiation that is re-radiated by the building can cause heat to accumulate and may generate a ‘greenhouse’ effect making the space uncomfortable. SHG will vary seasonally based on the change in angle of the sun with respect to the building. To lessen excessive SHG the size and orientation of windows is important. ‘Brise soleil’ or deeper roof overhangs may be required to reduce SHG. Carefully considered and cost effective planting of deciduous trees or shrubs can also allow for beneficial SHG in winter whilst providing shading in the summer months. Epsom & Ewell Borough Council (EEBC) provides some information on solar shading in their ‘Revised Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document’.

Repair and maintenance is often better than replacement

Traditional period windows (wood and metal) can often be simply and economically repaired at less than their replacement cost (Historic England, 2017). The full lifecycle cost of a replacement will be much greater than simply refurbishing - repair is not only more sustainable but makes economic sense, particularly when the use of shutters, curtains or secondary glazing is also taken into account. Simple measures such as replacing seals, sash cords, touching up of paint or installation of draught excluders can

improve and prolong the life of the window. It is possible to replace the glazed sash with thinner profiled double glazed units whilst maintaining the original sash box of a period property. Epsom and Ewell has 21 conservation areas where the overall character of the area needs be maintained or enhanced. It is vital to check Local Planning conditions prior to any changes to the external appearance of a property. Given the range of options available to improve, repair or reinstate original windows there should be generally be an available option to suit individual budgets and environmental objectives.

Our choices have an impact on our heritage and environment

We stand to lose a lot more than heat and environmental credentials through poor window repair or replacement choices (Historic England notes that uPVC window replacements in conservation areas have a detrimental impact on the value of the property). Even in the seemingly modest actions we take we can positively improve the character of our neighbourhoods and reduce our homes' carbon footprint. Our actions in replacing, repairing or maintaining our windows can help us achieve both the Borough and Government's goal of reaching net-zero carbon emissions.

Sources and useful references:

Centre for alternative Technology <https://cat.org.uk/>

Historic England, Traditional Windows- Their Care, Repair and Upgrading, February 2017
<https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/traditional-windows-care-repair-upgrading/>

Energy Efficient Glazing guidance, available at www.energysavingtrust.org.uk

English Heritage, Energy Efficiency and historic buildings, 2011
<https://historicengland.org.uk/advice/technical-advice/energy-efficiency-and-historic-buildings/>

Epsom and Ewell Borough Council 2016 [Sustainable Design Supplementary Planning Document](#)

Aurélie Paoli

EVENTS

Events were curtailed throughout 2020 but we trust this year will bring some special occasions. A date for your diary is **Sunday 4 July** for an **Ian West exploration of Ewell**, which was cancelled last year. Please meet **at Bourne Hall at 2.00pm**, for a walk lasting approximately one hour.

I hope that by mid-June we shall be able to plan ahead with more certainty and so please do let me know if you would like to come on the walk after **Monday 14 June** and how many members of your family will be attending. Ideally please do ring me on 01372 275580 or email wadsworthfamily@btinternet.com

We will keep you updated on our website and in the Summer Newsletter. Stay tuned!

Sheila Wadsworth

Please send any letters or comments for consideration to: Newsletter Editor: publicity@epsomcivicsociety.org.uk
All of our newsletters are available in colour on our website: www.epsomcivicsociety.org.uk
The document can be downloaded on screen where the website links can be downloaded.

Printed by: Pixel Digital Printing, Unit 6 Epsom Downs Metro Centre, Waterfield, Tadworth, KT20 5LR Tel: 01372 740 113