

# Epsom Civic Society

formerly Epsom Protection Society

740001001



shaping the future, safeguarding the past

<mailto:marthur20@gmail.com>

20a Langton Avenue  
Ewell Epsom  
KT17 1LD

19 July 2023

Gemma Paterson  
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council  
Planning Department  
Town Hall  
EPSOM KT18 5BY

Dear Gemma Paterson

*Planning application 23/00577/FUL - 6a Bucknills Close KT18 7NY*

Epsom Civic Society has viewed the details of the application for the demolition of house and replacement with six new residential dwellings.

1. ECS notes that in the documents tab there is reference to the listing of four drawings as being existing site and location plans. There are no such drawings. What is listed are proposals. This omission is important as it is necessary to consider the site and block plan layouts as they exist.
2. The property, the subject of this application has its access and design as fronting and being part of the street scene of Bucknills Close.

Member of



3. What is presented as proposals for redevelopment is a back to front arrangement with a recent 1.83m high close boarded fence erected to the frontage blocking off the Bucknills Close access and view (this in itself is questionable about requiring prior approval). We believe this to be bad planning in turning the site around and accessing solely from White Horse Drive. The juxtaposition of the house is Bucknills Close
4. What is proposed is a far too intensive development in fitting six houses on to a site currently occupied with one. This is really a case of "Town Cramming" quoted in Development Management Policy at 3.19.
5. It is accepted that a higher density is expected for future re-development in the existing urban environment, but this must be done in an acceptable, sensible and policy compliant way which the proposals are not. They are contrary to plan polices, namely,
6. NPPF 130 "Requires well designed places with good accessibility.
7. CS1 "Requires high quality sustainable development"
8. DM10 "Requiring appropriate layout and access arrangements"
9. DM16 "Requiring consideration of the impact on neighbours" and "long access roads not normally acceptable".
10. In addition to the above, the proposals fall short:-
  - (a) The driveway (not a road access) is too narrow to accommodate what would be 9/10 properties under this plan. (Six new proposed plus two detached dwellings, plus a builder's yard plus an office which, seemingly, could be converted to residential under PD rights and, separately, retaining the yard).
  - (b) Surrey Design Guide for more than six properties accessing off a private drive requires a minimum ~~width~~ <sup>with</sup> of 4.1 m - far more that is available.

(c) Fire and Rescue services require a minimum of 3.7m wide access for buildings over 45m from the highway. The rear of the property proposed on the submitted block plan scales 133m from the highway - seriously in excess and therefore non-compliant on distance and drive width.

(d) The waste and recycling collections are non-compliant with the reason well set out in the Manager's submitted comments. The proposal documents say that it will circumvent this requirement by employing a private contractor, but that is not an option and would be illegal for this type of development.

11. The parking spaces fall short of requirements. There should be no relaxation from the parking policy adopted standards. There is high on-street parking stress both in White Horse Drive and all adjoining roads along Dorking Road and the hospital area.

12. This application is unsuitable in its design, layout and location.

In view of the foregoing, refusal is requested.

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Michael Arthur MBE Ret.FCIOB FCMI

c.c. Ward Councillors

Member of

