

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**



Name	Epsom Civic Society
Email Address	chair@epsomcivicsociety.org.uk
Address	[REDACTED]

Note: Details are needed to confirm legitimacy of response. Your response will be published on our consultation portal along with your name following the close of the consultation.

Please answer as many of the following 15 Questions as you would like. For ease of reference, we have provided the corresponding page numbers of the “Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan” document under each question.

Please return your completed response form by email (localplan@epsom-ewell.gov.uk) or by post to the following address by 23:59 on the 22 December 2023.

Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Town Hall,
The Parade
Epsom
Surrey
KT18 5BY

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Question 1 To what extent do you agree with the masterplan principles?

Page reference 1 - 9

Select the most applicable option in each row.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
[]	[]	[X]	[]	[]

Please enter any additional comments:

We suggest:

- tightening up these principles and more extensive and explicit linking into the rest of this document (and into future documents which it will inform) to assist the reader with cross-referencing and tracking
- improving Figure 1 (p7): to include at least some road names, the background is blurry. North South coordinates would be good too. Lots of ‘shoulds’ – suggest replacing with ‘must’. Inclusion of development heights and density indications.
- adding a specific principle on quality of design and quality of materials (or beef up Principle #1) Design quality is key
- adding a separate principle on the delivery of an improved public transport network to reduce the number of individual private vehicle journeys (or beef up Principle #4 – which should refer to the travel hierarchy)
- clearer language, avoiding jargon in Principle #5: ‘climatically comfortable’? We recommend using general terms of adaptation, mitigation, heat islands, surface water flooding, etc.
- clarifying Principle #6, which is very ‘broad brush’ even for a principle. Should it only apply to residents? What about businesses, and visitors? The final sentence, commencing ‘Seize the opportunity...’ relates to what, exactly?
- being bolder with Principle #7 so that it reads: “Deliver a net zero-carbon town centre and ensure buildings are constructed to a standard that meets the requirements of net zero carbon.” What is zero carbon ready? It’s either net zero (i.e. carbon emissions even out) or not. We broadly support the ‘fabric first’ approach, but note with interest the recent article by Eyre et al (2023) in Buildings and Cities: ‘Fabric first: is it still the right approach?’ <https://journal-buildingscities.org/articles/10.5334/bc.388>

We support:

- the context-led design approach in Principle #1
- Improving streets, spaces and public realm in Principle #2. This should link to quality of materials, eg stone setts in public alleyways (cf the public realm strategy and images P42)
- flexible spaces that can be easily re-purposed (Principle #3). We query whether the TCM can, of itself, ‘deliver communities’
- prioritising pedestrians and cyclists (Principle #4) BUT: what happens to the motor traffic? Where are the solutions? Needs to link to improving public transport
- greening the town centre (Principle #5) Pollinator-friendly planting should be a priority.

In general:

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

- it is useful to set out these principles, and we welcome their environmental focus and aspiration. We would like to see explicit and feasible solutions to these aspirations in the TCM, eg re Principle #4 (what happens to the traffic? Where are the solutions? Needs to link to improving public transport.)
- there should be an explicit acknowledgment that the Town Centre Conservation Area is – and has been for many years – on Historic England’s Risk Register. Masterplan principles and Local Plan policies must address this issue and provide solutions. Include a plan showing the extent of the TCCA and how it relates to the Town Centre Masterplan Area.

Question 2 To what extent do you agree with the baseline analysis?

Page reference 10 - 19

Select the most applicable option in each row.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
[]	[X]	[]	[]	[]

Please enter any additional comments:

We suggest:

- given the statement on page 11, section 2.3 (Ashley Centre and Global House): “...being mindful of heritage sensitivities intrinsic to this town centre location...”, and the section on Heritage and Building Heights paras 2.5 – 2.7, there should be an explicit acknowledgment in this section that the Town Centre Conservation Area is – and has been for many years – on Historic England’s Risk Register. Masterplan principles and Local Plan policies must address this issue and provide solutions. Include a plan showing the extent of the TCCA and how it relates to the Town Centre Masterplan Area
- substituting a photograph (page 11) of the other side of East Street appropriate to the location of Southern Gas Network site / Hook Road car park.

We are pleased to see an acknowledgment (para 2.5) that some architectural responses have detracted from the town centre’s overall character. The redevelopment of Station Approach springs to mind.

We support:

- a general presumption towards continuous active frontages (para 2.11). East Street and Ashley Avenue (p24) are areas that would benefit considerably from acting on this presumption
- bold ambition to improve the public realm, connectivity, and green infrastructure (para 2.12-2.17)
- emphasis on the importance of good design, ‘quality over quantity’, including deployment of appropriate materials. We would welcome explanation of the ‘tenacious approach’ advocated in para 2.15 and how to ensure its delivery.

Paragraph 2.41, page 11 – Access and Movement: “Barriers to pedestrian movement ...we see as essential.” Should this read “*Removal* of barriers to pedestrian movement...were seen as essential.”? (Cf Exhibition Road, Kensington reference, p51.)

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

The baseline analysis in these pages summarises Appendix B. It would assist the reader if:

- these pages made explicit reference to Appendix B (see, eg, para 2.4, which currently makes no reference to it)
- the pagination of this document were continuous, to include appendices A and B, rather than reverting to, respectively, 'Page A1' and 'Page 1' which is unhelpful for cross-referencing and not conducive to encouraging public engagement.

Question 3 To what extent do you agree with the design response?

Page reference 19-21

Select the most applicable option in each row.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
[]	[]	[x]	[]	[]

Please enter any additional comments:

We are largely in agreement but a truly holistic consideration (2.42) of the town centre must acknowledge that the Town Centre Conservation Area is – and has been for many years – on Historic England’s Risk Register. This is especially relevant in the section on Heritage and Building Heights (paras 2.46 – 2.50). Masterplan principles and Local Plan policies must address this issue and provide solutions. Include a plan showing the extent of the TCCA and how it relates to the Town Centre Masterplan Area.

We would like to see:

- a consistent approach to building heights throughout the document
- definitions of ‘low-rise’, ‘medium-rise’ and ‘high-rise’
- specified height limits
- inclusion of design approaches to delivering flood resilience
- acknowledgment of the role of design codes.

We query:

- inclusion of Areas 6 (Rosebery Park Edge) and 8 (Station Approach) as *Character Areas*. Is it realistic to suggest scope for significant and meaningful change when there isn’t any? If Area 6 is to be retained, we suggest enlarging it to include Swail House. To clarify our position on Station Approach, we agree with its description as: “a ... hostile environment lacking in aesthetic quality” (p32, para 3.22). It is in urgent need of improvement, which we would welcome, including improved permeability for pedestrians, but short of declaring it a Regeneration Area meriting large-scale redevelopment, the scope for improvement is limited.

We note the particular importance of paragraph 2.52 (p21) and the critical role of the A24. As we suggested in our response to the Reg 18 consultation on the draft Local Plan, reducing the speed limit to 20pmh would go some way in support of Principle #4, prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists.

Question 4 Do you think the "Character Areas" are an accurate representation of different areas of the town centre?

Page reference 22:

Yes [x]
Subject to the comments below
Please enter any additional comments:
We query:

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

- inclusion of Areas 6 (Rosebery Park Edge) and 8 (Station Approach) as *Character Areas*. Is it realistic to suggest scope for significant and meaningful change when there isn't any? See para 3.24 (p32) re Station Approach, also para 2.5 (p12).

We suggest:

- if Area 6 is to be retained, enlarging it to include Swail House.

To clarify our position on Station Approach:

- we agree with its description as: “a ... hostile environment lacking in aesthetic quality” (p32, para 3.22). It is in urgent need of improvement, which we would welcome, including improved permeability for pedestrians. However, short of declaring it a Regeneration Area meriting large-scale redevelopment, the scope for improvement is limited
- visitors new to Epsom are presented with an unwelcoming, negative experience upon exiting the station (para 4.39) and commuters can hardly “delight in their surroundings” (Principle #2). David M Nelson’s article (2014) ‘Thinking Beyond the Station’ for the Project for Public Spaces has ideas: <https://www.pps.org/article/thinking-beyond-the-station>

Question 5 Do you have any comments on our analysis of the character areas (please specify which ones)?

Page reference 22 – 35:

Our responses to Qs 3 and 4 are relevant to this question and are reproduced here for ease of reference.

Q3: A truly holistic consideration (2.42) of the town centre must acknowledge that the Town Centre Conservation Area is – and has been for many years – on Historic England’s Risk Register. This is especially relevant in the section on Heritage and Building Heights (paras 2.46 – 2.50). Masterplan principles and Local Plan policies must address this issue and provide solutions. Include a plan showing the extent of the TCCA and how it relates to the Town Centre Masterplan Area.

We would like to see:

- a consistent approach to building heights throughout the document
- definitions of ‘low-rise’, ‘medium-rise’ and ‘high-rise’
- specified height limits
- inclusion of design approaches to delivering flood resilience
- acknowledgment of the role of design codes.

We query:

- inclusion of Areas 6 (Rosebery Park Edge) and 8 (Station Approach) as *Character Areas*. Is it realistic to suggest scope for significant and meaningful change when there isn't any? If Area 6 is to be retained, we suggest enlarging it to include Swail House. To clarify our position on Station Approach, we agree with its description

Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation 24 November – 22 December 2023

as: “a ... hostile environment lacking in aesthetic quality” (p32, para 3.22). It is in urgent need of improvement, which we would welcome, including improved permeability for pedestrians, but short of declaring it a Regeneration Area meriting large-scale redevelopment, the scope for improvement is limited.

We note the particular importance of paragraph 2.52 (p21) and the critical role of the A24. As we suggested in our response to the Reg 18 consultation on the draft Local Plan, reducing the speed limit to 20pmh would go some way in support of Principle #4, prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists.

Q4: We query:

- inclusion of Areas 6 (Rosebery Park Edge) and 8 (Station Approach) as *Character Areas*. Is it realistic to suggest scope for significant and meaningful change when there isn't any? See para 3.24 (p32) re Station Approach, also para 2.5 (p12).

We suggest:

- if Area 6 is to be retained, enlarging it to include Swail House.

To clarify our position on Station Approach:

- we agree with its description as: “a ... hostile environment lacking in aesthetic quality” (p32, para 3.22). It is in urgent need of improvement, which we would welcome, including improved permeability for pedestrians. However, short of declaring it a Regeneration Area meriting large-scale redevelopment, the scope for improvement is limited
- visitors new to Epsom are presented with an unwelcoming, negative experience upon exiting the station (para 4.39) and commuters can hardly “delight in their surroundings” (Principle #2). David M Nelson's article (2014) 'Thinking Beyond the Station' for Project for Public Spaces has ideas:
<https://www.pps.org/article/thinking-beyond-the-station>

In addition:

- The narrative around 'Market Square' (surely the 'Marketplace'?) indicates that designated Conservation Areas are at risk. Is there now a developing narrative that tower blocks will be unacceptable? Would the approved plans for 24-28 West Street receive approval if submitted today? This is another part of the TCM that needs to acknowledge the Town Centre Conservation Area is – and has been for many years – on historic England's Risk Register. Masterplan principles and Local Plan policies must address this issue and provide solutions. Include a plan showing the extent of the TCCA and how it relates to the Town Centre Masterplan Area
- Ashley Avenue: agree para 3.5. We query the benefit of the proposed location for civic space and “landmark structure at a gateway to the town centre”. Is this a euphemism for an unacceptably tall building? Colour codings on the map for listed buildings and locally listed buildings are indistinguishable.
- The Parade and Church Street: we do not see “moving away from red brick facades of the town centre, adopting yellow brick and slate-coloured roof tiles” (para 3.8) as a problem, rather it adds to variety. The local vernacular should be respected, but not exclusively. We support retention of the area's quiet nature and its attractiveness for pedestrian movement. We would like to see retention of the original Town Hall building, failing which retention of its footprint, which contributes to the open aspect of that part of The Parade.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

- High Street East: we support removal of street clutter and the development strategy overall. We are interested in exploring the suitability of a 'shared space' approach, combined with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. We are aware that individuals who are blind or partially sighted have concerns about adopting a shared space approach and those concerns would need to be addressed. We would like to see the inclusion of Epsom Square in this Character Area, it needs help to realise its potential (Appendix B, p52 para 4.47 refers.).
- West Street: sadly, we feel the horse has bolted as regards the development strategy, given the approved plans for the redevelopment of 24-28 West Street. Another example of the Town Centre Conservation Area being at risk and consequently on Historic England's Risk Register.
- We would like to see design codes mapped on to each Character Area, and a link to existing Conservation Area Appraisals.
- We would like updated information on local listing and a statement on how it will inform the TCM and draft Local Plan.
- We welcome the development strategy for Upper High Street / Depot Road. Surely "an emphasis on good placemaking and well-considered building design" (para 3.21 p31) is applicable throughout the document?
- Good luck with the development strategy for Station Approach. Our comments above re Qs 3 and 4 refer.

Question 6 Do you have any comments on the public realm strategy?

Page reference 36 – 42:

We support a robust strategy for public realm improvements and agree with the analysis of the existing public realm.

We recommend getting a new and more accurate map done for the town's way-finding signage.

We support removal of street clutter and the public realm strategy overall. We are interested in exploring the suitability of a 'shared space' approach, combined with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. We are aware that individuals who are blind or partially sighted have concerns about adopting a shared space approach and those concerns would need to be addressed.

Resolving the tension between pedestrian use, cycle lanes and the A24 will be a challenge.

We suggest a separate yet complementary strategy for E-bikes with associated infrastructure, eg with E-bike facilities at the railway station.

We suggest a ULEZ to improve the town centre's air quality.

Connectivity between the station and the High Street is poor and uninviting and needs improvement.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Re-allocation of street space should continue to accommodate the servicing of shops and offices. We would like to see an explicit acknowledgment of servicing in the TCM.

Images deployed:

- Considerable artistic licence in the image on p38.
- The visuallisation on p39 does little to address the bleakness of Ashley Avenue. Difficult to justify the 8 (or is it 10?) storey building, as rendered, as contributing to local distinctiveness and being sensitive to the Town Centre Conservation Area.
- P41 images are not appropriate examples for Epsom unless they are intended to as a subliminal warning of what is to come and what we need to prepare ourselves for. Likewise, the images on pp 16 and 17 of Appendix B: utterly uninspiring for a “once in a generation opportunity to establish a deliverable ambition to improve the public realm” so that people can “delight in their surroundings” (para 2.13, Principle #2)
- P42 images of materials provide useful examples of what might be possible locally.

Question 7 Do you have any comments on the draft transport strategy?

Page reference 43 – 45:

We broadly support the draft transport strategy, while noting that it is essentially aspirational.

We query whether the draft strategy is realistic, deliverable within the timeframe of a new Local Plan, and where resources to fund delivery will come from.

We seek clarification of what exactly is intended regarding the blue and yellow routes on the map on p45 and what will happen to displaced motor traffic.

We suggest that taxi cabs be a central part of the transport strategy.

Cross-referencing to Appendix B, pp33-40 would be helpful in terms of aiding the reader and encouraging public engagement.

Please refer to additional comments in our response to Q15.

Question 8 Do you have any comments on the targeted interventions on the A24 (Please specify, e.g. Ashley Avenue, Ashley Road, High Street, Church Street or East Street).

Page reference 46 - 50:

Ashley Avenue: we support widened footways and improved pedestrian access. Proposed changes should include bus stops for members of the public to board and disembark.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Please refer to additional comments in our response to Q15.

Ashley Road: we support widened footways and widened pavements by bus stop facilities.

High Street: interventions supported. We would like to see dedicated paths for pedestrians, with separate cycle paths. We support removal of street clutter. We are interested in exploring the suitability of a 'shared space' approach, combined with the introduction of a 20mph speed limit. We are aware that individuals who are blind or partially sighted have concerns about adopting a shared space approach and those concerns would need to be addressed and resolved.

East Street: We would like to see dedicated paths for pedestrians, with separate cycle paths.

We query the feasibility of street tree planting, given the presence of underground services.

Question 9 Do you have any comments on proposals for either Upper High Street and/or Waterloo Road / Station Approach? (please specify).

Page reference 51 - 52:

Upper High Street: the proposal is an appealing one which we support in principle. We query the characterisation of the UHS merely as a local approach to the town centre, given the presence of Lidl and the possible presence of Aldi (subject to planning permission) on the former dairy site. Consequently, we wonder how successful this would be in practice.

Waterloo Road / Station Approach: we welcome improvements to Waterloo Road, not least because the Civic Society has nominated the parade of shops for local listing. Proposed improvements to Station Approach are attractive in theory, but will they work in practice?

Question 10 Do you have any comments on Public Car Parking?

Page reference 53:

We agree with para 4.42.

Cross-referencing to Appendix B, pp33-40 and to the map on p45 would be helpful in terms of aiding the reader and encouraging public responses.

Please refer to additional comments in our response to Q15.

Question 11 Which is your preferred option for the following sites?

Page reference 54 - 72

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Select the most applicable option in each row.

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Ashley Centre and Global House	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hook Road and Southern Gas Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please enter any additional comments, including alternative suggestions (please be specific).

NB We don't always like the options provided, eg as regards the Town Hall site, and have a number of caveats.

Ashley Centre and Global House: option 1 with a height limit of 5 storeys, to avoid a tunnel effect that 8 storeys and the buses would generate.

Hook Road and Southern Gas Network: option 1 with 4-5 storeys; and including Laine Theatre Arts. Our preference is for retrofit over demolition, and we query the rationale of knocking down the car park only to build another one elsewhere.

Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic: we would like to see retention of The Parade's green and quiet nature and its attractiveness for pedestrian movement. We suggest a maximum building height of 4 storeys. We would like to see retention of the original Town Hall building, failing which retention of its footprint, which contributes to the open aspect of that part of The Parade. The car park is one to keep eg for people with mobility issues / disabled parking. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies a protected view from The Parade over Dulshott Green. Please refer to additional comments in our response to Q15.

More generally:

- ensure all maps / plans / projected views have a key, or otherwise explain colour coding (eg pp 57 – 59, and much of Appendix A)
- we recommend that these opportunity sites are not considered in isolation from each other, nor from other strategies in the TCM

Question 12 Please indicate which your preferred options would be for the following site.

Page reference 73 - 76:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Option 1 Option 2

Depot Road and Upper High Street [] [**x**]

Please enter any additional comments including for suggested alternatives.

We seek assurance that option 2 will not have an adverse impact on Pikes Hill Conservation Area.

We think the design could be improved.

Incorrect image on p73.

More generally:

- ensure all maps / plans / projected views have a key, or otherwise explain colour coding (eg pp 75-6, and much of Appendix A)
- we recommend that this opportunity site is not considered in isolation from the others, nor from other strategies in the TCM.

Question 13 Do you have any comments to make on Appendix A: Townscape and Heritage Views?

Appendix A is useful as it gives the lay person an idea of what could come in terms of new development and its visual impact on the streetscape.

It would be helpful to prominently indicate for the reader that in the projected views, grey mass represents existing structures and yellow represents what is new / proposed.

Where is view 32? (pA4)

We support para 3, summary p A9. Eight storeys are visually intrusive.

Question 14 Do you have any comments on Appendix B: Stage 1 baseline report?

Appendix B contains useful information and is helpful.

The TCM would benefit from greater cross-referencing of Appendix B throughout the document.

Question 15 Are there any general comments you'd like make about the Draft Masterplan?

Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation 24 November – 22 December 2023

In general:

- a fair effort, if overly broad-brush (eg Section 2) and aspirational in places, lacking specifics on feasibility of delivery. It is good to see it is up to date, referencing the impact of the Ukraine war and how things have changed post Covid
- treatment of individual areas is generally good
- the Masterplan identifies four plausible opportunity sites, avoiding Green Belt controversy
- Character Areas are generally well-identified
- we are broadly supportive of the public realm and sustainable transport strategies.

In terms of presentation:

- figures difficult to read online - even zooming in
- overall frustration with the general layout - maps need names of key roads particularly Figure 1 (p7)
- general poor flow of the document with repetitions. Difficult to get key messages for town centre sub areas
- all maps / plans / projected views must have a key, or otherwise explain colour coding (eg pp 57 – 59, 75-6, and much of Appendix A)
- poor cross-referencing, see for examples our responses to Qs 1,2,7,10,11,12 and 14
- there is a lack of precise language and intent with generic language and quite a few new "Green" terms that the specialists on our response committee have never heard of before and consider don't mean much (eg climatic comfort (Principle #5 and p38)).
- visualisations really do not sell the vision.

In terms of substantive referencing:

- whilst reference is given to the LT4 transport plan it only covers some very high level ambitions with lack of detail provided. We would expect some detail here at this stage of what "improved" measures could include in terms of neighbourhood /redesign, road traffic, junctions; and whether these would be raised table junctions at crossings, zebra crossings, pelican crossings etc.
- the LCWIP plan needs to be referenced here- it is a requirement from Surrey Council that each local authority produce these by the end of 2024
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council are currently drafting the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan reference to which is not provided here. There is an important link between both documents and whilst both are in draft form acknowledgement needs to be made for the need to link/ reference both.
- reference should be made to the Healthy Streets for Surrey Design Code. Reference should be made to the Sustainable Travel Hierarchy produced by SCC in this document under core principles. This includes some mandatory requirements and covers topics such as pedestrian and pavement design, vehicle parking, sustainable drainage design, cycling strategy (no mention is given to including E-bikes) however there is ample mention of car parking opportunities
- there is no mention of sustainable drainage – this is one key issue and covers so many "Climate Change", flooding, sustainability, biodiversity issues, cooling opportunities, noise and pollution abatement. Items could include rain gardens, filter strips and verges, permeable pavements in their "Courtyard parking (?)" (Dulshott Green), large, vegetated tree pits, and soakaways. Again, even at draft

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

master plan stage some indication of some of these features' potential locations should be included

- reference should be made to the Town Centre Conservation Area being on Historic England's Risk Register
- there is confusion between the NHS Clinic site and the Ambulance site.

Additional itemised points on Individual pages:

Heritage and Building Heights p12

Why no reference to building heights here? They refer to context led approach (again wishy washy) and need to safeguard the historic environment. Surely a map with different building heights could be provided eg Dulshott Green and Ashley Centre max 6 storeys and Opportunity Sites such as gas works could go a little higher (8 storeys?)

Public Realm Connectivity and Green infrastructure p15

2.16 "Opportunities to improve connectivity should be identified in master plan"- Yes. Why not refer to SCC documents, or LCWIP here.

2.17 refers to street trees only but no mention of SUDS discussed in "Other green infrastructure features"- permeable paving, green roofs, rainwater gardens, filter strips, large tree pits etc, geocellular storage tank (underneath the green courtyard parking of Dulshott Green)

Page 11: Depot road decked parking – why not just call it a multistorey car park- also conflicts with utilisation of parking around town? Would we need this? What about covered cycle parking as well?

Page 20 Figure 3: So unclear - green and red are difficult for some people to visualise. Not sure why located here as inform's viewpoints in appendix and also no numbering or way of relating to places. Another example of poor cross-referencing.

Page 26: The Parade and Church Street. No figure number and key on other page. Could remove photo to have two side by side. What is green courtyard parking – why not just call it a car park with some trees? Or expand the idea of courtyard parking to all other car parks. Also what about cycle parking here? What does 'improve natural surveillance of Dulshott Green' mean? Also issues with delivery vans and scooters- should the plan consider this new modern form of living and accommodate these needs somehow?

Page 28: High Street East. Why don't we have a similar image to previous ones with opportunity areas. A tree lined central reservation could also have some SUDS features incorporated and this should be noted. Would this include raised table crossings? Enhance cycle experience? What does that mean?

Section 5 West Street: 3.16: Statement seems to conflict with the approval of the development of 24-28 West Street - and also conflicts with some loss of pavement space through the location of the building.

Figure 11: Surrey Heath Council mentioned in Key- couldn't see anything on the figure that was relevant to SHC?

P21: not everyone knows what is meant by sustainable travel- a glossary of terms would be useful. Is it public transport only, low-e vehicles, cycling and walking a combination of the above. Again perhaps a travel hierarchy should be mentioned.

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Cycle Lanes on Ashley Avenue: more details could be provided at this stage- would they be segregated, on road, fully marked, shared with pedestrians, both directions?

South Street no mention of any additional pedestrian crossings- currently can't switch between one side of the street to the other without walking long distances to either north or south ends and still at least several crossings required.

Figure 6: Green courtyard parking? Seems like greenwashing. How is that a civic space?

Item 9: Improve natural surveillance onto Dulshott Green? This needs to be explained as not everyone will know what that means.

P41: Landscaping: Here would be a good time to mention SUDS. Terminology is vague and not very technical. While this is a non-technical document it could do with more "professional" language. Surface water flooding, surface water management opportunities, runoff dissipation. Could also mention hedges as well as trees.

Materials: mention low embodied energy- need to define the term in a glossary. Also it would be useful to have a hierarchy. No mention of permeable pavements here (or below ground surface water runoff storage tanks such as geocellular blocks. Surely example materials contain recycled materials (recycled concrete could be highlighted). **4.30** Does this point need to be in a master plan? Perhaps just maintenance needs to be considered?

P45 Figure 10: No figure number. Couldn't work out what numbers related to. We address this in our response to Q10 where we stated that cross-referencing to Appendix B, pp33-40 and to the map on p45 would be helpful in terms of aiding the reader and encouraging public responses.

A24 targeted access: number 5 should also be addressed. This is another barrier to access south street as two lanes of incoming/outgoing car park traffic to address. Could an intervention measure not be created here to improve link around Ashley shopping centre island and better access to Epsom Playhouse. Also some trees could be planted near Playhouse/ permeable paving tree pit improvements here. High street: 3 d images showed segregated two way cycle lanes but this is not highlighted here.

Church Street images p49: End of High Street indicates cycle lanes but on opposite side to what was shown on 3D visualisation earlier in the document.

P52: Again some differences in High Street images earlier with different use of road space.

P59: Not sure what View 3 shows? A large railway bridge no trees what about 24-28 West Street?

P63/64: Again use of road/side pavements/ trees on highway seem to be different from previous images (p50 East Street Illustrative plan of potential layout)

Visualisations in Appendix don't really sell the vision! – A32, A34 in particular, No mention of light assessments- why have all trees on Dulshott Green been removed in visualisation (A35)? View 35 looks very blocky.

Interesting tables about utilisation of formal multi-storey/council car parks- which is not in line with on street parking issues within the town centre. Particular bug bear is parking all along Ashley Road beyond Rosebery Park when several car parks are nearby- Ashley

**Questionnaire: Draft Epsom Town Centre Masterplan Consultation
24 November – 22 December 2023**

Centre, Global House, Dulshott Green. Can road parking be reviewed as part of this process (for example Sunday parking along here blocks both pavements and cycle lane and renders footpaths un-useable for disabled users, young family with pushchairs etc).

Please also see our summary table attached as a separate document.

This concludes the response from Epsom Civic Society.

Sent by email.

22 December 2023