

# Epsom Civic Society

formerly Epsom Protection Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

20 March 2020

Ruth Ormella, MRTPI  
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council  
Planning Department  
Town Hall  
EPSOM KT18 5BY

Dear Ruth,

## **Planning application 19/01722/FUL – Epsom General Hospital**

Epsom Civic Society has viewed the details of this application for the NHS “Sold Off existing hospital buildings site” involving the demolition of accommodation block and other associated structures. Redevelopment of the site to provide a new care community for older people arranged in two buildings comprising 302 to 308 care residences, 8 to 12 care apartments and 26 to 30 care suites providing transitional care, together with ancillary communal and support services Use class C2, 24 key worker units class C3, childrens nursery Use class D1 as well as associated back of house and service areas, car and cycle parking, altered vehicular and pedestrian access, landscaping, private amenity space and public open space.

1. This is a very large development shoe-horned into a modest site as such it presents excessive height, bulk and massing. Thus it is at odds with policy DM 9 - Townscape Character and Local Distinctiveness.
2. It is incompatible with policy DM 10 – Design Requirements for new developments especially the density of the surrounding area given that the site is located on a “back” road to the main hospital situated on Dorking Road. Respect needs to be acknowledged to the residential housing together with open space of Millennium Green nearby and also the overlooking from residences of the development into existing adjacent housing of Digdens Rise and Woodcote Green Road.

Member of



3. Whilst the ethos of extra care living is not disputed there is far too much within the application for this site. The housing mix is unbalanced and does not fit the requirements of DM21. There is the known current need and shortfall of two and three bedroom family accommodation requirements. There are currently other live applications on other sites promoting extra care living and further applications likely too. To grant approval for this application to this extent is considered to “frontload” this type of accommodation over the Local Plan period. This is not desirable.
4. There is no affordable housing proposed. A site such as this should be required to provide its share of much a needed affordable housing provision.
5. We have read the very detailed response submission from the Woodcote Epsom Residents Association. We do not wish to repeat all the points advanced but we do have to say we believe that their assertions and commentary about the proposals are serious and very correct.
6. We understand that the original developer’s proposals were for a much more moderate density in a low rise scheme. We consider that would have promoted a more favourable reception than the one now advanced. We question the outcome of the pre-application discussions so over-riding the current policies.
7. In summary therefore, the scheme proposed is far too high and bulky and over development, it will have a serious impact on the surrounding neighborhood and the housing mix is unbalanced.
8. It cannot be supported in its current form.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Arthur MBE FCIOB FCMI

Member of

