

Epsom Civic Society

formerly Epsom Protection Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

27 April 2020

Support Group Requests
Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Planning Department
Town Hall
EPSOM KT18 5BY

Dear Sir,

Planning application 19/00921/FUL – Downhill

Epsom Civic Society has viewed the details of this application for the development of a new detached property in the rear garden of Downhill.

Notwithstanding amendments submitted to the original application, the proposal remains unacceptable and contrary to current policies on a number of fronts, some of the principal ones (not an exhaustive list):-

DM16: Backland Development. The proposal strongly falls into this category which this policy seeks to oppose, by virtue of its mass, separate summer house and depth of swimming pool excavation to impact on the existing trees, ecology and wildlife.

Member of



DM9: Townscape Character and Local Distinctiveness. The proposals of back timber cladding to the walls and seemed zinc roofing are incompatible with the local character which this policy seeks to ensure that proposals enhance the townscape.

DM5: Trees and Landscape. The back garden of Downhill contains many fine trees. These are worthy of protecting for the views and greens cape the area possesses. The Council Arboricultural Officer has presented a report which strongly does not favour the application. The Society supports this report. Despite the applicant's consultants report setting out methods of waylaying the objections, it remains a fact that fine trees have to be removed for the development and what are shown as being retained is questioned as being feasible with a likely desire for subsequent felling because of being too near, overshadowing deciduous leaf dropping, etc. Actual on-site conditions "come the day" maybe quite different to the theory advanced, compliance and full site supervision too, is a question. Apart for the backland site itself, hedge and shrub removal will be needed to create the driveway access, this loss also is deemed unacceptable as it contributes greenery and pleasantness close to the highway.

DM4: Biodiversity and New Development. There is said to be present living species and a variety of habitats that are protected by Law. The application documents deem to refute this as insignificant. Balance should be given to the side of caution and local knowledge.

CS1: The application cannot be seen as fulfilling the policy of contributing positively to the social, economic and environmental improvements to achieve a sustainable development.

CS3: The application is at odds with the policy of conserving and enhancing the biodiversity of Epsom & Ewell.

CS5: The application fails to fulfill the policy of high quality and inclusive design required for all developments.

Member of



NPPF Feb 19 Para 175a: States “If significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on a site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused” Applying this principle, the application should be refused.

Highways: The Report from the Highway Authority (SCC) is inconclusive, it being unclear if requested further information has been provided. A factor which the Society requests: cognizance be given that the access proposals to the site would incur the loss of valuable off street parking spaces available to residents of Briavels Court. In consequence, this development will increase the pressure, already high, given that the site is close to St. Martins School, by displaced residents seeking on-street parking as no alternative is proposed.

In view of the foregoing refusal is requested.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Arthur MBE FCIQB FCI

c.c. Ward Councillors

Member of

