

Epsom Civic Society

formerly Epsom Protection Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

19 May 2020

Viv Evans TP, MRITP, FRGS, FRSA
Head of Planning
Town Hall EPSOM
KT18 5BY

Dear Viv Evans,

Appln: 20/00525/FUL - 39 Manor Green Road

The Society has viewed the application and wishes to submit the following comments.

1. Although the application is described as “Change of use from Gym/Yoga Studio with only landscaping external works” and that the Design and Access statement refers to the building being currently used as that, it was observed on a site visit on 17/5/20, viewed from the public highway, a site warning notice displayed on temporary site barrier fencing stating “construction site”. Indications from viewing the site itself and the building, were that this was construction work in progress, that the work was incomplete and the building has not been (or able to be) used in the way described.
2. For a building which was built under permitted development rights, in effect a garden building within the curtilage of 39 Manor Green Road, seems inconceivable to be converted to a detached dwelling requiring no external alterations and to then front Hamilton Close as a separate residential dwelling house. The proposals would be contrary to CS 5 which requires that “High quality and inclusive design will be required for all developments”. The proposals too would seem to fall short of the Oct 2019 MHCLG National Design Guide the aim of which is to promote “High Quality buildings and places being fundamental to what planning and development policies should achieve”.
3. The resultant exterior amenity spaces to both the donor property and the proposed separate new dwelling would be seriously below the required standard.

Member of



4. It has always been regarded as custom and practice that a requirement to achieve an appropriate building plot comparable to the locality on a return frontage to a side street requires at least two or more donor main road properties to provide the plot size required. This site does not meet that.
5. Para. 3.19 of the narrative leading to Policy DM 10 – Design Requirements for New Developments, refers to excessive increases in the density can result in over development or “town cramming” and results in damages to residential amenity. The application falls short of the DM requirement.
6. Despite the “Call for sites” and the Council’s lack of a 5-year housing land supply, does not mean that existing policies can be set aside and all proposals deemed acceptable. This is backed up by NPPF para 127 “That planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting”. This application for a single storey one bedroom 40 m2 building is entirely incompatible with the character of the locality.

A one bedroom separate dwelling is normally located in buildings, purpose built or converted into blocks and not set within existing three and four bedroom housing which is typical of this locality.

7. The existence of a refusal of a similar application and upheld on appeal (APP/P3610/W/3144297) must give weight that this application too is not acceptable.

For the reasons above refusal to this application is requested.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Arthur, MBE FCIQB FCIM
On behalf of Epsom Civic Society

Cc Stamford Ward Councillors

Member of

