

# Epsom Civic Society

shaping the future, safeguarding the past

2 Leighton Way  
EPSOM Surrey  
KT18 7QZ

20 September 2014

Mr Mark Berry BA(Hons) MRTPI DMS  
Head of Planning and Building Control  
Town Hall  
EPSOM  
KT18 5BY

Dear Mr Berry

PLANNING APPLICATION 14/00760FUL  
ACER HOUSE, 97-101, EAST STREET, EPSOM  
REDEVELOPMENT FOR 14 FLATS

Acer House seems to have been a group of three houses at one time used as offices but more recently a non- residential care home. It was closed in 2011 and is stated to have been unlettable and unsaleable as offices or a care home. It was recently removed from local listing. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing buildings and erect a 2-3 storey building containing 14 flats.

In an ideal world, the attractive present two storey buildings would be retained and converted to residential use or, alternatively, the adjoining Wilsons motor sales site could amalgamated with Acer House to give an opportunity for a well- designed corner development. However, these possibilities are not available for consideration and comments must be limited to the application submitted.

No objection is seen to residential use, but the number of units is excessive and entails almost complete coverage of the main part of the site. It also leaves inadequate space for parking and the relationship of 14 units to 8 parking spaces is unacceptable. In terms of appearance, attempts have been made to “extend the reaches of the modern image” from other developments nearer the town centre. The result is to extend the number of flat roofed slab blocks with not enough interesting variation in design details. Some attempt to incorporate the pitched roof and gables of the present buildings would have given more individual interest.

In detail, the placing of the address in large letters on the roof is interesting but unattractive and hardly practicable for people looking for the premises.

The relationship with the houses in Kiln Lane and Middle Lane is important although the garage court immediately to the rear gives them some protection. Nevertheless, the provision of balconies at the rear so close to the boundary could give rise to overlooking.

In conclusion, no objection is seen to the housing use, but the number of flats is excessive, almost amounting to overdevelopment, the parking is inadequate and the appearance is unattractive. On the grounds of parking alone we consider that this application should be refused.

Yours sincerely

ALAN BAKER FRICS  
Vice Chairman

Cc ward councillors