



67 Church Street
Epsom
KT17 4QA

Viv Evans - Head of Planning
Euan Cheyne - Case Officer
Epsom and Ewell B.C.
Town Hall
The Parade
Epsom KT18 5BY

16 February 2021

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 21/00031/FUL

**Change of use of existing Care Home (Use Class C2) to Residential (Use Class C3):
Erection of three storey side and rear extension to create 9 flats and creation of
basement car park**

I am writing to strongly object to the Planning Application for the proposed development of nine flats to replace the existing home at 1 Burgh Heath Road, for several reasons:

- The proposed design of a high-density block of flats is entirely out of place and inappropriate in this Conservation Area and would have a negative impact on the area's character. I would refer you to both the Core Strategy C35 which states that the Council will preserve and enhance Conservation Areas, and DM10 which states that developments must ~~not~~ impact on neighbours' amenities in terms of outlook, privacy, light and disturbance.
- There would be serious issues of both loss of privacy and loss of light due to the height and depth of the proposed building and the extremely close proximity to neighbouring properties, in particular those houses which abut Epsom Lodge, either at the side or at the rear.
- My home, 67 Church Street, is a direct neighbour to 1BHR, and consequently this development would seriously impact both my light and privacy in both house and garden. The balcony on the proposed second floor would directly overlook the window of my bedroom, which is on my second floor. This window is not shown on the plans, but it very much exists. A three-storey side and rear extension will have a massive impact on my property and will dwarf it. The plans also do not show my garage, the back of which is a mere 3.9 m from the rear of my house, the access to which is from Rosebery Avenue. [It should be noted that the rear access is solely my property.]
- With regards to the impact on traffic, the care home is situated directly facing the mini roundabout which serves the junction of Burgh Heath Road, Church Street and Downs Road. Vehicles would need to exit the proposed underground car park directly onto this roundabout, causing an adverse impact on road safety. The cramped conditions are such that normal-sized refuse vehicles would not be able to enter the development in forward gear and thereafter exit in forward gear (there is insufficient space to manoeuvre within the curtilage of the development).

- At no time have I been approached, as the neighbour most affected by the proposals, either to discuss the proposals and their impact on my property and on my life, or to request permission to come on to my property for survey purposes. Submission of the Planning Application was the first that I had heard of the proposals. I am far from convinced that the drawings produced by the applicant's Architect, show correctly how close my dwelling is to my boundary with 1 BHR. As a result, I will need to be certain that the "Right to Light" obligations, amongst other matters, have been fully and correctly addressed.
- The proximity of my dwelling *and its foundations* to the boundary of the proposed development will give rise to serious Party Wall, etc Act 1996 issues - in particular how the basement car park and its construction and the high-water table of the chalk, coming off the Epsom and Walton Downs, will affect my property. At no time have I been consulted on this.
- One of the wonderful features of this area is the mature protected tree in front of 1 BHR. Its proposed removal will impact adversely on the area (Planning and Heritage Statement, para 4.9). It is puzzling that its condition is stated as having "... such a detrimental impact on the existing building that it needs to be removed", yet the existing building next to it is maintained in a largely unmodified form.
- There are believed to be a number of discrepancies within the Transport Statement, of which the most glaring is the assumption that the proposed development has access to Rosebery Avenue to the north of the site: see Figures 1.1, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. This is not the case: the site has access and egress from only BHR. The access to Rosebery Avenue indicated in the Transport Statement, from the rear of the proposed development, is via the 'lane' providing rear access to my property. This lane, like the adjacent Rosebery Avenue, is private. The owners of 1BHR do not have, and have never had, any rights of access over my land to the site of the proposed development.
- Your records will demonstrate the extreme care that the Council's Development Control team (officers *and* Councillors) took in the late 1980s to ensure that the brand-new property, that is my house, 67 Church Street, would physically match and blend in with the Edwardian style and character that is my neighbour's at no. 65. To break this established style in a Conservation Area, by the proposed development, is totally contrary to the Council's longstanding policies to maintain the character of its Conservation Areas, and does not bode well for other possible developments in the immediate area:

Planning and Heritage Statement, para 3:13, second bullet point "... the proposed extension should relate to the adjacent building" and final bullet point "... the extension should not extend close up to its neighbour".

I fully support the suggestion made by others that a Covid compliant site visit by the whole of the Planning Committee, to this prominent location within a Conservation Area, would be welcomed, as it would help to inform the Committee about the intrusiveness of the planned development.

