

# Public Document Pack

Legal and Democratic Services



**To: All Members of the Planning Committee**

Dear Councillor,

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - WEDNESDAY, 12TH MAY, 2021**

**Virtual link for public attendees:**

<https://attendee.gotowebinar.com/register/1836588354038710542>

**Webinar ID: 469-582-427**

**Telephone (listen-only): 020 3713 5012 Telephone access code: 769-340-528**

Please find attached the following update report. This was not included in the original Agenda pack published previously.

1. **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: UPDATE REPORT** (Pages 3 - 6)

Updated material for Item 2 of the Agenda of the Planning Committee to be held on 12 May.

For further information, please contact Democratic Services, email: [democraticservices@epsom-ewell.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@epsom-ewell.gov.uk) or tel: 01372 732000

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Beldan".

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Committee 12 May 2021 – UPDATE REPORT

~~Old wording~~ **New/replaced wording**

Agenda Item 2 - 20/00249/FUL

5 Comments from third parties (pages 7 – 9)

**An additional 2 letters of representation (objections) have been received, setting out the following concerns:**

- **Excessive height, mass and bulk**
- **Inappropriate design and materials**
- **Impact on character of surrounding area**
- **Adverse impact on heritage assets (Conservation Area)**

**Epsom Civic Society provided a further consultation response, dated 28.04.2021, with the following concerns regarding the sustainability credentials of the proposal, including:**

- **Green wall strips, unlikely to offset carbon from the development , in the absence of no information regarding the type of green wall system, irrigation and maintenance requirements**
- **Limited information provided regarding the choice of materials, in terms of their carbon footprint**
- **No reference to ensuring that biodiversity is both protected and enhanced**
- **Sustainability section of submitted Planning Statement is scant**
- **Unclear active charging points/electric vehicle car parking provision**
- **Travel Plan confirms that the hospital site is remarkably well connected**
- **It does not appear that the proposal meets Council, County or National Climate Change related objectives and little aspiration to provide an innovative design, in terms of material choice, on site generation of power or provision of EV charging points**

6 Consultations (pages 9 - 10)

~~EEBC Trees: no formal comment provided~~ **objection received, 10.05.2021**

~~15.9 (page 39) The Local Planning Authority's Tree Officer has not commented on this application, so Officers have used their professional judgement in assessing this. As the trees proposed to be removed are young and of low quality and landscape value, it is not considered that their removal will detract from the landscape, nor have a detrimental visual impact on the character or appearance of the area. The Report sets out measures to protect retained trees in accordance with current standards and guidance, which would be secured within a planning condition, subject to planning permission being granted.~~

**The Tree Officer formally commented on this application, on 10.05.2021. The objection to this proposed development concerns the lack of landscape provision for a scheme of this scale. The proposed landscaping provides little enhancement beyond the existing, yet the built form will increase considerably. A failure to provide a landscape environmental gain from this proposal is a negative aspect, which is contrary to planning policy. As a minimum, the Tree Officer has suggested some areas where he feels that there is scope for landscape improvements.**

**The Tree Officer sets out that the landscape scheme does not include the car park access parallel with the side of 47 Dorking Road. In the area adjacent to No.47's building flank and rear garden, there is only fragmented existing landscaping on the hospital boundary. However, this is an area where self-seeded trees are being proposed to be removed, rather than the area having**

more landscaping to soften/ameliorate the more harmful residential impact from the development. The Tree Officer considers that the footpath should be widened adjacent to 47 Dorking Road, as it is very narrow at this point, hemmed in by the fence. I feel this area needs more consideration on both the hard and soft landscape design.

The Tree Officer considers that the poor provision for landscaping in this proposal is insufficient to make a satisfactory treescape enhancement that would go some way to offsetting the potential environmental harm. Many of the proposed planting areas are into hostile compacted soil (of the car park) so there would need to be a need for a substantial enrichment to the landscape below the ground for all new planting to thrive. In addition there should be maintenance proposals for landscape aftercare and replacement of failed stock.

6 Consultations (pages 9 - 10)

EEBC Environment and Sustainability Project Officer provided a comment, on 28.04.2021:

In terms of the sustainability side of this application, I believe this would be adequate for the given car park. According to Weatherby et al (2019) *“currently eighty-three per cent of existing hospital sites have no charging points at all”* so this will definitely be ahead of the majority of existing infrastructure. By following the Section 106 Obligations and the SCC Highways recommendation, this would be adequate in terms on sustainability. Through this increased provision of charging points at hospital based car parks in EEBC (as noted), this could help boost the charging network in the borough and facilitate the adoption of EVs. This would contribute to the wider goals of zero emission transport and improved public health within EEBC.