

# Public Document Pack

Legal and Democratic Services



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

Dear Councillor,

**PLANNING COMMITTEE - THURSDAY, 9TH DECEMBER, 2021 , Council Chamber - Epsom Town Hall, <https://register.gotowebinar.com/register/9076644828459347214>**

Please find attached the following document(s) for the meeting of the Planning Committee to be held on Thursday, 9th December, 2021.

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

Update Report regarding Item 3 on the Agenda.

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

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Beldam".

Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

## Agenda Item 7

Planning Committee 09 December 2021 – Update Report

Agenda Item 3 – 19/01021/FUL - Development Site At 24-28 West Street, West Street, Epsom, Surrey

### Additional Third Party Comments

The following representation has been received from Rt Hon Chris Grayling MP:

'I am writing concerning the application that your Department is currently considering for the redevelopment of the above site in West Street; I gather that this updated application is due to be considered by the Planning Committee next week. As you know, the scheme involves the planned demolition of the present building on the site, a well-loved Victorian local landmark. This seems to me to be both unnecessary and highly undesirable, as it would significantly change the character of this part of Epsom if given the go-ahead.

I know that the scheme has generated strong opposition locally, with support given to a sympathetic redevelopment of the existing buildings rather than their replacement. This would be my preference too as local Member of Parliament, and I would be very grateful if you would ensure that these points are raised with the Committee in advance of their deliberations'.

### Questions from Councillors

Question:

Have conditions 11 and 12 been repeated?

Officer Answer:

Whilst conditions 11 and 12 are extremely similar, condition 11 relates to resident's cycle parking to be provided, retained, and maintained in accordance with (should permission is granted) the approved plans, whilst Condition 11 seeks to secure a scheme detailing visitor cycle facilities prior to occupation of the development.

Question:

Would it be reasonable to condition that construction work must be carried out in a way that does not lead to the closure of Station Approach, which would be harmful to traffic flow in the area. As it stands it leaves it open for them to apply for a closure. I would like them to know from start that they can't.

## Agenda Item 7

### Officer Answer:

Officers consulted Surrey Highway Authority on this question, who advised that they are not aware of any development where they have made it a requirement that a developer does not close the road during the construction process. They have also advised that this would be very difficult to impose.

Surrey Highway Authority have recommended that the Construction Management Plan (Condition 13) could be increased in scope to require the developer to detail how they **will** construct the development.

Furthermore, should it be the case that the developer had to, either in part or fully, close Station Approach at any time during the construction process, they would need to obtain all of the necessary permits to do so from the County Highway Authority and would also be required to implement necessary traffic management. Whilst Surrey Highway Authority appreciate that this would of course still cause disruption, it would be managed appropriately by the Highways Team.

In light of the above, should permission be granted, Officers recommend amending condition 13 to include the following:

- d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management and measures to prevent the closure of Station Road during the construction of the development)

### Question:

In regard to Informative 4, if the applicant is not successful in securing a TRO, they have to submit an alternative prior to first occupation. Wouldn't this be too late at this point?

### Answer:

Again, Officers consulted Surrey Highway Authority on this question. The TRO Team have advised that the lead-time for processing a permanent TRO is normally 8 weeks from receiving the application with all the relevant information, prior to the first notice appearing in the press. This may be longer for parking restrictions, as the TRO team try to co-ordinate this so that they can be included with a parking review to save money and time.

After the first notice appears in the press there is a 28 day objection period and then the order is normally made within 1-2 months of any objections being resolved. The next parking review for Epsom and Ewell is next parking review is April 2023.

To secure the TRO prior to commencement of development could delay the commencement of the development until July/August 2023, which could have implications for the delivery of the proposal.

Whilst this would not alleviate Members concerns should the application for the TRO fail, it would be unreasonable for Officers to either amend Informative 4 or to secure the TRO prior to construction by way of condition. If required, an alternative scheme will need to be presented by the applicant prior to occupation of the site.

### Amendments to Report

Paragraph 3.3 makes reference to the Car Club Bay being off-street. This should read on-street and further reference to this bay can be found at paragraphs 22.23 – 22.26 of the agenda report.

Paragraph 4.3 has erroneously reported that there would be a maximum of five storeys toward the station. This should read 7 storeys.

Paragraph 5.1 should read part 7 and part 8 storey building.

### Amendment to Conditions

Condition 13:

No development shall commence until a Construction Transport Management Plan, to include details of:

- a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials
- c) storage of plant and materials
- d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management and measures to prevent the closure of Station Road during the construction of the development)
- e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones
- f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation
- g) vehicle routing
- h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway

## Agenda Item 7

- i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused
- j) on-site turning for construction vehicles
- k) measures to ensure the footway/ cycleway are not obstructed during construction

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development.

Reason: In order for the development not to prejudice highway safety nor cause inconvenience to other highway users in accordance with the objectives of the NPPF (2021), and to satisfy policies DM35 and DM36 of the Development Management Policies (2015) and Policy CS16 of the Core Strategy (2007).