

Summary of responses to the Town Centre Masterplan

Section A- landowners and organisations

Contents

| | |
|---|----------|
| Section A - landowners and organisations | 1 |
| Opportunity Site - Land Owner Responses | 3 |
| Ashley Centre & Global House | 3 |
| NHS Property Services (Epsom Clinic): | 3 |
| Hook Road and SGN | 3 |
| EBC Property and regeneration (Town Hall and Depot Road) | 4 |
| Other Land Owner Responses | 4 |
| University for the Creative Arts (UCA) | 4 |
| Organisation Responses | 5 |
| Surrey County Council..... | 5 |
| Transport For London..... | 5 |
| Thames Water:..... | 5 |
| Network Rail: | 6 |
| Historic England: | 6 |
| Natural England: | 6 |
| London Gatwick | 6 |
| Epsom and St Helier NHS Trusts | 6 |
| Epsom Civic Society..... | 7 |
| Standing Committee of Residents' Associations (SoCRA) | 7 |
| Surrey Wildlife Trust..... | 8 |
| Liberal Democrats | 8 |
| Chris Grayling (former MP for Epsom and Ewell) | 8 |
| Section B – Summary Questionnaire Responses | 9 |
| Question 1 - To what extent do you agree with the masterplan principles? | 9 |
| Question 2 – To what extent do you agree with the baseline analysis? | 9 |
| Question 3 - To what extent do you agree with the design response? | 11 |
| Question 4 - Do you think the "Character Areas" are an accurate representation of different areas of the town centre? | 12 |
| Question 5 – Comments on analysis of the Character Areas | 12 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the public realm strategy? | 13 |
| Question 7 - Do you have any comments on the draft transport strategy? | 14 |
| Question 8 - Do you have any comments on the targeted interventions on the A24 (Please specify, e.g. Ashley Avenue, Ashley Road, High Street, Church Street or East Street). | 16 |
| Question 9 - Do you have any comments on proposals for either Upper High Street and/or Waterloo Road / Station Approach? (please specify). | 17 |
| Question 10 - Do you have any comments on Public Car Parking? | 18 |
| Question 11 - Which is your preferred option for the following sites? | 18 |
| a) Ashley Centre and Global House | 18 |
| b) Hook Road and Southern Gas Network..... | 18 |
| c) Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic | 18 |
| Question 12 - Please indicate which your preferred options would be for the following site. | 20 |
| Question 13 - Do you have any comments to make on Appendix A: Townscape and Heritage Views? | 21 |
| Question 14 - Do you have any comments on Appendix B: Stage 1 baseline report? | 23 |
| Question 15 - Are there any general comments you'd like make about the Draft Masterplan? | 24 |

Opportunity Site- Land Owner Responses

Ashley Centre & Global House

- Disappointed consultation is limited to 4 weeks.
- Masterplan lacks ambition to help Epsom reach its full potential.
- Masterplan not underpinned by robust evidence, some baseline completed after design exercise.
- Explains history of discussions with council, including Design Southeast Advice, which recommended a masterplan approach.
- Masterplan Lacks vision for wider “island” site.
- Does not maximise potential of brownfield, being low density and low rise.
- Decision to retain car park undertaken before parking survey completed.
- Little consideration given to the delivery of the sites, e.g. only generic data on market conditions and values has been looked at.
- No evidence of why there has been no consideration of this wider opportunity.
- 8 Storeys is too restrictive.
- Suggests that previous discussions with officers indicated 12 storeys would be acceptable.
- Requests further height analysis (ZTV) carried out,
- Densities of between 23 and 40 dph significantly lower than 54 DPH suggested in earlier pre apps.
- Retaining the multi storey car park is at odds with the overarching principles of sustainable development.
- Questions timing of car parking survey (i.e. after decision to retain AC car park made) and period they were conducted.
- Does not agree with full retention of Ashley Centre as is, and retail offer should be reimagined. Limiting the adaptation of the Ashley Centre until 2040 prevents it from adapting to market signals.
- Whilst retail offer is important, does not agree that the Ashley centre itself is a “highly valued town centre use”.
- No evidence to suggest Epsom Playhouse cannot be relocated.
- Concerned that Road interventions will impact bus layover / dwell area, taxi spaces, cycle parking.
- Not clear how cycle lanes will be delivered & whether shared with pedestrians.
- No modelling has been done to support the measures.

NHS Property Services (Epsom Clinic):

- Support Proposals for Opportunity Site 2 particularly re-provision of Clinic.

Hook Road and SGN

- Comparison with their (Formation Architect’s) Plan.
- Figure 2 outline is unclear and should include Rainbow Leisure Centre and Majestic Wine
- Remove student accommodation i.e. reference to accommodation for Laines Performing Arts School in Para 5.8.
- Repeats response to Local Plan allocation – e.g. 250 instead of 400 PBSA. 450 instead of 640 units (600 if LTA removed). Higher density needed, remove reference to café, 11 storeys rather than 7, podium parking not appropriate, new public square overly prescriptive, relocation of gas holder not required.

- do not support the assertion that development should ‘make a valuable contribution to the town centre offer by delivering a mixed-use scheme incorporating the land-uses set out in the draft Local Plan policy
Tall buildings should be allowed across entirety, not just centre of site.
- Does not agree with para 5.12 (Option 3 won’t undermine vibrancy and attractiveness).
- Viability concerns re: expansion of LTA, relocation of gas and remediation work and Car Park, treatment plant.

EBC Property and regeneration (Town Hall and Depot Road)

- Masterplan Adequate but needs to address viability and has not maximised opportunities available.
- Town Hall has potential for higher density flatted proposal of 5-6 storeys.
- Green courtyard parking on existing Town Hall would see loss of revenue for the Council and need to be provided.
- Hook Road and SGN are not viable at 2-7 storeys. Laines are looking for a larger space than shown.
- Some inaccuracies and contradictions in the baseline analysis, e.g. suggests need to build up but does not follow through enough on this.
- Plan will not be sustainable or affordable if heights are restricted.
- Doesn’t agree with design response – sketches don’t show viable development.
- Agrees with character areas.
- Removing carriage ways will only increase congestion, more work required on transport plan.
- Public realm is expensive, and no financial benefit so should only be supported by planning gain.
- Agrees with section on Public Car parking – underused should be repurposed but lost ones that are needed should be provided.
- Ashley Centre: Option 2, Hook Road & SGN, Option 1, Town Hall, Option 3 with question mark. Depot Road – Option 2 with concern over viability of feeder road.

Other Land Owner Responses

University for the Creative Arts (UCA)

- The Wells and Parkside House will shortly be occupied as education uses from September 2024.
- Welcomes masterplan’s support and recognition of University.
- Education should be specifically referred to in the principles of the masterplan.
- Zero carbon ready commitment aligns with UCAs ambitions.
- Reiterates request as stated in local plan response for Education to be designated a main town centre use.
- Would like to see a more robust policy approach to student housing calculation.
- Projects it will have 3000 students in Epsom by 2027. Has 321 student rooms available for first years leaving a shortfall of 1014 student accommodation rooms for first year students.
- Landlords leaving the rental market, which is adding to pressure.
- Returning students could occupy approx. 1,200 bedspaces.
- Supports transport strategy with caveat that further thoughts be given to public Transport.

- Welcomes draft local plan policy to allocate site for mixed use development including 400 student homes at HR and SGN site but conscious that developer will be responding to market signals with regards to who to lease accommodation to. Therefore, a wider range of options for student accommodation is needed.
- Baseline analysis should update the wells and parkside house as being in education not office use.
- UCA should be within the actual TCMP boundary.

Organisation Responses

Surrey County Council

- Support draft vision and principles, aligns with Surrey 2050 Place Ambition.
- Some legibility concerns (e.g. size of age numbers and labels)
- According to Health and Wellbeing Strategy there is only one Health and Wellbeing Area in Epsom – Court Ward, masterplan should be assessed against the strategies metrics.
- Pleased with strong heritage thread, comprehensive and well researched but uses old local list. New one should be consulted on before any development decisions made.
- Supports retention and reuse of town hall, though not of particular antiquity.
- Increasing heights should require careful consideration.
- Welcome proposals to green the town centre, but no mention of SUDs and no reference to mapped surface water flooding areas.
- Plan overlaps with LCWIP
- New parking should provide Charging points.
- Could be more radical in terms of pedestrian prioritisation but may not be enough provision for the blind.
- Some images suggest more priority than expected given to cars.
- Welcome designing to overcome socio economic and demographic changes. Would like to see more health and wellbeing services e.g. workspaces, leisure and health hubs.
- Early years provision
- Plans for Epsom Library which will deliver modernised access.

Transport For London

- Crossrail 2 will serve Epsom but decision pending Government decisions.
- Lack of understanding of different regulatory frameworks that apply to TFL and non TFL services, i.e. only SCC referenced.
- Would like to see existing bus stops maintained and enhanced.
- Bus stop at Ashley Centre should be retained.
- Clarification on a number of images and what intention for bus stops would be is needed.

Thames Water:

- SA1: Hook Road: Upgrade in water supply likely needed. Early engagement by developer required.
- SA2 Town Hall Site: No infrastructure concerns
- SA3: Depot Rd: Upgrade in water supply likely needed. Early engagement by developer required.

- SA4: Ashley Centre and Global House: No infrastructure Concerns.

Network Rail:

Supports approach establishing routes promoting sustainable travel, some clarity on maps would help.

Historic England:

- Welcomes coherent vision.
- In general, masterplan protects quality and condition of assets.
- Suggestions adoption of design codes or framework, update a register of heritage assets,
- There may be an imbalance with the treatment of heritage assets with regards to road remodelling.
- “We Applaud the ambitious approach to dealing with long standing problems such as the public realm, severance caused by the roads and traffic conditions and associated poor environment”.
- However, a better balance would be achieved by including in the masterplan a more positive recognition of the role and importance of the historic environments of the town.

Natural England:

- The nearest designated site would be the Stones Road Pond SSSI. This site shouldn't be directly affected due to the lack of an impact pathway to the site and shouldn't need specific mitigation but would need to be considered when any proposals for redevelopment come forward around the Rainbow Leisure centre area.
- Epsom and Ashted Commons SSSI is approximately 800m to the west of the masterplan area however there shouldn't be any direct impact pathways.
- The improvements to the public realm will all be helpful when combating climate change.

London Gatwick

- Consult on any buildings above 200m above ground level or wind turbines.

Epsom and St Helier NHS Trusts

- Supports public realm improvements.
- Housing could attract more clinic staff to the area.
- CIL should take into account healthcare.
- Should make provision for “Health in the High Street” initiatives – i.e. units where people can submit blood samples and not have to go to clinics.
- Some staff work in buildings in the town centre and so it is important to keep them there.
- Encourages staff to travel by public transport and therefore welcome emphasis on this.
- Struggles with accommodating everyone who wants to park on site.
- Some staff use Depot Road for H1 park and ride service. Regular updates required.
- Welcomes wayfinding and security.

Epsom Civic Society

Supportive of:

- Masterplan principles – including environmental aims and baseline aims
- Identification of opportunity sites, character areas, public realm and sustainable transport.

What's missing

- Clear building heights limits
- Prioritisation between opportunity sites
- Principle of 'retro fitting not demolition' for redevelopments
-

What needs clarifying / correcting

- How achieve environmental / zero carbon objective
- How engage with and address motorist concerns re improving pedestrian and cycling experience
- Town Hall relocation – where to? Is new location appropriate?
- Bus layby – where does it get moved to post opportunity site scheme.

Don't like

- Repetitive presentation of opportunity sites in TCM document
- Contradiction between West Street gateway status and planning permission granted to demolish Furniss Building
- Lack of labels on Views in Appendix A

Suggestion

- Grid to link principles to specific sections of chapters 2 to 5 and appendices
- Improvements to air quality of town centre
- Expansion of locally listed buildings completed and reflected in TCM

Standing Committee of Residents' Associations (SoCRA)

- Sound principles but questions realism in the face of government advice, market conditions. E.g. doubts that council can control housing mix or improve public transport.
- Lack of clarity in design approach e.g. to building heights
- Design code needed
- Agrees with character areas but are a little contrived.
- Provides some more detail on response to character areas
- Supports public realm objectives but concern about narrowing roads.
- Concerned that the role of the A24 is underplayed.
- Welcome targeted interventions along Ashley Avenue and Road and High Street east and Environmental improvements caveated with concern about narrowing of highway and congestion potential.
- Unclear why overall parking provision hasn't been factored into the Masterplan.
- 8 Storeys not acceptable at Ashley Centre, agrees with analysis for SGN site.

- Visuals not properly explained in Townscape analysis.

Surrey Wildlife Trust

- No real focus on biodiversity apart from opportunities to introduce trees, green areas, infrastructure features (Principle 5)
- Recommends alignment / introduction of Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.
- The right trees should be in the right place.
- Sensitive lighting and shelter as well as soft landscaping is needed to attract biodiversity.
- Wants EEBC to adopt a 20% net gain approach.
- Brownfield Lands can also have high ecological value.
- Assumes Opportunity sites have been assessed for “Habitats of Principal Importance” ref S40 and 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.
- Questions if a BNG metric assessment has been undertaken.

Liberal Democrats

- Principle 6 should be better fleshed out to determine what “optimum” density should be.
- A24 will still dominate character.
- Supports making roads safer but better worded to acknowledge car access necessary for foreseeable future. Car parking needed to support retail.
- Supportive of climate change principles
- Emphasis on respecting heritage required.
- Well-designed apartment options should be explored, they are necessarily quantity over quality.
- Agree with assessing views
- Further work to explore impact on A24 needed.
- Consider Upper High Street is a strategic through route
- Caution needed when interpreting car park occupation rates to make decisions about future provision, a further car parking study is required.
- Should be mention of BNG in baseline analysis.
- Mention of “permeability” welcome but required more identification of public footpaths.
- Ashley Centre: Option 2, Hook Road and SGN: Option 2, Town Hall: Option 3, Depot Road: Option 2
- Should consider higher density development at the opportunity sites.
- Would be inappropriate to build +8 storeys at SGN

Chris Grayling (former MP for Epsom and Ewell)

- On the whole, sensible but:
- Too anti-car. Council needs to focus on electrification of fleets.
- Narrowing roads will cause more congestion.
- Does not support proposals for upper high street, reduction or parking around Town Hall
- Does support replacing car parks with multi storey at depot road.

Section B – Summary Questionnaire Responses

Question 1- To what extent do you agree with the masterplan principles?

General

- Use of obscure / planning language e.g. context led approach / zero carbon ready.
- Maps in document difficult to read.
- Document too long / difficult to read.
- No reference to National Design Guide.
- Insignificant reference to areas outside of the Town Centre.
- Proposals are anti car.
- Questions about how the proposals be funded.
- Retail offer declining.
- Provision of creative space / affordability of area for young people.
- Council's Climate Change Action Plan – how will the Masterplan contribute to its aims.
- Concern about 15 minute neighbourhoods.
- Need for an economic principle.

Infrastructure

- Need for additional social infrastructure school places / GPs etc.
- Need for quality segregated cycle lanes.
- Public Real Improvements / More priority to pedestrians / cyclists welcomed.
- Need to improve public transport provision, especially at the weekend.

- Concerns about increased traffic congestion / rat running from proposed improvements to A24.
- Impacts on those that need to use cars (disabled / elderly).
- Greenspace & biodiversity should have a higher profile.
- Need for a ring road.
- Concern about loss of public parking.
- Need to retain drop of / pick up facilities for station.

Character / Heritage

- Traffic problem.
- Attention must be given to protecting and enhancing its market town heritage.

Development

- Support a range of housing to meet different needs.
- More social housing and higher density in town.
- Concerns about level of housing.
- Concerns about building heights / over development.
- Convert empty offices to housing.

Question 2 – To what extent do you agree with the baseline analysis?

General Comments

- Document lengthy and difficult to understand / use of jargon.
- Concern about consultation questions in general (agree with some bits not others).

Transport

- No reference to need for station parking.
- Concerns about public transport services / frequency.
- Traffic congestion concerns.
- Little mention of traffic congestion on A24.
- Question how links between the centre and station are weak.
- Support reduction in public parking to improve public transport and active travel.
- Concerns about what car park utilisation data shows and why July and not December.
- Support for continuous bike routes and cycle parking.
- Impacts of loss of Hook Rd car park on town centre traffic.

Design / Density / Height / Character / Environment

- Tall buildings can be located on East Street.
- Expected more detail on scale and height.
- Important to keep historical elements of town / recognise heritage.
- No mention of green islands / retention of green corridors.

Town Centre Offer

- Diversification of Shopping Centre (more leisure / other uses activities).
- More markets (different specialist markets).
- Varied views on provision of student housing.
- Not enough about West Street.

Infrastructure

- Concerns about development adding to infrastructure issues.

Question 3- To what extent do you agree with the design response?

General

- Too vague / Too detailed.
- Difficult to understand.
- Use of technical language – e.g. "place-based assessments", "holistic consideration"...
- Agree retention of car parking is important for Town Centre.
- Figure 3 - not easy to read / poor annotation (red / green arrows).
- Too detailed.
- Good utilisation of existing vacant space.

Design

- Push for higher buildings not wanted in Epsom.
- Agree building heights should be kept relatively low.
- Support increasing green spaces / trees.
- Design is subjective.
- More detail of the scale and design of the developments is needed if the plan is to be used to inform decision making.

Transport

- Opportunity for a bypass to remove traffic from town centre?
- Concern about increased traffic congestion from plans (A24).
- Concerns about impacts on those with limited mobility.
- Need a robust network to encourage reduced car use.
- Like the idea of the Kensington Exhibition Road approach of removing kerbs and street furniture.
- More pedestrian friendly the better but no analysis has been done – no quantitative information to review.
- Concern of loss of parking, highway capacity and that the proposals are anti-car.

Infrastructure

See no plans to improve infrastructure (education, health)

Question 4- Do you think the "Character Areas" are an accurate representation of different areas of the town centre?

- Seem reasonable.
- Ideas for high street / station approach ignore traffic volumes at peak times.
- Creating new homes for former and unused office spaces.
- Extent of areas not clear enough.
- Consider areas can be combined (some very small – Ashley Avenue).
- Can not see mention of Derby square – unsuccessful and still needs work.
- Don't recognise the difference between some areas in character of use (e.g. 7 and 9).
- Area 5. Should add to the title "South Street (part)".

Question 5 – Comments on analysis of the Character Areas

General

- More areas in wider area (beyond TC boundary).
- Areas are accurate from experience.
- Reduce the retail area.
- Figure 5 - A poor legend to map in that colour coding is too closely similar.
- Support better landscape and removal of Highway clutter (A24).
- No mention on how to integrate the university with the town.
- Concerns about highways impacts of A24 improvements (including impacts on bus services)

1. Market Square

- No reference to town centre conservation area being included on Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register 2023.
- Market Square - consider pedestrianising the whole High Street (East) to make a real impact.
- prime site for retaining the character and enhancing to reflect the heritage of the borough.
- TK Maxx area an opportunity site.
- More can be done here to improve the historic environment and townscape, along with improved connectivity to the train station.

2. Ashley Avenue

- Without addressing the volume of traffic that uses Ashley Avenue it is unlikely that the attractiveness of the area can be improved significantly.
- Needs a re-think from current format, could definitely be improved.
- Need for a pedestrian crossing across the car park entrance /exit at the Ashley Centre.
- The main way to improve this area is enhancing pedestrian access and reducing traffic flow.
- Maintaining the trees along the avenue is positive and important.

3. Parade and Church Street

- Potential for this area as a community hub.
- Opportunity for increased housing, but must create sufficient 'green spaces' and respect character of housing in the south part of The Parade.
- Favour re-purposing of Old Town Hall (1934 building).
- Keep the existing greenery e.g. Dullshot Green.

4. High Street East

- Current reality /volume of traffic and needs further thought if it is improve the environment.
- Improving active travel should not significantly impact existing travel options negatively.
- The assessment of the area is spot-on and a re-imagination of the street surface should be undertaken - redefine the area as a pedestrian-first space which cars are merely a visitor to
- Agree with more provision for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Broad agreement with highway proposals shown on the visuals.
- Majority of High Street was redeveloped 1930's - not 1950's except for a small section (12-20 High Street).

5. West Street

- Attempt to make a more obvious link to the Rail Station and a better sense of connection.
- Reference to a specific approved planning application within the area.
- Broadly agree with the analysis.

7 Depot Rd

- So much potential for housing with pleasant paths to link with the rest of town.
- Need a green area – limit height of car park.

8. Station Approach

- Needs improvement to make it a welcoming place and signal routes to the town centre.
- Welcome "gentrifying" around station/ landscaping to create great first impression, visuals of potential improvements look promising.

9-Hook Rd

- High rise acceptable here.
- proposals to more or less start from scratch here would make total sense.
- an opportunity to be explored.
- potential for imaginative redevelopment. The Rainbow Centre should be retained as is.
- Agree - many of the present buildings, mostly office blocks, are dreary, boring and anodyne and need a considerable makeover if not replacement

Question 6 – Do you have any comments on the public realm strategy?

- Approach to reducing car parking needs strengthening to be aligned with reaching zero carbon by 2050.
- Would be a great improvement for the area.
- Too much reliance on hard landscaping.
- Support more trees / enhanced biodiversity / prioritising biodiversity.
- Landscaping needs to be maintained – suggestion of low maintenance species.
- Use traditional signage and street furniture.
- Cycling infrastructure supported should include dedicated lanes / 'boxes' at junctions.
- Prioritising Active Travel' to be a flawed strategy. There is no apparent traffic modelling to support this strategy nor to predict the consequences.

- Wayfinding: This also needs to consider protected routes for those with mobility needs to get around the town centre.
- Support cycle parking provision near the rail station and Ashley centre.
- Concerns about traffic management/ congestion / pollution if A24 narrowed / capacity reduced.

Question 7- Do you have any comments on the draft transport strategy?

- Support new cycle provisions, particularly on A24 which is not considered safe at the moment.
- Cycling is mentioned but lacks detail on how routes will join up with safe corridor cycling routes in from the surrounding areas.
- Require more covered cycle racks and safer places to leave bicycles.
- Suggestion of new footpath across the in/out car park at the Ashley Centre, Pedestrians should have priority here.
- Support for narrowing of highways in the core of the town and for widening pedestrian areas and bigger crossings.
- Plan to create an integrated transport hub based around the railway station to improve connectivity by bus, rail, cycling and taxi. Bus stops and stands should be relocated.
- Request for a solution to allow the High Street to be completely pedestrianised whilst encouraging traffic flow along the A24 avoiding the town centre.
- Support the need to rebalance away from cars. Prioritising and encouraging more pedestrian and cycle journeys, there needs to be even more emphasis.
- The strategy is aspirational without practical plans to deliver and integrate alternative modes of transport - clear plans and funding to deliver it required.
- Proposals need to cater for a range of people, including residents, commuters, elderly, wheelchair users, children, vulnerable people (e.g. RNIB residents)
- Increasing safety for cyclists and pedestrians should be priority.
- Consider complete pedestrianised zone e.g of the Western half of the High Street and expansion of the marketplace; better links between the Station and the marketplace, scope for much more cafe culture; Ashley Avenue and the Northern part of Ashley Road to revert to two-way traffic.
- No attractive public space where people can secure their bicycle, sit and relax, away from cars.
- Bike theft issues.
- Need to ensure that continued flow of traffic through one side to the other (east/west or north/south). Street parking and the unloading of vehicles is a problem.
- Public transport not fit for purpose. Can't decarbonise without better public transport.
- Alleviate through traffic through the town with a new crossing over the railway line.
- Disagree with identifying issues and opportunities to deliver pedestrian and cycle priority on A24.
- Motorised traffic must have priority on an A-road.
- Modal shift from private cars to sustainable transport, unlikely.
- Strategy is anti-car, will create congestion and damage the attractiveness of the centre.
- Pedestrians and cyclists are prioritised at the expense of motorists. Support for improving walking and cycling routes, but not at the expense of reduced road space.

- Carbon reduction aims are supported however it is considered that the effect of the strategy will be to increase emissions and reduce air quality through increased congestion.
- Suggestion for a new park and ride or bypass.
- Reducing the capacity of the A24 will lead to an increase in traffic, congestion and pollution.
- Traffic volume on the A24 is mentioned within the Masterplan as being 24,000 and would not be possible to accommodate with single carriageway.
- Accessibility of emergency services vehicles need to be considered.
- Any restricting of road size in the high street will create congestion.
- Concerns about the dedicated road space for cyclists, suggestion that they should be shared with pedestrians or located away from the highway along 'back routes'.
- In the longer term all cars are going to be electric and will have a greater impact on carbon emissions than the interventions proposed.
- Concerns about plans to reduce bus services (e.g. E10s service).
- Pavements are uneven and narrow in places - dangerous for vulnerable and older people.
- Obstruction caused by delivery mopeds and parking along the high street.
- Wayfinding in the town centre is poor. Simple directional signs could assist the pedestrian to find their way from the station and access to the town centre.
- Inadequate bus services, need more services to areas such as Langley Vale, Ewell, Cheam and more services in the evening.
- Car parks should be reduced in the town centre, and the consideration of a 'Park and Ride' Scheme should be considered for the town.
- Shoppers making large purchases should be able to bring cars in and park near the shop to collect said purchase, otherwise people will drive out and purchase elsewhere.
- Concern about safety walking around the town safely in the evening (antisocial behaviour).
- Should not assume everyone supports less cars. Trends show this will grow in the future, autonomous cars will be more in the future.
- Concerns about reduced frequency of train services following pandemic.
- Consideration should also be given to the possible arrival of Crossrail Two, either to the station or nearby, both of which will increase footfall.
- There is no detailed statistical information in the Masterplan e.g. current transport usage, where do people come from, and go to, and why, together with their preferred and actual mode of transport.
- Lack of published traffic modelling of the impact of the current proposals nor a mitigation plan. Suggests carrying out traffic surveys.
- Existing road layout around the interchange near the Ashley Center car park not fit for purpose and difficult to access. Significant improvement is required.
- Concerns about servicing, particularly delivery from large vehicles.
- Concerns that cyclists can sometimes ride dangerously quickly on the pavements.
- There was a disappointing lack of detail here - e.g. what the bus network will look like.
- Concern of the lack of consideration given to the wider road transport issues - the plan will only make them worse.
- Proposals for High Street do not have regard to access requirements for 87 High Street (car park to rear)

Question 8- Do you have any comments on the targeted interventions on the A24 (Please specify, e.g. Ashley Avenue, Ashley Road, High Street, Church Street or East Street).

- The proposed narrowing of carriageways on the High Street without considering the current issues where vehicles stop and block lanes and where buses have stopping areas on the main carriageway will increase congestion.
- Proposals will encourage cars to rat run, pushing cars to roads like Chase Road.
- Proposals as will create increased congestion.
- There is currently no direct cycle route from Ashley Road to Waterloo Road and the railway station. It would be useful to be able to cycle westbound along the High Street west of the junction with Waterloo Road / Ashley Road. At present, the only route is through the hostile environment of Ashley Avenue.
- Suggest the Council consider alternative routes off the highway, e.g. extensive network of alleyways in the area, to identify potential cycle routes. The shared footway in East Street is a much better approach.
- Suggestion of 20mph through the centre of town.
- Comment that there is insufficient modelling data has been provided on the impact to the A24 areas north and south of the town centre.
- Comments about delivery drivers motorbikes being an obstruction/hazard for pedestrians. Suggests provision for drivers to park in a sensible designated, licensed spaces - much like taxis.
- More attention needs to given to traffic flows and avoid increased traffic jams. I can see nothing that addresses this issue in conjunction with adding cycle lanes and improving pedestrian crossings.
- More pedestrian crossings.
- The A24 is a major road carrying traffic into and out of London and the densely populated places situated along the route.
- A narrowed carriageway will cause additional congestion and additional crossings will encourage pedestrians to cross without care.
- Comment that high levels of traffic and housing not compatible each other. e.g. Ashley Road and Ashley Avenue.
- Support the enhancement of the pedestrian experience and green the area.
- Consideration to making Ashley Avenue two-way and closing off the western end of the High Street completely.
- Safety issue created by tree canopy- creation of dark spaces and blocking light.
- Synchronising traffic lights needing to be reviewed to improve the flow of traffic.
- Whilst improvement to pavement widths would be helpful there would be negative impacts of making the A24 one lane.
- Proposals are anti-car proposals.
- Generally strongly disagree with the targeted interventions on the A24 - have the potential to be severely detrimental to Epsom.
- Navigating around Ashley Avenue, South Street and the High Street is dangerous when cycling - need for cycle lane(s).
- The A24 is always busy and ruins Epsom town centre – opportunities for traffic diversion.
- Reducing Ashley Road to one lane southbound is very concerning, this could have a significant impact on travel up to the downs.

- Comments about the need to resolve problems with commercial vehicles and deliveries.
- How would long term bus and train improvements work and how are they to be funded?
- The consequences of tree planting, the need for maintenance.
- The carriageway should not be narrowed at Ashley Road.
- Concerned the repurposing of the commercial premises to residential will add additional pressure on the road network.
- It would also be useful to understand the level of traffic which is passing through Epsom.
- Concern '15 minute Cities'.
- Support for recent upgrades in the Market Place which demonstrates how effective such planting can be in lifting an area - and therefore support the proposed public realm improvements.
- All these improvements depend on the transport strategy being delivered and any plans not leading to traffic congestion being exacerbated.
- Aerial Photographs and Illustrative Plans – consider to be very confusing to the point of being almost illegible. There is no orientation (like a compass sign pointing north) and no street names are displayed.

Question 9- Do you have any comments on proposals for either Upper High Street and/or Waterloo Road / Station Approach? (please specify).

- Good change of public realm with better pedestrian experience and tree planting.
- Routes need to remain accessible to those with mobility issues. Brail bars could also be used to help those with sight constraints to guide themselves independently around.
- Concern that zero cycling infrastructure proposed.
- Good ideas so long as they don't increase traffic in other parts of the town.
- Concerns about impacts on A24 and increased congestion / air pollution.
- Support for proposals.
- How about part time pedestrianisation and 20mph zone otherwise.
- Insufficient consideration of vehicular volume and that delivery vehicles.

Station Approach

- Improvements to Station Approach are needed.
- Better lighting required around station approach.
- Need a bus station near the train station.
- Is there any consideration for picking up rail travellers by car (drop off / pick up).

Upper High Street

- Concern with street design like Exhibition Road.
- Like Exhibition Road type design.
- Do not support – will damage business.
- Categorized as an A road – A2022 - This is not insignificant – implications of traffic diverting to other local roads
- Idea looks great as underutilised part of town currently and would invigorate businesses.

Question 10- Do you have any comments on Public Car Parking?

- Consider methods to increase capacity in car parks, e.g. Size of parking spaces, multistorey elements.
- When trying to support Modal shift, need to ensure facilities to support other methods of travel, e.g. cycle parking and improved cycle facilities.
- There is a need for short stay spaces e.g. 20 mins in the Town Centre.
- Need to retain existing parking levels and queries any loss and where it will go.
- What provisions will be put in place for disabled members of the community in the plans?
- Comments about aesthetics and safety concerns with multi storey car parks.
- Comments about the operations of car parks, e.g. Too expensive and charges need reducing.
- Parking required for the convenience of shoppers- particularly for large and heavy items.
- The prosperity of the town centre relies on sufficient parking otherwise people will shop elsewhere.
- Motorists are being unfairly penalised. Public transport is too expensive, slow and may be the only option for vulnerable users.
- Suggestion of a Park and Ride scheme at Kiln Lane.
- Some support for rationalising the car parking and redevelopment for other uses.
- Hook Road Car Park is well used but can be issues when exiting and turning right at the small roundabout.
- Hook Road Car Park is underused because it is further away from the main centre.
- Comments regarding multi storey carparks with low ceiling heights limiting users with large cars and roof boxes.
- Does not support redevelopment of car parks but that they be retained but prices lowered or free for first couple of hours.
- Additional safe cycling parks would be welcome.

Question 11- Which is your preferred option for the following sites?

a) Ashley Centre and Global House

b) Hook Road and Southern Gas Network

c) Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic

| Results of those that selected an option | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|
| Ashley Centre and Global House | 32 | 42 | 10 |
| Hook Road and Southern Gas Network | 67 | 9 | 14 |
| Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic | 32 | 41 | 11 |

Additional comments:

General

- Need for health and education infrastructure to support site development.
- Too many flats and not enough houses.
- Development needs to be of good architectural quality.
- Developments should not exceed 5 stories.

- I support development of sites as obvious brown field sites but heights should be in keeping with existing buildings max 6 levels high. Aim to keep an element of parking

SGN / Hook Road

- Preference is retaining car parking – alternative uses on lower ground floors an option.
- Concern contamination will cause issues with future occupiers obtaining mortgages.
- stories too high.
- Height should not exceed the of the existing Car Park.
- Buildings should be no higher than exiting.
- Include the telephone exchange in the site area.
- Suggest keeping an element of multistorey parking.
- The proposed high-rise tower on the old gas work site in the town centre (view 19). The development of the gas works will benefit the area, however this building would have a negative impact on the character and livability of the town, and should be limited in height.
- The proposed high rise tower - would be completely out of character with the rest of the town and would not fit in with the existing architecture and style
- Proposed high rise tower would cast shadows over nearby homes and businesses, reducing the amount of natural light and potentially lowering property values.
- Consider site for a tribute museum to horse racing to attract visitors.
- no objections to building on the Southern Gas Site, access to the Rainbow Centre is not an improvement on the current position.

Global House / Ashe Centre

- Any new development around the theatre should consider acoustic impacts.
- Option 2 the preference - Ashley Avenue as a whole needs to be rejuvenated.
- Could the existing building be converted.
- Concern about any loss of trees.
- 8 Stories too high.
- Buildings should be no higher than exiting.
- Don't like any of the options.
- Retain building and convert to community hub.
- Convert Atkins building (outside of red line) for residential.
- Opportunity for rooftop garden / leisure uses on top floors.
- No Option 3 shown.
- Suitable for student accommodation.
- Opportunity for cycle storage in the car park
- Potential for height increase as long as does not impact historic environment or townscape

Town Hall, Hope Lodge and Epsom Clinic

- Health facilities should be retained to support growth
- Dulshott Green should be retained.
- Concerns about where the police will relocate to

- Concern about parking for residents of capital square
- Retain 1930's Town Hall building and convert
- Agree with the provision of a limited number of homes in this area surrounding Dulshott Green and what I understand to be a maximum 4 storey height which would include the roof.
- Do not agree with any options – town hall building should be retained.
- retain car parking
- Town houses the way to go
- Retain some surface level car parking
- Opportunity for communal bike parking area
- Against the loss of parking places in Dulshott Green
- Concerns about limited parking for proposed residential properties – impacts on parking in surrounding roads
- Concerns about loss of public car parking for visitors (having regard to the schemes at the police and ambulance station site)

Question 12- Please indicate which your preferred options would be for the following site.

Depot Rd and Upper High Street

| Results of those that selected an option | Option 1 | Option 2 |
|--|----------|----------|
| Depot Road and Upper High Street | 53 | 34 |

Additional comments:

- Car park needs to be retained.
- Need to be more parking for residential.
- Preference for low storey family homes.
- Preference a mix of housing (houses and flats).
- Need for family homes -already lots of apartments.
- Need for more infrastructure to support additional houses.
- Concern about impact of new road shown on concept plans (on traffic flow / adjoining residential areas) (multiple respondents).
- Option 2 – Car park should be reduced (not 4 storeys) (multiple respondents).
- Consider cycle parking provision in the new car park (e.g. using some car spaces for bike storage).
- New builds should be in keeping with heritage.
- Proposed through road is a poor attempt at creating a mini by-pass for traffic – impacting businesses - reduced car parking available to town centre users

Question 13- Do you have any comments to make on Appendix A: Townscape and Heritage Views?

General

- Comments welcoming inclusion of information to visualise proposals.
- Images are rather hard to understand (e.g. A10).
- Building Heights not be weighed too heavily when considering the social necessity of more housing.
- While it is important to use brownfield sites for housing, it is also important to not have tall high-rise developments.
- Clear that building heights should be strictly limited, and very careful attention paid to the materials and finishes of any construction.
- It is important that new taller buildings do not unduly dominate the landscape.
- Masterplan is contradictory to the heritage of the town.
- Building should not exceed the current heights – character and landscape impacts.

Comments on view images

- View 10 (A16) looks terrible - we should not have high-rise buildings (the higher building would seem to be next to the Rainbow Centre?)
- View 10 (A16) - do not allow the high-rise building to be developed.
- View 2 & 3 (A11 & A12) - high rise buildings are inappropriate.
- View 14 - again the Hook Road area - too much height and bulk (comment also applies to views 19, 24 and 26-29).
- View 14 (A19) - concrete jungle - totally inappropriate.
- View 17 (A21) - promising if design requirements are tight and developments are required to be delivered in line with heritage themes to enhance the idea of Epsom as a premium destination and town.
- View 18 - Inappropriate development on corner of Ashley Road Ashley Avenue.
- View 18 (A22) - worrying.
- View 19 (A23) - terrible.
- View 24 - is inaccurate and does not show a 4-storey multi storey car park that would clearly be visible for residents of The Grove
- View 19 and 24 – General high rise acceptable but tower appearance incongruous and may provide precedence for other over height developments in planning appeals, in other parts of the town.
- View 22 (A25) - development massing looks inappropriate and the proposed new buildings should not be visible behind the existing ones.
- View 24 misleading – described as looking north – multi storey car park not shown and needs correcting
- View 24 (A26) - high-rise building in the background looks totally out of place.
- View 25. This appears to be an extension of global house over and around the old House of Fraser back entrance. The entrance provided access to the Ashley centre from Ashley Road and could have been made more useful. The terrace could also have been better utilised as a outdoor entertainment area. Was that access/egress also part of the Ashley Centres Emergency / Fire Plan?
- View 26 (A28) - development is at least one storey too high.
- View 28 (A30) - do not develop above existing building heights.

- View 29 (A31) - heights of building are hidden by the poor aspect of the picture. This needs to be corrected so that a transparent impression is given so that the proposal can be considered properly.
- View 30 – Not sure the retention of the car wash is relevant if Depot Road Car Park is built on.
- View 30 (A32) - development is far too dense.
- View 34 and 35 - Inappropriate development of green space when there is need for more green space not less.
- View 34 and 35 indicate some amendment to the Dullshot Road plans are needed - it would be a pity to lose all the trees (maybe the graphic is misleading in this regard)
- View 37 – Loss of Town Hall unacceptable
- View 37 -Much prefer and press for old Town Hall retention (with internal conversion) to maintain the character of The Parade.

Question 14- Do you have any comments on Appendix B: Stage 1 baseline report?

- Interesting to read about the current car park use, traffic flow and housing costs.
- The Heading two pages lack numbering. As with Appendix A the pages numbered within appendix B should continue throughout as a whole document. It is confusing as presented.
- The pictures on the second page are very good and liked.
- Although small scale, the maps here on 2, 3 and 4 are more informative than those in the main body of the plan and are welcomed. However, No.4 is rather faint and needs to be stronger.
- Pages 5 and 22 again refer to High Street East as 1950's which should be 1930's.
- Page 10 figure 6 shows Kings Arms Pub as locally listed. (Just outside study area further along East Street). It was demolished and site re-developed in 2020, should be removed as no longer relevant.
- Page 12, can't find figure 8.
- Page 18 map is interesting but there is too much green colour background and needs improving.
- Page 21, Like and support reference to "Palette of Materials" as a way forward approach.
- The dates on the historic mapping are somewhat suspect. E.g 1934, north of the railway station housing development in 1920's not shown. 1953, the Town Hall, opened in 1938, not shown on the Parade. This could be to do with survey dates and publication dates by the Ordnance Survey, but in this document, without explanation, could be construed as misleading.
- 2.11 - The Masterplan could consider more sensitive approaches to traffic management where appropriate to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings.
- 2.19 - Any planning must preserve the conservation area and the views to and from it.
- 2.29 - the Masterplan should look to capitalise on the town's specialist uses to distinguish Epsom from competing locations. The planned expansion of the UCA, for example, brings with it an opportunity to diversify the economy through creativity.
- Point 3.25-3.28 mentions the need to improve cycling routes into the town, and better cycle parking when people arrive, which makes sense. The section does not however mention the need for improving cycling through town – therefore question the need for the schemes proposed.
- The various markets carry on a very old tradition and should be increased and encouraged.

Question 15- Are there any general comments you'd like make about the Draft Masterplan?

General comments

- This is a welcome document, and it is good to see the scale of the ambitious approach proposed.
- Document organised by planning topic, not by geography, which makes it very hard for the average person to get a full picture of what changes are proposed in a given part of the town they are interested in.
- Appendices A and B don't, somehow flow on from all that up to page 119. There is duplication. My impression is that it lacks editing and proof reading with a rush to be publicized by a deadline date. I am uncertain if this "Draft" is to be followed up by a "Actual" for presentation as evidence based to the Local Plan submission. If so, re-jigging and presentation editing is needed.
- The feedback from the last round (Summer 2022) has not been summarised in detail and from what I know it appears to have been largely ignored.
- Number of typographical errors in the document
 - repeated use of "Laines Theatre Arts" (plural) which should be singular "Laine Theatre Arts".
- Too long too verbose quite impractical.
- Concern about consultation period length.
- More concise version of document should have been produced for residents.
- Needs to be written in plain English.
- Complex long document.
- The image on page 28 of High Street East depicts a different solution than a similar area on page 48.
- There is very little evidence of Future Needs and how the Masterplan delivers those, together with carbon reduction and how the Masterplan fits with reduction plans already in place, such as EV dominance.

Transport

- There is no mention of an integrated transport hub which would do more towards a modal shift (carrot) than the strangulation of the town's traffic and car parking (stick).
- Surrey Climate Commission would be very willing to support a transformation of town centres to sustainable environments, that really nourish a safer, cleaner and more vibrant society.
- Concern about A24 proposals.
- Need for improved street lighting -only one reference in the Masterplan.
- Traffic dictates too much and cuts the high street in two (is that inevitable?)
- There seems to be an ill-conceived thought that by planning to reduce the current twin lanes of traffic that run through the high street with one lane will alleviate traffic levels. The high street is a major link to other routes.
- Need to return train frequencies to pre-covid levels.

Town Centre Offer

- There is no attractive night time economy.

- Consolidate the retail offer (e.g. upper high street properties could be converted to residential)
- No information on what local businesses require to develop.
- 2.33 you state that there is a "lack of local support for a balance between chain and independent stores." Please explain as I can see no explanation of this statement in the plan or either Appendix?
- No reference to the population demographic and how this is expected to change, particularly if the university grows and more housing is built - the type of housing will affect the demographic.

Housing

- There should be more emphasis on affordable homes.
- No references to electrical vehicle charging points.
- No reference to multigenerational living.
- No reference to the population demographic and how this is expected to change, particularly if the university grows and more housing is built - the type of housing will affect the demographic.

Height / Density / Design

- Keep the maximum number of stories to between 6 and 8.
- There is a need for the Borough to insist on truly high-quality architecture.
- Concern about buildings heights – once precedent set – e.g. only needs one tall building.
- Epsom can be regenerated in a modern way by utilising historic design themes and delivering a modern town with a traditional feel.
- lack some analysis on how to improve the existing buildings which have been deemed detrimental to the character of Epsom town centre.

Infrastructure

- Concerns no plans for increased infrastructure to accommodate population growth.
- Need to resolve infrastructure issues in the town.
- Secure cycle storage needed.
- Zero cycling infrastructure proposed.

Biodiversity / Environment

- The construction of new buildings offers a unique opportunity to support biodiversity and this has been overlooked. A simple example is the integration of swift bricks.
- Give Higher priority for biodiversity, e.g. native and wildlife-friendly planting.
- They want to improve air quality then they need to stop building on every spot of land they can squeeze something on.
- Add more greenery (trees and vegetation) to the market square.
- The emphasis on pedestrian and green areas is vital to improve the overall feel of the town.

- Disappointed that word search for drainage, SuDS, nature based solutions and rainwater all returned no hits.

Heritage / Culture

- The Master Plan represents a great, potentially a once in a lifetime opportunity, to enhance the cultural heritage of Epsom. Not just its Derby association (upon which there has been too much emphasis in the past), but also, critically, the creative arts.