

## Planning Report August 2015 (as at 2nd August) 2 pages

| Status of Application       | Planning Number | Address                             | Details                                       |  |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Current Undecided</b>    | 1               | 2014/4839                           | 1 Myrtle Cottage & Ditton Lea Portsmouth Road | <b>On Appeal</b> (July 2015) Rear detached garage with room above with new access  |
|                             | 2               | 2014/3862                           | Land at Claremont Lane                        | <b>On Appeal</b> (July 2015) Prior Notification Telecom: Installation 15 metre high monopole supporting 6 antennas & ancillary development   |
|                             | 3               | 2014/4699                           | Waitrose 105 - 113 High Street                | Redevelopment existing Waitrose store with demolition of the former Surrey Police Station and redevelopment to provide flexible ground floor retail space with 5 residential units above.<br><b>Now awaiting Archaeological Study results</b>                        |
|                             | 4               | 2015/2222<br>2015/2109              | 34 Esher Green                                | <b>Listed Building Consent:</b> Single storey rear infill extension in association with application for planning permission for a single storey rear extension   |
|                             | 5               | 2015/2494                           | Paddock View 35 Blair Ave                     | Deed of Variation in respect of the S106 Agreement to remove the requirement for Affordable Housing Contributions. By <b>Green Belt</b>  |
|                             | 6               | 2015/2108                           | 8 Lynne Walk                                  | Pair of semi-detached 2 storey houses with rooms in the roof space, dormer windows, 1.45m front boundary wall and new access following demolition of existing house. <b>2 objections from neighbours</b>   |
|                             | 7               | 2015/2256                           | 29 Esher Park Avenue                          | Detached 2 storey house with rooms in the roof space, rear balcony, basement & attached garage following demolition of existing house. <b>6 objections from neighbours</b>   |
| <b>New Applications</b>     | 8               | 2015/2274                           | Healix House Esher Green                      | 4 storey attached building comprising A1 (Retail) and A3 (Restaurant) on ground floor front & B1 (office) on ground floor rear & all upper floors following demolition of existing<br><b>* CAAC Letter ** ERA Letter</b>   |
|                             | 9               | 2015/2370                           | 10 Littleworth Common Road                    | Detached garage with accommodation over and new 1.8 metre high automatic entrance gates with 1.9 metre high brick piers and 1.5 metre high boundary wall   |
|                             | 10              | 2015/2502<br>2015/2503<br>2015/2647 | 20-22 High Street                             | <b>Listed Building Consent: EMBASSY / ODEON</b><br>External alterations including new main entrance door, new door in South Elevation & internal alterations to include replacement seating, removal of wall acoustic panels & soft flooring + advertisement consent |
| <b>Applications Allowed</b> |                 |                                     | None of note                                  |  |

|   |                        |  |   |
|---|------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Applications Refused</b><br>(Officer level refusal is OLR) | 2014/2264              | Warwick House 1<br>Claremont Lane                | 2 storey side extension + roof space rooms, 1st floor extension over existing vehicular entrance, front & rear dormer windows, new recessed entrance etc. <b>Appeal refused</b> - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the <b>Conservation Area</b> & adjacent <b>Listed Building</b> & the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of existing occupiers (Victoria Place) re light & outlook. |
|   | 2015/0522              | Sandown Park                                     | Retention of a telecommunications base station incorporating 35m overall height lattice mast et al – its height would be visually intrusive in <b>Green Belt</b> & would dominate street scene  |
|   | 2014/4803<br>2014/4824 | Land r/of<br>ABC Music<br>83 & 85<br>High Street | 2 blocks of 8 terraced houses with ancillary parking & landscaping, following demolition of existing rear extension at 85 High Street & <b>Listed Building Consent</b> for demolition of existing single storey rear extension. <b>OLR</b> – Due to proposed Mansard roof design the views from Claremont Lane car park will be one where the flank elevation will appear overly dominant. Fails to enhance character of <b>Conservation Area</b>               |
| <b>Applications Withdrawn</b>                                 |                        |  | None of note  |

**\* CAAC (Conservation Area Advisory Committee) Letter to Council.**

6 August 2015  
 Planning Services Elmbridge Borough Council High Street  
 Esher, Surrey  
 KT10 9SD

Dear Sir or Madam,

2015/2274 Healix Esher Green,  
 I write as chairman of the Esher Conservation Area Advisory Committee. In summary we strongly oppose this application. Our reasons are as follows.

1. The loss of a landmark corner building identified in the conservation area appraisal carried out by the Paul Drury Partnership (now the Drury McPherson Partnership) on behalf of Elmbridge Council. In recent conversations with these consultants they expressed the view that the Lloyds Bank building was an important element in the immediate townscape acting to screen

the poor quality Healix building to the rear and marking the threshold to the Esher Green element of the Conservation Area. The loss of the building would therefore be contrary to local and national planning policy. We regard the proposed demolition of this townscape asset as the architectural equivalent of ethnic cleansing.

In 1928 the tenets of modern architecture were defined in terms which were partially a response to a perceived machine age zeitgeist. The propaganda used by modernists and their acolytes (including Nicholas Pevsner) led to the commonplace use of such terms as Victorian monstrosity. Essential anything old or traditional was seen as reactionary and anti progressive. This view and mindset became pervasive and exists today and is reiterated without much thought by architects to justify otherwise inexcusable proposals and often associated demolition. This is why Clive Chapman (the architect) describes the existing building as 'not fit for purpose' however this is a meme ( in this context a reiteration of historicist dogma) it is factual and philosophical nonsense. The existing building fulfills its current purpose and use. It is only through seeking to impose a seemingly incompatible use that it doesn't appear to suit the applicants purposes. In philosophical terms it is like accusing a dog of being at fault because it isn't a fish.

**2.** The proposed replacement would harm the setting of the adjacent listed building. This is due to both the scale which is excessive in relation to the listed asset and the fact that key views to the listed cinema and from the opposite direction to the spire of Christ Church would be lost. We therefore suggest the scale is inappropriate and harms the setting of listed buildings which would be contrary to Supplementary Design Guidance for Esher Town Centre (page 5 identifies Christ Church as a local landmark as such views should be preserved not lost).

**3.** Our third reason is the very poor architectural quality of the replacement building.

To be convincing a building with a brick facade must behave in a certain way. Great contemporary architects like Louis Kahn and Michael Hopkins understand and understood this. Put simply brickwork is good in compression but poor in tension. In other words good for solid walls, poor for openings. An opening must therefore ideally have an arch. This can be a flat arch (as in the Lloyds Bank building) or a curved arch. A genuine flat brick arch has a limited span and it is this that dictates the opening size.

The proposed building has over wide openings with hidden support in other words it is an immediately dishonest use of this material. This makes it even to untrained eyes look instinctively wrong. It is immediately a bad piece of architecture. This characteristic also makes it seem badly proportioned and ugly. It is the only building in the high street to do this.

It is therefore immediately out of place, an example of poorly considered intellectually dishonest fakery. It does further odd things like having half started window openings in the brickwork a half baked afterthought. The end result is a grossly insensitive building more suited to a second rate office park in Basingstoke than a town centre context.

We believe the proposal is contrary to core strategies CS17 and CS5- CS11 and the supplementary design guidance for Esher Town centre.

For the above reasons we would strongly support the refusal of this application.

Yours faithfully Michael Blair Phillips MA el .01372 467720 mphilips06@btinternet.com

**\*\* ERA Letter to Council.**



**esher residents association**  
58 New Road, Esher, KT10

24th August 2015

The Head of Planning  
Elmbridge Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
High Street  
Esher

Dear Sir,

**Planning Application 2015/2274 Healix House, Esher Green, 4 Storey Attached Building Following Demolition of Existing Bank.**

The Esher Residents Association Committee strongly object to the application for the expansion of the Healix building in the centre of Esher.

Our reasons include the loss of a building which has made a positive contribution to the town for over 80 years. This building has been identified on council plans as being worthy of retention. It is one of a group of the banks which make a significant grouping within the town.

The proposed new replacement would be over dominant in the street scene and is of a poor design. This form of architecture is totally out of character in Esher.

As such it dominates the listed cinema and obscures it from certain viewpoints.

In summary we feel the poor quality of the scheme, the total lack of imagination in failing to retain a significant building and the over-scaled nature of the new proposal all support our view that the application should be refused.

The proposed development is contrary to core Strategy CS17, the Supplementary design guidance for Esher Town Center and ENV1 & ENV2 of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan 2000.

Yours faithfully

Gary Lay, Chairman.