

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Internal Consultation Session – Conservation and Urban
Design Issues
16 September 2008

Attendees:

Anthony Evans – Conservation Officer
Tony Michael – Principle Planner (Design)
Karol Jakubczyk – Planning Policy Team Leader

Introduction:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process to date, with emphasis upon the application of the methodology, potential conservation and urban related issues/ constraints (to the process), and site identification, yields and density.

Discussion:

- TM introduced a discussion note to the meeting, which is reproduced at the end of the meeting notes.
- KJ introduced the SHLAA and explained the process to date. Stated that EEBC had undertaken to closely follow the DCLG guidance upon SHLAA production; adjusting the methodology in order to reflect the characteristics of the Borough's sources of housing land supply.

KJ explained that the SHLAA methodology had been subject to two consultation exercises – the first with the Steering Group (comprising key stakeholders) and the second with a wider group of stakeholders (also open to the general public). KJ noted that the SHLAA methodology had been amended in response to the consultation exercises – most significantly, potential sites located within the Green Belt were now being thoroughly assessed through the SHLAA rather than being discounted at the initial site sifting stage (Stage 4).

- The meeting discussed the issue of potential subjectivity creeping into the assessment of housing potential. KJ explained that fundamentally there are two elements of the assessment process where subjective judgements could occur; determining site viability/ deliverability and determining site density/ potential yield.

KJ explained that the methodology (site survey form in particular) requires Officers to make an initial judgement on a site's potential ability to come forward. Sites that are committed and are either within or have been within the planning process are more likely to come forward. Equally those sites where a landowner or developer has expressed a clear interest in developing the site are also more likely to be developable. Such sites score highly. Sites with clear potential and minimal (obvious) constraints but where the landowner's intentions are presently unknown will score a mid-ranking. Other sites that may have potential but which are constrained are more difficult to score (in the high or mid ranking) and will tend to be placed in the not currently

developable category. Further research (especially into landowner intentions) may adjust such a score. It was noted that landownership is a major constraint to the development potential of a site. In general terms, large sites, in single landownership were seen as being fairly straightforward. Smaller sites, comprising multiple-landownership are more considerably more difficult. Specifically, it was noted that the (generally) small urban sites, particularly garden sites, tended to be in multiple ownership, consequently reducing developability and potential yield.

The issue of density was discussed at length. It was agreed that density is a difficult factor to quantify accurately. KJ suggested that the Officer experience had (to date) applied a conservative approach to potential/densities. KJ explained that potential densities were being calculated by Officers applying a combination of average densities (from the surrounding area) and also by using indicative layouts, also taken from the surrounding area and from recent schemes. Whilst such an approach appears to have been successful, there have been instances where (historic planning proposals have suggested) higher densities could have been introduced. The meeting agreed that potential sites with the potential to make a strategic contribution towards housing land supply would benefit from the preparation of bespoke indicative layouts; incorporating additional infrastructure requirements to more accurately determine net density. AE and TM agreed that they would contribute to this process.

- TM spoke on the SHLAA providing a twenty year trajectory of housing supply. KJ explained how the SHLAA will input into EEBC's AMR process and aid in the preparation of a five year housing supply trajectory. KJ also explained that the SHLAA will incorporate (and validate) existing commitments and allocations (as yet uncompleted).
- Further discussion on the methodology included the individual site assessment matrix (Stage 7, Annex 5). KJ provided the meeting with an explanation of the matrix's role and how it would function as part of the assessment process. KJ stated that the matrix would not provide the sole assessment of housing potential but would provide a crude scoring mechanism that would rank sites. This process would help explain the SHLAA outputs to the wider community; attaching crude values/ scores to site specific factors/ issues. KJ emphasised that the matrix would not be the exclusive assessment mechanism; work at the site survey stage and subsequent assessment of potential, developability and overall review (Stages 6 – 8) would ensure that each site was assessed robustly.
- TM spoke on the need to clearly demonstrate to our communities that there are a number of options (to address the issue of housing land supply) and that these options have different implications for how the Borough develops and grows. TM emphasised that the implications of these different (site) options need to be clearly spelt out so that our residents understand how we could meet our housing target. KJ agreed; the future Site Allocations Options Paper will provide alternative options, complete with explanation of the implications of each option.
- TM continued by explaining his discussion note; namely, setting out what the planning authorities objectives should be in terms of protecting character and appearance and retaining important existing uses, which positively contribute

towards the character and appearance of the Borough. TM specifically spoke on the retention of urban open spaces (both recreation and allotments) and the 'green fingers' of Green Belt land that separate the Borough from neighbouring settlements. TM emphasised that we should not take an approach that sweeps away all of the Borough's quality elements simply to achieve our housing target – there needs to be balance; as explained through consultation on options/ implications as set out above.

- There followed extensive discussion on the potential need to retain urban allotments for future needs. TM explained that Councils are obliged (by law) to provide their residents with such provision, where there is demand. It was argued that as urban densities increase, and urban garden sizes (in new developments) decrease, the need for urban open space provision (and accessibility) will increase. Rising global food prices, diminishing oil stocks and the potential impacts of climate change could also demand the retention of balanced urban open space provision.
- Discussion shifted slightly beyond housing, to include the potential need to allocate further employment land within the Borough. There are compelling arguments for more employment floorspace – evidence shows that we do not have enough provision for our resident population and that 'clawing back' residents, who currently commute beyond the Borough boundary, will be a sustainable option that positively contributes developing our sustainable communities. However, given the pressure to develop existing urban sites for housing, the only viable options for further (modern) employment floorspace may well be restricted to the release of Green Belt land. The discussion examined the possibility of the part development of the West Park site as an office campus. All present agreed that such an option would marginal viability – due to the need to retain historic buildings on site, as opposed to demolition. KJ noted that a similar proposal at the Cane Hill Hospital site, Coulsdon had not proved developable (to date).
- The discussion shifted onto the capacity within the Borough's existing infrastructure to take further housing (at specific locations). AE emphasised that this is a considerable issue for our Members; residents expressing their concern at not being able to access local schools, health facilities etc. KJ explained that this will be an issue to consider in detail once we have identified specific site options – the RSS housing quantum makes an assumption that infrastructure capacity for further housing exists or will be developed/ enhanced to accommodate future growth. Such enhancements coming forward as specific (development related) infrastructure schemes or being paid for through our Developer Contributions tariff. If we need significant infrastructure improvements due to the cumulative impacts of growth it may be the case that our Developer Contributions tariff will need adjustment to reflect such need.
- With reference to his discussion note TM suggested that the WS Atkins produced Character Area Assessment be utilised to determine how much capacity for change (in terms of potential housing yield) exists within different parts of the Borough. KJ agreed to this approach but added that such a capacity assessment should also include a site assessment element as currently being undertaken through the SHLAA. KJ argued that a combination of these approaches would be more robust, identifying sites with

specific potential rather than just a broad area of search. The group agreed that such an approach could work.

KJ developed this discussion by suggesting that such an approach could potentially correspond to an Optional Stage (to the SHLAA), identifying specific areas (wards or sub-wards) that have an unquantifiable housing potential. KJ reasoned that such unquantifiable areas still contribute to our housing land supply through windfall sites. Identifying (and quantifying) their potential housing capacity through this approach could help square the windfall circle. Such an approach would also ensure that key qualities and characteristics (in terms of design and townscape) were not lost or harmed by setting a ceiling to capacity.

KJ theorised that such an approach could translate into a number of site allocation or policy options. Namely;

- Identifying all sites with housing potential as allocations – which may prove excessive (+300 sites).
- Splitting the Borough into its constituent urban parts and specifying an upper ceiling capacity for these separate areas, thereby quantifying all potential housing supply.
- Taking a traditional approach of allocating medium and major sites for specific housing delivery and having a generic approach to sweep up the residual. Such a generic approach could incorporate maximum targets for specific parts of the Borough – based upon site survey evidence and the capacity of that part of the Borough to accommodate further change (in terms of it's character, mix of uses, appearance, townscape etc).

The group agreed that it would be worthwhile running this approach as a pilot exercise for one part of the Borough. The issue was whether the exercise was carried out selectively (for those parts of the Borough where housing supply was difficult to quantify) or carried out Borough wide.

Tony Michael's Discussion Notes for 16 September 2008

SHLAA CONSULTATION PAPER:

Constraints should factor in.....**ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

- There are some significant constraints on future development deriving from “quality”, and these should be identified at the beginning of any study;
- Without these, we would be open to building on lands that should not be developed, or building development that adversely affected neighbouring lands, or building in a way which was alien to the nature and character of the place and so on; all of which would be likely to produce a lot of opposition;
- One could take the view that all these “quality” parameters should be built in at the beginning of the study, and then the housing figures would (probably) be achieved with some difficulty, or locally awkward implications;
- Or one could have say three choices, one where only the major quality indicators were all in place; and then two others where the quality indicators were progressively increased; this would give both a choice to the Council/Public, and indicate the often very real implications of having these “quality” criteria in the plan.

What would these “Quality criteria” be? Suggestions could include.....

GRADE 3: the minimum environmental standard

- Green Belt lands zero extra housing build
- Nature zones and SSSI's zero extra housing build
- All defined Open Spaces zero extra housing build
- Historic Parks zero extra housing build
- Allotments zero extra housing build
- Other Open Lands eg school grounds zero extra housing build
- Flood zone lands zero extra housing build

GRADE 2: a higher standard All those in Grade 3 plus.....

- Beside Open Lands 10m zero build protection swathe (for overlooking, privacy, daylighting)
- Neighbouring land protection constraints (for overlooking, privacy distances, daylighting etc)
- Replacement of existing communal/mixed use facilities on new development sites

GRADE 1: the highest standard All those in Grade 2 above plus.....

- Height of building limitations (for scale, character, energy generation protection)
 - Percentage of site cover limitations (for trees, greenery, biodiversity, permeability)
 - High resistance to loss of big trees (eg in rear gardens via backland housing)
-

FUTURE SITES POTENTIAL?

- Take each of the 50+ Character Areas in the Atkins Study; & the Conservation areas & ETC; work through how much additional housing each area could support minimum and maximum;
- Town centre sites could include; Tesco in UHS; Fire Station; United Reformed Church; Conservative Club; Baptist Church; Depot Road Garage; TKmax site in High Street etc.....

**Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Internal Consultation Session – Countryside Team
Countryside, Habitat and Ecology Issues
30 September 2008**

Attendees:

Stuart Cocker – Countryside Manager
Karol Jakubczyk – Planning Policy Team Leader

Introduction:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process to date, with emphasis upon countryside and green infrastructure related issues/ constraints (to the process), and site identification.

KJ opened the meeting by explaining the scale and scope of the SHLAA and the need to account for the Borough's housing land supply – to meet our housing quantum.

Discussion:

The following discussion focussed upon the potential for individual sites to come forward but also set out some useful principles for consideration throughout the process.

- SC noted the existence of a study (from four years previous) that examined the availability/ accessibility of open space provision. It was noted that the study may provide an input to the SHLAA on the potential for (existing open space) sites to come forward – as surplus to requirements.
- Starting from the northern end of the borough the discussion shifted onto specific sites:
- It was noted that Royal Avenue open space (Cuddington Ward) had not been identified by the SHLAA. SC stated that this site does provide strategic open space provision. However, suggested that the site be included within the SHLAA to ensure consistency – it may be available if surplus to requirements and subject to ecological assessment. It was noted that this site is owned by EEBC.
- The adjoining SCC owned site (which had been identified by the SHLAA) was also noted as having some potential – subject to an ecological assessment under the NERC Act 2006. KJ noted that such assessment requirements would be signalled by the SHLAA process and would be carried out at a later stage, as part of the site assessment (and SA) process prior to identification as an option/ future allocation.
- The southern portion of Shadbolt Park was noted. SC stated that release of this site encounter political opposition. However, in comparison to other, more ecologically sensitive sites, this site presents more of an opportunity.
- SC noted the identification of large gardens and multiple gardens within Cuddington and Auriol Wards and asked how Officers had identified these sites. KJ explained that whilst the identification process was (essentially) arbitrary, it never the less provided an indication of potential sources of supply

(typically sites that would have normally come forward as windfalls) and levels of potential yield.

- SC noted the allotment site at Auriol Park and suggested that the general approach should be to protect such sites, unless the site was underused, was of poor quality provision or had been blighted by adjoining (inappropriate uses). Under those circumstances allotment sites could be considered – perhaps not in their entirety but in-part. SC noted that this site is well utilised.
- Timber Croft Island was noted for its value in terms of character and its mature trees.
- SC also noted Dancer Dick Wood, Salisbury Road (Cuddington Ward), which is in EEBC ownership. SC suggested that the site may prove to be Ancient Woodland, in which case it would be inappropriate for development BUT that it should be examined through the SHLAA.
- SC noted that the SHLAA had identified a number of sites either along the edge or adjoining (onto) the Hogsmill Nature reserve. SC stated that those sites at the (narrow) mouth of the Hogsmill are important – due to the narrow constrained character of the Hogsmill at this point. SC suggested that these sites be discounted on the basis of the potential impact upon the nature reserve.
- SC noted the land to the north of the allotments at Northcroft Road (ID 173), West Ewell Ward. SC stated that the field immediately adjoining these allotments (to the north) had originally formed part of the site but had been required for the provision of a major drain. The land had since returned to scrub land and was now desirable for inclusion within the nature reserve.
- SC also noted the adjoining site at land to the rear of Eastcroft Road (ID 280), West Ewell Ward, which was inappropriate due to the presence of a large old/ ancient oak tree within the centre of the site.
- Land to the east of Church Street (ID 278), Ewell Ward was noted as being potential ancient meadow land, with high ecological potential.
- There followed a long discussion on a long discussion on the potential for Cherry Orchard Nursery site (ID 114) and adjoining land at Lower/ Southern Nonsuch Park (ID313). SC noted that all of the land is within EEBC ownership and is generally of low value in nature conservation value. Suggested that the site, if left unmanaged, could have longer term potential as a source of housing land supply. SC noted that there is some wildlife interest upon the former Nursery site (ID114) in the form of a badger set and common lizards. SC emphasised that these sites are not being managed. SC also stated that it would necessarily be appropriate (or necessary) to release these sites in their entirety. SC suggested that release of these lower quality sites could fund enhanced management of the Council's other (higher value) open space assets.
- The Dell at Hatch Furlong (ID119) was identified has having some potential, albeit that it has heavy tree cover. SC noted that the site was a historic chalk pit.
- SC noted that the SCC land at Northey Fields (ID 272) could be a valuable natural resource. SC noted the areas visual beauty/ quality.
- KJ noted that Horton Park Golf Course (ID264) had been submitted as a representation (for development). KJ noted that this proposed allocation had been promoted on the basis that the borough's housing quantum will not be delivered within the existing urban area and that the development of this site provides an opportunity to improve sports facilities at Hook Road Arena. SC noted that this is a curious proposal given the investment made by the golf course in this land. He also stated that such a reduction in the size of the golf course could make the site unviable as a commercial course. SC noted that

the land is owned by EEBC and that if the golf course doesn't want it then it should be returned to form part of the adjoining nature reserve. SC stated that if the site were to come forward, monies from the development of this site should be used (in preference) to maintain, manage and enhance the nature reserve, rather than provide improvements to Hook Road Arena – SC argued that the nature reserve (which is immediately adjacent to the site) is more closely related to the site than Hook Road and that the impacts of site development would need to be met on the nature reserve. SC also noted that the woodland area (to the immediate west of the site) may also prove to be ancient woodland, which would require some form of mitigation, or a buffer zone to any potential future development.

- KJ noted that Horton Heath Farm house complex (ID 268 controlled by English Partnerships) also formed a significant potential development opportunity (not just for housing). KJ explained that there may be a need for a new/ modern business park within the borough and that this site appeared to be a potential location for such a use. SC explained that there may be genuine potential to allow development on part of the site. SC explained the need to maintain (equestrian) access across the site onto the adjacent Country Park. SC noted that whilst the cemetery element of the site may have some habitat/ ecology value it, never the less, could be developed. SC emphasised that Horton Lane does form a firm boundary to the northwest.
- The discussion moved onto the potential of the scrubland located adjacent to the Manor (ID 293). SC stated that currently this site provides an important buffer between the developments (at the former hospitals) and Epsom Common (a SSSI), which is extremely environmentally sensitive. SC noted that the site is divided in two; the northern part being the former cricket oval and the southern rapidly returning to unmanaged scrub. SC suggested that the development of the northern part of the site (the cricket oval) could be positive in terms of enabling more effective use and management of the southern half; which would be targeted specifically at dog walkers, who currently pass through the site on their way to Epsom Common. SC emphasised that Natural England are very concerned about controlling access onto Epsom Common – they don't want it to be completely accessible (especially frequent users such as dog walkers). Consequently, providing some form of dog walking provision closer to the residential areas within the hospital cluster would be desirable.
- Hollywood Lodge site (ID 269), which adjoins the above, was also discussed. SC noted similar issues applied to this site – proximity and conflict with the adjoining SSSI. SC noted that the western third of this site display ground features that may indicate features of archaeological interest (Neolithic?). SC noted that Roman period finds had been discovered on the adjoining West Park site. For similar reasons to site ID 293, SC suggested that the northern part of this site could be developed for housing, whilst the southern third be retained as informal open space (for dog walkers amongst others).
- Woodcote stud (ID 310) was discussed. SC noted that development of this site would be unfortunate in landscape terms – with impacts visible within the wider landscape context. SC also emphasised the site's close proximity to Epsom Common (a SSSI). Both KJ and SC noted that development of this site would effectively constitute an extension to Ashstead, not Epsom and that this may prove difficult (in cross-boundary terms).
- KJ pointed out the site identified west of Rifle Butts Lane (ID 266). SC acknowledged that this site offers some potential, particularly in terms of not being readily visible within the wider landscape.

- SC also identified a potential site at one of the two underground hospitals (ID 314), which he thought may have potential – being reasonably well located in relation to the existing urban area.
- Finally, SC highlighted the fact that land at Stone's Road (ID 24) and Conifer Park, Kiln Lane (ID 304) are both adjacent to the Stone's Road SSSI (Great Crested Newt Pond) and that any development within this area will have to be handled with great care. SC clearly stated that site ID 24 provides a hinterland function for the resident newt population – where they go to feed – so, development on site ID 24 may not be desirable.

**Epsom & Ewell Borough Council
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
Internal Consultation Session – Development Control
31 July 2008**

Attendees:

Neil Milligan
Anthony Evans
John Robinson
Nicola Pettifer
Sarah Edman-Taylor
Susie Peck
Kate Chitty
Karol Jakubczyk

Introduction:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process to date. The meeting provided an opportunity to inform development control colleagues on the role of the SHLAA, in terms of identifying potential sites to meet our housing quantum, in plotting our 5 year housing supply trajectory and as an initial site assessment tool (for both LDF and development control purposes).

The meeting provided an opportunity for Development Control Officers to discuss and identify potential sites. It also provided an opportunity to discuss issues relating to the SHLAA process and methodology.

Discussion:

- Discussion on SHLAA methodology focussed on how Officers had identified sites during Stage 3 and whether Officers had effectively sifted sites prior to Stage 4 of the process.

KJ explained that under ideal conditions a completely unconstrained would consider every single piece of available land within the Borough. Indeed, with an entirely urban Borough (with no rural land/ countryside) such an approach may be demanded. However, such an idealised approach presents clear resource problems. So, whilst we propose to take an unconstrained approach with our SHLAA, it would not be practical to assess the housing land supply potential of every single of land within the Borough. Consequently, it was acknowledged that Stage 3 of the process did involve sifting element of sites that appeared highly unlikely to come forward. However, such sites are not entirely discounted by the SHLAA process, the 'call for sites' consultation exercise provides landowners with an opportunity to promote their sites for assessment – even if Officers had initially discounted them from the process. This has proved to be the case.

KJ explained that the original intention was that sites currently within the Green Belt would be discounted at Stage 4 of the process. However, comments received during the consultation on the methodology had convinced Officers to take an unconstrained approach towards Green belt sites. Equally, whilst the DCLG guidance on preparing SHLAAs suggests a

minimum site threshold (0.12ha), the application of such a threshold has proved to be counterproductive and Officers will consider the potential of significantly smaller sites. It was noted and emphasised that the assessment of such small sites (below 0.12 ha), particularly in terms of their viability was very difficult. Never the less, identification within the SHLAA took such sites out of the windfall equation.

- Development Control Officers debated the issue of what is more important, in terms of character and appearance and sustainability; retaining urban open space provision (within the urban area) or retaining poor quality land with the Green Belt. One argument suggested that a planned strategic extension (in the right location) would take the pressure off the existing urban area and conceivably improve the Green Belt. Officers identified a number of sites for consideration through the SHLAA.
- There was some discussion on how the SHLAA could potentially account for retrospective planning permissions, in terms of legalising housing that didn't have planning permission. Officers noted that this illegal housing (typically single dwellings in multiple occupancy) forms part of our current supply but sits below the radar in respect of counting towards our housing target. KJ suggested that such sources were impossible to factor into the SHLAA due to their highly unpredictable nature – past trends would not provide a genuine indication of quantity. Consequently, it was accepted that such underground housing land supply sources will have to continue to be counted as windfalls if they come forward for legalisation.
- It was noted that Epsom's growing student population (and their demand for student housing) could help with the delivery of future housing. It was noted that student housing is by its nature high density and (usually) sustainably located in relation to the education facility, town centres, shops, public transport and other facilities and amenities. One problem is that a most student accommodation (like some types of sheltered elderly person accommodation, and/or care facilities) follows a communal layout. This type of accommodation does not normally count towards housing targets due to the lack of self-containment. Possible options to address this position include reviewing the general classification of communal living accommodation (should it count as housing), or encouraging student housing that provides self-containment.
- Moving from the above discussion, the group spoke on the potential to increase housing densities within town centre locations. Current average densities (within Epsom) are at about 300 – 400 units/ ha. NM suggested that density could be raised further if current height restrictions were re-examined. NM noted that densities in Kingston and Richmond were between 700 – 1000 units/ ha.
- A number of Officers spoke of the potential for increasing density within the Hospital Cluster site, possibly examining areas within the boundaries of these sites but beyond the former footprint.
- Officers suggested an alternative approach to certain types of housing/ accommodation within the Green Belt, most notably in relation the commercial racehorse and equestrian activities. Officers suggested a generic development management approach that would allow for stable boy

accommodation within existing stud/ stable footprints. Officers suggested that this could provide a niche type of affordable housing provision.

- NM, KJ and SP discussed how the SHLAA could provide an assessment of upper storey living (particularly within town and local centre locations). The question was asked – how can we quantify this potential source of housing land supply? Possible approaches discussed included:
 - Identifying redundant upper storeys through site survey work.
 - Looking at trend data - including permissions/ completions.
 - Identifying potential sites for new housing/ mixed use developments within town and local centres.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Internal Consultation Session – Housing Services

5 August 2008

Attendees:

Emma Langmead
Kevin Ryan
Annette Snell
Elisabeth Campbell
June Roach
Karen Lawrence
Lavina Steele
Lesley Neville
Louise O'Hara
Olwin Butterworth
Pauline George
Karol Jakubczyk

Introduction:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process to date. As the consultant group were neither intimately familiar with the planning policy process, nor specifically the SHLAA process, KJ provided a basic but thorough overview, encompassing the need to account for our potential housing land supply (in order to meet our housing quantum).

The consultant group's primary interest lay with securing affordable housing provision through either partnership working with local RSLs or through the development/planning process. Their interest in the SHLAA is thus as a possible mechanism for identifying potential future sources of affordable housing land supply or sites that could financially contribute towards affordable housing. The group has an additional related interest in provision of accommodation for our gypsy, traveller and travelling show person communities.

Discussion:

The following discussion focused upon identifying sites that could provide a potential source of housing land supply.

- Cox Lane Social Centre, doctor's surgery and car park. Officers suggested that the recently developed site has very low usage and the community facilities located here might be better utilised/ consolidated elsewhere. An opinion was expressed that the site could be redeveloped as part of an extension to the adjoining gypsy and traveller pitch provision.
- Kiln Lane Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation. This site comprises 14 pitches, of which only four are in use (by two families). Officer opinion suggests that it will be very difficult to fully utilise this provision in the future and that it will remain under utilised. Consequently, Officers suggested that a possible solution would be to relocate the two families to a site that specifically met their needs and subsequently redevelop the Kiln Lane site for housing – either market (to specifically fund gypsy and traveller accommodation) or affordable housing.

- An Officer suggested two plots/ houses at Francis Close off Kingston Road, Ewell Court Ward. The Officer stated that both houses were unoccupied and in poor condition and had potential to be redeveloped to a higher density.
- Officers suggested a site adjacent to Stoneleigh Broadway/ Kenilworth Road Garages. Whilst Officers identified a potential site on a map during the course of the meeting, Planning Policy Officers were unconvinced that the site provides any housing potential.
- The potential to redevelop and enhance Roseberry's short term homeless accommodation (at Depot Road) was noted.
- The potential intensification of the temporary accommodation at Blenheim Road was also noted.
- The proposal (subsequently granted at appeal) at Berrydale was noted.
- The potential source of housing at Linton's Lane was also noted – this site having previously come forward through site consultation (2006).
- Officers suggested that the SHLAA actively seeks the views and input from Roseberry RSL on the potential sources of housing land supply that may exist within their existing housing stock – such as strategic landscaping and garage blocks.

Epsom & Ewell Borough Council

Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

Internal Consultation Session – Leisure Services

28 October 2008

Attendees:

Sam Beak
Karol Jakubczyk

Introduction:

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process to date. As the consultant group were neither intimately familiar with the planning policy process, nor specifically the SHLAA process, KJ provided a basic but thorough overview, encompassing the need to account for our potential housing land supply (in order to meet our housing quantum).

The consultant group's primary interest lay with securing open space recreation provision across the Borough. As the SHLAA desk top study element identifies a number of existing open space sites, either in part or their entirety, this session provided an opportunity to assess some of these sites, either for their open space value, or as potential housing sites.

The meeting also provided an opportunity to discuss wider leisure and recreation policy implications; such as the potential identification and allocation of strategic formal recreation provision.

Discussion:

The following discussion focused upon identifying sites that could provide a potential source of housing land supply.

- SB identified Christ Church Road recreation pitch (Stamford Ward) as a possible site with housing potential. SB stated that the existing formal pitch provision was poor and that the small size of the site precluded further development of the site, namely, the site is too small to provide the Borough Council with further recreation development opportunities. **NB:** This site has already been identified as a potential site ID293.
- Shadbolt Park, Cuddington Ward was discussed. KJ suggested that the southern portion of the site could be considered as a logical open land release, on the basis that it would form an extension to the existing townscape. SB suggested that this may be a possible option. Her statement was made on the assumption that formal recreation provision is the most valuable type of provision and that informal provision has a lesser recreation value – in terms of levels/ intensity of use. KJ noted that this release would retain the majority of the park in recreation use. SB noted that the ultimate decision would depend on how highly Members and residents valued their urban open space over the need to release greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
- SB made the important statement that whilst the Borough has lots of urban recreation open space, the Borough's overall density (of development) and

the associated levels of traffic congestion make it important for us to maintain existing provision where it is – so that it remains accessible.

- SB expanded this point through her discussion of Baker's Field, Chessington Road. She emphasised that this small informal open space site serves as the only real open space provision within the Longmead estate, which is one of the Borough's two areas of deprivation. SB further emphasised that the Baker's Field site provides the only outlet for the estate's youth – who would otherwise have nowhere to go and nothing to do. It was loosely agreed that the Baker's Field site could only be released if the provision be relocated locally to a new site (possibly Hook Road Arena) and made equally accessible.
- Hook Road Arena – the discussion moved onto the Horton Park Golf Club representation, which KJ explained sought to redevelop part of the course for housing, relocate the golf driving range and provide some football pitch provision (on Hook Road Arena). SB expressed her concern over this proposal. It was noted that the proposed housing site was still in EEBCs ownership (leased to the Golf Club – approx 90 years remaining). SB stated that Hook Road Arena is an ideal site for structured recreation – especially for football pitch provision, which the Borough currently lacks. SB stated that she had been pressing for the comprehensive development of Hook Road Arena for structured recreation provision. SB emphasised the local resident concerns, particularly in relation to flood-lighting (essential to maximise the recreation use/ benefit) and potential highway issues. KJ suggested that the Site Allocations DPD could be a mechanism for exploring the recreation open space options on Hook Road Arena further. It was agreed that Leisure Services and Planning Policy would work to bring these options forward.
- Priest Hill – SB noted the potential for this site to provide further strategic structured open space provision. SB and KJ discussed the possibility of the site coming forward as part of the wider NESOT proposals. There was also some discussion about the possible use of the site by either Epsom & Ewell FC (who currently play outside of the Borough) or Sutton & Epsom Rugby Club (who play within the Borough but at a substandard site). SB suggested that there wouldn't be an opportunity to ground share. SB stated that either FC or RFC provision would require a number of pitches (possibly an all weather surface as well), in order to accommodate the various teams involved. SB stated that there would also be a requirement for flood-lighting, and if the FC were involved some form of stadia provision as well (although not Wembley sized). It was agreed that Leisure Services and Planning Policy would work together to examine possible options through the Site Allocations SPD.