

Epsom & Ewell Local Plan Examination

Council Responses to Matter 2: Housing Need and Supply

12 September 2025

Issue 3: Whether the housing need and supply for the borough and contained within the Plan are positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy

The standard method identifies that the housing need over the plan period is 10, 242 dwellings, 569 dpa.

Q3.1 Policy S1 identifies that the housing requirement for the period 2022-2040 is 4700 homes. This is a shortfall of 5500 homes when considered against the standard method. The Plan makes provision for 4914 homes over the plan period. The Council are not suggesting that an alternative method for the calculation of housing need should be adopted here – is this correct?

- 3.1 Yes, the Council confirms that it is not proposing an alternative method for, calculating housing need. In accordance with national policy and guidance, the standard method (in place at the time the HEDNA was written) has been used as the starting point for identifying housing need in the Borough.
- 3.2 The NPPF para 61 (December 2023) states that *'there may be exceptional circumstances, including relating to the particular demographic characteristics of an area which justify an alternative approach to assessing housing need'* and through footnote five states that *'such particular demographic characteristics could, for example, include areas that are islands with no land bridge that have a significant proportion of elderly residents'*.
- 3.3 The Council does not consider exceptional circumstances apply in the borough to justify an alternate approach to the standard method.
- Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA):
- 3.4 The Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (document reference HB03) forms the principal evidence base for the housing requirement and confirms the application of the standard method.
- 3.5 Paragraph 3.3 of the HEDNA states:
"In order to determine the minimum number of homes required within their area over a Local Plan period, councils are required by national policy to use

the Standard Method described in the housing and economic needs chapter of PPG unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach.”

- 3.6 Paragraph 3.4 further clarifies:
“It should be emphasised that this report does not set housing targets. It provides an assessment of housing needs, based on relevant PPG. This is intended to provide inputs to plan-making alongside wider evidence including land availability, environmental and other development constraints and infrastructure.”

- 3.7 In line with paragraph 61 of the NPPF (2021), the local housing need figure (LHNF) for Epsom & Ewell has been calculated using the four-step standard method set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). This is detailed in Chapter 8 of the HEDNA (pp. 105–115), with specific reference at paragraph 8.1.

Plan Preparation and Housing Requirement:

- 3.8 In preparing the Local Plan, the Council has:
- a) Applied the standard method as the starting point for assessing housing need;
 - b) Undertaken a comprehensive site assessment process, including the Land Availability Assessment (LAA), to identify deliverable and developable sites;
 - c) Considered the Borough’s significant constraints, including the Green Belt, flood risk, and infrastructure capacity;
 - d) Assessed the environmental implications of growth through the Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which informed the spatial strategy and the scale of development proposed;
 - e) Engaged with neighbouring authorities and those within the same Housing Market Area (HMA) to investigate meeting housing needs outside of the borough;
 - f) Concluded that it is only possible to accommodate 4,700 homes over the plan period within the borough, without causing unacceptable harm.
- 3.9 The Plan makes provision for 4,914 homes, which includes a modest buffer above the minimum requirement of 4,700 to provide flexibility.

Conclusion:

- 3.10 The Council confirms that:
- a) The standard method has been used to calculate housing need;
 - b) The shortfall of approximately 5,500 homes reflects the physical and policy constraints of the Borough, not a departure from the standard method;
 - c) The Plan is consistent with national policy, which allows for such shortfalls where fully evidenced and justified.

- 3.11 The Council considers that the Plan is positively prepared, justified, and sound in this regard.

Q3.2 Is the Plan justified in not meeting the full LHN?

- 3.12 Yes, the Local Plan is justified in not meeting the LHN of 10,242 dwellings in full. As detailed in the Council's response to Matter 1 Question 2.5 (document reference COUD_005), there is insufficient capacity from available sites to meet the LHN in full. Specifically, the total theoretical capacity of available sites within the LAA 2024 (document reference HB01a) is up to 8,301 homes, which equates to 80% of LHN. It is important to note that not all of these sites are considered suitable for development, as set out in Table 3 (p22) of the Site Assessment Methodology (document reference HB05).
- 3.13 The Local Plan spatial strategy is an appropriate strategy as demonstrated by the Sustainability Appraisal (document reference SD05a) that seeks to balance housing needs with the borough's constraints. This is compliant with paragraph 11b of the NPPF (2023) which makes it clear (emphasis added) that for plan making... 'strategic policies should, as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas, unless:
- i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area (note this includes land designated as Green Belt); or
 - ii. any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

Q3.3 Does the approach demonstrate that the Plan has been positively prepared in accordance with paragraph 35 of the Framework and will it be effective?

- 3.14 The Plan has been positively prepared; it has been informed by a Sustainability Appraisal (document reference SD05a) that has tested reasonable alternatives (growth scenarios) including higher growth scenarios than proposed in the plan to close the gap in meeting development needs (see Table 5.2).
- 3.15 The Plan is effective as the Local Plan will deliver sustainable development (as evidenced by the SA) over the local plan period and has been informed by effective joint working on cross boundary strategic matters as demonstrated by the Statements of Common Ground that have been prepared with

partners. Further detail on the joint working undertaken is contained in the Council's response to the MIQs, Matter 1, questions 1.1-1.3 (document reference [COUN_005](#)).

Q3.4 The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that when preparing strategic policies, it may be concluded that insufficient sites / broad locations have been identified to meet objectively assessed needs, including the identified local housing need. In the first instance, strategic policy-making authorities will need to revisit their assessment, for example to carry out a further call for sites, or changing assumptions about the development potential of particular sites to ensure these make the most efficient use of land. This may include applying a range of densities that reflect the accessibility and potential of different areas, especially for sites in town and city centres, and other locations that are well served by public transport. Has the Council completed this exercise?

- 3.16 Yes, the Council has undertaken the exercise described in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) to identify sites and broad locations to try and meet its objectively assessed needs.
- 3.17 Throughout the Local Plan process the Council has sought to maximise the number of sites that were considered in the LAA through the following exercises:
- a. extensive Call for Sites exercises - to identify land available for development in the borough;
 - b. desktop reviews - essentially an urban capacity study to identify land that could potentially accommodate additional development if the land were to become available; and
 - c. directly contacting landowners - to boost the number of sites that may be submitted for consideration and to confirm their availability for development.
- 3.18 The Council has reviewed the sites included in the LAA to ensure their yields have been optimised. This has involved:
- a. Site visits of all available urban sites;
 - b. Site Assessment Matrix development – standard density multipliers calculated for each site, to inform site capacity assumptions;
 - c. Reviewing site capacities with Development Management officers and;
 - d. Using the emerging Town Centre Masterplan to inform densities.
- 3.19 A timeline of these activities is outlined in Table M2-1 overleaf.

Table M2-1: Timeline for Land Availability Assessment activities

Date	Activity Undertaken
February 2022	Initial Call for Sites commenced 11/02/22 (6 weeks). Council writes to landowners of sites to promote the 'Call for Sites' exercise.
March 2022	Deadline for initial Call for Sites 27/03/22 (Sites received by the 27/03/22 were considered in the LAA 2022 document reference HB02a). Following the deadline, the Call for Sites remains open on the Council's website until July 2023.
July 2022	Council sends follow up letter to landowners who had not responded to the initial 'Call for Sites' exercise to encourage further site submissions.
November 2022	LAA 2022 published (document reference HB02a).
February 2023	Call for Sites promoted again, alongside the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation (1/02/23 to 27/03/23).
March/April 2023	Council writes to landowners of sites identified in the LAA 2022 as being 'developable' to confirm site availability, including a call for sites form.
July 2023	Call for Sites exercise concludes (Sites received by the 31/07/23 were considered in the LAA 2024 document reference HB01a).
August/September 2023	Site visits undertaken of all available urban sites
October 2023	Density multipliers applied to all available urban sites as part of the site assessment methodology exercise
November 2023	Discussions with Development Management officers to review the capacity of urban sites.
January to April 2024	Updating site assessment methodology to reflect site visits, density multiplier exercise, discussions with Development Management officers and emerging Town Centre Masterplan.
August 2024	Town Centre Masterplan published (document reference HB06a)
September 2024	LAA 2024 published (document reference HB01a). Site Assessment Methodology published (document reference HB05).

3.20 Further details on the activities stated in the timeline are outlined below:

Call for Sites

3.21 The initial Call for Sites was opened on 11 February 2022 with the request for site submissions to be submitted to the Council by 27 March 2022. Sites submitted up until the end of March 2022 were included in the LAA (2022)

(document reference [HB02a](#)), with sites submitted after this date included in the subsequent LAA (2024) (document reference [HB01a](#)).

- 3.22 Following this initial 6 week Call for Sites period, the Call for Sites remained open and was promoted again as part of the Regulation 18 consultation, which ran from 1 February to 19 March 2023. From March to July 2023 a total of 16 sites were put forward, which had not previously been promoted through the initial 6 week call for sites exercise. 1 was rejected, as the site put forward was not in their ownership and the site wasn't promoted by the landowner.
- 3.23 The 2023 Call for Sites exercise concluded on 31 July 2023, and only sites submitted up until this date were included in the LAA (2024) (paragraph 1.5 document reference [HB01a](#)). Since 1 August 2023, no additional sites have been submitted through the call for sites process, however the Council has continued to monitor planning applications to identify additional sites.

Proactive engagement with landowners

- 3.24 The Council has been proactive in engaging with landowners to help boost the number of sites submitted. As part of the promotion of the initial Call for Site exercise (February to March 2022), the Council wrote to landowners identified through the 'desktop review' process. This desktop review process included sites identified previously, such as through Urban Capacity Study (2018) and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (2017) and more recently, through satellite imagery searches and the identification of under-developed parcels of land that may have potential to accommodate additional development (such as development of garage sites).
- 3.25 The Council wrote to these landowners twice, first in February 2022 with a follow up letter sent in July 2022.
- 3.26 The LAA (2022) (document reference [HB02a](#)) identified a list of 41 developable sites (Appendix 2, pages 10-11), 31 of which did not have confirmation of availability. The Council contacted the landowners of these sites in March/April 2023¹. The LAA 2024 (document [HB01a](#)) was updated to reflect those landowners that confirmed land was available and where land was not confirmed to be available, the sites were discounted (due to lack of availability).
- 3.27 The LAA 2024 Maps (document reference [HB01b](#)) provides a high-level appraisal of each 'available' site's suitability, availability, and achievability, along with indicative yields and other details.

¹ See paragraph 7.2 of the Spatial Strategy Topic Paper (document [TP07](#)))

Development Potential (capacity)

- 3.28 The Council has followed a three-stage process to reviewing the site capacities following the publication of the Land Availability Assessment in 2022. The three stages process is detailed below:
- 3.29 Stage 1 - Site visits were undertaken of all available urban sites in August 2023 to review sites including their character and surroundings to help determine an appropriate site capacity.
- 3.30 Stage 2 - During the development of the Site Assessment Methodology (document reference [HB05](#)), standard density multipliers were applied to all available urban sites, to sense check and inform discussions with development management colleagues in relation to site capacity. This exercise is available in Appendix M2a.
- 3.31 Stage 3 – meeting with Development Management Colleagues to review the site capacities of urban sites, having regard to the LAA 2022, subsequent site visits, the density multipliers and where applicable the emerging Town Centre Masterplan.
- 3.32 In addition, the town centre masterplan was being progressed at this time and has informed the capacity of the town centre sites with a consultation undertaken on a draft Masterplan in November – December 2023 and the final masterplan published in August 2024, which increased the capacity of some of the opportunity sites. Further information this can be found in the Council's response to Q6.1 under Matter 5.
- 3.33 The outcome of this staged approach to reviewing site capacities are reflected in Appendix 7 of the LAA 2024 (document reference [HB01a](#)).
- 3.34 Finally, throughout the plan-making process the Council has continuously monitored planning applications and pre-applications to identify any new sites that could contribute to the housing supply.

Q3.5 Where is the evidence base to support this? As far as I can see, the evidence base in this regard consists of the LAA 2024 (HB01a). The conclusion from this assessment suggests there is insufficient land within the urban area to meet the identified need against the standard methodology of 573 dpa (around 34%). Is this the totality of the evidence in relation to this point?

- 3.35 No, the LAA 2024 ([HB01a](#)) does not comprise the totality of the evidence as set out in our response to Q3.4 above. Further exercises and evidence have informed the conclusions of the LAA. These comprise density multiplier exercises (available in Appendix M2a) and the Town Centre Masterplan

(document reference [HB06a](#)), which has informed capacities for key strategic town centre allocations in the Local Plan.

Q3.6 The LAA 2024 (HB01a) states that it is ‘unlikely that increasing the density of potential sites is likely to yield a sufficient amount to address the shortfall, nor would revisiting discounted sites’. What evidence has the Council to support these statements?

- 3.36 The LAA (HB01a) identifies that *‘the number of residential units that can be accommodated on the deliverable and developable sites within the urban area. This demonstrates that there is sufficient land to deliver approximately 34% of the housing need (objectively assessed need based on the standard method) within the plan period’* (para 4.12). Table 3 of the LAA (p9) provides a summary of the housing trajectory for urban sites with LAA sites making up between 1,287 and 1,582 homes over the plan period, and other sources of supply such as outstanding permissions and windfalls making up the remainder.
- 3.37 As set out in response to Q3.4, the Council has undertaken a robust staged process to reviewing the capacity of sites in the context of making efficient use of land from the limited number of sites in the urban area that the LAA 2024 (document reference [HB01a](#)) identifies to be Deliverable (23 sites with a total capacity of up to 947 dwellings) and Developable (10 sites with a total capacity of up to 635 dwellings). Given the limited number of dwellings capable of being accommodated on these urban sites, even if the densities of all these sites were to be uplifted by 50% (which we do not consider to be appropriate following the three stage process detailed Q3.4), the increase in supply would be under 800 dwellings (or 7.7% of housing need (objectively assessed need based on the standard method)).
- 3.38 In addition, there are 16 sites in Appendix 5 of the LAA (covering a total area of 1.7ha) that have been identified as *‘too small to accommodate 5 or more dwellings’* and which are *‘available’*. The staged process detailed in Q3.4 was followed in assessing these sites, however if we assume each of these sites could accommodate 5 units (which we do not consider to be appropriate) then only an additional 80 units could be delivered (which is less than 1% of housing need)

Q3.7 Has the Council identified land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, as required by paragraph 70 (a) of the Framework?

3.39 Yes, the Council has met this requirement. It is estimated that approximately 26.6% of the housing requirement will be met on sites no larger than one hectare. A breakdown of this is provided below:

- a. Of the 35 site allocations within the Local Plan, 26 sites are less than 1 hectare (10,000sqm) in size.
- b. These will collectively deliver 795 units (765 units on sites <1ha in the urban area and 30 units on a site <1ha within the existing Green Belt).
- c. The housing requirement is 4,700 units.
- d. Therefore, without considering windfall delivery, commitments or completions, 16.9% of the housing requirement will be met through the supply of sites of less than 1 hectare.
- e. The number of units from small windfall (1-4 units) is estimated to be 455 over the Plan period, which equates to 9.7% of the housing requirement.
- f. As such, 26.6% of the housing requirement will be met on sites no larger than one hectare, which are either allocations or small windfall.

Q3.8 Could the Council identify which sites make up this requirement and where in the evidence base is the support for the approach put forward?

3.40 Table M2-2 below shows the number of units that make up this requirement and from which source they come from. That is, site allocations of less than 1 hectare and small windfall (1-4 units).

Table M2-2: Summary of sites which make up the less than 1 hectare requirement

Housing requirement	4,700
Total supply from Site Allocations (<1ha)	795
Percentage of requirement from Site Allocations	17%
Supply from small windfall (1-4 units)	455
Percentage of requirement from small windfall	9.7%
Total Supply from Site Allocations (<1ha) and small windfall (1-4 units)	1,250

Percentage of requirement from Site Allocations and small windfall	26.6%
---	--------------

- 3.41 The Site Allocations of less than 1 hectare, which make up this requirement are identified in the table M2-3 below.

Table M2-3: Site Allocations of less than 1 hectare (10,000sqm)

Site name:	LAA ref	SA ref	Area (sqm)	Allocated yield
Hook Road Car Park	TOW022	SA02	4,765	150
20 Hook Road	TOW055	SA03	718	20
Bunzl, Hook Road	N/A	SA04	1,688	20
Town Hall	TOW021	SA05	7,425	90
Hope Lodge car park	TOW011	SA06	3,958	30
Former Police Station & Ambulance Station	TOW060	SA07	3,704	47 (C3 equiv.)
Epsom Clinic	TOW018	SA08	1,660	30
79-85 East Street, Epsom	TOW017	SA10	2,195	35
Finachem House, 2-4 Ashley Road	TOW020	SA11	1,211	20
Global House	TOW024	SA12	2,863	75
60 East Street	N/A	SA14	2,377	30
Corner of Kiln Lane & East Street	TOW043	SA15	369	5
Kiln Lane (site 3)	TOW058	SA16	6,714	40
Hatch Furlong Nursery, east of Ewell By-Pass	NON004	SA17	5,187	30
1-7 Station Road, Stoneleigh	AUR004	SA19	373	5
Ewell Autoway & Tesco Express, 26 Reigate Road	EWE004	SA20	2,542	10
Richards Field car park, Chessington Road	WEW004	SA21	710	7
Etwelle House, Station Road	NON001	SA22	1,974	20
140-142 Ruxley Lane West Ewell Surrey	RUX023	SA23	2,011	12
Garages at Somerset Close & Westmorland Close	COU045	SA24	1,009	6
64 South Street, Epsom	WOO004	SA25	1,360	6
35 Alexandra Road	COL016	SA26	1,017	8
22-24 Dorking Road	WOO022	SA27	1,227	18
63 Dorking Road	WOO023	SA28	1,367	6

65 London Road	N/A	SA29	3,010	45 (C3 equiv.)
Land at Chantilly Way	HOR010	SA33	6,966	30
Total from Site Allocations				795

- 3.42 It is important to note that the Council is now aware that some of the smaller allocations detailed in Table M2-3 above are not deliverable and it is suggested that they are removed from the Local Plan. Our responses to Q6.13 and Q13.1 provide further detail. The removal of these 4 sites reduces the number of dwellings to be delivered from small site allocations from 795 to 769.

Q3.9 Will the plan provide for a five year supply of deliverable sites upon adoption, with particular reference to the definition of derivable contained within annex 2 of the Framework?

- 3.43 Yes, Appendix 2 of the Local Plan (p162) identifies the housing trajectory for the plan period and confirms that a five-year supply will be in place following adoption which is anticipated to be April 2026 in the Local Development Scheme (document reference based on the minimum housing requirement (4,700 homes) annualised (261 dwellings) as shown in the table M2-4 below:

Table M2-4 –five year land supply (2026/27 to 2030/31)

	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	Total
Local Plan delivery	490	397	347	267	377	1,878
Requirement (annualised)	261	261	261	261	261	1,305
20% uplift (HDT)	313	313	313	313	313	1,566

- 3.44 The above demonstrates that a five-year land supply can be demonstrated for the five years of the Local Plan following adoption (totalling 7.2 years). Factoring the Housing Delivery Test 20% uplift would make it 5.9 years supply.
- 3.45 Following submission of the Local Plan (which was initially approved by the councils licensing and planning policy committee in November 2024), some amendments are proposed to the site allocations and trajectory (see responses to Q3.10 and Q13.1).

Q3.10 Is the trajectory contained within the Plan up to date? The Council should provide any updates which should include identified completions, existing commitments and any other sources of supply the Council are seeking to rely upon.

3.46 No, we now have monitoring data for the 2024/25 monitoring year which includes the latest commitments and completions data ([Authority Monitoring Report 2024/25](#)) . In addition, following the preparation of the Local Plan (which was presented to committee in November 2024), updates are required to the trajectory to reflect up to date information on sites (including revised capacities and phasing) with further detail provided in our response to Q13.1. A revised trajectory has been prepared which is attached as Appendix M2b).

Q3.11 In terms of windfall, paragraph 72 of the Framework advises that where an allowance is made for windfall sites as part of an anticipated supply, there should be compelling evidence that they will provide a reliable source of supply. The housing trajectory includes a windfall allowance of 455 (small windfall) and 407 (large windfall) over the plan period, is this a justified approach to provide separate figures for large and small sites?

3.47 Yes, the inclusion of a disaggregated windfall allowance is a justified approach and makes a modest contribution to the housing supply. The inclusion is based on compelling evidence, which confirms that both small and large windfall sites are reliable and realistic sources of future housing supply in the borough.

3.48 The Council has ensured that all the sites allocated within the Local Plan are available for development (i.e. availability being confirmed by the landowner). This is a high bar for the allocation of sites within the plan, with sites considered to be 'developable' but with unconfirmed availability being excluded from allocation. It is therefore possible that these 'developable' sites may come forward during the plan period as windfall, alongside other unidentified sites. The Council has undertaken an exercise to demonstrate how these 'developable' sites may contribute to a larger windfall allocation during the plan period.

3.49 As part of the Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan, 46 sites were identified within Appendix 2 (page 292, document reference [PV01](#)) as being 'developable' (following assessment as part of the LAA 2022) but with unconfirmed availability. The Council has reviewed these Appendix 2 sites and found that a number have since had their availability confirmed and are now allocated, while some have received planning permission. After removing these, 24 sites remain which collectively have a potential yield of 591 units (see table M2-5 overleaf). These sites therefore have the potential to deliver an average of 54 units per year across the 11 year period during which a larger windfall

allocation is included in the housing trajectory (Appendix 2, page 162 in the Local Plan document reference [SD02](#)). This figure is above the larger windfall allocation of 37 units per annum.

Table M2-5: Review of Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Appendix 2 sites (identified as ‘developable’ but with unconfirmed availability)

Address	Ward	LAA Ref	Potential Yield	Area (ha)	Windfall category
Builders Yard Mill Road	College	COL001	15	0.43	5-19
25 Alexandra Road, Epsom	College	COL006	10	0.20	5-19
Gainsborough Road Estate, Epsom	Court	COU020	15	0.26	5-19
Parking at 54 Gainsborough Road	Court	COU021	10	0.10	5-19
Garages Morland Court, Ardrossan Gardens	Cuddington	CUD002	16	0.18	5-19
5 Ruxley Lane, Ewell	Ewell Court	EWC001	30	0.18	20+
TA Centre Welbeck Close	Ewell	EWE001	62	1.02	20+
Homebase, 23 Reigate Road, Ewell	Ewell	EWE005	64	1.59	20+
Land west of Ewell By Pass	Ewell	EWE012	46	0.87	20+
106-112 East Street	Ewell	EWE016	15	0.10	5-19
Public House (Toby Carvery) 45 Cheam Road	Nonsuch	NON002	35	0.46	20+
47 Cheam Road, Ewell	Nonsuch	NON003	9	0.10	5-19
Cox Lane Community Centre	Ruxley	RUX001	15	0.24	5-19
Crane Court/Rowden Road (Garages)	Ruxley	RUX005	6	0.18	5-19
442 Chessington Road and Coach Park	Ruxley	RUX006	14	0.33	5-19
Behind Texaco Petrol Station, Ruxley Lane	Ruxley	RUX007	6	0.19	5-19
Petrol Station at corner of Chessington and Ruxley Lane	Ruxley	RUX015	5	0.10	5-19
Eclipse Business Park, West Hill	Stamford	STA001	25	0.38	20+
1 Beaufort Way	Stoneleigh	STO008	30	0.56	20+
Conservative Club, Epsom Club and Church	Town	TOW002	40	0.38	20+
TK Maxx	Town	TOW007	65	0.14	20+
Land R/O The Albion Public House (Mccaffertys Bar)	Town	TOW008	8	0.14	5-19
32 Waterloo Road and BRM Coachworks	Town	TOW013	35	0.23	20+
Spread Eagle Shopping Centre	Town	TOW016	15	0.18	5-19
Total			591		

- 3.50 The Council's Larger Windfall Allowance Topic Paper (document reference TP04), provides further justification. A summary of the evidence is set out below:
- a) There is a strong track record of windfall sites being delivered in the borough (Table 2, page 7 of document TP04 sets out the delivery rates for various sized sites over an eleven-year period).
 - b) Historically a significant proportion of housing in the borough has been delivered on smaller sites in the built-up/urban areas, delivering between 5 & 20 units.
 - c) Larger sites typically emerge from redevelopment, intensification, and changes of use within the borough's urban fabric.
 - d) Smaller sites tend to arise from the gentle densification of individual plots of which there is a plentiful supply in the borough.
 - e) Windfall delivery is expected to continue throughout the borough: larger windfalls are likely to occur in the Town ward and to a lesser extent Ewell Village ward, while smaller windfalls are likely to continue across the borough.
- 3.51 The decision to disaggregate the windfall allowance figures by site size (in terms of net number of units) is a deliberate and justified approach:
- a) The Topic Paper (document reference TP04) explores six scenarios for categorising windfall sites, including options that include or exclude sites of 20 units and above. This analysis led to the adoption of a definition for large windfall sites as those delivering 5–19 units, based on observed delivery patterns, and a precautionary approach and an intention to not be (over)reliant on windfall to meet housing need.
 - b) A smaller windfall allowance is introduced in 2027/28 in the housing trajectory to avoid the double counting of any sites which have received planning permission and are therefore included in the 'commitments' figure. The base date for the commitments is April 2024.
 - c) The introduction of a larger windfall allowance (5-19 units) commences at a later stage in the housing trajectory 2029/30, as per the Planning Practice Guidance which advises that local planning authorities have the "ability to identify broad locations in years 6-15, which could include a windfall allowance based on a geographical area".
 - d) The Council considered alternative approaches for a windfall allowance, which included aggregating all windfall into a single figure and excluding large site windfall from the trajectory. These options were discounted as they would not reflect the borough's historic delivery patterns or provide an accurate forecast.
- 3.52 The chosen approach is therefore an appropriate strategy, which enhances the transparency and accuracy of the housing trajectory, ensuring that the contribution of different types of windfall sites is properly accounted for.

Q3.12 Document TP04 explains the approach to large windfall sites. Is this a justified approach given (a) the allocation of sites within the urban area as assessed by the LAA and (b) given the fact that the allocation of town centre sites is the primary source of housing supply over the plan period?

- 3.53 The Council considers the approach to large windfall sites, as set out in the Topic Paper (document reference [TP04](#)) and in the response to MIQ 3.10, to be justified in accordance with paragraph 35(b) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that plans be “*an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence.*”

Avoidance of Double Counting

- 3.54 While it is correct that town centre sites represent the primary source of housing supply over the plan period, these sites are all expected to deliver 20+ dwellings and have therefore been excluded from the windfall allowance. This ensures that there is no double counting between allocated supply and projected windfall.
- 3.55 While it is acknowledged that actual delivery may occasionally differ from allocated yields, the Council has taken a cautious and proportionate approach by excluding sites of 20+ units from the windfall allowance altogether.
- 3.56 The windfall estimate is deliberately conservative; the Council could have included a higher figure — for example, by incorporating sites above 20 units — but chose not to.

Treatment of Urban Allocations (5–19 Units)

- 3.57 Urban sites delivering between 5 and 19 units have only been allocated within the first five years of the plan period. This approach ensures that any such sites coming forward later in the plan period can be legitimately counted as windfall, without overlap with the identified supply. This is a precautionary and proportionate strategy to maintain the integrity of the housing trajectory.

Spatial Distribution of Allocated Sites

- 3.58 The spatial analysis of allocated sites further supports the separation of windfall and allocated supply:
- Of the 11 small urban sites (5–19 units) allocated (as listed in Appendix 2 of the Local Plan):
 - None are located within the Town Centre Boundary (as defined on the Policies Map).
 - Only one site (Corner of Kiln Lane & East Street – SA15 – 5 units) is located within Town ward.
 - Of the 17 larger urban sites (20+ units):
 - 13 sites are located within the Town Centre Boundary.

- 15 sites are located within Town ward.

3.59 This confirms that the town centre allocations are aligned with the windfall assumptions, both in terms of scale and spatial distribution, ensuring a coherent and justified approach to housing supply.

Conclusion

- 3.60 The approach to large windfall sites is justified because:
- a) It is based on a clear and proportionate methodology that avoids double counting.
 - b) It distinguishes between allocated and windfall supply based on unit thresholds and plan period timing.
 - c) It reflects the spatial reality of site allocations, ensuring that town centre sites (20+ units) are not conflated with windfall projections.
- 3.61 This strategy provides a transparent and sound basis for estimating future housing supply and aligns with the requirements of the NPPF.

Q3.13 Paragraph 4.4.1 of document TP04 states the Council does not intend to be reliant on the delivery of windfall sites in order to meet the housing requirement. With reference to the housing trajectory presented at appendix 2 of the Plan, is this statement correct?

- 3.62 No, the statement is not correct as 18% of the housing requirement is intended to be met from windfall. The housing trajectory presented at Appendix 2 of the Plan includes a windfall allowance of 862 dwellings over the Plan period, comprising:
- Small windfall sites (1–4 units): 455 dwellings (35 units per annum)
 - Large windfall sites (5–19 units): 407 dwellings (37 units per annum)
- 3.63 This combined windfall contribution represents approximately 18% of the total housing requirement, broken down as follows:
- 9.7% from small windfall sites
 - 8.6% from large windfall sites
- 3.64 While this is a notable proportion, the Council does not consider this level of windfall delivery to constitute an *over-reliance*. The windfall assumptions are based on robust evidence, as set out in the Larger Windfall Allowance Topic Paper (document reference [TP04](#)), which demonstrates a consistent pattern of windfall delivery in the borough and provides a reasoned basis for future expectations.
- 3.65 However, it is acknowledged that if windfall delivery were not to come forward to the degree anticipated, the housing requirement would not be met in full. In

that sense, the Council is *reliant* on windfall delivery to meet the requirement, albeit to a limited and justified extent.

- 3.66 Moreover, [TP04](#) provides evidence that windfall delivery could exceed the current allowance. For example, Table 3 (paragraph 3.4) of [TP04](#) outlines scenarios where windfall could include sites of 20+ units. Under Scenario 5, expanding the windfall definition to include sites up to 25 units & office-to-residential conversions could yield an additional 19 units per annum, further strengthening the supply position.
- 3.67 In conclusion, while windfall delivery forms part of the housing supply, the Council maintains that it is not over-reliant on it. The assumptions are evidence-based and conservative, and there is potential for windfall contributions to exceed current projections.

Q3.14 Section 3.3 of document TP04 considers the sites which have contributed to the largest windfall sites. Please could the Council explain the rationale for the conclusions drawn in relation to the sites considered at paragraphs 3.3.2, 3.3.3, 3.3.5?

- 3.68 The Council's rationale for the conclusions drawn in paragraphs 3.3.2, 3.3.3, and 3.3.5 of [TP04](#) is based on the nature and location of the sites in question, and the likelihood of similar sites coming forward again as windfall during the new Plan period.

Paragraph 3.3.2 – Epsom & Ewell High School (161 net units, ref: 18/01360/FUL)

- 3.69 This site is a greenfield site within the urban area, approximately 2.8 hectares in size (while the total site size was larger, only the parcel developed for residential is relevant). It was a school playing field and is not located within the Green Belt. The Council considers this type of site unlikely to come forward again as windfall during the new Plan period as:
- There is a finite supply of surplus playing fields or similar greenfield land within the urban area.
 - If such a site were to come forward, it is likely to be identified during the Plan preparation process, rather than emerging unexpectedly.
 - There is no clear evidence of other comparable greenfield sites (i.e. not protected open space or recreation land) remaining in the borough, that we are, at the very least, aware of.

Paragraph 3.3.3 – Woodcote Grove (98 net units, ref: 19/00999/FUL)

- 3.70 This site is a brownfield site within the urban area, approximately 0.75 hectares in size. The Council considers this type of site may come forward again as windfall during the Plan period, based on the following rationale:
- a. Brownfield sites in the urban area are generally more likely to come forward as windfall than greenfield sites.
 - b. There is a possibility that sites of this nature could come forward again during the Plan period, but this cannot be relied upon with confidence, and therefore a cautious approach has been taken in the housing trajectory.

Paragraph 3.3.5 – Presto Haulage, the Old Mill (80 net units, ref: 18/01430/FUL)

- 3.71 This site is also a brownfield site within the urban area, approximately 1 hectare in size, previously used for industrial warehousing. The Council considers this type of site may come forward again as windfall, for the following reasons:
- a. The site had an existing built footprint, making it suitable for redevelopment.
 - b. Similar industrial sites may exist, but the supply of such sites is limited, particularly outside of designated employment areas such as Longmead and Kiln Lane.
 - c. As such, while this type of site could come forward again, the Council applies a cautious approach to its likelihood, recognising the constraints on industrial land availability.

Q3.15 If the windfall rate to be applied to this Plan only focuses on small and medium sites, (units 1-9) what would this mean for the windfall delivery rates to be applied to the housing supply?

- 3.72 If the windfall allowance were restricted to only include small and medium sites (1–9 units), based on historic delivery rates as set out in the Larger Windfall Topic Paper (document reference [TP04](#)), this would result in a reduction in the overall housing supply of 209 units over the Plan period.
- 3.73 This assumes that sites of 5-9 units would be delivered from year 5 of the Plan period onwards (i.e. from 2029/30 up until 2039/40) and that the annual medium windfall figure (for 5-9 units) is 18 units.