



# Green Belt Topic Paper

Update following Examination Hearings

January 2026

**Epsom and Ewell**  
**Local Plan** 2022-2040



# Green Belt Topic Paper – Update following Examination Hearings

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	ii
2. Site Proformas.....	1
3. Conclusion.....	111

# 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This document has been produced following the Examination Hearings for the Epsom and Ewell Local Plan 2022-2040 held at the end of 2025. It includes additional work requested by the Examiner during the Hearings with regards to the [Green Belt Topic Paper](#) (Document Reference TP02) that the Council prepared to support the Consultation on the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Regulation 19).
- 1.2 The [Green Belt Topic Paper](#) (Document Reference TP02) comprised of four sections, Section 2 considered the policy and legal context for the alteration of Green Belt boundaries at Plan making; Section 3 set out the case for exceptional circumstances on a strategic level having regard to the first 3 matters of the Calverton Case and Section 4 considered the exceptional circumstances on a site specific level, specifically having regard to the last two matters of the Calverton Case tests iv and v. these are as follows:
  - iv. the nature and extent of harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and,*
  - v. the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonable practicable extent.*
- 1.3 During the Examination Hearing on Matter 4 Green Belt held on 1 October 2025, the Examiner identified shortcomings in part of the Green Belt Topic Paper (Document Reference TP02) and outlined the need to undertake further work on Section 4 which comprised of site assessments of individual Green Belt sites and whether exceptional circumstances existed for making alterations to the Green Belt boundaries.
- 1.4 During the Hearing Session the Council agreed that updates to the topic paper could be undertaken to address the Inspector's concerns in relation to Section 4. In addition, it was agreed that the Council should provide additional information to demonstrate how paragraph 147 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) has been satisfied:

*'Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport...'*
- 1.5 The Council committed to prepare a Hearing Action Note for consideration by the Inspector to set out the scope of the additional work to be undertaken. The [Post Hearing Action Green Belt Topic Paper](#) (Document Reference HD4\_1) was prepared by the Council and subsequently approved for publication by the Inspector as part of the Examination Library.

- 1.6 This paper delivers what is set out in the Post Hearing Action Note, which can be summarised as:
- revisiting Section 4 of TP02 in relation to the site appraisals relating to all the Green Belt LAA (Land Availability Assessment) sites and review them against the Calverton Tests only and consistently.
  - identify whether any of the site is previously developed or not (or is in part).
  - details of how each site scored in the [Transport Assessment](#) (Document reference IS06) carried out at Regulation 18 stage and additional information on the proximity of the site to public transport including the nearest train stations and bus stops.
- 1.7 This update document has been prepared in conformity with Document Reference HD4\_1 and has assessed 28 Green Belt LAA sites and 7 sites designated as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt in the Epsom and Ewell Core Strategy (2007). Chapter 2 of this document contains the individual site assessments which include:
- an assessment against the Calverton Tests,
  - identify whether any of the site contains previously developed land, and
  - identifying whether sites are well served by public transport.

## Methodology

- 1.8 This paper is 'policy off' and solely focuses on the harm and potential mitigation of the purposes of the green belt and does not factor in other constraints that may apply to the sites.
- 1.9 The Calverton Case refers to a legal case on the matter of assessing 'exceptional circumstances' through plan making (Calverton Parish Council v Greater Nottingham Councils [2015] EWHC 1078). This sets out that the planning judgements involved in the consideration of exceptional circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt land for development. This sets out that 5 matters that should be considered, with matters 1-3 best considered at a strategic level and matters 4 and 5 on a site-by-site basis.
- 1.10 In Chapter 2 of this paper, each of the Green Belt sites have been assessed against matters 4 and 5 set out in the Calverton judgement:
- iv. the nature and extent of harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and,
  - v. the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonable practicable extent.

1.11 The assessments relate to the three (of the five) purposes defined in Paragraph 143 of the NPPF December 2023:

- a. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas.
- b. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
- c. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

This is consistent with the Green Belt Study Update 2024 ([Document Reference GB01](#)) which assesses and scores 53 Green Belt Parcels against the purposes of the Green Belt.

1.12 Each site has been assessed to determine whether there is Previously Developed Land present This has been identified via desktop review using GIS mapping and aerial photography and informed by previous site visits.

1.13 Each site has been assessed for its accessibility to Public Transport This includes data on how well served the sites are by public transport utilising the outputs of the [Transport Assessment](#) (Document reference IS06) carried out at Regulation 18 stage which provides an accessibility score for each site. In addition, information on the proximity of the site to public transport including the nearest train stations and bus stops (including information on services) is provided.


1.14 Chapter 3 provides a summary of the conclusions for each of the sites assessed.

## Contents


1 West Park (Major Developed Site).....	3
2 Manor Park (Major Developed Site).....	6
3 Livingstone Park (Major Developed Site).....	9
4 Clarendon Park (Major Developed Site).....	12
5 St Ebbas (Major Developed Site).....	15
6 Epsom College (Major Developed Site).....	18
7 NESCOL (Major Developed Site).....	22
COL017 Land West of Burgh Heath Road.....	25
COL019 Land east of Burgh Heath Road.....	29
COL020 Land near Downs Road -north.....	33
COL021 Land near Downs Road -South.....	36
COL022 Clear Heights, Downs Road.....	39
COL023 Land near Downs Road-east.....	42
COU026 Hook Road Arena.....	46
HOR001 Cuddington Glade.....	50
HOR002 Hollywood Lodge.....	53
HOR003 Manor Park.....	56
HOR004 Land off Cuddington Glade.....	59
HOR005 and HOR006 LAA ref West Park.....	62
HOR007 Noble Park extension.....	65
HOR008 LAA ref West Park.....	68
HOR009 Horton Farm.....	71
HOR010 Land at Chantilly Way.....	75
HOR011 Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park.....	78
HOR012 Clarendon Park HOR012.....	81
HOR014 Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park HOR014.....	84
NON013 Land at Priest Hill NON013.....	87

NON016 and NON042 Downs Farm (LAA ref NON016 and NON042).....	90
NON021 Drift Bridge Farm (LAA ref NON021).....	95
NON038 Banstead Road.....	99
NON040 The Looe, Reigate Road NON040.....	102
WOO019 Land near Downs Road-west (WOO019).....	105
WOO020 Land North of Langley Bottom Farm.....	108

# 1 West Park (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**

Building 11.16% General surface 38% Natural Environment 41.43, Road/Path/track 9.42%

Area: 25.6 ha

**Relevant Green Belt parcel**

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 20 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P20	Land at and immediately surrounding West Park former hospital site	1	0	1	2

**Purposes of Green Belt**

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

**Scores**

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## 1 West Park (Major Developed Site)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The whole area was not assessed as part of the TA however sites to the north and south were assessed separately scoring 8.5 (north) and 11 (south) against the multi-criteria analysis. These are low scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 254 and 249 out of 256 respectively  
In the context of GB sites the sites are low scoring

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Town 1.5 miles (33 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Sherwood Way E10 located centrally within site

E10 Manor Park to Epsom Station Daily (reduced service Sundays)  
06.30-23.20 every 30 mins



Aerial Photo

### Site description

West Park is a former hospital site which has been largely redeveloped into a residential estate. There are buildings to the north and south which remain in NHS use, some of these have become vacant and surplus to requirements and are being proposed for redevelopment (Ref HOR005, HOR006 and HOR008). The residential estate is suburban in character and well landscaped, including significant areas of tree coverage particularly on the edges, many of the trees are covered by TPOs. Approximately 60% of the land is previously developed, comprising residential houses and flats/apartments and property boundaries and roads and hard surfaces.

The southern horse shoe of the site is a large conservation area comprising a number of locally listed buildings. A statutory listed water tower is located at the centre of the site.

The NE boundary runs adjacent to the boundary of Horton Country Park (SNCI), the SW runs adjacent to Christ Church Road where Epsom Common (SSSI) runs alongside.

The NE and SE consist of public rights of way.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 20 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (2).

In terms of sprawl, the area is already a developed residential estate and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard. Therefore further development within the site would have minimal harm.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard, therefore any additional development within the area would have little to no harm to the GB purpose.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area is previously developed, therefore additional development within the area would have little contribution to the impact on the open character of the countryside.

## 1 West Park (Major Developed Site)

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The area is predominantly previously developed within a parkland setting and has clear boundaries. The NE boundary runs adjacent to the boundary of Horton Country Park (SNCI), the SW runs adjacent to Christ Church Road where Epsom Common (SSSI) runs alongside. The NE and SE boundary abut public rights of way. The proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl, the area makes very little contribution in this regard, but any development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures are identified.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully designed/masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.

Defensible Boundaries: The proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**


- The area sits within GB parcel 20 which overall score is low (2) made up of a low score in terms of sprawl and a low score in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- The area is previously developed and makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Should the area be removed from the Green Belt, the impact of any new development within the area on the remaining Green Belt could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.


### **Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:**

West Park was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area possessed minimal characteristics of openness and a boundary that follows tightly the built-up area was proposed for removal from the Green Belt.

## 2 Manor Park (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



© Crown copyright and database right 2024, Ordnance Survey Licence AC0000906036

Area: 13.71 ha

Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Buildings 5.33%, General Surface 16.44%, 60.06% Natural Environment; Road/Path/track 18.17%

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 22 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P22	Land at and immediately surrounding Horton former hospital site	0	0	1	1

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



© Crown copyright and database right 2025 Ordnance Survey Licence AC0000906036

## 2 Manor Park (Major Developed Site)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the TA however the adjoining site Manor Park was assessed as well as other smaller sites below . These scored between **17 and 18** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is a moderate score relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 184/256

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 1.3 miles (28 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Horton Lane E10 (0.3 miles 7 mins walk)

E10 Epsom station-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat 06.30-23.30, reduced Service Sun.



Aerial Photo

### Site description

Manor Park is a former hospital site which has been redeveloped into a residential estate. The residential estate is comprised of two parcels located side by side, separated by vegetation and a perimeter road running around the western parcel. Both parcels are surrounded by dense landscaping on the perimeter. The areas are suburban in character and dominated by cul-de-sacs mainly of detached/semi detached and terrace housing. There is significant areas of tree coverage particularly on the edges, many of the trees are covered by TPOs. Approximately 60% of the land is undeveloped, particularly to the south. The area adjoins SNCI to the NE (Livingstone Park) and NW (Horton Country Park). The southern part of the western parcel and tip of the open space is within a (Manor) conservation area.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 22 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area is already a developed residential estate and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard. Therefore further development within the site would have little to no harm.

In terms of merging, The area makes no contribution in this regard therefore any additional development within the built up area would have little to no harm to the GB purpose.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area is previously developed therefore additional development within the area would have little contribution to the impact on the open character of the countryside.

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The site comprises two developed parcels. The proposed area for inseting would tightly follow the built-up elements.

## 2 Manor Park (Major Developed Site)

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the area makes very little contribution in this regard, but any development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.

Defensible Boundaries The proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site sits within GB parcel 22 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).
- The area is previously developed and makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Should the area be removed from the Green Belt, the impact of any new development within the area on the remaining Green Belt could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.

### Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:

Manor Park was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. Although the site comprises significant natural landscape on the edges, the built-up area possesses minimal characteristics of openness, and these are the areas proposed for the removal from the Green Belt.



### 3. Livingstone Park (Major Developed Site)

#### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the TA but the surrounding site/parcels were. These were assessed separately in the TA scoring between 15.5 and 16.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 191-212 out of 256

#### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 1.2 miles, 27 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Haven Way E9

E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park

Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

#### Site description

Livingstone Park is a former hospital site which has been redeveloped into a residential estate. The residential estate is semi-circular surrounded by open green space. The area is suburban in character comprising of a mixture of detached/semi detached and terrace housing and flatted residential. To the SE there is a school, to the north are local shops and in the centre is The Horton (cultural/arts venue). There are significant areas of tree coverage, many of the trees being covered by TPOS.

The area consists of SNCI to the SW (Livingstone Park), open green space to the SE (Long Grove Park).

The northern part of the site is located within a (Horton) conservation area and The Horton venue is located here where the building is listed.

#### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 25 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area is already a developed residential estate and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard. Therefore further development within the site would have little to no harm.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard, therefore any additional development within the area would have little to no harm to the GB purpose.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area is previously developed therefore additional development within the area would have little contribution to the impact on the open character of the countryside.

### 3. Livingstone Park (Major Developed Site)

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built-up elements.

#### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl, development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures are identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.

Defensible Boundaries: The proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel.

#### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**


- The site sits within GB parcel 25 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).
- The area is previously developed and makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Should the area be removed from the Green Belt, the impact of any new development within the area on the remaining Green Belt could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.


#### **Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:**

Livingstone Park was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area, although comprised significant natural landscape on the edges, the built-up area possessed minimal characteristics of openness, and these are the areas proposed for the removal from the Green Belt.

#### 4. Clarendon Park (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



© Crown copyright and database right 2024. Ordnance Survey Licence AC000080636

Area: 12.19 ha

Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Buildings 6.94%, General Surface 23.02% Natural Environment 63.30%, Road/Path/track 6.74%

#### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 27 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P27	Land at Clarendon Park (Long Grove former hospital site)	0	0	1	1

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



© Crown copyright and database right 2025 Ordnance Survey Licence AC000080636

#### 4. Clarendon Park (Major Developed Site)

##### Accessibility

##### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The whole site was not assessed as part of the TA however the adjoining small area was assessed as well as other smaller sites below. These scored **11.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly low scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5).

##### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 1.7 miles (37 mins walk)

##### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Sandy Mead within the site

E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park  
Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

##### Site description

Clarendon Park is a former hospital site which has been redeveloped into a residential estate. The residential estate is in a semi-circular area surrounded by open green space. The area is suburban in character comprising of a mixture of detached/semi detached housing and flatted residential properties located within numerous cul-de-sacs, where the whole estate is accessed from two entrances along Horton Lane.

Horton Country Park (SNCI) wraps round the area from SW to NE, the area is well landscaped, including significant areas of tree coverage particularly on the edges, many of the trees are covered by TPOs. The SE part of the site is located within a conservation area (Long Grove).

##### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 27 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area is already a developed residential estate and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard, therefore further development within the site would have little to no harm.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard therefore any additional development within the built up area would have little to no harm to the GB purpose.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area is previously developed therefore additional development within the area would have little contribution to the impact on the open character of the countryside.

Defensible Boundaries: the former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates and currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built-up elements.

#### 4. Clarendon Park (Major Developed Site)

##### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures are identified.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area makes little contribution in this regard. However to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.

Defensible Boundaries: the proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel. Proposals for the redevelopment of PDL in the GB would not be inappropriate development.

##### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.


- The site sits within GB parcel 27 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).
- The area is previously developed and makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Should the area be removed from the Green Belt, the impact of any new development within the area on the remaining Green Belt could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.


##### Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:

Clarendon Park was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area, although comprised significant natural landscape on the edges, the built-up area possessed minimal characteristics of openness and these are the areas proposed for the removal from the Green Belt.

## 5. St Ebbas (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Buildings 9.97%, General Surface 29.32%; Natural Environment 51.62%  
Road/Path/track 9.09%

Area: 16.14 ha

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 30 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P30	Land at St Ebba's former hospital site	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose  
 1 Parcel is lower performing  
 2 Parcel is moderately performing  
 3 Parcel is higher performing



## 5. St Ebbas (Major Developed Site)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the TA however the adjoining open space east was assessed scoring **18.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5).

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell West 0.8 miles (18 mins walk) and Epsom 1.2 miles (27 mins walk).

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Harvester Road edge of the site E9  
At Hook Road edge of the site E5

E5 Langley Vale, Watersedge (Mon-Fri) 6.07 until 19.21 (every 2 hour)

E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park  
Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

St Ebbas is a former hospital site which has been redeveloped into a residential estate. The residential estate is split into two linear areas with an open green space corridor running through the centre (SW to NE) the site. The area is suburban in character comprising of a mixture of detached/semi detached housing/town houses and flatted residential properties located. The area sits adjacent to public open space Hook Road Arena (COU026) which is identified in for allocation in the Proposed Submission Local Plan for residential development to the south and playing pitches to the north. It is well landscaped, including many trees which are covered by TPOs. The NW edge of the site adjoins a conservation area (St Ebbas).

The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built-up elements, excluding the north/west part of the site, which is in NHS use and is within a conservation area.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 30 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area is already a developed residential estate and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard, therefore further development within the site would have little to no harm.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard, therefore any additional development within the area would have little to no harm to the GB purpose.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside. The area is previously developed therefore additional development within the area would have little contribution to the impact on the open character of the countryside.

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built-up elements.

## 5. St Ebbas (Major Developed Site)

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the area makes very little contribution in this regard, but any development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the area makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.

Defensible Boundaries: The proposed area for removal tightly follows the built-up limits of the parcel.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.


- The site sits within GB parcel 30 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contribution towards sprawl or preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).
- The area is previously developed and makes a limited contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt.
- Should the area be removed from the Green Belt, the impact of any new development within the area on the remaining Green Belt could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.

### Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:

St Ebbas was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area, although comprised natural landscape on the edges, the built-up area possessed suburban/urban qualities with minimal characteristics of openness, and these are the areas proposed for the removal from the Green Belt.

## 6. Epsom College (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Area: 30.39 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Buildings 7.8%, General Surface 21.78%, Natural Environment 66.5%; Road/Path/track 3.92%

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 36 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P36	Land at Epsom College	1	2	1	4

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## 6. Epsom College (Major Developed Site)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the TA however the adjoining areas east and west were assessed scoring **11.5 and 12.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly low/moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5).

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 0.7 miles (16 mins walk) and Epsom 1.0 miles (22 mins walk).

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Longdown Lane south 166, 615

At College Rd 166, 408, 615

166 Epsom Hospital-Banstead-Coulsdon-Purley Hourly service

408 Epsom, Leatherhead Cobham (Mon-Fri)  
06.23 until 19.41 (every 70 mins)

615 St Andrews School, Epsom-Banstead  
(school bus)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

Epsom College is a private Independent School for the 11+ age group and upwards. It is located on the edge of settlement. The grounds include historic buildings, educational buildings, boarding houses, chapel, numerous sports pitches and fields. Most of the buildings are located along the northern and eastern edges of the site adjoining College Road and Longdown Lane South. The large building along Longdown Lane South is statutory listed building and the chapel located more centrally is also listed. Approximately 33.5% of the area is built up and the remaining area (66.5%) is open green space, comprising of various sports fields/pitches and amenity greenspace. The majority of the open fields make up the central part of the property, with the built development on the edges.

There are clear views of the grounds from College Road (from the northern boundary) over the hedge and through the open sports fields. The open aspect here allows for more distant clear views south towards the distant Epsom Downs.

The site is a 'D' shaped, with a strong building line along the perimeter two roads where the central part of the site is mainly open. The site is large and appears sprawling but is contained/hemmed in by the educational buildings on the edge. The site is fairly flat with views of Epsom Downs to the south. College Road further east is on higher ground and the College buildings can be seen on approach to the junction of College Road and Longdown Lane North and South.

The site includes tree/hedge lines, these clearly define the different fields/pitches, many of the trees are covered by TPOs. The NW part of the site is located within a conservation area (College Road).

## 6. Epsom College (Major Developed Site)

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site falls within GB Parcel 36 and has an overall score of 4. It scores moderately against the purposes of the GB in terms of preventing neighbouring towns from merging and low for sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary, the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the defined urban area boundary to the south. However the site is the campus of a private school, it consists various school buildings and playing pitches, and the site adjoins ribbon development in the area. Therefore, in this context, sprawl of the built up area has already occurred here, although remains washed over by the Green Belt. Therefore, the site itself has minimal impact on this purpose.

In terms of merging, the site scores moderate for this purpose. The nearest largest settlement from the edge of Epsom is Nork/Tattenham Corner to the South where this site creates approximatey a 760m gap. The development of the site would reduce the gap by 500m between these areas. Therefore the development of the site would cause considerable harm in terms of merging. However as noted above, a degree of development has already occurred between these neighbouring areas in the form of ribbon development (washed over by green belt), so technically the harm in terms of merging has occurred but the degree of development is such that the site remains washed over by green belt.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is previously developed, although the PDL elements are mainly focussed on the edges with open space at the centre. The site is also surrounded by urban development to the W and NE, with ribbon development on the E (washed over by GB). Therefore it is recognised that the area consists of urbanising elements therefore the degree of additional development harm is minimal.

Defensible Boundaries: The area is predominantly previously developed with open space/playing pitches towards the centre. The site is defined by clear physical features following the property line of the campus. As the PDL elements are mostly located on the edges, the boundary of the potential area for removal would tightly follow the built-up edge which would include the open/space in the centre.

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt. At present development is focussed on the perimeter, with open playing fields in the centre. Whilst sprawl has occurred here, the extent and spread of any future development of the site could be restricted to the existing pattern of development on the edges to preserve views from the northern part of the site through the open fields in the centre.

In terms of merging, At present development is focussed on the perimeter, with open playing fields in the centre. Whilst development has taken place, the intensity and spread of the built elements are focussed on the edges. Any future development of the site could be restricted to the existing pattern of development on the edges to preserve the open aspect from the centre of the site. This would reduce the extent of harm in terms of merging. Natural screening could be reinforced to aid the sense of separation of areas.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development should be carefully masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The potential area for removal tightly follows the campus boundary. Any future development of the site could be restricted to the existing pattern of development on the edges to preserve the open aspect from the centre of the site.

## 6. Epsom College (Major Developed Site)

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.


- The site falls within GB Parcel 36 and has an overall score of 4. It scores moderate against purposes of the GB in terms of preventing neighbouring towns from merging and low for sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- The area consists of some previously developed land mainly on the edges and the level of harm caused by additional development would depend on the development proposed and the impact on the character. It is considered that any future development of the site could be restricted to the existing pattern of development on the edges to preserve the open aspect from the centre of the site.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.

### Conclusion from the Green Belt Study Update 2024:

Epsom College was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area possessed some characteristics of openness particularly within the centre, where over 66% of the site is open space with buildings on the perimeter of the site.

## 7. NESCOL (Major Developed Site)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 14.55%, General surface 25.56%, Natural Environment 56.34%, Road/Path/track 3.55%

Area: 10.08 ha

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 52 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P42	Land at and associated with NESCOL College	1	3	1	5

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## 7. NESCOT (Major Developed Site)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the TA however the adjoining areas east and west were assessed scoring **15** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly moderate score relative to other sites (highest score 25.5).

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell East 0.4 miles (9 mins walk)

**Nearest Bus stops and routes:**  
At Cheam Road (0.1 miles) S2

S2 Epsom – St Helier  
Daily 06.20-midnight, every 20 mins,  
Sundays every 30 mins



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a further education establishment NESCOT (North East Surrey College of Technology) located on the edge of settlement. It is located on the edge of settlement at the centre of the Borough. The grounds includes educational buildings, large surface car parking, sports pitches and agricultural fields to the south arranged in a rectangular parcel. Most of the buildings and PDL elements are located to the northern part of the site.

Approximately 44% of the parcel is built up and the remaining area 56% is open green space, comprising of various sports fields/pitches and amenity greenspace and agricultural fields to the south- which are used by the college for educational purposes.

The site has clear defensible boundaries. There is a public right of way to the south, railway line to the north, public highway to the west and field boundary to the east. The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built-up elements of the campus to the north, where the southern boundary would follow the line of the property edge parallel to the extensive surface car park to the south.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site falls within GB Parcel 42 and has an overall score of 5. It scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of neighbouring towns from merging and low for sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the existing GB boundary at the centre, however the campus is located fairly centrally to the main urban area and the built up area has extended further south adjacent to the site. Therefore, the site itself has minimal impact on this purpose.

In terms of merging, the site scores high for this purpose, although the nearest largest settlement from the edge of Epsom is Nork/Tattenham Corner to the South where this site creates an approximate 2km gap. The development of the site would reduce the gap by 260m between these areas. Therefore would still ensure a sufficient buffer between these areas, limiting the degree of harm in terms of merging.

## 7. NESCOL (Major Developed Site)

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is previously developed, with the PDL elements being mainly located in the northern section of the site. The site is surrounded by urban development to the W and N. Therefore it is recognised that the area is influenced by its urban context and therefore the degree of harm is minimal.

Defensible Boundaries: The site comprises of two main elements the main campus and built development to the north and agricultural fields to the south. The site is defined by clear physical features following the property line of the campus. The proposed area for removal would tightly follow the built up elements of the campus to the north, where the southern boundary would follow the line of the property edge parallel to the extensive surface car park to the south.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl, development here should ensure that it respects the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt.

In terms of merging, the proposed area for removal is the northern part, the southern field is proposed to be retained in the Green Belt. Any future development of the northern part of the site should respect the surrounding character and proximity to the settlement edge/Green Belt. Natural screening could be reinforced to aid the sense of separation of areas.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development should be carefully designed to ensure any built form respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The potential area for removal tightly follows the campus boundary.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**


- The site falls within GB Parcel 42 and has an overall score of 5. It scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of neighbouring towns from merging and low for sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- The northern part of the site is largely previously developed and the level of harm caused by additional development would depend on the development proposed and the impact on the surrounding character. It is considered that any future development of the site could be ameliorated through careful and sensitive design.

Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying the release of the area shown in the site boundary from the Green Belt.

### **Conclusions from the Green Belt Study Update 2024**

NESCOT was assessed in the Green Belt Study Update 2024 to consider whether the area possessed an open character, justifying the retention within the Green Belt and what boundary would be a defensible boundary if removed. The area possessed minimal characteristics of openness and a boundary that follows tightly the built-up area to the north was proposed.

## Land West of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL017)



Site Location Plan



Site Location Boundary

Site Area: 1.52 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land (100% undeveloped land)

Assessed Yield: 50 residential units

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 32 which scores the following against the GB Purposes 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P32	Land to the west of Burgh Heath Road east of Rifle Butts Alley	3	2	2	7

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



Relevant Green Belt parcel Map showing site within relevant GB parcel

## Land West of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL017)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **12** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is low scoring relative to all other sites PDL and GB assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 240/256  
In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks poorly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.1 miles (25 mins walk) and Epsom 1.2 miles (26 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Beech Rd, Aston Way 318 (Epsom to Banstead)  
At Treadwell Road 617, 619 (School bus)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is an agricultural field located at the southern edge of settlement north of Epsom Downs. The surrounding area comprises of various paddocks and stables.

The eastern boundary abuts Burgh Heath Road and western boundary lies adjacent to a public bridleway. The boundaries are well vegetated, screening most of the site from view, however glimpses of the site are visible, particularly to the NW corner of the site which is elevated above the existing properties on Beech Road.

The site is rectangular in shape, well defined on all sides except the southern boundary which does not follow a physical feature but follows the boundary to a development site known as 'South Hatch' directly south of the site.

There are urban features, particularly to the north as it adjoins the existing urban area and the adjoining properties along Beech Road which create an existing sharp, clean settlement edge.

The site promoters ([Reg19 REP148](#)) have submitted a sketch masterplan of how the site could be developed. The site would be a cul-de-sac with a single vehicular access from Burgh Heath Road and pedestrian access along Rifle Butts Ally and will include a small area of amenity green space. It includes a vegetated boundary treatment, reflecting the existing boundary treatment to the north, east and west.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within the northern portion, approximately 12% of a larger GB parcel 32 which extends down to the Golf Course. The GB parcel scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl of large built up areas and scores moderately for the purposes of merging of towns and assisting the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing urban area boundary of the Borough to the south. However, the level of harm in this case is less significant given the fact that permission has been granted and is currently under construction for an 'enabling' scheme for equestrian and residential development to the south of the site (known as 'South Hatch' application reference 18/00308/FUL Racehorse Training Establishment and 46

### Land West of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL017)

apartments currently being built out). Consequently, the site being assessed has become an undeveloped gap between the existing settlement edge and the new enabling scheme to the south, leaving it vulnerable to infilling in the future. Therefore, the extent of the harm in terms of sprawl has been lessened and would now be limited.

In terms of merging, although the parcel is moderate scoring for this, the site is a small part of a larger parcel and has minimal impact on the merging of the towns. The gap between Epsom edge and the nearest large settlement edge Tattenham Corner is approximately a 1km gap, the site would reduce this gap by 90 meters. Therefore a significant buffer would be retained with the development of the site. Therefore the harm would be minimal.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, development of the site would result in encroachment into the countryside. The site is an open field and the wider area rises towards sensitive landscape to the south. This area is considered to be a transitional landscape between the southern built-up edge of the urban area and the more sensitive open countryside landscape to the south. As identified above, permission has been granted and has commenced to the south of the site, therefore there are increasingly urbanised features in the vicinity. Therefore, there is limited harm in this regard

Defensible Boundaries: There are urban features, particularly to the north as it adjoins the existing Urban Area boundary and the adjoining properties along Beech Road which create a sharp, clean settlement edge. Whilst a strong boundary, the permanence of the existing edge is weakened by the fact that development is currently being undertaken to the south.

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

Sprawl: The main impact from the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary, but as mentioned above, there is an enabling development to the south of this site (for a new Racehorse Training establishment and 45 apartments) , which has established the extension of the settlement beyond the existing boundary, making this site vulnerable to being infilled in the future. The limited harm could be reduced by a more gradual transition with softer edge, sensitive design that takes into account the edge of settlement character.

Merging: The potential harm to this can be reduced by maintaining the sense of visual separation. The use of natural screening of the site to preserve the sense of separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The harm to this transitional landscape between the built-up edge and the more sensitive landscape to the south could be reduced by careful master planning, including the use of trees and natural features to screen and soften views. The topography the area should be considered and used to its advantage to help protect views or screen development. Any development should ensure a gradual transition with a soft edge to the south taking into account the edge of settlement character and impact of the development on the openness of the remaining surrounding green belt. Enhanced landscaping to the western boundary, soften /screen views. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out.

Defensible Boundaries: The existing settlement edge and public bridleway to the west create a strong boundary however the permanence of the existing edge is weakened by the fact that development is currently being undertaken to the south.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.


### **Land West of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL017)**

- The site sits within the northern portion, approximately 12% of a larger GB parcel 32 that scores high against purpose 1 and moderate for purposes 2 and 3 with an overall high score of 7
- In isolation, the development of the site would be considered sprawl beyond the edge of the defined Urban Area however as noted, planning permission has been granted and is under construction for a racehorse training establishment and 45 apartments directly to the south of the site, already extending the settlement edge beyond the point of this site.

Whilst it is recognised that the parcel is overall high scoring against the Green Belt purposes, it is the case that an enabling development has already extended the Urban Area edge beyond this point further south leaving the site as a notable gap that is vulnerable to development in the future.

Some degree of harm has been recognised and concluded that it could be ameliorated, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site exhibits Exceptional Circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

**Land east of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL019)**



**Site Location Plan**



**Site Boundary**



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
Building 2.15 %; Undeveloped Land 96.38 %; Road/Path/track 1.46%

**Site Area: 8.82 ha**

**Assessed Yield: 300 residential units**

**Relevant Green Belt parcel**

The site sits within Green Belt parcels 33 and 34 which scores the following for the GB Purposes 1-3 scores


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P33	Land to the east of Burgh Heath Road south of Beech Way	3	2	2	7
P34	Land north of Epsom Golf Course east of Burgh Heath Road	2	2	2	6

**Purposes of Green Belt**

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

**Scores**

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land east of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL019)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 11.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is low scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 245/256. In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks poorly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.1 miles (25 mins walk) and Epsom 1.3 miles (28 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Beech Road, 318, NW corner of the site 1 mins walk (Epsom to Banstead), 3-4 services a day (Mon-Fri)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site consists mainly of a series of various sized agricultural fields, with some built development located at the southern edge of the Urban Area north of Epsom Downs. The western boundary abuts Burgh Heath Road and to the north a collection of executive homes which protrudes beyond the Urban Area boundary but remains washed over by Green Belt.

The site is located to the edge of settlement, with urban development to the north and various paddocks and stables to the south.

The site boundary is well defined by physical features, mainly field hedging and property boundaries and Burgh Heath Road. The site as a whole is an irregular shape and may make it vulnerable to further infill of adjacent parcels.

The site promoters have not submitted any supporting information or concept plans for the site but have submitted an updated site boundary which comprises of the two northern parcels adjoining the settlement boundary (this follows the boundary of GB parcel 33).

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site staggers over two parcels, the whole of parcel 33 and the western part (approximately half) of parcel 34. The northern part of the site (parcel 33) abuts the Urban Area and scores high against purposes in terms of sprawl and both parcels scores moderately against the purpose of merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The northern parcel scores an overall high score of 7. The southern part of the site (parcel 34) scores moderately for all purposes with an overall score of 6.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be a significant extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary to the south of the Borough. It is noted that existing Green Belt boundary has already to a degree been compromised by the small collection of executive houses to the north known as College View, these protrude out of an otherwise continuous straight-line boundary stretching either side of Burgh Heath Road. Overall the extent of the harm in terms of sprawl would be considerable if the site were fully developed.

### Land east of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL019)

In terms of merging, the site staggers over two GB Parcels and scores moderately for this purpose. The site is a considerable size, stretching from the edge of the Urban Area to Epsom Downs Golf course to the south, if the whole site were developed it would reduce the gap between Epsom's southern edge and the nearest large settlement edge Tattenham Corner (850m) by almost half the distance. Therefore the potential harm would be significant.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, development of the site would result in encroachment into the countryside. The site is a series of open fields, with a collection of buildings to the north, south, as well as the surrounding area north and west (new development site South Hatch). The site rises towards sensitive landscape to the south towards Epsom Downs. The land uses are pastoral and has the character of the edge of settlement, transitioning away from the urban environment in the north. There are urbanising elements to the north and south and increasingly to the western side of the road. Therefore there would be some degree of harm but it is recognised that the area already consists of urbanising elements.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is defined by physical features, mainly field hedging and property boundaries and Burgh Heath Road to the west. However, the site as a whole is an awkward shape and may make it vulnerable to further infill of adjacent parcels threatening the permanence of the settlement edge here.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl: The main impact from the development of this site would be a significant extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary into an increasingly sensitive landscape setting in the Green Belt here. To reduce the potential harm, development could be focussed at the northern part of the site, following existing hedge lines however it is considered that the development of part or the full length of the site would both represent unrestricted sprawl posing significant harm in term of this purpose

Merging: As a large linear site, the harm in regard to merging can be reduced by focussing development to the northern parcel and maintaining a green buffer between north and south. Restricting development to the northern parcel would ensure a sufficient buffer is maintained in this transitional landscape. The use of trees and natural features could be used to screen/soften views and assist in the visual separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The development of the site would cause considerable harm within this transitional landscape to the south. Whilst development could be focussed to the north and development could be carefully masterplanned to reflect it's location on the settlement edge and landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out, it is considered that the harm to this purpose would be too great taking into account the edge of settlement character and impact of the development on the openness of the remaining surrounding green belt which could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is a large site, the existing Green Belt boundary here is strong but has been compromised slightly by a small development enclave to the north, which remains washed over by Green Belt. If development were to take place it could be focussed to the north, rounding off that edge along the existing well defined hedge line, regulating that edge into a clear crisp edge.


**Land east of Burgh Heath Road (LAA reference COL019)**

**Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site staggers over two parcels all of parcel 33 and the western part of parcel 34, where the northern part of the site (parcel 33) scores high against purposes in terms of sprawl. The parcels scores moderately against the purpose of merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores are 6 and 7
- Taking the site in isolation, the main impact from the development of this site would be significant extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary to the south into a transitional landscape between the built-up boundary and more sensitive landscape to the south of the Borough. The site consists of some built development to the north and scattered in the south but over 96% of the site is undeveloped land. The development of the whole site is considered to be a significant harm to the GB.

The degree of harm is recognised to be significant and concluded that harm caused by the development of the site in whole or in part (northern part) could not be satisfactorily ameliorated. Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site does not exhibit Exceptional Circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

## Land near Downs Road -north (COL020)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Undeveloped land 100 %

Site Area: 0.77 ha

Assessed Yield: Woodland as part of other sites (COL020, 21, 23 and WOO019)

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 7 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3 scores


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P07	Land between Downs Road and Ashley Road	3	2	2	7

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land near Downs Road -north (COL020)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **12** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly low scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 240/256


In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks poorly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.5 miles (35 mins walk) and Epsom 1.4 miles (30 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along adjacent road Ashley Road ,  
408 Epsom to Cobham (hrly service)  
460 Epsom to Crawley hourly service (Mon-Fri)  
480 Epsom to Preston (Tattenham Corner) every 45 mins (Mon-Sat, Sunday fewer services)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a small triangular paddock adjacent to Ashley road, located away from the settlement edge. The site has a vegetated boundary well screened from Ashley Road. Most of Ashley Road running south from the settlement edge has a more rural character, with a single narrow pavement on the east side of the road. The site is not being proposed for development but for woodland creation as part of the proposed development of COL023 ([REG18 REP660 Savills Land East of Downs Rd](#)).

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site is a very small part (approximately 4%) of a much larger parcel 7, which scores high against purposes in terms of sprawl. The parcel scores moderately against the purpose of merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The parcel has an overall high score of 7. The proposed woodland use would not constitute development and would not cause harm to the Green Belt in this location and would not require changes to the Green Belt.

In terms of sprawl, the site has been promoted along with others as part of a Green Infrastructure network (GI/woodland creation) alongside the development of the northern part of the site COL023 (development site), therefore no development is proposed, and the nature and extent of harm has not been considered in this regard.

In terms of merging, the site has been promoted along with others as part of a Green Infrastructure network (GI/woodland creation) alongside the development of the northern part of the site COL023 (development site), therefore no development is proposed and the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is being proposed for GI/woodland creation alongside the site development of COL023 (northern part of the site), therefore no development is proposed nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered

**Land near Downs Road -north (COL020)**

Defensible Boundaries: The site is defined by physical features, mainly field hedging and property boundaries. The site as a whole is completely detached from the existing settlement edge however woodland creation does not constitute development and would not require changes to the GB boundary.


**To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

The proposed woodland use would not require changes to the Green Belt.

**Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

The proposal for woodland creation would not be inappropriate development and does not require changes to the GB boundary

## Land near Downs Road -South (COL021)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 0.8 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Land 98.6 %; Road/Path/track 1.39%

Assessed Yield: Woodland as part of other sites (COL020, 21, 23 and WOO019)

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 7 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3 scores


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P07	Land between Downs Road and Ashley Road	3	2	2	7

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land near Downs Road -South (COL021)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **16.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 191/256. In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks moderately.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.3 miles (28 mins walk) and Epsom 1.4 miles (30 mins walk), Tattenham Corner 0.8 miles (20 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

South along Ashley Road and Epsom Racecourse,  
408 Epsom to Cobham (hrly service)  
460 Epsom to Crawley hourly service (Mon-Fri)  
480 Epsom to Preston (Tattenham Corner) every 45 mins (Mon-Sat, Sunday fewer services)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a small paddock, open with no buildings located away and detached from the settlement edge. It sits opposite buildings as part of Epsom Downs Racecourse and open racecourse beyond this. To the East of the site is a public house and car parking and the the North and West land is in uses associated with the horse racing industry.

The site is not being proposed for development but for woodland creation along with others as part of GI enhancement alongside the proposed development of COL023 ([REG18 REP660 Savills. Land East of Downs Road](#))

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site is a very small part (approximately 4%) of a much larger parcel 7, which scores high against purposes in terms of sprawl. The parcel scores moderately against the purpose of merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The parcel has an overall high score of 7. The proposed woodland use would not harm the Green Belt in this location and would not require changes to the Green Belt.

In terms of sprawl, the site is not being proposed for development but as part of site COL023 (development of part of the site) and others (for GI, woodland creation), therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered.

In terms of merging, the site is not being proposed for development but as part of site COL023 (development of part of the site) and others (for GI, woodland creation), therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is not being proposed for development but as part of site COL023 (development of part of the site) and others (for GI, woodland creation), therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered.

**Land near Downs Road -South (COL021)**

Defensible Boundaries

The site is contained by a well-defined hedge/tree boundary. The proposed woodland use would not require changes to the Green Belt.


**To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

The proposed woodland use would not require changes to the Green Belt.

**Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

The proposal for woodland creation would not be inappropriate development and does not require changes to the GB boundary

# Clear Heights, Downs Road (COL022)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 8.98 %; Undeveloped Land 68.94 %; Road/Path/track 22.08 %

Site Area: 0.4 ha

Assessed Yield: 11 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 7 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P07	Land between Downs Road and Ashley Road	3	2	2	7

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Clear Heights, Downs Road (COL022)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **16.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 191/256

In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks moderately.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.5 miles (33 mins walk) and Epsom 1.3 miles (27 mins walk).

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Ashley Rd to the west, 5 mins walk through the cemetery 318, 617, 619

- 318 Epsom to Banstead (Mon-Fri 4 services a day)
- 617 St Andrews School-Banstead (School bus, Mon-Fri, twice a day)
- 619 Lower Kingswood-St Andrews School (School bus, Mon-Fri, three times a day)

Along Downs Road, 0.4 miles, 7 mins walk, 408, 460, 480

- 408 Epsom/Leatherhead/Cobham Approx hrly, Mon-Fri
- 460 Epsom/Crawley. Hourly service daily (reduced service Sundays)
- 480 Preston/Tattenham Corner, Every 45 mins, Monday-Friday



© Crown copyright and database right 2023.  
Ordnance Survey License 100019271

Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is square plot with a two storey detached residential property with garden land, surrounded by a well vegetated boundary. It is an isolated dwelling, detached from the settlement edge, separated by Epsom Cemetery to the north which stretches almost 600m from the settlement edge. To the west of the property appears to be horse racing related uses and to the south is utilities uses.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site is a very small part (approximately 2%) of a much larger Green Belt parcel 7, which scores high against the GB purpose in terms of sprawl. The parcel scores moderately against the purpose of merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The parcel has an overall high score of 7.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the site makes up 2% of the GB parcel and the potential harm in terms of sprawl is minimal. The site is very small and completely detached from the defined urban area. The site is however partly previously developed. Redevelopment of PDL part would depend on the development proposed.

In terms of merging, although the parcel is moderate scoring for this, the site is a very small part of a larger GB parcel and has minimal impact on the merging of towns. The gap between Epsom edge and the nearest large settlement edge Tattenham Corner is approximately a 1.5 km gap, the site would occupy approximately 50m of this, where there is already development on the site. Therefore the harm would be minimal.

## Clear Heights, Downs Road (COL022)

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is an existing single, detached property set within a transitional landscape between the urban area to the north and open countryside to the south. The nature and level of harm would depend on the development proposed.

Defensible Boundaries, the site has clear property boundaries however the site is detached from the settlement edge. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the GB here

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: the site on its own is partly PDL, any future development should not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness of the Green Belt than the existing built form/building footprint.

Merging: although the site alone has minimal impact on the merging of towns the site could be well as screened to preserve the sense of separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site is a small single, detached property. Part of the site is PDL therefore the redevelopment of this part would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated. However, most of the site is not PDL and redevelopment would have to be carefully planned and not have a greater impact on openness of the Green belt than the existing built form. The release of this site would also create a detached element/satellite within the GB.


Defensible Boundaries: The site is an existing single property detached and located away from the existing settlement edge. It has clear defensible boundaries, the cemetery boundary, established hedge line, highway to the east, tree line to the south and west. However, the release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, compromising the integrity of the boundary here.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site sits within a larger parcel that scores high against purpose 1 and moderate for purposes 2 and 3 with an overall high score of 7
- the proposal for the redevelopment of PDL would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated, however most of the site is undeveloped
- In isolation, the development of the site and the level of harm would depend on the level of development proposed, and whether there is a greater impact on openness than what is there currently. The site promoter has suggested the site could be redeveloped into a bespoke development of houses, but no plans have been submitted
- The release of this small site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the GB here.

In conclusion, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the release of the site would be disproportionate and fragment the high performing GB in this location and therefore it is considered that exceptional circumstances do not exist justifying the release of the Green Belt here.

## Land near Downs Road-east (COL023)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 7.21 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Land 97.15 %; Road/Path/track 2.8%

Assessed Yield:160 residential units

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 8 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P08	Land to the east of Downs Road	3	2	3	8

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land near Downs Road-east (COL023)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site scores **16.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 191/256

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.4 miles (32 mins walk) and Epsom 1.4 miles (30 mins walk), Tattenham Corner 1.1 miles (26 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Ashley Rd. (other side of the cemetery) 5 min walk through the cemetery 318, 617, 619

- 318 Epsom to Banstead (Mon-Fri 4 services a day)
- 617 St Andrews School-Banstead (School bus, Mon-Fri, twice a day)
- 619 Lower Kingswood-St Andrews School (School bus, Mon-Fri, three times a day)

Along Downs Road north, 0.4 miles, 7 mins walk, 408, 460, 480

- 408 Epsom/Leatherhead/Cobham Approx hrly, Mon-Fri
- 460 Epsom/Crawley. Hourly service daily (reduced service Sundays)
- 480 Preston/Tattenham Corner, Every 45 mins, Monday-Friday



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a large, linear site which consists of 2 adjoining paddocks/ fields which extends from the existing settlement edge towards Epsom Downs golf course. The surrounding hedgerows/tree belt are fairly tight but there are some gaps in the vegetation along the western boundary along Downs Road that allow for views into the site. The eastern boundary adjoins a series of narrower fields which also extends from the settlement edge down to the Golf Course. These fields form part of the transitional landscape between the urban edge of Epsom and the more open landscape towards The Downs.

There is a large cemetery to the west of the site extending from Treadwell Road down to the south to the edge of The Downs. The aspect of the site is north-east facing and there is a significant change in level rising up towards the south.

The site promoters ([REG18 REP660 Savills. Land East of Downs Road](#)) have submitted a vision document which includes this site(northren field of COL023) and other parcels promoted alongside (COL020, COL021 and WOO019) for biodiversity and open space/community use. An intial concept plan for the site proposes the development of the northern

### Land near Downs Road-east (COL023)

field only, with the remaining area remaining in the Green Belt. It shows development into a perimeter block layout, with a small area of green space at the NE corner and the retention of a tree line along the western boundary screening the site with two access points from Downs Road.

#### **What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))**

The site forms part of (approximately 66%) of a slightly larger GB parcel 8 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It scores moderately against the purpose of merging. The overall scores is high (8).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be a significant extension of the built form beyond the defined Urban Area of the Borough to the south, in effect an elongated finger tracking south. It should be noted site promoters are not proposing the full length of the site is developed but that development would be focussed within the northern portion of the site. However it is considered that the development of part or the full length of the site would both represent unrestricted sprawl posing significant harm in terms of this purpose

In terms of merging, the site is a considerable size, if development extended the full length of the site, the harm would be the reduction in the gap between Epsom and Tattenham Corner (approximately a 1.1 km gap) the site would reduce this gap by 36%. Therefore the potential harm would be significant. However, the site promoters are not proposing the full length of the site is developed but that development would be focussed within the northern portion of the site, this would reduce the gap by 20%.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site comprises of a two large undeveloped fields that leads towards sensitive landscape to the south. Development of the site would result in encroachment into the countryside. The area is considered to be a transitional landscape between the southern built-up edge of the urban area and the more sensitive open countryside landscape to the south. The development of the site would be within this transitional landscape, removing the gradual transition in character creating an abrupt stop to the settlement edge. Therefore there would be a considerable degree of harm if developed.

Defensible Boundaries: The existing settlement edge is well defined, with adjoining properties along Downs Way creating a sharp, clean settlement edge. The site boundaries are well defined and regular, stopping at the existing hedge line. The development of the site would extend the settlement edge creeping further south.

#### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl: The main impact from the development of this site would be a significant extension of the built form beyond the defined Urban Area into an increasingly sensitive landscape setting however the site promoters are not proposing the full length of the site is developed but that development would be focussed within the northern portion of the site. It is considered that even restricting development to the northern part of the site would be harmful and represents unrestricted sprawl that could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.

Merging: As a large linear site, the harm in regard to merging can be reduced by focussing development site to the northern parcel and retain the rest of the southern area within the Green Belt. Restricting development to the northern parcel would reduce the gap by 20% rather than 36%, whilst ensuring a sufficient buffer is maintained in this transitional landscape. The use of trees and natural features could be used to screen/soften views and assist in the visual separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The development of the site would cause considerable harm within this transitional landscape to the south. Whilst development could be focussed to the north and development could be carefully masterplanned to reflect it's location on the settlement edge and landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA

### **Land near Downs Road-east (COL023)**

should be carried out, it is considered that the harm to this purpose would be too great taking into account the edge of settlement character and impact of the development on the openness of the remaining surrounding green belt which could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.


Defensible Boundaries The site is a large, elongated site, the existing defined edge of the Urban Area is strong and regular. If development were to take place it could be focussed to the northern parcel along the existing natural hedge line boundary, retaining a green buffer to the south and maintaining the transitional landscape of the rest of the site.

#### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms part of (approximately 66%) of a slightly larger GB parcel 8 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It scores moderately against the purpose of merging. The overall scores is high (8)
- Taking the site in isolation, the main impact from the development of this site would be significant extension of the built form beyond the defined Urban Area boundary and encroachment into the countryside into a transitional landscape between the built-up boundary and more sensitive landscape to the south of the Borough. The development of the whole site is considered to be a significant harm to the GB.

The degree of harm is recognised to be significant and concluded that harm caused by the development of the site in whole or in part (northern part) could not be satisfactorily ameliorated. Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site does not exhibit Exceptional Circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Hook Road Arena COU026



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Land 92%; Road/Path/track 8%

Assessed Yield: 100 residential units

Site Area: 13.74 ha

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 31 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P31	Land to the north west of St Ebba's former hospital site	2	3	2	7

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Hook Road Arena COU026

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **18.5** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to all other sites assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 151/256  
In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks high.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell West 0.8 miles and 17 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Chessington Road adjacent

- 418 Epsom Station to Kingston Bus station, daily, every 20mins 05.45-00.30
- 467, Epsom Hopsital to Hook, Mon-Sat, every 30 mins 06.15am to 19.11pm Hinchley Wood School
- 868 Epsom- Worcester Park Mon-Frid (school bus service, twice a day monrnng and afterschool)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a large, elongated site that sits at the edge of the defined urban area (located to the North and East). The southern boundary consists of a residential housing estate constructed in the 2000's which formed one of the former hospital cluster sites and to the West a Riding School (Epsom RDA), north of which are within the Green Belt. The northern part of the site adjoins two main roads, Chessington Road and Hook Road.

This site is a publicly accessible, open space with a well vegetated boundary edge which is further sub-divided into variable-sized fields by a series of mature hedgerows/tree line. There is L shaped group of trees with TPOs located through the centre of the site which essentially divides the site into two. The site is bordered by two main roads Chessington Road to the East and Hook Road to the North.

There are multiple pedestrian access points to the site including from Hook Road, Chessington Road, from the footpath south and from St Ebbas estate SW. Vehicular access is from the roundabout on Hook Road.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP030](#) EIBC Property Services) have submitted the site for residential, sport and leisure uses but have not provided any further information or concept plans for the site.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within (67% of ) a slightly larger GB parcel 31 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of merging. It scores moderately against the purpose of sprawl and in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is high (7).

## Hook Road Arena COU026

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be an extension of the built form beyond the defined urban area that adjoins the site to the North East. To the South West is St Ebbas, a former hospital cluster, built in the 1990-2000s but remains washed over by Green Belt. The Southern part of the site is well enclosed by residential development and the harm here is considered to be limited. The Northern part of the site, which is bordered by residential on one side is considered to have a moderate impact.

In terms of merging, although the wider site scores high for this purpose, the site itself has little impact on preventing the merging of towns but performs as a green wedge between built development areas to the North East (the built area of West Ewell/Ruxley) and South West (in the form of the hospital clusters) and North West (Chessington). The development of south of the site would reduce the gap between Epsom and Chessington to the north slightly, from 1.55 to 1.2 km but would still maintain a significant buffer. Therefore the degree of harm in this regard is considered to be moderate.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is an undeveloped public open space comprised of a series of open fields surrounded by urban development, some of which are visible from the site, particularly to the south. The proximity of the site to the urban edge, adjacent to a busy road network particularly along Chessington Road adds to the urban character, although it does begin to feel more open as you move to the northern part of the site. Therefore, the degree of harm in this regard is considered to be limited.

Defensible Boundaries: The site consists of clear well-defined boundaries, with public highway to the east and north, footpath to the south and property/field boundary to the west. The site adjoins one of the former hospital cluster sites that has been redeveloped for housing which is currently washed over by the Green Belt but is low scoring against the Green Belt purposes and is proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. In this context, the site would be a natural continuation and rounding off of the built form here.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: residential development could be focussed within the southern part of the site where the harm is considered to be limited. Open sports and leisure uses could be directed to the north to ensure limiting the spread/scale of the development.

Merging: To preserve some sense of separation, development could be restricted to the southern part of the site closest to the central built core, the northern part of the site could be left as open space or leisure uses that would maintain a more open aspect moving away from the urban edge. The area existing vegetated boundary could be reinforced, and development could be carefully considered in terms of the height and scale to reduce the impact on views. These measures would maintain a gap between this area and Chessington to the north would be minimised slightly, from 1.55km to 1.2 km still maintaining significant buffer. Therefore reducing the potential harm.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: Focusing development to the south would reduce the potential level of harm of encroachment to the north where it becomes more quieter and more characteristic of open countryside. Any future development should be carefully masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character and the sense of openness is maintained to the north. The site promoters have indicated the potential to accommodate a sport hub including one or more outdoor sports facilities on the northern land parcel. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The site consists of clear well-defined boundaries.


## Hook Road Arena COU026

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site sits within (67% of ) a slightly larger GB parcel 31 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of merging. It scores moderately against the purpose of sprawl and in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is high (7)
- The main harm from the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing urban area boundary however, as mentioned above development beyond this point has already occurred in the adjoining areas including the former hospital clusters and the character of the area is heavily influenced by the surrounding urbanised context. Therefore, the level of impact could be reduced through residential development of the southern part of the site and a sports hub (including sports pitches) to the north to maintain a degree of openness to the northern part of the site.

Whilst some degree of harm is recognised, it is concluded that the site is on the edge of settlement with a close relationship with the adjoining urban character and the harm from the development focussed on the southern part could be ameliorated and the northern part of the site could accommodate less visually intrusive sports/leisure uses. Therefore, on balance, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR001)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 0.52 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Land 93.6 %; Road/Path/track 6.38%

Assessed Yield: 10-15 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 22 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P22	Land at and immediately surrounding Horton former hospital site	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR001)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **18** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 169/256. In the context of the GB sites the site ranks high in this regard.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 0.9 miles (18 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Church Road (0.2 mile from site, 3 min walk)

E9 Epsom-Manor Park (every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.

E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a small triangular area of semi natural amenity land/open space adjacent a small number of residential properties. It is overgrown with trees (TPOs) to the east and is gated off and does not appear to be publicly accessible. It adjoins a woodland area also covered by TPOs.

The site sits in the vicinity to Epsom Common/SSSI to the south of Christ Church Road to the south of the site.

The site is within the Green Belt detached from the existing Urban Area boundary. Whilst it sits adjacent to a small number of residential properties to the north- these are currently washed over by the GB.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP153 NEXUS](#)) are proposing the site is used for specialist care accommodation but have not provided a concept plan for the site. There is currently a live application for a 70 bed (C2) Care Home - 26/00002/FUL.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a very small part of (approximately 1.5 %) a wider GB parcel which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to contribute at all against purposes of merging and sprawl.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential contribution to containing sprawl is negligible. The site is very small and detached from the Urban Area.

In terms of merging, the site is a very small part of a larger GB parcel and has no specific contribution to the purpose, therefore there is little to no harm in this regard.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is small undeveloped greenfield site in the Green Belt, and there will be some harm through the development of it however there are existing urbanising features adjacent in the form of existing residential development to the north, therefore it's contribution to this purpose is limited.

### **Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR001)**

Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries, property boundaries to the north, east and south and highway land to the west. However the site is detached from the Urban Area boundary although sits adjacent to development which is washed over by Green Belt.

#### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: The development of this site presents little harm in this regard therefore no suggestions/measures are put forward

Merging: The development of this site presents little harm in this regard therefore no suggestions/measures are put forward

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site is small and adjacent to an existing residential enclave. The impact could be ameliorated by careful master planning to ensure additional development blends in with the existing built form adjacent to the site and the height, mass and density of development is carefully considered and not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness. Natural features could be used to soften or screen views of the built form.


Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries however the release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB boundary fragmenting the GB here

#### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms a very small part (1.5%) of a larger GB parcel which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to contribute at all against purposes of merging and sprawl.
- The site is a small area of semi natural green space adjacent to existing development. The impact could be ameliorated by careful master planning to ensure additional development blends in with the existing built form adjacent to the site and the height, mass and density of development is carefully considered and not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness. Natural features could be used to soften or screen views of the built form.
- It is also noted that the site is very small and would result in a small area being removed from the Green Belt, however it is adjacent residential development to the north and to a former hospital cluster being proposed for release from the Green Belt

In conclusion, having weighed up the issues outlined above, it is considered that the extent of harm is limited and could be satisfactorily ameliorated, based on the Calverton test this site exhibits exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Hollywood Lodge HOR002



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 1.26 %; Undeveloped land 95.06 %; Water 2.1%; Road/Path/track 1.58%

Site Area: 4.9 ha

Assessed Yield: 50 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 21 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P21	Land to the east of West Park former hospital site	3	3	2	8

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Hollywood Lodge HOR002

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **13** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is fairly low scoring relative to all other sites assessed including PDL and GB sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 233/256. In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks moderately in this regard

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 0.9 miles (18 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Horton Lane (0.2 mile from site, 5 min walk)

- E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a large property that has become derelict and no longer in use. The buildings have been subject to vandalism. The buildings sit within an extensive garden area where the vegetation has become overgrown. The site has extensive tree coverage, particularly the SW corner which are covered by a group TPOs, The buildings and hardstanding are existing development on the site that would be considered to be previously developed. The site sits in close proximity to Epsom Common/SSSI to the south of Christ Church Road and to the north are allotments. The site promoter has put forward the site for housing or health uses but has not provided any further information or concept plan

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a small part (35%) of a larger GB parcel which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score of the parcel is high (8).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing GB boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the Urban Area boundary to the West, whilst some harm is recognised the site forms part of a gap/corridor between two former hospital clusters that are large areas redeveloped into residential although at present these areas remain washed over by the Green Belt, therefore in this context, development beyond the built up area has already occurred in the area in the form of the development of the hospital clusters.

In terms of merging, although the wider GB parcel scores high for this purpose, the site itself has little impact on preventing the merging of towns, with the nearest larger areas being Chessington to the North (2.35km), Oxshott to the West (3.6km) and Ashted to the South (1.6km), therefore the development of the site would have limited impact on this. However, the site does form part of an undeveloped green wedge between built development areas of the former hospital clusters. So it performs as a buffer between these areas.

## Hollywood Lodge HOR002

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside: the site is a derelict property set with a large garden, most of the site is therefore not PDL. Outside of the redeveloped hospital clusters, the character of areas between the clusters moving west towards West Park and beyond becomes more characteristic of edge of settlement and semi-rural. To the south is Epsom Common, a dense wooded area and further west the landscape opens up to open countryside south. The site is previously developed set within a transitional landscape to the west. The nature and level of harm would depend on the development proposed.

Defensible Boundaries: the site has strong boundaries to the east and south (highway) and footpath to the north, with a clearly defined hedgeline to the west. However, the site is detached from the settlement edge. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, compromising the integrity of the boundary, fragmenting the Green Belt here.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: the development of this site represents sprawl however as noted above, sprawl of the built form has already occurred partly on this site and in the wider area in the former hospital clusters in the vicinity. In order to ameliorate the potential harm caused by development, development could be carefully masterplanned, focussing development around the existing footprint of the built form.

Merging: the site maintains a gap between developed areas. Development could be carefully masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves & respects the edge of settlement character and the sense of openness is maintained to the south. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site. Although already well screened, additional natural screening of the site could be incorporated to preserve the sense of separation of areas.


Safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside: In order to ameliorate the potential harm caused by development, development could be carefully masterplanned to not have a greater impact on the impact on the openness by focussing development around the existing footprint of the built form. Any built form should preserve and respect the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA could be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB fragmenting the green belt here, compromising the integrity of the boundary & fragmenting the Green Belt.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms a small part (35%) of a larger GB parcel which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score of the parcel is high (8).
  - A proposal for the redevelopment of PDL part of the site would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated. However, most of the site is not PDL.
  - The site is completely detached from the Urban Area boundary and removing the site from the Green Belt for development could further fragment the Green Belt in this location.
- In conclusion, the proposal for the redevelopment of PDL part of the site would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated. However, most of the site is not PDL and based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the release of the site would fragment the high performing Green Belt parcel in this location and therefore does not exhibit exceptional circumstances justifying the release from the Green Belt.

# Manor Park (LAA reference HOR003)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Undeveloped land 92 %; Road/Path/track 8%

Site Area: 6.2 ha

Assessed Yield: 90 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 22 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P22	Land at and immediately surrounding Horton former hospital site	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
  - 2 Parcel is moderately performing
  - 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Manor Park (LAA reference HOR003)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **17** against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 184/256  
In the context to the other GB sites the site ranks highly in this regard

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 0.9 miles (18 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Church Road (0.2 mile from site, 3 min walk)  
E9 Epsom-Manor Park (every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.

E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.

Along Horton Lane (0.2 mile from site, 3 min walk)  
E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is an elongated area of amenity grassland with vegetated edges. There is significant tree coverage on the site, many are protected (TPO). Some mown grassland but most of the site is in a semi-natural state. The site is accessible from footpath running along the northern boundary, with minimal accessibility to the west and to the south where it is fenced off and dense vegetation to the east.

The landscape is self contained and possesses semi natural qualities that blend in well with the character of the surrounding area and it's vicinity to Epsom Common/SSSI to the south of Christ Church Road. In this area, new build development is scattered in a semi rural parkland setting. The site sits between two former hospital clusters Manor Park and West Park which have developed into residential areas but remain washed over by Green Belt.

The northern part of the site is within a (Manor) conservation area.

The site promoters have submitted the site for housing but have not provided further information or a concept plan. The site is also being considered separately for its suitability for off site biodiversity net gain

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a small part (approximately 18%) of a larger GB parcel and scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, taken in isolation, the site makes no contribution to containing sprawl. The site is detached from the existing Urban Area boundary and sits between built up development of the former hospital sites which have been redeveloped into residential estates which remain washed over by Green Belt- therefore in this context, development has occurred beyond Urban Area boundary to the west, although at present these areas remain washed over by the Green Belt.

## Manor Park (LAA reference HOR003)

In terms of merging, the site itself makes no contribution to preventing the merging of towns, but the site does form part of a gap/green buffer that separates development areas of the former hospital clusters of Manor Park and West Park.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is an undeveloped, linear greenfield site with a semi natural character, it forms part of a gap/buffer between existing residential development in an area which are connected by paths to the north and south of the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The site has strong boundaries, footpath to the north and highway land wrapping around remaining edges. The site is detached from the settlement edge. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: the site's contribution to containing sprawl of large built up areas is minimal and the extension of the built form has already occurred in the wider area in the former hospital clusters in the vicinity.

Merging: the site makes no contribution in this regard and therefore no amelioration measures are identified. It is noted that the site forms part of a green corridor between the hospital clusters which remain washed over by Green Belt.

Safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside: The site is an undeveloped gap between development areas, the development of this site would represent isolated development beyond the existing large built up area in the vicinity of the former hospital clusters. The site is semi natural in character and the edge of settlement characteristic, it is considered that it contributes to an important gap/buffer between existing residential development in an area. The development of the site here would further fragment the green belt in this area.


Defensible Boundaries: The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms a small part (approximately 18%) of a larger GB parcel and scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).
- The site is a large area of semi natural green space located between existing development (former hospital cluster). Development of the site would close a green buffer/gap between existing development but in GB terms the harm would be limited as the site performs poorly on all Green Belt purposes 1-3.
- In terms of defensible boundaries, the site is large linear semi natural open space which is detached from the existing settlement edge removing the site from the Green Belt for development would potentially fragment the Green Belt in this location.

In conclusion, the degree of harm in GB terms is minimal and concluded that it could be ameliorated, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site exhibits exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

## Land off Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR004)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Land 100%

Site Area: 1.11 ha

Assessed Yield: 30-50 residential units

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 22 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P22	Land at and immediately surrounding Horton former hospital site	0	0	1	1

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land off Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR004)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores **17** against the multi-criteria analysis.

This is moderate scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 184/256

In the context of other GB sites the site ranks highly in this regard

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 0.9 miles (18 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Church Road (0.2 mile from site, 4 min walk)

E9 Epsom-Manor Park (every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.

E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is an irregular shaped area of public open space consisting of amenity grassland, sandwiched between two residential areas north and south. It is self contained with semi natural qualities with scattered trees (TPO) which reflects the character of the surrounding area in the it's vicinity to Epsom Common/SSSI to the south of Christ Church Road. The site adjoins a small collection of existing residential development to the south which it wraps around.

The character of the area is modern residential development scattered in a semi natural parkland setting. To the east, the site borders Stamford Green Primary School

The site promoters ([REG 19 REP159](#)) are proposing the site be developed into residential and have submitted a vision document including a concept plan to support their site. This shows vehicular access from Cuddington Glade with footpaths joining the existing footpaths tot the north

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a very small part (3.3%) of a larger GB parcel which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to contribute at all against purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential contribution to containing sprawl is negligible. The site is very small and whilst detached from the existing Urban Area boundary, the site is sandwiched between two residential areas (washed over by Green Belt).

In terms of merging, the site is a very small part of a larger GB parcel and has no specific contribution to the purpose, therefore there is little to no harm in this regard.

### **Land off Cuddington Glade (LAA reference HOR004)**

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is small greenfield site in the Green Belt, adjacent to existing residential development to the south and north, urbanising features therefore it's contribution to this purpose is limited therefore it's contribution to this purpose is limited.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is bounded by a primary school to the east, residential development to the south, and footpath to the north. Whilst adjacent to residential development these are washed over by Green Belt and therefore is detached from the Urban Area boundary.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: the development of this site presents little harm in this regard therefore no suggestions made

Merging: the development of this site presents little harm in this regard therefore no suggestions made

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site is small and adjacent to an existing residential development. The impact could be ameliorated by careful master planning to ensure additional development blends in with the existing built form adjacent to the site and the height, mass and density of development is carefully considered and not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness. Natural features could be used to soften or screen views of the built form.


Defensible Boundaries: The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB boundary, however the site is adjacent to residential development although is washed over by Green Belt. Manor Park to the north is proposed for release from the Green Belt.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms a very small part (3.3 %) of a larger GB parcel which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to contribute at all against purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).
- The site is a small area of semi natural green space adjacent to existing development. The potential impact from the development of the site could be ameliorated by careful master planning to ensure additional development blends in with the existing built form adjacent to the site and the height, mass and density of development is carefully considered and not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness. Natural features could be used to soften or screen views of the built form.

In conclusion, having weighed up the issues outlined above, it is considered that based on the Calverton test exceptional circumstances exist to justify an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# West Park LAA Reference HOR005 and HOR006



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 9.98 %; Natural environment.15.17 %; Road/Path/track 15.07%  
 General surface 59.68%

**Assessed Yield:** 50 residential units

**Site Area:** North 3.17 ha; South 1.97 ha

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 20 which scores the following Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P20	Land at and immediately surrounding West Park former hospital site	1	0	1	2

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



©Crown copyright and database right 2025 Ordnance Survey Licence AC0000806036

## West Park LAA Reference HOR005 and HOR006

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The sites to the north and south were assessed separately scoring 8.5 (north) and 11 (south) against the multi-criteria analysis. These are low scoring relative to all the other GB/PDL sites assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 254 and 249 out of 256 respectively

In the context of the other GB sites these are poorly scoring

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 1.5 miles (33 mins walk)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Sherwood Way located centrally, between the two sites, E10

E10 Manor Park to Epsom Station Daily (reduced service Sundays)  
06.30-23.20 every 30 mins



Aerial Photo

### Site description

West Park is a former hospital site which has been redeveloped into a largely residential area where some clinical uses still remain but are being vacated or reduced. The sites identified are NHS buildings and parking that have become surplus to requirements. The buildings to the north are dated and no longer fit for purpose and are now vacant.

The southern part of the site are still in use. These sit within West Park Conservation Area.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within GB parcel 20 which overall a low score (2) made up of a low score in terms of sprawl and a low score in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

In terms of sprawl, the site makes very little contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm to the GB purpose

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm to this GB purpose

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is previously developed therefore makes very little contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site and the impact on the open character of the countryside will be limited and will depend on the development proposed.

Defensible Boundaries: the site has clear boundaries. In additions, these sites forms part of a former hospital cluster at West Park. The area of West Park proposed for potential removal from the green Belt including the sites proposed for development.

## West Park LAA Reference HOR005 and HOR006

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl, the site makes very little contribution in this regard and is very urban in character, development could be focussed on the existing built footprint but otherwise no other amelioration measures identified here

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.


Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries. these sites forms part of a former hospital cluster at West Park which is proposed for potential removal from the Green Belt including the sites proposed for development.. The area is previously developed so the impact on openness will be limited and will depend on the development proposed.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances that would outweigh to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site sits within GB parcel 20 which overall score is low (2) made up of a low score in terms of sprawl and a low score in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- The site is previously developed, and the level of harm would depend on the level of development proposed and whether there is a greater impact on openness than what is there currently. It is considered that the extent of harm can be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

In conclusion, the proposal for the redevelopment of PDL would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated.

## Noble Park extension (LAA reference HOR007)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Undeveloped land 85.34 %; Road/Path/track 14.64%

Site Area: 7.32 ha

Assessed Yield: 90 residential units

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits mostly within Green Belt parcel 21 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P21	Land to the east of West Park former hospital site	3	3	2	8

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Noble Park extension (LAA reference HOR007)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 12 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is low scoring relative to all the other PDL/GB sites assessed, ranking 240/256


In the context of GB sites the site ranks poorly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 0.9 miles (18 mins walk)

**Nearest Bus stops and routes:**  
Along Horton Lane adjacent, north

E10 Epsom-Noble Park every 30 mins) Mon-Sat, reduced Service Sun.



© Crown copyright and database right 2023  
Ordnance Survey Licence 100023771

0 45 90 180 Meters

Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site comprises of two parts, allotments to the northern triangle and open land to the south. The two parts are separated by a footpath cutting the site horizontally east-west. The existing vegetation to the south is overgrown.

The parts are self contained, little is visible from the surrounding footpath/bridleway and roads on the site boundaries. The site is covered by group TPOs along the PROWs (footpath cutting through the site and bridleway west), southern boundary.

The site sits in the vicinity of Epsom Common/SSSI to the south of Christ Church Road. The whole site falls within a (West Park) conservation area.

The site promoters ([REG18 REP274 Icenio Vistry Group and Crest Nicholson](#)) have submitted a vision document for the site, indicating the intention for the allotments to be retained and enhanced. There is no concept plan but they have set out some design principles which suggest the inclusion of extensive landscape features and ecological enhancements.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms part (approx 52.4%) of a larger GB parcel which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score of the parcel is high (8).

In terms of sprawl, the site is completely detached from the Urban Area boundary of Epsom but is adjacent to West Park residential area a former hospital cluster which is washed over by Green Belt. The site is undeveloped with allotments to the north which is proposed for retention. When the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing GB boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area to the West, however the site forms part of a gap/corridor between two former hospital clusters that are large areas redeveloped into residential although are washed over by the Green Belt, therefore in this context, development has already extended west in the area in the form of the development of the hospital clusters, Therefore the harm would be limited in this regard.

### **Noble Park extension (LAA reference HOR007)**

In terms of merging. although the whole parcel scores high for this purpose, the site itself has little impact on preventing the merging of towns with the nearest larger areas being Chessington to the North (2km), Oxshott to the West (3.3km) and Ashted to the South (1.6km), therefore the development of the site would have limited impact on this. However the site does form part of a wedge between built development areas of the former hospital clusters (washed over by Green Belt).

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site currently undeveloped and development would result in development beyond the settlement area. The site is fairly quiet and self-contained with limited views in/out. The site forms part of a gap between developed areas where the character of the area becomes quieter and more characteristic of edge of settlement. To the south is Epsom Common, a dense wooded area and further west the landscape opens up to open countryside south. Development of the site would cause some harm the established character of the area although it is acknowledged that there are urbanizing features present in the adjoining area.

Defensible Boundaries The site has strong boundaries including highway land to the north and south, bridleway to the west, footpath at the centre and hedge line in the centre.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl, the development of this site represents sprawl however as noted above, sprawl of the built form has already occurred in the wider area on the former hospital clusters in the vicinity although are washed over by Green Belt (these areas are proposed for removal). In order to ameliorate the potential harm caused by development, development could be carefully masterplanned having regard to preserves respects the edge of settlement character.

Merging: The site maintains a gap between developed areas, development could be carefully masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site. Although already well screened, additional natural screening of the site could be incorporated to preserve the sense of separation of areas

Safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside: The development of this site would represent development beyond the existing Urban Area boundary but is directly adjacent to West Park, former hospital cluster washed over by Green Belt. In order to ameliorate the potential harm caused by development, development could be carefully designed to ensure any built form should preserve and respects the edge of settlement character and the semi natural characteristics in the vicinity. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.


Defensible Boundaries: Whilst the site has strong boundaries the release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB. However the site is adjacent to West Park, which is being proposed for release from the Green Belt.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms part (approx 52.4%) of a larger GB parcel which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score of the parcel is high (8).
- The site comprises of an undeveloped parcel to the south and allotments to the north- where the allotments are proposed for retention (therefore would not require release from the Green Belt. It is considered that the potential harm caused by development could be satisfactorily ameliorated, through careful design to ensure any built form should preserve and respects the edge of settlement character
- In terms of defensible boundaries, removing the site from the Green Belt for development would create a detached element, however the site is adjacent to West Park which is being proposed for release from the Green Belt.

In conclusion, having weighed up the issues outlined above, it is considered that the extent of harm is limited and could be satisfactorily ameliorated, based on the Calverton test this site exhibits exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# West Park LAA Reference HOR008



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 1.47 ha



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 6.74%; General surface 29.4 %; Natural Environment 58.67%,  
 Road/Path/track 5.16%  
**Assessed Yield:** 150 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 20 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P20	Land at and immediately surrounding West Park former hospital site	1	0	1	2

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## West Park LAA Reference HOR008

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site was not assessed as part of the Reg18 TA however the adjacent site was assessed separately scoring 8.5 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is low scoring relative to all the other PDL/GB sites assessed, ranking 254/256. In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks poorly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 1.5 miles (33 mins walk)

**Nearest Bus stops and routes:**  
At Sherwood Way E10

E10 Manor Park to Epsom Station Daily (reduced service Sundays)  
06.30-23.20 every 30 mins



Aerial Photo

### Site description

This site was former hospital known as The Cottage Hospital and surface car park which is now derelict. The buildings that are no longer in use are boarded up. The site sits within a wider area known as West Park, a former hospital site which has since been predominantly redeveloped into a mainly residential area but where some clinical uses remaining.

The site has some level changes with slopes and steps down to the adjoining buildings south of the site. The site is previously developed and has no landscape designations. It is a former hospital cluster and is affected by a Conservation Area.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site scores low against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and assisting in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of towns merging. The GB parcel overall score is low (2)

In terms of sprawl, the site is already developed and therefore makes very little contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm here.

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm to the GB purpose

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is previously developed therefore makes very little contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site and the impact on the open character of the countryside will be limited and will depend on the development proposed.

## West Park LAA Reference HOR008

Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries. In additions, the site forms part of a former hospital cluster at West Park. The area of West Park proposed for potential removal from the Green Belt including this site proposed for development.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

In terms of sprawl, the site makes very little contribution in this regard and is very urban in character, development could be focussed on the existing built footprint but otherwise no other amelioration measures identified here.

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully masterplanned including a LVIA to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.


Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries and forms part of a former hospital cluster at West Park which is proposed for potential removal from the Green Belt including the sites proposed for development. The area is previously developed so the impact on openness will be limited and will depend on the development proposed.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site sits within GB parcel 20 which overall score is low (2) made up of a low score in terms of sprawl and a low score in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- The site is previously developed and the level of harm would depend on the level of development proposed and whether there is a greater impact on openness than what is there currently. It is considered that the extent of harm can be ameliorated through careful and sensitive masterplanning.

In conclusion, the proposal for the redevelopment of PDL would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated

## Horton Farm (HOR009)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Building 0.59 %; Undeveloped land 94.86 %; Road/Path/track 4.50%

Site Area: 37.9 ha

**Assessed Yield:** 1,250 residential units, including some specialist housing and self build plots, 10 gypsy and traveller pitches, business incubation space, community building and a public park of approximately 7ha in addition to other green and blue infrastructure.

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 28 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P28	Land to the north of Chantilly Way east of Horton Lane	3	3	2	8

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose  
 1 Parcel is lower performing  
 2 Parcel is moderately performing  
 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Horton Farm (HOR009)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site scores 17.5 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is moderate scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites assessed ranking 175/256. In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks highly.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell West 1.1 miles and 24 mins walk.

Epsom Station 1.2 miles, 28 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along adjacent rd Hook Road and Chantilly Road

- E5 Langley Vale, Watersedge (Mon-Fri) 6.07 until 19.21 (every 2 hour)
- E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park, Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site comprises of a series of open fields that make up a large triangular wedge between three former hospital clusters (washed over by Green Belt) to the NW of the Borough. The site is mostly undeveloped open land with some agricultural buildings to the SE corner. The surrounding hospital clusters are large sites within the Green Belt that have been redeveloped into residential areas around the late 1990s to early 2000s and are located to the north-west, south-west and north-east of the parcel, effectively enclosing the site. The Former Hospital clusters are also being proposed for release from the Green Belt.

There are no landscape designations. The vegetated boundary provide is fairly tight, limiting views into the site, there are some looser screening and breaks in the vegetation of the Hook Road (NE boundary) which allows visibility across the site. There are Conservation Areas in all hospital clusters that surround the site.

Horton Country Park and Golf Course are located to the north. The character of the land surrounding this parcel is substantially influenced by the adjacent residential areas, the hospital cluster sites and associated busy road network.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP155 Litchfields](#)) have submitted a vision document which includes an assessment of the site and a concept masterplan. This includes a 7 ha public open green space to the north with enhanced pedestrian and cycling links connecting the adjoining neighbourhoods in the area. Other green and blue infrastructure, new business incubation space and community building are also proposed.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site makes up most of GB parcel 28 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms sprawl and in terms of merging. It scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is high (8).

## Horton Farm (HOR009)

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary of the Borough to the NW, however the site is actually completely surrounded by built up development on most sides from the former hospital sites which have been redeveloped into residential estates- therefore in this context development has already occurred in the development of the hospital cluster- However these areas are currently washed over by the Green Belt.

In terms of merging, although the site scores high for this purpose, the nearest largest settlement is Chessington to the north -which actually continues the land mass of Epsom- so technically these areas have already merged. Horton Country Park/Golf Course maintains a gap of just under 1km buffer between Chessington and the site promoters are intending on keeping the northern part undeveloped- mainting at least a 1 km to the north. The site also acts as a wedge between built development areas of the former hospital clusters, where development here would close this gap, but these areas are not towns, therefore the site itself has little impact on this purpose preventing the merging of towns.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is a large series of open fields surrounded by urban development surrounded by a dense vegetated boundary except along Hook Road where views across the site are visible. The adjacent surrounding residential estates from the former hospital cluster completely enclose the site and busy road network particularly influence the urban character to the south of the site. Moving north, development becomes more sparce and feels more open towards the golf course and beyond.

Defensible Boundaries: The site itself is self-contained. The eastern part of the site is less screened and views from the southern bridleway and from St Ebbas estate. It is important to note that the triangular site is hemmed in by former hospital clusters which are now residential estates. These former hospital clusters are currently washed over by the Green Belt but are low scoring against the Green Belt purposes. These areas are being proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. In this context, the site would be a natural continuation and rounding off of the built form here.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: As noted above, the site is currently enclosed by built development of the former hospital clusters and therefore built development has already occurred beyond the boundary here, albeit currently remains washed over. The site promoters have considered the context of site and submitted an initial conceptual masterplan proposing the development line continues from St Ebbas (East) to Clarendon Park (West), rounding off the built form south of this line, leaving public open space to the northern part of the site. It is also noted that the hospital clusters are proposed for removal from the Green Belt.

Merging: the site alone has minimal impact on the merging of towns however it is a gap between developed areas, development could be carefully masterplanned to ensure the development is focussed to the south, maintaining the green buffer/gap to the north. This is being proposed by the site promoters. The use of natural screening could be reinforced to aid the sense of separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: the site promoters are proposing the northern 7 ha of the site remain open, assisting in reducing encroachment to the more open countryside to the north where it becomes more quieter and more open. To reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development should be carefully masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character and the sense of openness is maintained to the north. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

## Horton Farm (HOR009)

Defensible Boundaries: The site has well defined robust and durable boundaries on all sides which is considered capable of forming a new Green Belt boundary in conjunction with the development of Chantilly Way. In addition, the adjoining former hospital clusters are currently washed over by the Green Belt but are all low scoring against the Green Belt purposes. These areas are being proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. In this context, the site would be a natural continuation and rounding off of the built form here.


An initial concept plan of the site shows a potential proposal would result the northern part of the site being retained for open space/green infrastructure. This would retain a green buffer to the north of the site reflecting a continuation of the structure of the built form adjoining area. The boundary could be drawn to include the whole site or with the northern part of the site remaining in the Green Belt. It is also noted that the hospital clusters are proposed for removal from the Green Belt and the redrawing of the boundary would take into account these adjacent areas.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site makes up most of GB parcel 28 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms sprawl and in terms of merging. It scores moderately in terms of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is high (8).
- The main impact from the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing Urban Area boundary however, as mentioned above the development of the hospital clusters means that development has already occurred beyond this edge. The former hospital clusters are also being proposed for removal from the Green Belt. The site promoters are proposing that development of the site continues the existing building line of the adjacent hospital cluster sites and leaving the northern part of the site as open space, therefore maintaining openness to the northern part of the site and a gap between this area and Chessington to the north.

Whilst it is recognised that the parcel is overall high scoring against the Green Belt purpose, the site is on the edge of settlement with a close relationship with the adjoining redeveloped hospital clusters, whilst some degree of harm is recognised, it is concluded that the impact from development could be ameliorated. In addition, the adjacent hospital clusters currently washed over by Green Belt are proposed for removal from the Green Belt and in combination with the site would result in the rounding off of the settlement edge here. On balance, based on the above it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Land at Chantilly Way HOR010



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Undeveloped land 100%

Site Area: 0.7 ha

Assessed Yield: 30 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 29 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P29	Land to the east of Chantilly Way	2	0	0	2

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land at Chantilly Way HOR010

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site scores 21 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is moderate scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites assessed ranking 81/256  
In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks the best.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell West 1.1 miles and 23 mins walk.

Epsom Station 1.1 miles, 28 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along adjacent rd Hook Road and Chantilly Road

- E5 Langley Vale, Watersedge (Mon-Fri) 6.07 until 19.21 (every 2 hour)
- E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park, Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a narrow undeveloped paddock adjoining residential properties along Brettgrave which is a parallel Road to the rear of the site. The site is overlooked by adjacent rear of properties, adding to the urban character of Chantilly Way. The western boundary is a new highway (including segregated footpath and cycle track) constructed as part of the hospital cluster development.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP140 Boyer](#)) have submitted a vision document which includes an illustrative masterplan which includes a couple of small areas of open green space, including the retention of an attenuation pond to the NE corner.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site comprises of most of GB parcel 29 which scores moderately against purposes of the GB in terms sprawl and is not considered to contribute to the purposes of the merging of neighbouring towns or in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is low (2).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary the site would represent a small, narrow extension of the built form beyond the existing settlement of the Borough, however the site is heavily influenced by the surrounding built form and is urban in character. The extent of the harm of development on this site is considered minimal.

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm to the GB

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site makes no contribution in this regard therefore the development of the site would have little to no harm to the GB

Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries, with highway land on most sides and property boundary to the south/east.

## Land at Chantilly Way HOR010

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the site is very narrow and has very urban in character. The extension of the GB from the rear of Brettgrave to the Chantilly Road would make a negligible impact on sprawl and would round off the urban area boundary neatly here.

In terms of merging, the site makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified


Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear boundaries. The extension of the GB from the rear of Brettgrave to the Chantilly Road would make a negligible impact and would round off the settlement edge neatly here.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.


- The site comprises of most of GB parcel 29 which scores moderately against purposes of the GB in terms sprawl and is not considered to contribute to the purposes of the merging of neighbouring towns or in assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall scores is low (2).
- The main impact from the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the defined urban area boundary however the potential harm is considered to be negligible and can be ameliorated, rounding off the settlement edge neatly along Chantilly Way.

The degree of harm is recognised as negligible and based on the above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park HOR011



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Land 99 %; Road/Path/track 0.99%

Site Area: 0.5 ha

Assessed Yield: 10 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 25 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P25	Land at The Manor former hospital site	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park HOR011

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 15 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is moderate scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites assessed, ranking 222/256  
In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks moderately

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom TC 1.2 miles, 27 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Haven Way E9, 4 mins walk

- E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park

Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a former house/property with significant tree coverage (some protected by TPO) which has become overgrown and the access boarded up from Horton Crescent. It sits at a prominent corner between Horton Lane and Abbas Avenue. The site is well screened.

The site sits within a former hospital site set within a highly managed parkland landscape setting and is within a conservation area.

The site promoter has submitted the site for potentially 10 dwellings but have not submitted any concept plan.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a tiny part (1.3%) of GB parcel 25 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contributions towards GB purposes in terms of sprawl or in preventing towns merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and therefore the harm is negligible.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard therefore and therefore the harm is negligible

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is the garden of a large property, the site sits within a former hospital cluster which has been developed into a large residential estate set within landscaped park setting.

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The site boundary does not follow any existing physical features; therefore, it is weak in this regard. The site here is adjacent to a redeveloped former hospital cluster washed over by Green Belt being proposed for removal from the Green Belt.

## Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park HOR011

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside. The site makes little contribution in this regard however to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development could be carefully designed including a LVIA to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character within the hospital cluster.


Defensible Boundaries. The wider housing estate adjacent is a former hospital cluster which is washed over by Green Belt but is being proposed for removal.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site forms a small part (approximately 1.3%) of a larger GB parcel and scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).
- The site is a small undeveloped site of a former property located within a former hospital cluster. The former hospital clusters are redeveloped residential areas washed over by Green Belt also being considered for release from the Green Belt.

The degree of harm is minimal and concluded that it could be ameliorated, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site exhibits exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Clarendon Park HOR012



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Land 95.31 %; Road/Path/track 4.68%

Site Area: 1.96 ha

Assessed Yield: 40 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 27 which scores the following for Purposes 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P27	Land at Clarendon Park (Long Grove former hospital site)	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Clarendon Park HOR012

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 11.5 against the multi-criteria analysis (for context the highest score was 25.5). This is low scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites assessed (ranking 245/256)

In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks poorly

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Town Centre 1.9 miles 41 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Sandy Mead

E9

E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park

Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is open space associated with residential development to the north as part of Clarendon Park. Clarendon Park is a residential development set within a former hospital and parkland landscape.

The open space is a well-managed parkland used for recreation by nearby residents. There is a dense tree belt running along the southern boundary which are protected (TPOs) and also fall within a designated area covered SNCI and connects the rest of Horton Country Park to the West which is SNCI.

The site promoters have put forward the site for housing but have not provided any additional information or concept plan.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a small part (10%) of GB parcel 27 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contributions towards GB purposes in terms of sprawl or in preventing towns merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and therefore the harm is negligible.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard therefore and therefore the harm is negligible.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site comprises of public amenity land located on the edge of the former hospital cluster which has been developed into a large residential estate set within landscaped parkland setting. The site forms part of this landscaping of this area where the development of the site would have a significant impact on the character of the area. The southern swathe of the site comprises of TPOs and a SNCI – so are also important areas for nature conservation.

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The site forms the open space on the edge of the built-up area and is proposed area for retention in the GB.

## Clarendon Park HOR012

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the development of the landscaped areas on the perimeter of the former hospital cluster would have a significant impact on the character of the area to the extent that it could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.


Defensible Boundaries: The wider housing estate proposed for removal follows tightly the built-up limits of the parcel. The site here is outside of the area proposed area for removal.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site forms a small part (approximately 10%) of a larger GB parcel and scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).
- The site consists of an area of publicly accessible amenity greenfield land located on the edge of a former hospital cluster. The site is low scoring in terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside development of the parcels and therefore it is considered that the limited harm can be satisfactorily ameliorated.

The degree of harm is considered to be low and could be ameliorated, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site exhibits exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park HOR014



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 10.58 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Land 87.63%; Road/Path/track 12.09%; 0.27%

Assessed Yield: Housing, older persons accommodation

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 25 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P25	Land at The Manor former hospital site	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park HOR014

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

This various parcels were assessed separately in the TA scoring between 15.5 and 16.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 191-212 out of 256

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom 1.2 miles, 27 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Haven Way to the northern part of E9

E9 Epsom, Longmead, Clarendon Park  
Daily 06.20-23.00, every 30 mins (reduced service Sunday)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site comprises of various parcels of amenity green space surrounding Livingstone Park. Livingstone Park is a residential development set within a former hospital and parkland landscape. Livingstone Park is washed over by the green belt but is being proposed for removal from the GB.

The area is highly managed parkland landscape setting, the northern part of the site is covered within a conservation area and SNCI to the SW.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms a small part (29%) of GB parcel 25 which scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and is not considered to make any contributions towards GB purposes in terms of sprawl or in preventing towns merging. The overall score for the GB parcel is low (1).

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and therefore the harm is negligible.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard therefore and therefore the harm is negligible

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site scores low for this purpose. It comprises of numerous parcels of public amenity land located on the edge of the former hospital cluster which has been developed into a large residential estate set within landscaped park setting. Therefore there is potential harm to the character to the area but the area is adjacent a residential estate and consists of significant urbanising elements. Therefore the harm in terms of encroachment into the countryside is limited.

Defensible Boundaries: The former hospital clusters have been redeveloped into housing estates that currently remain washed over by the Green Belt. The site forms the open space on the perimeter of the built-up area and is proposed area for retention in the GB.

## Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park HOR014

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

In terms of sprawl, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified.

In terms of merging, the area makes no contribution in this regard and no amelioration measures identified

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, in order to reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development should be carefully designed/masterplanned to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.


Defensible Boundaries: The wider housing estate proposed for removal follows tightly the built-up limits of the parcel. The site here is outside of the area proposed area for removal

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site forms a small part (approximately 29%) of a larger GB parcel and scores low against purposes of the GB in terms safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It is not considered to contribute to the purposes of merging and sprawl. The overall score of the parcel is low (1).
- The site consists of various parcels of publicly accessible amenity greenfield land located within a former hospital cluster; it forms the landscape setting for the area. The site is low scoring in terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside development of the parcels and therefore it is considered that the limited harm can be satisfactorily ameliorated.

The degree of harm is considered to be low and could be ameliorated, based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# Land at Priest Hill NON013



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 8.63 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Undeveloped land 78.60%; Road/Path/track 5.63%; General Surface 15.75%

Assessed Yield: 250-350 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 43 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P43	Land to the east of NESCOL College	3	3	2	8

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land at Priest Hill NON013

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 16 against the multi-criteria analysis (for context the highest score was 25.5). This is moderate scoring relative to all other pdl/gb sites assessed, ranking 203/256  
In the context of other GB sites, the site ranks moderately in this regard

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell East (north west of the site along public right of way)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Multiple stops along Cheam Road, S2  
Regular service every 15-20 mins Epsom to St Helier Station



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site consists of open space/playing fields, (approximately 78%) and previously developed land to the north-comprising of hard surfacing and former tennis courts. The proposal for the redevelopment of PDL part of the site would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated.

The site borders the railway line, Cheam Road (the A232) and Banstead Road, with public rights of way to the north (parallel to the railway line) west (along the edge of Nescot College) and south of the site where Priest Hill Nature Reserve is located. The Nature Reserve is also a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI).

The site is not publicly accessible, and the southern part of the site is used by a community Rugby club and provides 3 senior pitches and 1 mini pitch. The remaining part of the site was previously used by another Rugby club however their use of the site for sport ceased in 1999. The development of the site would result in the loss of outdoor sports pitches which would need to be justified and replace/re provided on site or elsewhere.

The site is located adjacent to busy roads (Cheam Road and Banstead Road) and Ewell East railway station. The site is surrounded by residential development along three of its five edges and is influenced by the adjoining urban character. The site forms the settlement edge of Ewell East.

The boundary of the site consists of vegetation, the varying degrees of density, allowing for glimpses into the site.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP163 Carter Jonas on Coldunell](#)) have submitted supporting information and an illustrative masterplan and most recently pre-application report/document as part of their regulation 19 response. The latter promotes the site in two phases comprising the development of the site into 283 dwellings to the northern half, with the second phase developed into 161 dwellings and a central green park/square and linear park along/green buffer on the southern boundary.

## Land at Priest Hill NON013

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms part of (46%) of a larger GB parcel 43, which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately against the purpose safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score is high (8)

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing settlement edge to the north, NW and NE. However, the site is part PDL to the north (15-20%) with the remaining part of the site being open sports field. Therefore, the extent of harm is recognised but the site is partly pdl and adjacent to urban development which it is already influenced by.

In terms of merging, although the wider parcel within which the site is located scores high for this and the site does make up a gap between Ewell and Banstead. The gap between the built up edge of Ewell north and Banstead (Banstead) to the South is approximately 2km. The development of the site would reduce the gap by approximately 380m, the development of the site would cause a degree of harm but on balance a healthy buffer could still be maintained. In addition, the site adjoins Priest Hill Nature Reserve to the south, a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) which contributes significantly to the buffer and will ensure it remains.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is PDL to the north with the remaining area an open sports field, whilst it would result in result in encroachment into the countryside. The urban influence of the site's proximity and relationship with the adjoining environment/character along Cheam Road is strong, as you move south along Banstead Road it becomes quieter and has a more edge of settlement, countryside character. Therefore, there is limited harm except perhaps to the southern part if the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The site has clear defensible boundaries, public right of way to the SW, railway line to the NW, public highway the north and east. However, the site in isolation is an awkward shape that protrudes south and may make the adjacent parcel to the west (Nescot College) which forms part of the Green Belt Parcel 43 vulnerable to development in the future.

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

Sprawl: To reduce the level of harm, development could be limited to the northern part of the site where the existing urbanised features are (hardstanding) and the continuation of built form here may be less intrusive, particularly where combined with green features to soften the views.

Merging: The development of the site would reduce the 2km gap between Ewell and Banstead however a sufficient gap would still remain, including Priest Hill Nature Reserve. The use of natural screening of the site and retention of playing fields to the south to preserve the sense of separation of areas could be utilised to reduce the harm

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: Development could be focussed to the northern part of the site, and the site would have to be carefully masterplanned, the height, mass and density of development could be carefully considered to reduce harm to the surrounding character to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character moving south. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

#### Defensible Boundaries

The site has clear defensible boundaries, including a railway line, highway and public footpaths, although in isolation the site protrudes awkwardly. Development could be focussed to the northern part of the site, potentially rounding off the site in a way that is parallel to Cheam Road.


## Land at Priest Hill NON013

### Concluding Assessment of whether there are exceptional circumstances to release of the site from the Green Belt.

- The site forms part of (46%) of a larger GB parcel 43, which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and scores moderately against the purpose safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score is high (8).
- In isolation, the main impact from the development of the site is sprawl and to a lesser degree merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Development of the site could be concentrated to the northern part of the site where the previously developed land is located and carefully masterplanned with gradients of development, more intensive to the north/centre of and lower density on the edges. The height, mass and density of development could be carefully considered to reduce harm to the surrounding character to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character moving south. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Whilst it is recognised that the parcel is overall high scoring against the Green Belt purposes, the site is on the edge of settlement with a close relationship with the adjoining urban character, whilst there is a degree of harm, it is concluded that harm from the comprehensive development of the site could be ameliorated for the site. Therefore, on balance, based on the Calverton test it is considered there are exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

## Downs Farm (LAA reference NON016 and NON042)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Building 0.35 %; Undeveloped land 96.75 %; Road/Path/track/rail 1.59%, general surface 1.29%

Site Area: 27.97ha NON016 (north), 17.92 ha NON042 (south)

**Assessed Yield:**

Northern parcel 675 residential units, park, school and employment, GI on southern parcel

**Relevant Green Belt parcel**

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 37 (north) 35 (south) which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P37	Land north of College Rd west of Reigate Road	1	3	2	6
P35	Land to the east of Longdown Lane South, south of College Road	1	3	2	6

**Purposes of Green Belt**

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

**Scores**

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Downs Farm (LAA reference NON016 and NON042)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site scores 12.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is low scoring relative to other PDL and GB sites assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 235/256.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 0.8 miles 17 min walk. Ewell East station, 1.2 miles, 25 min

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Reigate Road past the railway bridge south 166 (Epsom to Croydon)  
Mon-Fri Hourly service



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site comprises two large triangular parcels intersected by College Road. The site promoters are only proposing development on the northern parcel and Green Infrastructure including pedestrian footpaths to the southern parcel. The existing uses include paddocks, pasture, farmland with some light Industrial use and small business units within a small collection of buildings on the northern parcel. The southern parcel consists of undeveloped land.

The northern parcel of the site is wrapped/contained by existing residential development ribbon development on to the NE and West. Exiting access onto the northern parcel is midway down the parcel along Reigate Road where there is an existing access road to the industrial uses there. There are some light industrial/skip hire uses located on the southern part of the northern parcel which gain access from College Road. The southern parcel is bounded by ribbon development to the west and partly south, as well as the railway line to the south, and the northern boundary is College Road which leads to a pinch point to the east.

The northern parcel possesses north facing slopes, views are possible across the site. Thick vegetation along the edges help to screen views of the elevated site from the surrounding roads.

As you move south, away from the more urbanized center, Reigate Road changes into a more rural/edge of settlement character, The pedestrian pavement on the western side of the road disappears, and there is only a single pedestrian pavement along the length of College Road that intersect the parcels.

The site forms part of the gap of 1.14km between the Epsom and residential areas of Nork, adjacent to the Epsom Downs Station.

The site promoters ([Regulation 19 REP098 Dandara](#)) have submitted supporting information including an analysis of the site and a conceptual masterplan which recommends a public open space to the southern part of the northern parcel to retain a gap between Epsom and Nork. They are also proposing the retention of the southern parcel in the GB to retain a visual and physical separation with enhanced 'green links' providing pedestrian and cycling movement in the area.

## Downs Farm (LAA reference NON016 and NON042)

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site comprises of two parcels north and south which correspond to two separate GB parcels. The scores are the same for each purpose for both parcels, both scoring an overall moderate score of 6. The sites score high against purposes of the GB in terms of merging, moderately against the purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and low for the purpose sprawl.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the defined Urban Area south, however the site is surrounded by built up development, particularly to the west and ribbon development is present on the western side of both parcels - therefore in this context, development of the built up area has already occurred here, however to the east and south these areas are currently washed over by the Green Belt. Therefore the site itself has minimal impact on this purpose.

In terms of merging, the site scores high for this purpose, the nearest largest settlement is Nork to the South where this site creates an approximately 1.14km gap. The development of the site would reduce the gap between these areas. Therefore the development of the site would cause some harm here. However as noted above, there has been a degree of development that has already occurred between these neighbouring areas in the form of ribbon development - so technically the harm in terms of merging has occurred. The site promoters are proposing the northern parcel be developed and retaining the southern parcel for GI.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is predominantly (over 96%) undeveloped but parts of the site are previously developed. The site is also surrounded by urban development, some visible. The character of the area feels like a transitional landscape moving away from the urbanized core, pedestrian pavements begin to fade and becomes quieter and more open. Therefore, there would be a degree of harm but it is recognised that the area consists for urbanising elements.

Defensible Boundaries: The site itself is self-contained, hemmed in by residential ribbon development, vegetated boundary, roads and railway lines.

North - clear defensible boundaries – residential development on most sides and south of the parcel bounded by College Road and the Chalk Pit employment site

South – clear boundaries – part rail line and station and residential to south, residential to west and College Road to North

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

Sprawl: As noted above, the site has minimal impact on this purpose where built development has already extended the boundary here, albeit currently washed over. The site promoters have considered the context of their site and are proposing development occurs on the northern parcel and GI on the southern parcel. An initial concept masterplan has been submitted indicating that a green buffer would round off the built form to the south of the northern parcel. This would reduce the extent of potential harm here in regard to sprawl.

Merging: The development of the site would reduce the gap between Epsom and Nork, however the site promoters are proposing development be confined to the northern parcel leaving the southern parcel for Green Infrastructure. Therefore, the extent of harm is reduced. A gap of approximately 300m between the indicative building line of the northern parcel and end of the southern parcel would be retained, minimising the extent of the harm. Whilst this is a significant reduction in the existing extent of the gap, it is noted above that existing ribbon development has already occurred and started to merge this area. The topography of the site could be used, and the use of natural screening could be reinforced to aid the sense of separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site promoters are proposing the southern part of the site remain open, assisting in reducing encroachment to the more open countryside moving south where it becomes more quieter and more open. To reduce harm to the surrounding character, any future development should be carefully masterplanned

### **Downs Farm (LAA reference NON016 and NON042)**

to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site.

Defensible Boundaries: The site has well defined boundaries on all sides which is considered capable of forming a new Green Belt boundary.

An initial concept plan of the site shows the southern part of the northern parcel being retained for green infrastructure. This would reinforce the green buffer to the southern parcel.


The southern parcel is proposed for enhanced Green Infrastructure and new paths, which would not require changes to the Green Belt boundary.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**


- The site comprises of two parcels north and south which correspond to two separate GB parcels. The scores are the same for each purpose for both parcels, both scoring an overall moderate score of 6. The sites score high against purposes of the GB in terms of merging, moderately against the purpose of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and low for the purpose sprawl.
- The proposal for the redevelopment of PDL part of the site would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated.
- The main impact from the comprehensive redevelopment of this site would be the merging of Epsom and Nork (over the Borough Boundary) and the reduction of the gap between these areas. However, it is noted above that ribbon development has occurred here effectively reducing this gap already, although it is washed over by the Green Belt. The site promoters are proposing that development of the northern part of the northern parcel, and GI on the southern parcel, therefore maintaining a degree of separation between Epsom and Nork.

Whilst some degree of harm is recognised, it is concluded that the impact from development that is focussed on the northern part of the northern parcel could be ameliorated. The green buffer from the northern parcel and the southern parcel retained for Green Infrastructure would ensure a degree of separation is maintained between the urban area of Epsom and Nork. Based on the Calverton test above it is considered that there are exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary for the northern parcel of the site.

## Drift Bridge Farm (LAA reference NON021)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land

Building 0.31 %; Undeveloped land 96.62 %; Road/Path/track 3.05%

**Assessed Yield:** Proposed for a variety of potential uses including 500 residential, specialist housing, leisure, recreation

Site Area: 24.02 ha

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 38 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P38	Land to the east of Reigate Road north of railway line at North Looe	3	2	3	8

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Drift Bridge Farm (LAA reference NON021)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 10.5 against the multi-criteria analysis (highest score 25.5). This is low scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites ranking 251/256.

In the context of GB sites the site scores poorly

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs, 0.5 miles (12 mins)

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Reigate Road past the railway bridge south 166 (Epsom to Croydon)

Mon-Fri Hourly service



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a large triangular shaped parcel located at the south-eastern edge of the Borough boundary. It is currently in agricultural use, with a collection of agricultural buildings and a dwelling grouped near the entrance of the site to the west and the rest of the site (over 96%) is undeveloped comprising of varying sized fields, rising to the south.

Access to the site is restricted to the west from Reigate Road (the A240), which is where the site tapers to the narrowest point, widening to the rear (east) which stretches 1.42km from the entrance. The site is heavily vegetated bounded by railway line to the south residential to the east, tree/ hedgeline to the north and Reigate Road to the West.

The site promoter has submitted supporting information suggesting a variety of opportunities for the site including residential, commercial and leisure. No initial or concept masterplan has been submitted.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site comprises of GB parcel 38 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and moderately against the purpose of merging. The overall score for the site is high (8).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation and in the context of the existing Green Belt boundary the site would be an extension of the built form beyond the existing settlement edge south (over the Borough boundary). The southern boundary of the site, also the Borough boundary, is delineated by a railway line which is a strong durable boundary between the GB and non-green belt. The development of the site would result in the loss of this strong defensible boundary of the railway line with a less durable boundary field hedge line along the northern boundary of the site. It is therefore considered significantly harmful in this regard.

In terms of merging, the site scores moderate for this purpose, the gap between the built up edge of Epsom north and the nearest largest settlement is Nork (Banstead) to the South, between the two railway lines is approximately 2km. The development of the site would reduce the gap by approximately 300m (measured midway from the site) . Therefore the

### **Drift Bridge Farm (LAA reference NON021)**

development of the site would cause a degree of harm but a healthy buffer could still be maintained. However It should also be noted that there is a scattering of development peppered in the area to the east of Reigate Road including industrial uses and a gated ribbon development, therefore in this context, a degree of occurred here although is washed over by the Green Belt.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is predominantly (over 96%) undeveloped but a small area to the west is previously developed. The site is also in the vicinity of urban development to the east and south- although the influence of the southern residential area is limited, where the railway line creates a distinctive physical and visual edge. The character of the area feels like a transitional landscape moving away from the urbanized core to the north to a quieter area moving south and then opening up again to a more urbanized environment past the railway bridge. Therefore there would be a degree of harm but it's proximity to urbanising features is recognised.

Defensible Boundaries: The site itself is self-contained defined by clear physical features including field boundary, property boundaries and railway line to the south. The southern boundary, also the Borough boundary, is delineated by a railway line which is a strong durable boundary between the GB and non-green belt. The development of the site would weaken this edge making the area vulnerable to future development. Increasing the chances of creep from the south. It is therefore considered significantly harmful in this regard.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: The development of the site would represent sprawl from the South, penetrating the railway line the currently forms a strong boundary line. The level of harm is considered significant and could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.

Merging: The development of the site would reduce the 2km gap between Epsom and Nork however a sufficient gap would still remain. There is already development scattered in this area and therefore urbanising features already exist, however spread out which minimises the impact they have. The penetration of the railway line boundary to the south removes a strong boundary edge and could set a precedence for the gradual ebbing away of the gap here.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site promoters have not provided any supporting information to identify the development of the site. The site would have to be carefully masterplanned, to reduce harm to the surrounding character to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA could be carried out alongside any proposal for the site. However, it is considered that the level of harm could not be satisfactorily ameliorated in light of the impact of the other purposes.

Defensible Boundaries: The development of the site would result in the weakening of a strong Green Belt boundary which also forms part of the Borough boundary. The railway line and bridge adjacent to the site creates a clear, distinctive clean edge which have distinctly different characters.


### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site comprises of GB parcel 38 which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and moderately against the purpose of merging. The overall score for the site is high (8).
- The main impact from the development of the extension of the Green Belt from Nork and the breach of a strong durable boundary of the railway line to the south which also forms the Borough Boundary. The site would also reduce the gap between these areas.

**Drift Bridge Farm (LAA reference NON021)**

The level of harm is recognised on this high scoring site and concluded that the development of the site would result in sprawl from the south and breach an existing strong durable boundary making the area vulnerable to further development in the future. Based on the above it is considered that exceptional circumstances do not exist justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary here.


# Banstead Road NON038



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Undeveloped land 98.55 %; Road/Path/track 1.46%

Site Area: 5.98.ha

Assessed Yield: 50-80 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 45 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score			Overall Score
		1	2	3	
P45	Land at DW Fitness Banstead Road	3	3	1	7

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Banstead Road NON038

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 8.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is one of the lowest scoring sites relative to all other PDL/GB sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 254/256. In the context of the GB sites the site scores poorly

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Ewell East 0.8 miles 19 mins walk, Banstead 1 mile 19 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Nearest bus stops along Cheam Road (15 min walk),

- S2 Regular service every 15-20 mins Epsom to St Helier Station



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is completely undeveloped but is an awkward shaped site which wraps around a private gym which is located in isolation along Banstead Road. The site has a vegetated edge and is well screened from the road along the western boundary. The northern and southern parts of Banstead Road have an urbanised character with a triangular wedge of development to the north and ribbon development to the south (washed over by green belt), but there is a section in the centre that is quieter, more characteristic of edge of settlement/countryside, where the public pavement stops on the western side of the road for this portion. The site sits within this gap between Ewell and moving towards Banstead, where the green belt extends past Banstead Downs (SSSI) to the south.

This gap also comprises of areas of nature conservation interest, with SNCI to the north and west and the site located within the 'North Downs' Biodiversity Opportunity Area. The site is in multiple ownership where the site is divided into multiple plots and therefore there is no singular site promoter. No concept masterplan has been submitted.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms most of GB parcel 45, which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and is low scoring against the purpose safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score is high (7).

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the potential harm is that the development of this site would be sprawl of the built form beyond the existing defined urban area however there is a degree of sprawl that has already happened from the north and south in the form of ribbon development from Ewell and Banstead. The site surrounds a private gym (PDL) which itself is development beyond the built-up edge. Whilst the site is adjacent to PDL and ribbon development over the LA border, these remain washed over by green belt. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the Green Belt here. Therefore, there would be considerable harm caused.

## Banstead Road NON038

In terms of merging, the site does make up a gap between Ewell and Banstead. The gap is approximately 2km overall but ribbon development from the north and south has crept into this gap leaving approximately 490m on this side (eastern side) of Banstead Road with the gym in between. The development of the site would reduce the gap by approximately 385m, closing the gap almost entirely on this side of the road. Therefore, there would be considerable harm caused.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site surrounds a PDL site, and joins onto ribbon development to the south. The urban influences exist but are limited on this particular part along Banstead Road where it becomes quieter and does to some extent possess the characteristics of it being open countryside/edge of settlement, countryside character. Therefore there is some harm in terms of the character of the area here.

Defensible Boundaries: The site follows physical boundaries of the field. The site is an awkward shape detached from the Urban Area boundary. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the Green Belt here. Therefore, there is considerable harm caused.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the Green Belt here

Merging: The development of the site would close the undeveloped gap on this side of the road almost entirely. This cannot be satisfactorily ameliorated or reduced.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: Development could be limited to the existing developed areas and carefully masterplanned, the height, mass and density of development could be carefully considered to reduce harm to the surrounding character to ensure any built form preserves respects the edge of settlement character moving south. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out alongside any proposal for the site. However, it is considered that this could not satisfactorily ameliorate the harm caused overall.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is detached from the edge of the defined Urban Area (with ribbon development north and south washed over by Green Belt). The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, compromising the integrity of the boundary, fragmenting the Green Belt here.


### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

The site forms most of GB parcel 45, which scores high against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and merging and is low scoring against the purpose safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The overall score is high (7).

- In isolation, the harm from development would be considerable. Development of the site would close the gap between settlements almost entirely, leaving a tiny sliver that would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, compromising the integrity of the boundary, fragmenting the Green Belt here.

The degree of harm is recognised and concluded that development could not be satisfactorily ameliorated. Based on the Calverton test it is considered that the site does not exhibit Exceptional Circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

# The Looe, Reigate Road NON040



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



**Previously Developed Land or greenfield land**  
 Building 10.61 %; General surface 66.94 %; Road/Path/track 7.66%, undeveloped land 14.77%

Site Area: 0.4 ha

Assessed Yield: 13 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 52 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P52	Land to the east of Reigate Road	0	0	1	1

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## The Looe, Reigate Road NON040

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 12.5 against the multi-criteria analysis (for context the highest score 25.5).

This is low scoring relative to all other PDL/GB sites, ranking 235/256.

In the context of other GB site the site is moderate scoring

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 0.8 miles 17 min walk. Ewell East station, 1.2 miles, 25 min

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

Along Reigate Road past the railway bridge south 166 (Epsom to Croydon)

Mon-Fri Hourly service



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site comprises of existing commercial uses which is accessed along a single lane narrow track. The site is previously developed, with a large industrial building and some smaller ancillary buildings on the edge. It is self-contained, siting in cluster of development between the gap of Epsom-Nork.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site is a very small part (approximately 4.32%) of a larger parcel 52, which scores low safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, and is not considered to make any contribution to the purposes in terms of sprawl and merging. The parcel has an overall low score of 1.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the site is small and detached from the settlement edge. It sits amongst a cluster of development in the area which is washed over by the Green Belt. The degree of harm is considered to be minimal.

In terms of merging, the site is a small site and is already previously developed, the development of the site would have minimal additional impact than what currently exists.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is previously developed with buildings on site. It is also located amongst other built development and is surrounded by urbanising features in its immediate surroundings. Therefore, the degree of harm from the development of the site is considered to be minimal.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is detached from the settlement edge. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB, fragmenting the GB here. In addition, the site is a small PDL site where limited infilling and partial or complete redevelopment is not considered inappropriate if it does not impact openness of the Green Belt.

## The Looe, Reigate Road NON040

### To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))

Sprawl: the site is currently previously developed and presents little harm in this regard. No measures identified

Merging: although the site alone has minimal impact on the merging of towns the site could be well as screened to preserve the sense of separation of areas.


Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The site is a previously developed. To reduce any potential harm of development on the surrounding character, any future development should not result in a disproportionate larger or have a greater impact on openness of the Green belt than the existing built form.

Defensible Boundaries: The site is previously developed and is located away from the existing GB boundary and settlement edge. The release of this site from the Green Belt would create a detached element/satellite within the GB. The site is PDL therefore the redevelopment of the site would not be inappropriate development and would not require exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated.

### Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.

The site is a small, PDL site that can be redeveloped without the need to change the Green Belt boundary.

## Land near Downs Road-west (WOO019)



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Building 0.38 %; Undeveloped land 94.22 %; Road/Path/track 5.39%

Site Area: 28.53 ha

Assessed Yield: Retained paddocks with new footpaths to COL023

### Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 9 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3


Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score 1	Purpose score 2	Purpose score 3	Overall Score
P09	Land between Chalk Lane and Ashley Rd	3	2	3	8

#### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

#### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land near Downs Road-west (W00019)

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The scores 15.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is moderate scoring relative to other sites (highest score 25.5), ranking 212/256

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Town Centre 0.8 miles. 20 mins walk

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Ashley Road  
408 Epsom to Cobham (hrly service)  
460 Epsom to Crawley hourly service (Mon-Fri)  
480 Epsom to Preston (Tattenham Corner) every 45 mins (Mon-Sat, Sunday fewer services)



Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is a large linear area consisting of a series of paddocks/fields divided by hedgerows. The site lies between Chalk Lane and Ashley Road. Both roads have a rural character, there are no pavements along Chalk Lane and only one side of Ashley Road has a narrow pavement. The land use is pastoral, reflective of the settlement edge. The site is not being proposed for development but for new footpaths as part of the proposed development of COL023 ([REG18 REP660 Savills. Land East of Downs Road](#))

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site sits within a most of GB parcel 9, which scores high against purposes in terms of sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. It scores moderately against the purpose of merging. The parcel have an overall high score of 8.

In terms of sprawl, the site is not being proposed for development but for new footpaths as part of site COL023 therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered

In terms of merging, the site is not being proposed for development but for new footpaths as part of site COL023, therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is not being proposed for development but for new footpaths as part of site COL023, therefore the nature and extent of harm in this regard is not considered

## Land near Downs Road-west (WOO019)

Defensible Boundaries: The site is defined by physical features, mainly field hedging and road boundaries.

The proposed footpaths would not harm the Green Belt in this location and would not require changes to the Green Belt


**To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

The proposed footpaths would not require changes to the Green Belt.

**Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

The proposal for footpaths would not be inappropriate development and does not require changes to the GB boundary

# Land North of Langley Bottom Farm WOO020



Site Location Plan



Site Boundary

Site Area: 5 ha



Previously Developed Land or greenfield land  
Undeveloped land 98.17 %; Road/Path/track 1.83%

Assessed Yield: 100 residential units

## Relevant Green Belt parcel

The site sits within Green Belt parcel 03 which scores the following for Purpose 1-3

Parcel ID	Site Description	Purpose score			Overall Score
		1	2	3	
P03	Land to the south west of Langley Vale	2	1	2	5

### Purposes of Green Belt

- 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

### Scores

- 0 Parcel does not perform against the purpose
- 1 Parcel is lower performing
- 2 Parcel is moderately performing
- 3 Parcel is higher performing



## Land North of Langley Bottom Farm WOO020

### Accessibility

#### Reg 18 Transport Assessment

The site scores 7.5 against the multi-criteria analysis. This is lowest scoring relative to other PDL and GB sites assessed (highest score 25.5), ranking 256/256  
In the context of GB sites it is the poorest performing.

### Well served by public transport?

**Nearest Train Station:** Epsom Downs 2.1 miles (48 mins walk) and Tattenham Corner 1.6 miles (40 mins walk).

#### Nearest Bus stops and routes:

At Grosvenor Road (0.1 miles) 408, E5  
At Rosebery Road (0.2 miles) 408, E5

408 Epsom, Leatherhead Cobham (Mon-Fri) 06.23 until 19.41 (every 70 mins)

E5 Langley Vale, Watersedge (Mon-Fri) 6.07 until 19.21 (every 2 hour)



© Crown copyright and database right 2023  
Distance Survey Licence 100023771

0 45 90 135 180 Metres

Aerial Photo

### Site description

The site is an L shaped area of land which wraps around the SW part of Langley Vale. The site is a large agricultural/arable field located within an 'Area of High Landscape Value', adjacent to SNCI and Ancient Woodland to the SE. Langley Vale itself is a small settlement located to the south of the Borough, detached from the main built up area of Epsom to the north, separated by Epsom Downs.

The site is a steeply sloping open agricultural field which is part of a farm complex, set within a wider open and hilly landscape.

The site promoters ([REG19 REP139 Boyer](#)) have submitted supporting information including vision statement and concept plan. This shows the inclusion of an open green space at the centre of the site and a landscape buffer on the entire perimeter of the site boundary.

### What is the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt in this location if the site is developed? (Calverton (iv))

The site forms part of (32%) of a larger GB parcel 3 which scores moderately against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and assisting in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site scores low against the purpose of merging.

In terms of sprawl, when the site is considered in isolation, the site would represent an extension of the built form of Langley Vale. The site would extend Langley Vale beyond the exiting strong boundary line to the south into the Green Belt. However, the site sits adjacent to a site to the west approved and under construction for 20 residential units (21/00044/REF). The site boundary does not follow strong physical boundaries- although development to the west now forms part of its western edge. The southern boundary weak, not follow physical feature and therefore poses a risk in terms of unrestricted sprawl. Therefore, the harm against this purpose is moderate.

## Land North of Langley Bottom Farm WOO020

In terms of merging, the development of the site would have minimal impact against this purpose. The nearest settlement edge would be Tadworth to the east of the site (over 2.3 km) where the development of the site would reduce the gap beyond the most easterly part of Langley Vale.

In terms of assisting in the safeguarding of encroachment of the countryside, the site is open undeveloped land. The existing boundary line to Langley Vale and the boundary of the Green Belt creates a clear, clean edge. Langley Vale has an urban character and the properties on edge are prominent from the site. Therefore, the development of the site would encroach into this open sensitive landscape, but it is noted there is currently existing urbanising features located adjacent and under construction beyond this site

Defensible Boundaries: The boundary of the site to the east follows the clearly delineated settlement edge of Langley Vale, however to the west the boundary line is weak and does not appear to follow any physical feature but cuts through the field to the north where it then meets up with the alignment of a track/footpath to the south. The lack of defining physical features to the western boundary is explained by a planning application to the west which meets the site boundary here. The southern boundary is weak, not following any defining feature.

### **To what extent can the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent? (Calverton (v))**

Sprawl: The main impact from the development of this site would be extension of the built form beyond the existing settlement edge of Langley Vale into the Green Belt, but as mentioned above, permission has been granted for a development to the west of this site (for 20 residential units), which means that development beyond the established edge here has already taken place. However, the southern boundary is also a weak boundary and poses a risk of unrestricted sprawl further south that could not be satisfactorily ameliorated.

Merging: Although limited, the topography of the site may make the site more prominent in the landscape, giving the sense of closeness. This can be reduced by maintaining the sense of visual separation. The use of natural screening of the site to preserve the sense of separation of areas.

Safeguarding encroachment of the Countryside: The harm to this designated landscape is recognised, however it is also noted that permission has been granted adjacent and the settlement of Langley Vale adjacent possesses an urban character, whilst the site is undeveloped itself. The harm to the countryside character could be reduced by careful master planning, including the use of trees and natural features to screen and soften views. The topography the area should be considered and valley here used to its advantage to help protect views or screen development. Any development should ensure a gradual transition with a soft edge taking into account the edge of settlement character and impact of the development on the openness of the remaining surrounding green belt and Area of High Landscape Value. A landscape and visual impact assessment LVIA should be carried out.

Defensible Boundaries: The existing settlement edge is a strong boundary however the permanence of the existing edge is weakened by the fact that permission for 20 dwellings has been granted to the west of the site. The southern boundary is weak and does not follow a clear physical boundary.

### **Conclusion as to whether there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of the site from the Green Belt.**

- The site forms part of a wider parcel (32%) and scores moderately against purposes of the GB in terms of sprawl and assisting in the safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The site scores low against the purpose of merging.
- In isolation, the development of the site would be considered sprawl of the settlement edge and whilst it is noted that planning permission has been granted adjacent/under construction to the west and has already extending the settlement beyond the point of this site, the southern boundary of the site is weak, not following any physical feature posing a risk of unrestricted sprawl here.

In conclusion, the moderate degree of harm it is recognised, and the southern boundary does not follow a physical feature and poses a risk of unrestricted sprawl, therefore based on the Calverton test above it is considered that the site does not exhibit exceptional circumstances justifying an amendment to the Green Belt boundary.

## 3 Conclusion

### Previously developed land

3.1 Paragraph 147 of the NPPF (Dec 2023) states that:

*Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously-developed and/or is well-served by public transport...*

3.2 In terms of previously developed land, the site assessments in chapter 2 individually identifies whether the site is PDL or not (or is in part). Table 1 below lists all Green Belt sites that are previously developed or partly previously developed with those highlighted in blue proposed to be removed from the Green Belt (or allocated) in the [Proposed Submission Epsom and Ewell Local Plan 2022-2040](#).

**Table 1 – Green Belt sites containing PDL**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL
COL019	Land east of Burgh Heath Road	Yes some (3.62%)
COL022	Clear Heights, Downs Road	Yes (24.55%)
HOR002	Hollywood Lodge	Yes, part (2.84%)
HOR005 and HOR006 (SA31 and SA32)	West Park	Yes (30.24%)
HOR008 (SA32)	West Park	Yes (41.33%)
HOR009 (SA35)	Horton Farm	Yes, part (5.09%)
NON013	Land at Priest Hill	Yes, part (21.38%)
NON016 and NON042	Downs Farm	Yes, part (3.25%)
NON021	Drift Bridge Farm	Yes, part (3.36%)
NON040	The Looe, Reigate Road	Yes (85.22%)
1 West Park (MDS)	West Park	Yes (58.57%)
2 Manor Park (MDS)	Manor Park	Yes (39.94%)
3 Livingstone Park (MDS)	Livingstone Park	Yes (36.79%)
4 Clarendon Park (MDS)	Clarendon Park	Yes (36.7%)
5 St Ebbas (MDS)	St Ebbas	Yes (48.38%)
6 Epsom College (MDS)	Epsom College	Yes (33.5%)
7 NESLOT (MDS)	NESLOT	Yes (43.66%)

3.3 The table 1 above demonstrates that most of the areas identified for removing from the Green Belt or for allocation in the [Proposed Submission Epsom and Ewell Local Plan 2022-2040](#) (SA31, SA32 and SA35) are identified as having some element of brownfield/previously developed land. The only site allocations not on this list are SA33 (Land at Chantilly Way) and SA34 (Hook Road Arena). However, you will see below that of the Green Belt sites only, SA33 Land at Chantilly Way scored the highest and SA34 Hook Road Arena scored the second highest in terms of the Multi Criteria Analysis, which is the scoring system used in the Transport assessment.

### **Public transport**

3.4 In terms of land that is “well-served by public transport”, there is no specific method to determine this so we have used the Transport Assessment (Document Reference IS06) carried out at the Regulation 18 stage to inform on this matter supplemented by desktop survey of the nearest bus stops and train stations and information on bus services.

3.5 It should be noted that the transport assessment assessed all LAA (Land Availability Assessment) sites that were being considered for potentially delivering future development including previously developed and greenfield sites in the urban area and Green Belt. Ninety-one sites were assessed and scored according to their proximity to various service and facilities including schools, GPs, pharmacies, town and secondary retail centres and green spaces, including proximity to train stations. Each site was given a multi criteria assessment score and the sites were ranked. Table 2 below shows the how each Green Belt site scored with those highlighted in blue proposed to be removed from the Green Belt (or allocated) in the [Proposed Submission Epsom and Ewell Local Plan 2022-2040](#).

**Table 2 – Green Belt site multi criteria assessment scores**

Site Ref	Site name	Public Transport Info	Reg 18 MCA score
HOR010 (SA33)	Land at Chantilly Way	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre E5 and E9, the nearest train station Ewell West is 23 mins walk away.	21
COU026 (SA34)	Hook Road Arena	Regular bus services to Epsom and Kingston from Chessington Road, the nearest train station Ewell West is 20 mins walk away	18.5
5.St Ebbas (MDS)	St Ebbas	with regular bus services E5 and E9 Epsom Town centre, Langley Vale and Clarendon Park, the nearest train station Ewell West is 27 mins walk away.	18.5

**Table 2 – Green Belt site multi criteria assessment scores**

Site Ref	Site name	Public Transport Info	Reg 18 MCA score
2. Manor Park (MDS)	Manor Park	Regular bus services E10 Manor Park the nearest train station Epsom is 28 mins walk away.	17 to 18
HOR001	Cuddington Glade	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E9 and E10), the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	18
HOR009 (SA35)	Horton Farm	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre E5, E9, the nearest train station Ewell West is 24 mins walk away.	17.5
HOR003	Manor Park	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E9/E10), the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	17
HOR004	Land off Cuddington Glade	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre, the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	17
COL021	Land near Downs Road South	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station is a 20 walk away	16.5
COL022	Clear Heights, Downs Road	Although bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is approximately a 30 mins walk away	16.5
COL023	Land near Downs Road east	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hour walk away	16.5
HOR014	Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	15.5 to 16.5
3 - Livingstone Park (MDS)	Livingstone Park	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	15.5 to 16.5
NON013	Land at Priest Hill	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre and St Helier the nearest train station Ewell East adjacent to the site	16

**Table 2 – Green Belt site multi criteria assessment scores**

Site Ref	Site name	Public Transport Info	Reg 18 MCA score
WOO019	Land near Downs Road-West	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is 20 mins walk away	15.5
HOR011	Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	15
7 – NESкот (MDS)	NESCOT	Regular bus services to S2 Epsom Town centre St Helier, the nearest train station Ewell East is 9 mins walk away.	15
HOR002	Hollywood Lodge	There is a regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10) the nearest train station Epsom 20mins to half an hrs walk away.	13
NON016 and NON042	Downs Farm	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 17 mins walk away	12.5
NON040	The Looe, Reigate Road	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 17 mins walk away	12.5
6 - Epsom College (MDS)	Epsom College	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 22 mins walk away	11.5 and 12.5
COL017	Land West of Burgh Heath Road	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hours walk away	12
COL020	Land near Downs Road-north	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station is half an hours walk away	12
HOR007	Noble Park	There is a regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10) the nearest train station Epsom 20min-half an hrs walk away.	12
COL019	Land east of Burgh Heath Road	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hours walk away	11.5
HOR012	Clarendon Park	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 41 mins walk away.	11.5

**Table 2 – Green Belt site multi criteria assessment scores**

Site Ref	Site name	Public Transport Info	Reg 18 MCA score
4 - Clarendon Park (MDS)	Clarendon Park	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 37 mins walk away.	11.5
NON021	Drift Bridge Farm	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 12 mins walk away	10.5
HOR005 and HOR006 (SA31 and SA32)	West Park	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10), the nearest train station Epsom over half an hrs walk away.	8.5 and 11
1 West Park (MDS)	West Park	Regular bus services E10 Manor Park the nearest train station Epsom is 33 mins walk away.	8.5 and 11
HOR008 (SA32)	West Park	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre, the nearest train station Epsom over half an hrs walk away.	8.5
NON038	Banstead Road	Site is 15mins walk from regular bus services to Epsom Town centre and St Helier the nearest train station Ewell East adjacent to the site	8.5
WOO020	Land North of Langley Bottom Farm	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station is 40 mins walk away	7.5

3.6 The highest performing sites include all three of the proposed Green Belt Site Allocations, including SA33 (Land at Chantilly Way) scoring the best out of all the other Green Belt sites proposed for development, this is followed by SA34 (Hook Road Arena), and then SA35 (Horton Farm).

- 3.7 In addition to this the assessment, a desktop exercise using online mapping services (Google maps) was carried out for individual sites that looked at the proximity of sites and walking distances to train stations and bus stops. In general, the borough is well served by train stations with four within the Borough Epsom (Central), Ewell East (East), Ewell West (East) and Stoneleigh (North) and with a number on the edge including Epsom Downs (South East), Tattenham Corner (South East), Banstead (East/South East) and Cheam (East) and Worcester Park (North) and Chessington North and South (North West) and Tolworth (North West). These are fairly evenly spread with regular services to London Victoria, London Bridge, London and London Waterloo as well as to other areas including Sutton, West Croydon and other Surrey towns including Dorking and Guildford. Most areas are within 30 mins of a train station except to the southern part of the Borough where it becomes more rural and further away from the built up.
- 3.8 The Borough is fairly well placed in terms of [bus services](#), particularly to the main built up area to the north, with regular bus services to Epsom as well as nearby areas including Sutton, St Helier, Kingston, Ashted, Banstead. Again, similar to rail services, bus services to the southern part of the Borough are fewer and less frequent. The individual site assessments set out the proximity of sites to bus stops and the routes served.
- 3.9 Table 3 on the next page summaries the conclusions of the assessments.

**Table 3 – Summary of site assessments**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL	Reg 18 MCA score	Public Transport Info	GB Parcel	GB overall scores	Calverton Test
1	West Park (MDS)	Yes (58.57%)	8.5 and 11	Regular bus services E10 Manor Park the nearest train station Epsom is 33 mins walk away.	20	2	Satisfied
2	Manor Park (MDS)	Yes (39.94%)	17 to 18	Regular bus services E10 Manor Park the nearest train station Epsom is 28 mins walk away.	22	1	Satisfied
3	Livingstone Park (MDS)	Yes (36.79)	15.5 to 16.5	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	25	1	Satisfied
4	Clarendon Park (MDS)	Yes (36.7%)	11.5	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 37 mins walk away.	27	1	Satisfied
5	St Ebbas (MDS)	Yes (48.38%)	18.5	Regular bus services E5 and E9 Epsom Town centre, Langley Vale and Clarendon Park, the nearest train station Ewell West is 27 mins walk away.	30	1	Satisfied
6	Epsom College (MDS)	Yes (33.5%)	11.5 and 12.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 22 mins walk away	36	4	Satisfied
7	NESCOT (MDS)	Yes (43.66%)	15	Regular bus services to S2 Epsom Town centre St Helier, the nearest train station Ewell East is 9 mins walk away.	42	5	Satisfied
COL017	Land West of Burgh Heath Road	No	12	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hours walk away	32	7	Satisfied

**Table 3 – Summary of site assessments**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL	Reg 18 MCA score	Public Transport Info	GB Parcel	GB overall scores	Calverton Test
COL019	Land east of Burgh Heath Road	Yes, part (3.62%)	11.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hours walk away.	33, 34	7,6	Not satisfied. Harm cannot be mitigated
COL020	Land near Downs Road-north	No	12	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station is half an hours walk away.	7	7	Not required for proposed land use ( open space / Green Infrastructure).
COL021	Land near Downs Road South	No	16.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station is 20 walk away.	7	7	Not required for proposed land use ( open space / Green Infrastructure).
COL022	Clear Heights, Downs Road	Yes (24.55%)	16.5	Although bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is approximately 30 mins walk away.	7	7	Not satisfied. Development would create a detached element/satellite within the GB.
COL023	Land near Downs Road east	No	16.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is half an hours walk away.	8	8	Not satisfied. Harm cannot be mitigated
COU026 (SA34)	Hook Road Arena	No	18.5	Regular bus services to Epsom and Kingston from Chessington Road, the nearest train station Ewell West is 20 mins walk away.	31	7	Satisfied
HOR001	Cuddington Glade	No	18	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E9 and E10), the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	22	1	Satisfied
HOR002	Hollywood Lodge	Yes, part of the site (2.84%)	13	There is a regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10) the nearest train station Epsom 20min-half an hrs walk away.	21	8	Not satisfied. Development would create a detached element/satellite within the GB.

**Table 3 – Summary of site assessments**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL	Reg 18 MCA score	Public Transport Info	GB Parcel	GB overall scores	Calverton Test
HOR003	Manor Park	No	17	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E9/E10), the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	22	1	Satisfied
HOR004	Land off Cuddington Glade	No	17	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre, the nearest train station Epsom approximately 20 mins walk away.	22	1	Satisfied
HOR005 and HOR006 (SA31 and SA32)	West Park	Yes (30.24%)	8.5 and 11	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10), the nearest train station Epsom over half an hrs walk away.	20	2	PDL in the GB. Does not need exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated
HOR007	Noble Park	No	12	There is a regular bus services to Epsom Town centre (E10) the nearest train station Epsom 20min-half an hrs walk away.	21	8	Satisfied
HOR008 (SA32)	West Park	Yes (41.33%)	8.5	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre, the nearest train station Epsom over half an hrs walk away.	20	2	PDL in the GB. Does not need exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated
HOR009 (SA35)	Horton Farm	Yes, part (5.09%)	17.5	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre E5, E9, the nearest train station Ewell West is 24 mins walk away.	28	8	Satisfied
HOR010 (SA33)	Land at Chantilly Way	No	21	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre E5 and E9, the nearest train station Ewell West is 23 mins walk away.	29	2	Satisfied
HOR011	Land south of West Cottage, Livingstone Park	No	15	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	25	1	Satisfied
HOR012	Clarendon Park	No	11.5	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 41 mins walk away.	27	1	Satisfied

**Table 3 – Summary of site assessments**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL	Reg 18 MCA score	Public Transport Info	GB Parcel	GB overall scores	Calverton Test
HOR014	Horton Hospital, Livingstone Park	No	15.5 to 16.5	Regular bus services E9 the nearest train station Epsom is 27 mins walk away.	25	1	Satisfied
NON013	Land at Priest Hill	Yes, part (21.38%)	16	Regular bus services to Epsom Town centre and St Helier the nearest train station Ewell East adjacent to the site.	43	8	Satisfied
NON016 and NON042	Downs Farm	Yes, part (3.25%)	12.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 17 mins walk away.	37,35	6,6	Satisfied for northern land parcel (NON016)-
NON021	Drift Bridge Farm	Yes, part (3.36%)	10.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 12 mins walk away.	38	8	Not satisfied. Loss of strong defensible boundary
NON038	Banstead Road	No	8.5	Site is 15mins walk from regular bus services to Epsom Town centre and St Helier the nearest train station Ewell East adjacent to the site.	45	7	Not satisfied. Development would create a detached element/satellite within the GB.
NON040	The Looe, Reigate Road	Yes (85.22)	12.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train station Epsom Downs is 17 mins walk away.	52	1	PDL in the GB. Does not need exceptional circumstances to be demonstrated
WOO019	Land near Downs Road-West	No	15.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is 20 mins walk away.	9	8	Not required for proposed land use (open space / Green Infrastructure).

**Table 3 – Summary of site assessments**

Site Ref	Site name	PDL	Reg 18 MCA score	Public Transport Info	GB Parcel	GB overall scores	Calverton Test
WOO020	Land North of Langley Bottom Farm	No	7.5	Bus services in the area are limited and infrequent, the nearest train stations is 40 mins walk away.	3	5	Not satisfied. Harm cannot be mitigated