



## LICENSING AND PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Tuesday 8 May 2018 at 7.30 pm

Council Chamber - Epsom Town Hall

The members listed below are summoned to attend the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee meeting, on the day and at the time and place stated, to consider the business set out in this agenda.

Councillor Graham Dudley (Chairman)	Councillor Rob Geleit
Councillor David Wood (Vice-Chairman)	Councillor Tina Mountain
Councillor Michael Arthur MBE	Councillor Martin Olney
Councillor Steve Bridger	Councillor David Reeve
Councillor Chris Frost	Councillor Alan Sursham

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Beldan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long, sweeping underline.

Chief Executive

For further information, please contact Sandra Dessent, tel: 01372 732121 or email: [sdessent@epsom-ewell.gov.uk](mailto:sdessent@epsom-ewell.gov.uk)

### AGENDA

#### 1. QUESTION TIME

To take any questions from members of the the Public

**Please note: Members of the Public are requested to inform the Democratic Services Officer before the meeting begins if they wish to ask a verbal question to the Committee.**

#### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare the existence and nature of any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests in respect of any item of business to be considered at the meeting.

**3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 3 - 6)**

The Committee is asked to confirm as a true record the Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee held on 25 January 2018 (attached) and to authorise the Chairman to sign them.

**4. EPSOM & EWELL LOCAL PLAN ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT 2016 - 2017 (Pages 7 - 74)**

The Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) assesses the performance of adopted planning policies and tracks the Council's progress against the Local Plan Programme. The Council is required to publish this information on an annual basis.

**5. MAKING EFFICIENT USE OF LAND - OPTIMISING HOUSING DELIVERY (Pages 75 - 80)**

This report advises Members of the material considerations when assessing planning applications against the current adopted policies in relation to conflicting demand regarding different use, densities and building heights. This advice should be reflected in the decisions of the Planning Committee.

**6. CONSULTATION ON DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK (Pages 81 - 106)**

The Government has published its draft revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for consultation. The deadline for responses is 10 May 2018. The Committee is asked to consider the draft comments on the Government's proposals and that, subject to any changes, agree that they form the basis of the Council's response to the Consultation.

**Minutes of the Meeting of the LICENSING AND PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE  
held on 25 January 2018**

---

**PRESENT -**

Councillor Graham Dudley (Chairman); Councillor David Wood (Vice-Chairman); Councillors Michael Arthur, Tony Axelrod (as nominated substitute for Councillor Chris Frost), Steve Bridger, Rob Geleit, Tina Mountain, Martin Olney, David Reeve and Tella Wormington (as nominated substitute for Councillor Alan Sursham)

Absent: Councillor Chris Frost and Councillor Alan Sursham

Officers present: Rachel Jackson (Licensing, Grants and HIA Manager), Karol Jakubczyk (Planning Policy Manager) and Sandra Dessent (Democratic Services Officer)

**28 QUESTION TIME**

No questions had been submitted or were asked by members of the public.

**29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made by councillors regarding items on the Agenda.

**30 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The Minutes of the Meeting of the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee held on 7 December 2017 were agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

**31 HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICIES**

At the Licensing and Planning Policy Committee in September 2017 it was agreed in principal to the adoption of a Surrey-wide convictions policy for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Drivers, and that a further report would be brought before the Committee following the public consultation. The consultation commenced on 21 October 2017 and ended on 4 December 2017.

Details of the consultation were circulated to members to enable the opportunity for feedback. The draft policy was approved by Surrey Legal Heads and other relevant working groups. It was also noted that the trade had been asked to comment on the proposed changes and no representations had been submitted.

Therefore having considered the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy, incorporating the new Surrey-wide convictions policy, the Committee:

- (1) Agreed to recommend to Council the adoption of the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy
- (2) Authorised the Licensing, Grants and HIA Manager in consultation with the Chairman of Licensing and Planning Policy Manager to make minor amendments to the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy (including convictions policy) as may be required from time to time under the Delegated Powers scheme.

## 32 LOCAL PLAN ISSUES & OPTIONS CONSULTATION - OUTCOMES

With regard to the local plan an Issues and Options Consultation had been carried out which focused on the housing growth challenges facing the Borough.

The Committee were informed by way of a presentation; the progress to date of the Local Plan; the four options presented in the Issues and Options consultation for accommodating housing needs; an overview of the outputs from the consultation and the proposed way forward taking into account National Planning Policy and relevant government publications.

The Committee discussed the outcomes from the consultation and the following points arose from the discussion:

- The government methodology, i.e. a 'one size fits all' for assessing an objectively assessed housing need could best be challenged through the Council producing strong evidence to demonstrate the boroughs unique circumstances.
- The importance of 'visual character' when assessing developable potential was acknowledged and it was reiterated that incorporating high quality appealing designs was the only way forward to delivering an acceptable Local Plan.
- Housing growth supported by appropriate infrastructure was a principal consideration for the Council and officers were working closely with infrastructure providers, e.g. Surrey County Council, the NHS and Education authorities to explore innovative and cost effective solutions to enable the provision of necessary infrastructure to keep pace with growth. It was noted that to date Local Plan Inspectors had not placed great weight on infrastructure capacity as a constraint for growth. It was further noted that some utility providers for example Thames Water had highlighted the need for adequate water and sewerage infrastructure to be delivered prior to development and requested a strengthening of the policy requirements in the Local Plan.
- Following on from the consultation, officers were now working on producing a list of sites that could be considered as potential site

allocation options. These candidate sites will be assessed to establish whether they are genuinely available, deliverable and developable during the new Local Plan period.

- It was noted that there was significant support for Option 1 in the consultation – urban intensification - and that whilst most of the sites currently under consideration could not support this option due to their size, the principles of urban intensification may be considered in the long term as larger sites became available.
- It was confirmed that the next consultation stage of the Local Plan process will be promoted through the Borough Insight Magazine which is distributed to all households, enabling the widest possible number of residents to comment.
- Concern was expressed with regard to the scale of affordable housing need (identified through the SHMA) and the Council's ability to meet it in light of the constraints introduced through national planning policy. It was agreed that meeting the target was going to be extremely challenging and the Council's continual efforts to influence the Government position needed to be voiced whenever the opportunity arose.
- It was noted that the feasibility to increase the density of developments depended on the size of site, and officers would be producing materials to assist people to visualise the impact of increased density.
- A review of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which would form part of the evidence base for the Local Plan was due and the Committee was informed that if any problem sites were identified they would be reflected in the proposed options.
- The Chairman assured the Committee that manpower implications were being continually discussed and monitored to ensure sufficient staff resources that would enable the Local Plan to be delivered within the agreed timescales.

Having considered the Issues and Options Consultation as set out under Annexes 1 and 2, the Committee:

- (1) Agreed to the publication of the Annexes 1 and 2
- (2) Agreed Option 4 in the consultation as the way forward for the Local plan

*The meeting began at 7.30 pm and ended at 8.35 pm*

COUNCILLOR GRAHAM DUDLEY (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Epsom & Ewell Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2016 - 2017**

<b>Report of the/contact:</b>	Interim Head of Planning, Viv Evans
<b>Urgent Decision?(yes/no)</b>	No
<b>If yes, reason urgent decision required:</b>	N/A
<b>Annexes/Appendices (attached):</b>	<b>Annexe 1:</b> Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2016 – 2017 <b>Annexe 2:</b> AMR Supporting Appendices
<b>Other available papers (not attached):</b>	None Stated

### **Report summary**

The Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) assesses the performance of adopted planning policies and tracks the Council's progress against the Local Plan Programme. The Council is required to publish this information on an annual basis.

### **Recommendation (s)**

- (1) That the contents of the Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report be noted and approved for publication on the Council's website; and**
- (2) That future AMRs adopt a streamlined approach, which focusses upon key themes rather than reporting on individual policies and indicators.**

## **1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy**

- 1.1 The Local Plan provides the spatial planning mechanism for the delivery of the vision which is set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy, and will assist in the achievement of the Council's Key Priorities. Monitoring the performance of our adopted Local Plan policies is an important process that informs the successful development and evolution of an up-to-date and sound local plan.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 This Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) covers the period from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. It is the twelfth full AMR. The AMR covers the full range of indicators the Council has identified for its Core Strategy; the Plan E Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan; the Development Management Policies Document; and our Economic Development Strategy.

2.2 The Local Plan AMR 2016/ 2017 is comprised of the following elements:

- A summary of the housing completions this reporting year (April 2015- March 2016) and completions in the Borough since 2006
- The Housing Trajectory and Housing Land Supply Statement
- A summary of the 'affordable' housing completions this reporting year and future projections.

### **3 Main Headlines**

- 3.1 During the reporting period, the Council published its Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), which identifies and objectively assessed housing needs figure (OAHN) for the Borough. National planning policy states that in the absence of an up-to-date local plan, local planning authorities must monitor housing delivery against their OAHN figure. This is why Officers have substituted the housing target identified in our Core Strategy (Policy CS7) with the OAHN identified in the Council's SHMA.
- 3.2 The Council has not met its annualised OAHN figure this year. 308 new were delivered, which would have been considered a success against the Council's Core Strategy target.
- 3.3 The requirement to use the Council's OAHN as a de facto housing target has an impact on both the Council's Housing Trajectory and Land Supply Statement. Both show that the Borough does not have sufficient sites, either available or in the pipeline, to demonstrate a five year supply of housing. This is unsurprising given the substantial difference between the Council's Core Strategy target and the OAHN.
- 3.4 Given the Council's current housing land supply strategy, the availability of sites, market conditions and the readiness of the development industry (to build substantial numbers of new homes) there is little that the Council can do to transform its housing trajectory and land supply statement in the short term. Even adopting an approach to permit all new housing development proposals is unlikely to result in a steeper trajectory or significantly increased housing land supply position. The Council can provide a positive response through its Local Plan by adopting a new strategy for growth – one that increases densities and identifies appropriate sites for new housing. Nevertheless, such an approach is unlikely to provide an instant response to our situation – it may still take a couple of AMR reporting cycles to arrive at a positive trajectory and compliant housing land supply position.
- 3.5 The Council has an overall target of 35% of new dwellings to be provided as affordable (Core Strategy Policy CS9). In 2016/2017, 18.5% of all completions were classified as 'affordable housing'. This equated to 57 affordable units. The delivery of affordable housing has proved challenging over recent years. Developers' use of viability assessments



and the reinstatement of the written ministerial statement restricting the ability to seek contribution from housing developments comprised of 10 units or fewer have had an impact. However, positive action has been taken to address this through the publication of the Position Statement on the Exemption of Small Sites from Development Contributions (approved by the LPPC Committee in December 2017), which clearly sets out the Council's case for continuing to seek such contributions. The existing affordable housing policy will be considered as part of the Core Strategy review to ensure it remains achievable and relevant.

- 3.6 Progress in delivering the objectives and improvements identified within Plan E Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan during the reporting period has been noteworthy. Funds have successfully been obtained to deliver a number of the highways/environmental improvements identified in Plan E, and the works are currently underway. Retail wise Epsom appears to be performing well with a consistently low vacancy rate. The policies to protect retail frontages are well used, helping to preserve the core retail function of the primary shopping area. Monitoring has highlighted the need to ensure more frequent surveys of shopping frontages/parades to ensure the policies are being correctly implemented.
- 3.7 There has been some progress with regard to the opportunity sites identified in Plan E, with the Comrades Club receiving permission for redevelopment. Activity also occurred in relation to the emergency services site, although there appears to be limited interest from landowners in redeveloping the remainder of the Utilities Site (as allocated under Plan E Policy E15). The Council may need to be more proactive in facilitating the development of such a sustainably located site.
- 3.8 As part of changes to the permitted development regime, introduced in May 2013, changes from B1 office use to C3 residential use are now permissible without consent subject to a prior approval process covering flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination. Evidence demonstrates that this has had a negative impact on the supply and availability of office space, particularly in Epsom Town Centre. The general trend for employment land to be lost to residential uses continues. However, where non PDCOU applications are made, the Plan E policies (alongside the Core strategy and Development Management policies) are ensuring any losses are fully justified. Additionally, the Article 4 direction issued on a number of key office buildings is helping to retain the higher quality office buildings in the town centre.
- 3.9 This is the first AMR to report on the performance of the Council's Development Management Policies. Analysis shows that a number of the policies are particularly well used, although their performance can be challenging to meaningfully monitor.
- 3.10 Well used policies include DM9 Townscape Character and local Distinctiveness and DM10 Design Requirements which are frequently cited in reports. Their performance at appeal is varied due to the very

subjective nature of design and character. Other well used policies are the more niche policies such as those relating to the Green Belt (DM1 to 4), DM8 Heritage Policy, DM14 Shopfronts and DM19 Flood Risk, which appear to be performing well.

- 3.11 The policies relating to density, space standards and height again are well used, but may need to be reconsidered as part of the Core Strategy review in light of the pressing need for housing land and ensuring its most efficient use. Policy DM16 Backland Development could also fall into this category. While the policy offers a degree of flexibility, as demonstrated by three applications being permitted during the reporting year for development on garden land, it is likely to have prevented a number of applications for such development from coming forward. Again, this is very difficult to monitor.
- 3.12 One policy which appears to not be performing well is DM22 Housing Mix, which requires developments of four or more units to include at least 25% a three bed units or larger. Monitoring shows that this policy requirement is not being met. This appears to be partly due to the number of smaller sites coming forward, but is also heavily influenced by the market which is seeking to deliver smaller units.
- 3.13 Since the introduction of the AMR regime Officers have sought to improve the scale and content of Reports. To both streamline the process of production of the AMR as well to enable the AMR to be more accessible, it is proposed that the AMR for the next reporting period be streamlined, focussing on key themes such as housing delivery and economic development rather than seeking to report on each individual policy and its associated indicator. It is anticipated that this will result in a more meaningful data, which is easier to monitor and analyse. The Core Strategy review, will provide an excellent opportunity to identify key themes for monitoring.

#### 4 Financial and Manpower Implications

- 4.1 There is an ongoing requirement to monitor the performance of our Local Plan policies, to produce the data which is reported annually in the AMR.
- 4.2 Additional staff resources have been secured to ensure that our monitoring regime meets the requirements set out in national planning policy. Up to 5% of monies secured through the Community Infrastructure Levy can be allocated for administration purposes associated with the Levy. We are currently deploying some of this money to help meet our monitoring requirements.
- 4.3 ***Chief Finance Officer's comments*** Additional funding from the 5 percent admin fee element of Community Infrastructure Levy receipts was agreed to fund up to £80,000 in total over two years to support the delivery of the Local Plan. Any request for the use of any additional funding will need to be agreed by the Strategy and Resources Committee.

**5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)**

- 5.1 Section 113 of the Localism Act 2011 requires every authority to produce a series of reports containing information on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme and the extent to which the planning policies set out in the Local Plan are being achieved. This enables the effects of a policy to be monitored transparently to enable a plan to respond quickly to changing circumstances and to implement change where a policy may not be working as anticipated.
- 5.2 Provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which came into effect on the 6th April 2012, require local planning authorities' monitoring reports to contain key information.
- 5.3 This monitoring information is to be made available to their communities on-line in the AMR. Councils are no longer required to submit the AMR to Government Office.

**6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications**

- 6.1 The Local Plan AMR provides a mechanism with which to assess the impact of our planning policies. The planning policies within the Core Strategy, the Plan E Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan and the Development Management Policies Document have been subject to sustainability appraisal.

**7 Partnerships**

- 7.1 The Planning Policy Team has worked with a number of internal partner services and departments to ensure that the relevant data is accurate and consistent. These include the Development Management Team, the Finance Department and the Economic Development Officer.

**8 Risk Assessment**

- 8.1 We are required by government to produce an annual monitoring report reporting on the performance and delivery of our Local Plan.

**9 Conclusion and Recommendations**

- 9.1 It is recommended that the AMR be approved for publication on the Council's website.
- 9.2 It is recommended that future AMRs adopt a streamlined approach that focusses upon key themes rather than reporting on individual policies and indicators. The Core Strategy review will help to identify the themes.

**Ward(s) affected:** (All Wards);

This page is intentionally left blank

## Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report 2016/17

### Introduction and Background

Every Local Authority is required under Regulation 34 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012 to produce and publish an Annual Monitoring Report at least yearly. This is important to enable communities and interested parties to be aware of progress. Regulation 34 prescribes minimum information to be included in monitoring reports, including progress with Local Plan preparation and how the implementation of policies in the Local Plan are progressing, net additional dwellings, net additional affordable dwellings, Community Infrastructure Levy receipts, and action taken under the duty to co-operate. It also requires monitoring information to be made available online and in council offices as soon as it is available to the council, rather than waiting to publish in a report annually. In essence it is a matter for each Local Planning Authority to decide what to include in their monitoring report over and above the prescribed minimum information.

Monitoring is an essential element of the 'Plan, Monitor and Manage' approach to policy making. With its focus on the delivery of sustainable development and sustainable communities, monitoring is important in the planning system in providing a check on whether those aims are being achieved. This AMR in the spirit of transparency and the need to focus on key information that matters most to local communities, covers the **Core Strategy 2007, Plan E (Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan) 2012** and the **Development Management Policies 2015** targets and indicators for the period April 2016 – March 2017.

### Progress and Implementation of the Local Plan

The Epsom and Ewell Local Plan Programme (July 2016) sets out the rolling project plan for the production of documents comprising the Epsom & Ewell Local Plan. It provides a timetable for their production so as to monitor progress and milestones, as well as identifying the resources required and any potential constraints. The Programme focuses on the preparation and production of the Local Plan Core Strategy Partial Review.

The July 2016 Local Plan Programme sets out the timetabled dates for progressing the partial review of the Local Plan. The actual/ revised proposed dates are set out alongside these below. In light of the delays, the Programme was updated in June 2017.

This reporting year the Issues and Options paper was scheduled for February- April 2017. This was delayed till September 2107 whilst staff vacancies were successfully filled and the essential evidence base work was updated.

Key Stages	Timetabled dates	Actual/ Proposed Dates
Issues & Options Consultation	February- April 2017	September- November 2017
Publication	September 2017	December 2017
Pre-Submission Consultation	September-October 2017	March 2018
Date of Submission to Secretary of State	October- November 2017	May 2018
Pre-Examination Meeting	December 2017	September 2018
Public Hearing	January/ February 2018	Late 2018
Estimated Date for Adoption	July 2018	December 2019

It also contains the production of the following evidence base documents which are on schedule:

Strategic Housing Market Assessments, October 2016  
Green Belt Study Stage 1 February 2017  
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment July 2017  
Traveller Accommodation Assessment July 2017  
Constraints Study July 2017  
Green Belt Study Stage 2 November 2017

### The Context

It is important to possess a good understanding of the social, economic and environmental issues that affect the Borough when taking a 'spatial' planning approach. The Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was prepared and updated in July 2017 as part of the Local plan Review. This report contains a large amount of up to date data on wide ranging indicators that can be read alongside this AMR. This can be viewed on the [Councils website](#).

### Indicators

This AMR reports on Indicators deriving from:  
The Core Strategy 2007  
Plan E (An Area Action plan for Epsom Town Centre) 2012  
Development Management Policies DPD 2015

This is the first AMR to report on the performance of the policies contained in the Development Management DPD. As there are 38 new policies to report upon, the main section of the AMR will be set out in table format to attempt to limit the size of the document. Where possible hyperlinks will be used to refer to further information, rather than reproducing the information. Annexes are attached where appropriate. The indicators used are taken from the Monitoring Framework submitted alongside the document for examination. As it is the first time we have considered these Indicators it may be that some of them are found to be impractical or unnecessary and if this is the case it will be recommended that they are omitted/ streamlined in subsequent years.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
<b>DM1</b>	<b>Extent of the Green Belt</b>  The Green Belt will be maintained along the boundaries of the existing built-up area and extending to the outer Borough boundary as defined in the Epsom and Ewell Borough-wide Local Plan 2000 and as defined in the successor Site Allocations Development Plan Document.	Number and type of planning permissions granted in the Green Belt.	Core Strategy: All development allowed in Green Belt meets criteria in national policy	In 2016/17 there has been 93 permissions granted in the Green Belt.  These applications are broken down as follows:  17 for work on TPO trees. 2 for Listed Building works. 39 householder applications including small extensions and conversions of loft spaces and garages. 14 full planning permissions including The Old Moat Garden Centre redevelopment, RAC Club, Epsom Common Working Mens Club, Epsom College and the Grandstand. 17 minor amendments and condition discharges 3 Certificates of Lawful Development 1 Advertisement consent at the Derby Arms	All permissions granted in the Green Belt comprised extensions or alterations to buildings or development within the existing footprint, that were considered to have limited impact on the openness of the Green Belt and deemed to be appropriate development under Green Belt policy.  The Council will continue to oppose inappropriate development within the Green Belt and will consider whether the precise Green Belt boundary needs to be amended in the Local Plan review. The Development Management Policies document seeks to manage the size of new extensions in the Green Belt by ensuring that no increase in size over 30% of the original footprint would be permitted. The replacement of existing buildings in the Green Belt will be managed by retaining existing uses and ensuring that replacement buildings are not materially larger than those they replace.
<b>CS2</b>	To ensure the Green Belt continues to serve its key functions, its existing general extent will be maintained and, within its boundaries, strict control will continue to be exercised over inappropriate development as defined by Government policy.				
<b>DM2</b>	<b>Infilling within the boundaries of Major Developed Sites</b>  Proposals for infilling within the boundaries of Major Developed Sites as originally defined in the old Epsom and Ewell Borough-wide Local Plan 2000 and as defined in the successor Site Allocations Development Plan Document will be permitted provided that the development would not:  i) Have a greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt than the existing development ii) Exceed the height of the existing buildings; and iii) Lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.	Number and type of planning permissions granted within the boundaries of the Major Developed Sites	No target identified	In 2016/17 there were 2 FUL applications permitted at Epsom College, including the refurbishment of Robinson House and various external works including a formal pathway, pergolas, canopy and replacement windows. There was also TPO tree works. Sustainable drainage details were discharged at the NESCOL development site (for the care home application which is no longer being implemented)	For all applications, DM2 was fully considered and used to help determine the application (quoted in the Officer's report).
		Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Councils' policy compliant decision	None (0%)	No appeals have been allowed where DM2 was quoted in the refusal	
<b>DM3</b>	<b>Replacement and extensions of buildings in the Green Belt</b>  Replacement of buildings in the Green Belt will be supported where: (i) The replacement building is not materially larger than the	Number and type of planning permissions granted for replacement of buildings in the Green Belt	All permissions granted to be not materially larger than original building and	There has been 2 permissions granted for replacement buildings in the Green Belt. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>demolition of garages and out houses and replacement with side extensions (80 Longdown Lane South) and;</li> <li>redevelopment of derelict stores and garage at Old Moat Garden Centre.</li> </ul>	This proposal results in a 29% increase in floorspace. This is addressed in the planning report.  This proposal results in a slight reduction in developed floorspace

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>existing building (excluding temporary buildings) it replaces, taking into account floorspace, bulk and height; and</p> <p>(ii) The replacement building remains in the same use.</p> <p>The extension of buildings in the Green Belt will only be supported where:</p> <p>(i) The proposal would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt (e.g. the increase would be no greater than 30% above the volume of the original building. Increasing the extent of an existing building to maximum footprint will not be appropriate in every circumstance); and</p> <p>(ii) The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on rural character through its siting and design.</p>	<p>Number and type of planning permissions granted for the extension of buildings in the Green Belt</p> <p>Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's policy compliant decision</p>	<p>remain in the same use</p> <p>All permission granted to be not more than 30% above the volume of the original building</p> <p>None (0%)</p>	<p>There has been 22 permissions granted for extensions in the Green Belt. This does not include Certificates of Lawful Development.</p> <p>DM3 was used as a reason for refusal in two planning appeals that were overturned in 2016/17. These were:</p> <p>-A single storey side extension at 116a Reigate Road (16/00895). (This was the only reason for refusal): <i>The cumulative effect of the proposed extension combined with the previous extensions would cause significant harm to the openness and setting of the Green Belt contrary to Policy CS2 and CS5 of the Epsom and Ewell Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DM3 of the Development Management Policies document (2015).</i></p> <p>-Extensions and loft conversion at Sands House, Hook Road (16/00588). <i>The proposed extensions would lead to a disproportionate increase in volume over and above the original dwelling and as such would have a harmful impact on the openness of the Metropolitan Green Belt.</i></p> <p>Tree/hedgerow protection measures are common place conditions on new developments. More specific conditions are placed on planning applications where there are particular areas of biodiversity that may be at risk. The Council adopted guidance on Biodiversity in Planning in February 2012 which sets out advice and requirements for planners and developers.</p>	<p>Policy DM3 appears to be being used on a regular basis to determine whether an extension is materially larger than is acceptable. Proposals that are over 30% are not being approved.</p> <p>The appeal decision makes reference to the 30% maximum increase and acknowledges that this proposal exceeds that. However he states that the extension would not cause any harm to the openness and states that the minor material difference constitutes very special circumstances</p> <p>The Inspector disagreed and stated that the proposed development would <u>not</u> result in disproportionate additions to the building- and not harm the openness.</p> <p>This indicator is not easy to monitor formally. The only information available is anecdotal evidence to show that biodiversity is being considered in planning applications. This can include the requirement for bat boxes or additional tree planting and in some cases a protected species or badger survey to be carried out.</p>
<b>CS3</b>	<p><b>Biodiversity and Designated Nature Conservation Areas</b></p> <p>The biodiversity of Epsom and Ewell will be conserved and enhanced through the support for measures which meet the objectives of national and local biodiversity action plans in terms of species and habitat.</p> <p>Sites that are designated for their nature conservation attributes will be afforded protection appropriate to their designation.</p> <p>Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Ancient Woodland will be afforded the</p>	(Core Strategy Indicator- Number of new developments providing mitigation for loss of biodiversity or/ and incorporating features to improve existing biodiversity)	No target identified		



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>highest level of protection. Development which harms the scientific interest of these areas will not be permitted. Development that would harm Grade 2, Grade 3 SNCIs or Local Nature Reserves will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• suitable mitigation measures are put in place, and</li> <li>• it has been demonstrated that the benefits of a development would outweigh the harm caused.</li> </ul> <p>Elsewhere, development that is detrimental to the Borough's biodiversity will be minimised, and where it does take place, adequate mitigating measures should be provided. Wherever possible, new development should contribute positively towards the Borough's biodiversity.</p>				
<b>DM4</b>	<p><b>Biodiversity and New development</b></p> <p>Development affecting existing or proposed nature conservation sites and habitats of international, national or local importance will only be permitted if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The development would enhance the nature conservation potential of the site or is proven to be necessary for the conservation management of the site; or</li> <li>(ii) there is no alternative location for the development and there would be no harm to the nature conservation potential of the site; or</li> <li>(iii) there are imperative reasons of overriding public interest for the development</li> </ul> <p>Elsewhere in the Borough: Development affecting any site or building that supports species protected by Law, including their habitats, will only be permitted if appropriate mitigation and compensatory measures are agreed to facilitate the survival of the identified species, keep disturbance to a minimum</p>	Number of planning permissions granted for development considered to affect an existing or proposed nature conservation site/ habitat of international, national or local importance.	None (0%)	None	n/a



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>and provide adequate alternative habitats to ensure no net loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>Mitigation and compensatory measures will be secured through planning obligations or conditions, with priority for such measures to be provided within the development.</p> <p>Whether or not there are any species or habitats that enjoy statutory protection, every opportunity should be taken to secure net benefit to the Borough's biodiversity. To this end, an assessment of the existing nature conservation assets on a development site should be undertaken at the application stage and suitable biodiversity enhancements proposed.</p>				
DM5	<p><b>Policy DM5 Trees and Landscape</b></p> <p>The Borough's trees, hedgerows and other landscape features will be protected and enhanced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Planting and encouraging others to plant trees and shrubs to create woodland, thickets and hedgerows;</li><li>• continuing to maintain trees in streets and public open spaces and selectively removing, where absolutely necessary, and replacing and replanting trees;</li><li>• requiring landscape proposals in submissions for new development, which retain existing trees and other important landscape features where practicable and include the planting of new semi-mature trees and other planting.</li></ul> <p>Where trees, hedgerows or other landscape features are removed, appropriate replacement planting will normally be required. Consideration should be given to the use of native</p>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	NONE	N/A

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>species as well as the adaptability to the likely effects of climate change.</p> <p>Every opportunity should be taken to ensure that new development does not result in a significant loss of trees, hedgerows or other landscape features unless suitable replacements are proposed Where removal is required, sound justification will be sought, supported by appropriate evidence such as health, public amenity, street scene or restoration of an historic garden. In the case of arboriculture evidence, this will be provided by a suitably qualified individual.</p>				
<b>CS4</b>	<p>Emphasis will continue to be placed on protecting and enhancing the two Strategic Open Spaces of Nonsuch Park and the Hogsmill River, shown on the Key Diagram. These areas provide a particularly important recreational, amenity and wildlife resource.</p> <p>Provision of the amount and type of open space within the Borough will have regard to the standards identified in the most recent Audit of Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities and Assessment of Local Needs. The required quantity and range of open spaces will be rigorously maintained, and focus will be given to the creation and maintenance of an accessible network of green spaces within the built up area of the Borough.</p> <p>The Council will endeavour to address any shortfalls in provision of defined open space types and will seek opportunities to enhance the quality of existing open spaces where necessary, and improve access to them.</p> <p>Development which results in a deficit of open space provision will not be permitted.</p> <p>On all new residential developments there will be a requirement for open</p>	Amount and range of open space provided in the Borough relative to requirements set out in the most recent open space audit	Provision should meet defined audit standards. Appropriate targets will be developed in future local development documents	<p>Planning permission was granted 7/6/2016 at Salesian College Sports Ground, Old School Lane for the following:</p> <p><i>Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of a part 2 /part 3 storey building to be used as a 60 unit Extra Care facility (Use Class C2) with associated communal and ancillary facilities, including car and cycle parking and landscaping. Re-laying of sports pitches including an all weather surface, the erection of a two storey pavilion and provision of associated car and cycle parking. Provision of altered access onto Old Schools Lane.</i></p> <p>To compensate for the loss of playing fields at this location, the development is to construct a new sports pavilion and upgrade the remaining playing fields. This includes surface level uniformity and improved drainage which is intended to increase the quality and usage of the playing fields</p>	Despite the loss of some open space provision resulting from this planning permission, the enhanced quality of the provision on offer here is in line with the aim of the policy

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>space and recreational provision in accordance with the details set out in the Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document. This policy will apply to all new residential developments within the Borough where a quantitative or qualitative deficiency of open space or recreational provision exists, or where the development would lead to such a deficiency.</p> <p>Where it is impractical or inappropriate to provide the open space within the housing scheme, the Council will expect a financial contribution from the developer to allow an alternative means of provision or enhancement. The nature and extent of that contribution will be governed by the formulae set out in the SPD, the identification of needs in the Audit of Open Space, and other evidence as appropriate.</p>				
<b>DM6</b>	<p><b>Open Space Provision</b></p> <p>Development proposals should not result in the whole or partial loss of open space, outdoor recreation facilities or allotments unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accompanied by assessment that clearly demonstrates that the provision is surplus; or</li> <li>The proposal delivers replacement provision of equal or better quality within the locality; or</li> <li>The proposal is for new sports and or recreation provision, the needs for which clearly outweigh the loss.</li> </ul> <p>We will ensure all new provision for sports and play meets qualitative standards and optimises accessibility to all users.</p>	Net loss/ gain of public open space, outdoor recreation or allotment provision that is not 'surplus' to requirements.	No net annual loss	See above	
<b>DM7</b>	<p><b>Footpath, Cycle and Bridleway Network</b></p> <p>New development affecting existing or proposed footpath, cycle and bridleway networks will not be permitted if it results</p>	Number of planning permissions granted for development resulting in the loss	Zero applications approved	None	N/a

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	in the loss of, or has a harmful impact on, these networks.  Where new development provides an opportunity to improve existing and proposed networks and such improvements are practical and viable we will seek their delivery as part of the development. Alternatively we will seek financial contributions towards implementation of improvements through the appropriate mechanism.	of or harmful impact to footpath, cycle or bridleway networks.			
<b>CS5</b>	<b>The Built Environment</b>  The Council will protect and seek to enhance the Borough's heritage assets including historic buildings, conservation areas, archaeological remains, ancient monuments, parks and gardens of historic interest, and other areas of special character. The settings of these assets will be protected and enhanced High quality and inclusive design will be required for all developments. Development should: _ create attractive, functional and safe public and private environments; _ reinforce local distinctiveness and complement the attractive characteristics of the Borough; _ make efficient use of land and have regard to the need to develop land in a comprehensive way.	Number of listed buildings within the Borough on the national 'Buildings at Risk Register'  _ Number of "locally listed" buildings on the Council's local 'Buildings at Risk' register  _ Regular review of the quality of design in completed new development, in collaboration with other partners		There are no buildings on the 'At Risk' Register within the Borough.	A Design Quality SPD is scheduled to be commenced as soon as possible in 2018/19. This will provide supplementary guidance to the design policies in the Development Management DPD.
<b>DM8</b>	<b>Heritage Assets</b>  We will resist the loss of our Heritage Assets and every opportunity to conserve and enhance them should be taken by new development.  Development proposals that involve, or have an effect upon Heritage Assets must establish the individual significance of the Asset as part of the application or consent process. As part of the assessment process the significance of the Asset will be taken into account (namely whether it is a designated Heritage Asset* or a non-designated Heritage Asset) when determining	Number of development proposals that involve or have an effect upon Heritage Assets.  Number of planning applications for sites within Areas of High Archaeological importance where	No target identified  No target identified	There has been 46 Listed Building Applications received this reporting year. Of these, 35 were permitted and 4 were refused. Reasons for refusal include:  <i>The proposed replacement windows and front door due to their inappropriate design and detailing would have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the listed dwelling contrary to Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015.</i>  <i>Inadequate justification for the works and insensitive alteration to the Grade II* listed building, including the projecting south-eastern range, alteration of existing fenestration and staircase and removal of interior partitions would harm the significance of the designated heritage asset. The proposal is contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy</i>	This policy appears to be performing well, being used to assess applications for Listed Building works and in Conservation Areas. Where a refusal is made, policy DM8 is being quoted alongside the NPPF and is helping to create a strong policy grounds for refusal.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>whether the impact of any proposed development is acceptable.</p> <p>Within Areas of High Archaeological Potential, as identified on the Proposals Map, or outside of these areas on any major development site of 0.4ha or greater, applicants are required to undertake prior assessment of the possible archaeological significance of the site and the implications of their proposals, and may be required to submit, as a minimum, a desk-based assessment to accompany any application. Where desk-based assessment suggests the likelihood of archaeological remains, the Planning Authority will require the results of an archaeological evaluation in order to inform the determination of the application.</p> <p>We will from time to time review our Heritage Assets included on the Local Lists, with regard to the Historic Environment Record, in consultation with Surrey County Council.</p> <p>* Designated Heritage Assets comprise the following: Scheduled Ancient Monuments; Listed Buildings; Registered Parks and Gardens and Conservation Areas. Non-designated Heritage Assets identified by the Council are those buildings and structures identified as being of local importance and veteran trees.</p>	archaeological evaluation is required.		<p><i>CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies (2015).</i></p> <p><i>The utilitarian and generic design of the proposed security barriers would have a materially harmful impact on the setting of the nearby group of listed buildings contrary to Policy DM8 of the Development Management Document 2015 and Paragraphs 132 and 137 of the NPPF.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed fascia boards to the exposed open eaves would fundamentally alter the appearance of a key architectural feature of this Listed Building and thereby have a materially harmful impact on the character of the building and the Stamford Green Conservation Area. The proposal is thus contrary to Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets, Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DM8 of the Development Management Policies (2015).</i></p> <p>There has been 70 full or householder planning applications permitted within areas of high archaeological potential.</p>	
<b>DM9</b>	<p><b>Townscape Character and Local Distinctiveness</b></p> <p>We will use the Conservation Area Appraisals and Environmental Character Study to guide the assessment of development proposals.</p> <p>We will seek enhancement of the townscape through new development, particularly those areas with poorer environmental quality and where the character has been eroded or needs improving.</p>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	<p>There were 4 planning applications where DM9 was used in the refusal, where the decision was overturned. This equates to 44% of all overturned planning appeals for the year.</p> <p>Of all planning appeals that were upheld by the Planning Inspectorate, approximately 58% of those quoted DM9.</p>	<p>This policy is concerned with the approach to assessing applications rather than the delivery of specific development outcomes. However it is useful to monitor where it is being quoted in a refusal and the result of a subsequent appeal. This will help to determine the success, efficiency and appropriateness of the policy.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate included the following reasons for not upholding the Council's decisions(in relation to DM9): -found the development to have a 'neutral effect' on the character and appearance</p>



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Planning permission will be granted for proposals which make a positive contribution to the Borough's visual character and appearance. In assessing this we will consider all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compatibility with local character and the relationship to the existing townscape and wider landscape;</li> <li>• the surrounding historic and natural environment;</li> <li>• the setting of the proposal site and its connection to its surroundings; and</li> <li>• the inclusion of locally distinctive features and use of appropriate materials</li> </ul>				<p>-no harm to character and appearance of area</p> <p>These decisions are based on opinion rather than a policy deficiency, and although it is interesting to consider when these policies are being used, an overturned appeal including this policy does not necessarily indicate that the policy is not functioning correctly.</p>
<b>DM10</b>	<p><b>Design Requirements for New Developments (including House Extensions)</b></p> <p>Development proposals will be required to incorporate principles of good design. The most essential elements identified as contributing to the character and local distinctiveness of a street or area which should be respected, maintained or enhanced include, but are not limited, to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) prevailing development typology, including housing types and sizes;</li> <li>(ii) prevailing density of the surrounding area;</li> <li>(iii) scale, layout, height, form (including roof forms), massing;</li> <li>(iv) plot width and format which includes spaces between buildings;</li> <li>(v) building line; and</li> <li>(vi) typical details and key features such as roof forms, window format, building materials and design detailing of elevations, existence of grass verges etc.</li> </ul>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	<p>There were 5 planning applications where DM10 was used in the refusal, where the decision was overturned. This equates to 56% of all overturned planning appeals for the year. The Planning Inspectorate stated the following reasons for not upholding them (in relation to DM10):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- some architectural merit and not detract from the appearance of the building</li> <li>- no conflict with DM10 in relation to privacy outlook, sunlight, daylight, noise and disturbance</li> </ul>	<p>The Council expects a high quality of design in planning applications. Policies DM9 and 10 are frequently used policies. Design policies are generally the most subjective of the policies. Decisions often come down to a finely balanced opinion and these appeals are examples of those.</p> <p>This policy is concerned with the approach to assessing applications rather than the delivery of specific development outcomes. However it is useful to monitor where it is being quoted in a refusal and the result of a subsequent appeal.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Development proposals should also:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(vii) be adaptable and sustainability designed, subject to aesthetic considerations;</li> <li>(viii) incorporate the principles of safe design to reduce the risk and fear of crime, e.g. natural surveillance, appropriate levels of lighting;</li> <li>(ix) have regard to the amenities of occupants and neighbours, including in terms of privacy, outlook, sunlight/daylight, and noise and disturbance;</li> <li>(x) ensure that the development incorporates an appropriate layout and access arrangements for servicing the completed development from adjoining highway and pedestrian networks;</li> <li>(xi) where appropriate their design and layout must not prejudice the development potential for similar proposals on neighbouring plots;</li> <li>(xii) have regard to the public realm and to ways in which it can be enhanced as an integral part of the design of the development; and</li> <li>(xiii) avoid locating structures, including, e.g. telecommunications equipment and building plant where they will be visually intrusive and likely to result in an adverse effect on the character and visual amenities of the local and wider area.</li> </ul> <p>Further detailed guidance relating to residential developments, including householder developments, is included in our Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document<sup>1</sup>.</p>				

<sup>1</sup> It is anticipated that the Design Quality Supplementary Planning Document will be published for initial consultation in 2018/19.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
<b>DM11</b>	<p><b>Housing Density</b></p> <p>We will, in principle, support proposals for new housing that make the most efficient use of development sites located within the Borough's existing urban area.</p> <p>Proposals for new housing must demonstrate how the density of development would contribute towards maintaining and enhancing the visual character and appearance of the wider townscape and lead to no net loss of biodiversity.</p> <p>The density of new housing developments will in most cases not exceed 40 dwellings per hectare. We will consider exceptions to this approach where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development site has been identified in the Site Allocations Policies Document as being appropriate for a higher density; or</li> <li>• It can be demonstrated that the site enjoys good access to services, facilities and amenities via existing public transport, walking and cycling networks; and</li> <li>• The surrounding townscape has sufficient capacity to accommodate developments of higher density.</li> </ul>	Average density of completed housing development	Density of new housing developments will not exceed 40 dwellings per hectare unless an exception has been agreed.	<p>Of all sites containing housing completions this year, 51% of them were developed at above 40 dph. This includes mixed use schemes. The overall average density of development is 30 dph. This is based on the total site sizes and the total number of units on site. It is therefore a gross figure and is slightly skewed by mixed use developments.</p> <p>In an appeal that was dismissed at Court Lodge, Court Lane, the Inspector exercised the flexibility built in to the policy to disagree with the Council on the higher density proposed on the site. Although this was contrary to our opinion, it shows that there is flexibility to allow higher density proposals but still be policy compliant.</p>	<p>Whilst carrying out the Local Plan Review, the relevance of this policy should be considered carefully. If we are seeking to make the best use of brownfield sites by encouraging higher densities in sustainable locations, this policy does not fully support that.</p> <p>Recommendation: Consider whether this policy complies with the Councils' upcoming approach to meeting our housing need. Some higher density figures should be calculated on proposed sites to demonstrate the types of development that would come out of higher density development. A minimum target may be appropriate if the adopted approach to housing delivery involves increased densities in urban areas.</p>
<b>DM12</b>	<p><b>Housing Standards</b></p> <p>All new housing developments, including conversions, are required to comply with external and internal space standards*.</p> <p>The Council will only grant planning permission for new dwellings that provide adequate internal space and appropriate external private and/or communal amenity space to meet the needs generated by the development. Development must comply with the</p>	% of new housing developments, including conversions complying with external and internal space standards.	All new housing (including conversions) to comply with external and internal space standards (set out in the forthcoming Design Quality SPD)	<p>From our records/ audit of Development Management reports there are no new housing developments that do not meet our space standards</p> <p>No Appeals were granted where DM12 was used as a reason to refuse. 2 appeals refused 2016/2017 up holding DM12 8% of all refused appeals in 2016/17</p>	The Design Quality SPD is currently in production.



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>space standards set out in the Council's Design Quality SPD.</p> <p>Amenity space for all new dwellings should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) private, usable, functional, safe and bio-diverse;</li> <li>(ii) easily accessible from living areas;</li> <li>(iii) orientated to take account of the need for sunlight and shading;</li> <li>(iv) of a sufficient size to meet the needs of the likely number of occupiers; and</li> <li>(v) provide for the needs of families with young children where the accommodation is likely to be occupied by such.</li> </ul> <p>* New housing development must comply with 1) Nationally Described Space Standard technical requirements; 2) Document G: Requirement G2 Water Efficiency; 3) Document: Requirement H6 Solid Waste Storage; 4) Document M: Part M Access to and Use of Buildings; and 5) Document Q: Security. The Council's Design Quality SPD will also contain external/ amenity space standards.</p>				
<b>DM13</b>	<p><b>Building Heights</b></p> <p>Buildings higher than 12m will be inappropriate in all areas of the Borough except the identified areas within the Epsom Town Centre Boundary (Refer to Proposals Map Plan E) where buildings up to a maximum height of 16m will be allowed in certain locations.</p> <p>Maximum heights are defined as the distance between ground level and the building's eaves/ gutter. Above the maximum heights, the roof of the building shall be no higher than 4 m and the slope of the roof shall be no greater than a 45° pitch.</p>	Number of planning permissions granted for higher buildings (above 12 metres) outside of the identified areas in the Town Centre	Zero applications approved above the maximum height policy	The Premier Inn at the redundant Comrades Club was approved at 15.2 metres at its highest point. This is site H allocated in Plan E as a development site, but not within a higher building zone.	The justification for a higher building in this location is based on an appeal that was previously allowed on the same site.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Proposals that incorporate roof mounted building plant rooms that exceed the maximum heights will not be permitted. Subject to viability and practical considerations we will seek the siting of plant rooms within the building itself.</p> <p>Building up to the maximum heights stated will not be appropriate in every location. In addition it may not be appropriate for the roofspace to be utilised as an additional storey. Proposals must respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The character and context of the surrounding locality, particularly in relation to existing building heights and roofscapes</li> <li>• The impact on the streetscene and views</li> <li>• The Conservation Area (where applicable)</li> <li>• Listed buildings and the setting of listed buildings</li> <li>• Topography</li> </ul>				
<b>DM14</b>	<p><b>Shopfront Design</b></p> <p>Applications for new or replacement shopfronts will be determined having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the architectural merit of the existing shopfront;</li> <li>(ii) the character of the area;</li> <li>(iii) the suitability of the overall form, scale and architectural detail in relation to the overall appearance of the building;</li> <li>(iv) the suitability of the materials in relation to the overall appearance of the building;</li> <li>(v) the suitability of the elements to which the display of advertisements are to be fixed in relation to their impact on the overall appearance of the building;</li> <li>(vi) the suitability of any advertisements with regard to lettering, colour, form of</li> </ul>			<p>There have been 7 shop front applications in 2016/2017. None of these applications were refused and all of the decisions were decided with reference to this policy.</p> <p>Examples of this policy being referenced in officer's reports include:</p> <p>“ The proposed remodelling of the shopfront would considerably enhance its present appearance and would achieve a more complementary visual relationship with the building frontage above. The proposal would therefore make a positive contribution to the character of the conservation area as a whole and there is therefore no objection in terms of Policies DM8 and DM14.”</p> <p>Another case where this policy was quoted and used to support the officers comments : “Although obscuring the window is a reversible intervention which causes no permanent harm, it nevertheless noticeably alters the appearance of the principle elevation. Fenestration is a defining feature and the windows of the building were intended to be visually permeable. The intention to obscure the window is historically inappropriate and it diminishes the aesthetic quality of the principal elevation, which is a key component of the designated</p>	<p>This policy is being fully considered and used regularly.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	illumination and materials in relation to the overall appearance of the building.  Proposals will take account of the Council's Shopfront Design Guide, particularly in relation to Listed Buildings and shopfronts within Conservation Areas.			heritage asset. <i>(the application has subsequently been amended to omit this element)</i> "	
<b>DM15</b>	<b>Policy DM 15 Advertisements and Hoardings</b>  Proposals for advertising hoardings and other advertisements must demonstrate that their design and siting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• does no demonstrable harm to the character of the surrounding townscape; and</li> <li>• has regard to the interests of amenity and public safety (including for disabled people) and highway safety.</li> </ul> When determining proposals for new advertising displays we will consider whether they would have an adverse effect upon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a Conservation Area and its wider setting;</li> <li>• Listed Buildings or Buildings of Townscape Merit;</li> <li>• predominantly residential areas.</li> </ul> Where necessary we will use our powers to remove any advertisement or hoarding erected without permission and where appropriate and practical, to challenge existing hoardings and advertisements that cause substantial injury to visual amenity and public safety, including for disabled people.	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	0	No relevant appeals allowed/made	n/a
<b>CS8</b>	New housing development will be located within the defined built up area of Epsom and Ewell and within the three hospital cluster sites of West Park, St Ebba's and the remaining part of Horton B. The built up area will be defined on	% of housing completed on previously developed land	To be identified in the Site Allocations document	Of the 308 completions this year, 252 of these units were completed on Previously Developed Land (PDL). This equates to 82%. The 56 units on greenfield land include Land at Reigate Road, the NESOT agricultural land and eight small garden land sites.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>the Proposals Map. The three hospital sites will be identified as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt. Within these areas the emphasis will be on the re-use of suitable previously developed land (including the re-use or conversion of existing buildings) for housing. Subject to other policies in this plan, planning consent will be given for development within the built up areas, including infilling, redevelopment and conversion.</p> <p>In principle the strategy will be to direct higher density development to central locations, such as Epsom town centre and other local centres, close to existing services and facilities and accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. This will enable relatively lower densities to be applied to other parts of the built up area to help retain their character and local distinctiveness. The Council will also encourage mixed use developments within the more accessible town or local centre locations. Further policies on densities will be set out in subsequent DPDs.</p>				
<b>DM16</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 16 Backland Development</b></p> <p>There will be a presumption against the loss of rear domestic gardens due to the need to maintain local character, amenity space, green infrastructure and biodiversity.</p> <p>In exceptional cases, modest redevelopment on backland sites may be considered acceptable, subject to proposals demonstrating that there will be no significant adverse impact upon the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Garden land – Rear garden land which contributes either individually or as part of a larger swathe of green infrastructure to the amenity of residents or provides wildlife habitats must be retained;</li> <li>2. Impact on neighbours – The privacy of existing homes and gardens must be maintained and unacceptable light spillage avoided;</li> </ol>	Number of backland sites approved for development.	Zero applications approved resulting in the loss of garden land	<p>Our records show that there were three applications granted that have resulted in the loss of garden land. There have been others that have resulted in gardens being subdivided.</p> <p>15/01870/FUL 16 Kirby Close, Ewell 16/00885/FUL 15A Hyperion Place, Epsom 15/01860/FUL 44 Dorking Road, Epsom</p>	<p>These three applications have all resulted in one additional property and included adequate parking and amenity space for the existing and proposed properties. They are considered to be policy compliant under the second part of the policy which sets out the 'exceptional cases';</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan may decide that the backland policy is no longer relevant in light of the overwhelming housing need. It may be appropriate to amend this policy to allow more flexibility for higher density backland development or remove the policy entirely.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>3. Vehicular access or car parking – These must not have an adverse impact on neighbours in terms of visual impact, noise or light. Access roads between dwellings and unnecessarily long access roads will not normally be acceptable;</p> <p>4. Mass and scale of development – Development on backland sites must be more intimate in scale and lower than frontage properties to avoid any overbearing impact on existing dwellings and associated gardens;</p> <p>5. Trees, shrubs and wildlife habitats – features important to character, appearance or wildlife must be retained or re-provided.</p>				
<b>DM17</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 17 Contaminated Land</b></p> <p>Where it is considered that land may be affected by contamination, planning permission will only be granted for development provided that the following criteria are satisfied:</p> <p>(i) all works, including investigation of the nature of any contamination, can be undertaken without escape of contaminants which could cause unacceptable risk to health or to the environment;</p> <p>(ii) it is demonstrated that the developed site will be suitable for the proposed use without risk from contaminants to people, buildings, services or the environment including the apparatus of statutory undertakers.</p>	Number of planning permissions granted on contaminated land where policy criteria is not met.	Zero applications approved where policy criteria is not met .	None.	N/A
<b>DM18</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 18 Communications Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Planning permission will be granted for the erection of telecommunications apparatus which satisfies the following criteria:</p> <p>(i) the apparatus uses an existing mast or building</p>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	None.	N/A

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>where practicable, without causing serious harm to the appearance of the site or building to which it relates;</p> <p>(ii) where an existing mast or building is not available, the apparatus would be screened as far as practicable by the existing landform and trees, or by landscaping and planting incorporated in the proposal;</p> <p>(iii) the apparatus would not cause harm to the visual amenity of listed buildings, conservation areas or other sensitive areas;</p> <p>(iv) the proposal incorporates appropriate materials or treatments for any associated buildings or supporting structures;</p> <p>(v) the potential for physical interference has been minimised in the siting and design of the apparatus.</p> <p>The use of planning conditions or legal agreements may be considered as appropriate to ensure that new masts will be removed at the operators' cost if they become redundant in the future.</p>				
<b>DM19</b>	<p><b>Policy DM19 Development &amp; Flood Risk</b></p> <p>In order to manage flood risk, we will take a sequential approach to the allocation of sites in a Site Allocations Policy Document and when determining planning applications.</p> <p>Development within Flood Risk Zones 2 &amp; 3 or on sites of 1ha or greater in Zone 1 and sites at medium or high risk from other sources of flooding as identified by the Borough Council's SFRA, will not be supported unless:</p> <p>(i) In fluvial flood risk areas, the sequential and exception tests have been applied and</p>	The Core Strategy contains an indicator 'Number of planning permissions granted contrary to EA advice of flood risk'	The Core Strategy target is for '100% of decisions to be made in accordance with EA advice.'	No applications permitted contrary to Environment Agency advice.	
		% of development incorporating Sustainable Drainage Systems.	100% of development to reduce volume and rate of	<p>This is a very difficult indicator to monitor.</p> <p>Policy DM19 has been used in refusals in the following ways:</p> <p>"Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that, in principle, an acceptable foul</p>	



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
CS6	<p>passed and it is a form of development compatible with the level of risk; and</p> <p>(ii) For all sources of risk, it can be demonstrated through a site FRA that the proposal would, where practicable, reduce risk both to and from the development or at least be risk neutral; and</p> <p>(iii) Where risks are identified through an FRA, flood resilient and resistant design and appropriate mitigation and adaptation can be implemented so that the level of risk is reduced to acceptable levels.</p> <p>We will expect development to reduce the volume and rate of surface water run-off through the incorporation of appropriately designed Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) at a level appropriate to the scale and type of development.</p> <p>Development which seeks to restore areas of functional floodplain will be encouraged, especially where this would provide opportunities for recreation, habitat restoration/ biodiversity enhancement and green infrastructure opportunities.</p>		surface water run-off	<p>and surface water drainage strategy can be achieved as part of the development, including the accommodation of existing public foul sewers crossing the site. The application is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy (2007), and Policy DM19 of the Development Management Policies (2015)."</p> <p>"The building falls within Flood Zone 3 and the application is not supported by a Flood Risk Assessment. The application is therefore contrary to Policy DM19 of the Development Management Policies Document 2015, and policy CS6 of the Core Strategy 2007"</p> <p>Some larger sites such as NESLOT, Comrades Club and West Park incorporate SUDS within their design/ layout and these are monitored by discharging that condition.</p>	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Proposals for development should result in a sustainable environment and reduce, or have a neutral impact upon, pollution and climate change. The Council will expect proposals to demonstrate how sustainable construction and design can be incorporated to improve the energy efficiency of development - both new build and conversion.</p> <p>In order to conserve natural resources, minimise waste and encourage recycling, the Council will ensure that new development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_ minimises the use of energy in the scheme by using an appropriate layout, building design and orientation;</li> <li>_ minimises the emission of pollutants, including noise, water and light pollution, into the wider environment;</li> <li>_ has no adverse effects on water quality, and helps reduce potential water consumption, for example by the use of water conservation and recycling measures and by minimising off-site water discharge by using methods such as sustainable urban drainage;</li> <li>_ avoids increasing the risk of, or from, flooding;</li> <li>_ minimises the energy requirements of construction, for example by using</li> </ul>				
<b>CS7</b>	<p>The Borough Council will seek to ensure sufficient housing is provided to meet the Borough's housing requirements in accordance with the submitted South East Plan. In applying Policy H1 of the South East Plan, provision will therefore be made for at least 2,715 homes within the period 2007-2022 (based on the annual average of 181 new dwellings per annum).</p> <p>Annual monitoring will be carried out to ensure that there is not a projected shortfall in housing provision against the strategic requirement for the period to 2026. This will allow the managed</p>	Number of net housing completions per annum	Set out in Policy CS7	<p>This year there has been 308 (net) housing completions</p> <p>A list of housing completions is included in Annex 1. An up- to- date Housing Trajectory and 5 year housing land supply statement are included in Annex 2 and 3 This was prepared in line with the production of the 2017 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.</p>	<p>During the reporting period we published our Strategic Housing market Assessment (SHMA), which identifies an objectively assessed housing needs figure (OAHN) for the Borough (418 units per annum). National planning policy states that in the absence of an up-to-date local plan, local planning authorities must monitor housing delivery against their OAHN figure. This is why we have substituted the housing target identified in our Core Strategy (Policy CS7) with the OAHN identified in our SHMA.</p> <p>The Core Strategy housing target has been met, but the OAHN figure has not.</p>



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	release of housebuilding land to provide the amount and type of homes required.				<p>The Core Strategy target is now out of date and we are currently working on reviewing our Local Plan, with a focus on housing delivery.</p> <p>The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs figure is 418 per annum and for the purposes of the AMR is the most recent housing needs figure available.</p> <p>We do not currently have a five year housing land supply. As of April 2017 we only have a 1.3 year identified housing land supply (see Appendix 3).</p> <p>This figure could increase further in light of the government consultation on a standard method of calculating an authorities housing need. This calculates Epsom &amp; Ewell's housing need as 579 new dwellings per annum. A revision is due to be made to the NPPF Autumn 2018 to reflect this.</p> <p>The Council is working on a review of the Local Plan that will encompass all of the housing policies and allocate new housing sites. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (June 2017) is an important evidence base document to feed into that process.</p>
DM21	<b>Policy DM 21 Meeting Local Housing Needs</b>  We will grant planning permission for specialised forms of residential accommodation subject to the following requirements being met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the application documentation includes clear and robust evidence that demonstrates that there is a need for the new accommodation; and</li> <li>• The delivery of the new accommodation does not result in an over-provision of that particular type of accommodation; and</li> <li>• The design of the proposal is demonstrated as being sufficiently flexible to readily accommodate conversion to other</li> </ul>	Number and type of units permitted for specialised forms of residential accommodation	No target identified.	15/00845/FUL Salesian College Sports Ground. 60 unit Extra Care facility (use /class C2)	
		Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	<p>One refusal cited DM21: 16/01637/FUL: Internal and external alterations to dwelling and change of use from C3 residential to a Sui Generis use as a House in Multiple Occupation Reason for refusal:</p> <p>The design and layout of the accommodation is not demonstrated as being sufficiently flexible to readily accommodate conversion to other appropriate uses, either residential or non-residential, in the event that the need for the permitted use declines and while clear and robust evidence has not been provided that there is a need for the new accommodation, the application would therefore be contrary to Policy DM21 of the Development Management Policies Document - 2015.</p> <p>No appeal has been lodged against this decision.</p>	This refusal shows successful use of this policy. It shows that although an applicant can demonstrate a need for the form of housing, the design of the proposal is an important consideration, and the future flexibility of the layout of accommodation.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	appropriate uses, either residential or non-residential, in the event that the need for the permitted use declines.				
<b>CS9</b>	<p>The Council has a target that overall, 35% of new dwellings should be affordable. This equates to the provision of 950 new affordable homes over the period 2007 to 2022.</p> <p>New housing developments should include a mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures which help meet identified local housing needs and contribute to the development of mixed and sustainable communities.</p> <p>Taking into account the viability of the development proposed and other planning objectives, the Council will negotiate to achieve the provision of affordable housing as set out below:</p> <p>Residential developments of between five and fourteen dwellings gross (or on sites between 0.15ha and 0.49ha - irrespective of the number of dwellings proposed) should include at least 20% of dwellings as affordable.</p> <p>Residential development of 15 or more dwellings gross (or on sites of 0.5ha or above) should include at least 40% of dwellings as affordable.</p> <p>The Council will seek to ensure that the affordable housing remains affordable to successive as well as initial occupiers through the use of planning conditions or a planning obligation.</p> <p>Advice on the detailed operation of this policy, the definition and nature of the local housing needs to be met, the tariff system to be used, and the mechanisms</p>	<p>Number of affordable housing units completed per annum (and as a % of total net completions)</p> <p>_ Number of social rented and intermediate affordable housing units per annum (and as a % of total affordable housing completions)</p>		<p>A table detailing the affordable housing completions for this year can be found in Annex 4</p>	<p>There were 57 'affordable' units completed this year. This equates to just 18.5% of all completions being affordable.</p> <p>The Borough Council continues to monitor affordable housing delivery on an annual basis through the Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report. During the five year period from April 2012 to March 2017, 33% of all new homes completed were classified as 'affordable homes'. This is marginally below the target of 35% but exceeds the Core Strategy notional annual target by 186 units (63 units per year).</p> <p>The OAHN target of 418 equates to an affordable housing target of 181 units per year.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	for delivery of the affordable housing, will be set out in the Developer Contributions SPD.				
<b>DM22</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 22 Housing Mix</b></p> <p>We will grant planning permission for new residential development proposals that incorporate a mix of dwelling sizes and tenures that meet identified local needs.</p> <p>In order to meet this objective we will require all residential development proposals for four or more units be comprised of a minimum of 25% three bedroom, or more, units. We will consider exceptions to this approach where it can be demonstrated that such a mix would be inappropriate to the location or endanger the viability of the proposal.</p> <p>On sites particularly suited to larger-sized family houses, we will encourage the proportion of units having 3 or more bedrooms, as specified above, to be exceeded.</p>	% of planning permissions granted for four units or more, for development comprising 25% three bedroom or larger units	Development proposals for four units or more to be comprised of a minimum of 25% three bedroom or larger units.	There were 10 permissions granted for 4 or more units this reporting year. Of these, 4 were PDCOU so out of the control of this policy. Of the 6 planning permissions, only 1 comprised of 25% three+ bedroom units. Another comprised 20%.	There are two main reasons why this policy is not delivering the larger units that the Borough needs. The first is the overall capacity of the site, smaller sites coming forward with genuinely less space and the viability of delivering these sites. The second is that market signals are clearly wanting to deliver smaller units and the Council has to make a judgement on this. The NPPF does state that market signals should be considered in determining planning applications.
<b>DM23</b>	<p><b>Policy DM23 Gypsy and Traveller Sites</b></p> <p>The Council will protect the existing authorised gypsy and traveller plots at the Cox Lane and Kiln Lane sites, and will identify provision to accommodate additional plots.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document will meet the needs of gypsies and travellers by identifying and allocating suitable provision.</p> <p>Proposals for new sites will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) have good access to local services including shops, schools, GPs and other health services;</li> <li>(ii) have good access to and from the public highway, bus</li> </ul>	Core Strategy Indicator: Number of pitches provided for permanent gypsy and traveller accommodation and pitches for travelling showpeople against the requirements identified in the Traveller Accommodation Assessment	Will be set out in the Site Allocations Document based on the Traveller Accommodation Assessment	No new pitches have been provided for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation in the Borough.	In June 2017 the Council published a Traveller Accommodation Assessment. This is within the next reporting year and will be used to inform the housing policies and site allocations in the Local Plan review.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>routes and other transport modes;</p> <p>(iii) demonstrate that they are compatible with any existing neighbouring residential uses;</p> <p>(iv) not involve the erection of unsightly, significant permanent structures;</p> <p>(v) not be located in areas of high flood risk;</p> <p>(vi) not be located on contaminated land; and result in no net loss of biodiversity.</p>				
CS11	<p>Losses of employment land will be resisted in the strategic employment areas of the Nonsuch and Longmead Industrial Estates and within Epsom town centre and Ewell village centre. Regeneration of employment premises and intensification of employment uses will be encouraged in these locations.</p> <p>A cautious approach will be adopted to losses of employment land elsewhere. The Site Allocations/ Development Control DPDs will set out detailed policies for the redevelopment of employment sites within strategic employment areas and elsewhere and will define sites where particular policies apply. The Council will support and facilitate new working methods that seek to increase productivity without significant increases in workforce and which limit the need to travel, such as home working.</p>	Core Strategy Indicator: Amount of employment floorspace gained and lost per use class (outside of the existing employment policy areas)	No target identified	<p>8 applications were determined in the AMR reporting year which involved the loss of employment floorspace. Of these, 5 were permitted development change of use applications (PDCOU), which fall outside the scope of local policy. Collectively these resulted in the loss of 2792sqm of office floorspace (B1) and, if implemented, will deliver 42 residential units (C3). The three other applications which were determined against local policies and permitted would result in a potential loss of 1467sqm of office floorspace (B1) and if implemented will deliver 17 residential units (C3). Apart from Ryebrook Studios (Woodcote Ward) all the applications were within Epsom Town Centre and Ewell Village Centre.</p> <p>There were no applications submitted / determined to deliver new B class employment floorspace</p>	Employment floorspace is still being lost as a result of PDCOU applications, although the Council has taken action to protect key employment sites through issuing Article 4 directions. The non PDCOU applications were all considered against the local Plan employment policies and were justified.
DM24	<p><b>Policy DM 24 Employment Uses Outside of Existing Employment Policy Areas</b></p> <p>Outside of the existing identified employment locations and Epsom Town Centre, proposals resulting in the loss of employment floorspace will not be granted planning permission unless it can be demonstrated that:</p>				

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>i. The existing use has a significant adverse effect on residential amenity and there is no reasonable prospect that this effect can be alleviated while retaining the use; or</p> <p>ii. There is genuine evidence, including that the site has been marketed without success*, that the site, as it stands, is no longer suitable for its existing or other employment uses.</p> <p>Where the loss of existing employment floorspace can be demonstrated, new mixed-use redevelopment will be allowed provided that the development provides for a mix of uses including a significant element of employment generating uses.</p> <p>*The Council will require that the site has been marketed for a minimum period of 18 months at an appropriate rate for its location and condition.</p>				
DM25	<p><b>Policy DM 25 Development of Employment Premises</b></p> <p>Planning permission for employment developments will be approved providing the following factors are met:</p> <p>a) the accommodation should be flexible &amp; suitable to meet future needs especially to provide for the requirements of local businesses and small employers;</p> <p>b) the scale, bulk and appearance of the proposal should be compatible with the character of its surroundings;</p> <p>c) the development must not significantly harm the amenities of nearby occupiers nor cause adverse environmental impact on the surrounding area;</p> <p>d) the scale of development should be compatible with the level of existing or potential public transport accessibility,</p>	AS ABOVE		There were no applications for the development of new employment premises during the AMR reporting period.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>and the on-street parking situation. Where additional infrastructure is required due to the scale of the development, such a development will be required to fund the necessary infrastructure to support it; and</p> <p>e) the development should comply with the Council's transport, access, servicing, car and cycle parking standards and policies.</p> <p>Epsom Town Centre is the most sustainable location for new office facilities and other higher density employment uses. However, other locations will be considered on their merits and having regard to the policies contained within the local plan.</p>				
<b>DM26</b>	<p><b>Policy DM26 Equestrian-Related Development in the Green Belt</b></p> <p>Where equestrian-related development constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt, applicants will be expected to justify any proposal with reference to very special circumstances which clearly outweigh harm to the Green Belt. Very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>Where proposals do not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, applicants will be expected to demonstrate that:</p> <p>(i) the development is requisite to the maintenance of a successful race-horse industry in the Borough; and</p> <p>(ii) in the first instance priority is given to the re-use of existing buildings for stabling, tack rooms, feed stores or any other ancillary use which requires a non-residential building; and</p> <p>(iii) where replacement buildings are justified, the replacement(s) are well</p>	<p>Applications for equestrian related development in the Green Belt</p> <p>Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision</p>	<p>No target</p> <p>None (0%)</p>	<p>16/00476/FUL Equus Equestrian Centre, Horton Country Park. Erection of a detached building to accommodate a horse walker and provide storage for agricultural related equipment. PERMITTED.</p> <p>One application has been refused using DM26 as one of the reasons cited for refusal. To date this decision has not been appealed. (16/00404/FUL Demolition of the existing stables and the erection of a detached 2 bedroom bungalow, revised access and landscaping. REFUSED)</p>	No planning appeals overturned.



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	related to existing buildings and are not materially larger than the building(s) to be replaced; and (iv) where new buildings or ancillary development are justified these are well related to existing buildings and are small in scale.				
<b>DM27</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 27 Working from Home</b></p> <p>Where planning permission is required it will be granted for a business to operate from a residential property which remains in residential use provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the proposal would not cause serious harm to the living conditions of adjoining properties by reason of the nature of the activity, and incorporates appropriate noise attenuation measures where late working or the operation of machinery is involved;</li> <li>(ii) the proposal would not involve alterations to the property (such as extensions and fire escapes) which would substantially alter its residential character, cause serious harm to the living conditions of adjacent occupiers, or cause serious harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area;</li> <li>(iii) the proposal would not be prejudicial to highway safety and efficiency by reason of deliveries or of car parking by staff, suppliers or customers;</li> <li>(iv) adequate access and parking can be provided without introduction of new vehicular movement into the rear curtilage.</li> </ul>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	No applications have been refused citing this policy.	
<b>CS14</b>	Measures to improve Epsom town centre, including new development, will be encouraged especially where they	Amount of retail floorspace gained/lost within	Amount and percentage of all completed	Within Epsom town centre there have been 4 applications for a change of use within the primary shopping area as defined in	Each of the retail change of use applications were considered against relevant policies and the decisions justified. The amount of retail

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>help it to adapt and reinforce its role in meeting the needs of the local community and acting as a focus for a range of activities (including retail, cultural, business, leisure and residential) and where they recognise and build on the distinctive character of the place.</p> <p>Development should contribute to the following key objectives for the town centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>_ Creating a diversity, richness and balance of uses which will contribute to a flourishing day-time and night-time economy, help satisfy community needs and enhance environmental quality and sustainability;</li> <li>_ Ensuring that physical and land use changes recognise and build on the distinctive character different parts of Epsom town centre already have, and contribute to conserving and developing a “sense of place”;</li> <li>_ Improving the pedestrian and cyclist environments by creating new links and developing a street network which is designed with their needs in mind, and which reduces the adverse impact roads and traffic have on the town;</li> <li>_ Ensuring the town has a clear spatial structure for future growth and change and that development can be used to protect and enhance that pattern;</li> <li>_ Developing a greater sense of safety and security for users, both during the day and at night, and improving the perception of the town as active, inclusive and safe.</li> </ul>	town centre, and percentage within defined primary or secondary shopping areas	residential, business and cultural/leisure development within the town centre	<p>Plan E. Of these, three were permitted and one refused. The applications were:</p> <p>16/00648/FUL: 1-3 South Street COU from A1 to D1 secondary retail frontage (permit)</p> <p>16/00263/FUL: 68 High Street COU A1 to A2 primary retail frontage (refused)</p> <p>16/00215/FUL: 93-95 High Street A1 to A1/A3 primary retail frontage (permit). An additional 27sqm of retail floorspace.</p> <p>16/01156/COU: 5 Waterloo Road COU from A1/taxi office to taxi office only (permit)</p> <p>Of the 308 residential units which were completed in the AMR reporting year, 121 (39%) were located within the Epsom Town Centre boundary.</p>	<p>floorspace has not significantly changed, (an additional 27sqm of A1/A3). At the time of determination the % of A1 uses along primary retail frontages remained above 66%. However, it is recommended that more regular shop front surveys be conducted to ensure decisions are based on up to date information.</p> <p>The high proportion of residential units delivered within the town centre is positive, reflecting greater densities and use of town centre sites.</p>
<b>DM28</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 28 Existing Retail Centres (Outside of Epsom Town Centre)</b></p> <p>We will protect existing retail centres by:</p> <p>a) retaining existing shopping frontages in the Shopping Centres (as identified in the Site Allocations Policies Document and on the Proposals Map) predominantly for retail use, so that they continue to provide locally accessible</p>	Amount of A1 floorspace gained/ lost in shopping centres and primary retail centres as a result of planning permission granted	<p>The overall percentage of A1 retail uses to remain above 50% of the total shopping units within a designated shopping centre.</p> <p>% of A1 units in identified</p>	<p>There have been 4 applications relating to retail uses in local centres. Two of these were for the same retail unit in the Kingston Road / Ruxley Lane centre and related to a change of use away from an A use class. Both were refused referencing policies CS15 and DM28. The two other applications were for units in Ewell Village and were permitted.</p> <p>Ewell Village 16/00408/FUL 64 High Street, Ewell, COU A2 to A1/A3. Permit 183sqm</p> <p>16/00164/COU 38 High Street, Ewell, COU A1 to Sui Generis (beauty Salon). Permit Loss of 130sqm, outside of primary retail frontage.</p>	A review of the ‘Local Centre Study’ is recommended for 2018/19 to update the % A1 uses at each centre. This should include the Town Centre, Ewell Village and Stoneleigh.



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
<b>CS14</b>	<p>goods and services and employment opportunities of a suitable scale for the size of the centre and or catchment area. Proposals for changes of use that threaten the predominance of A1 uses will be resisted; and</p> <p>b) supporting local shops and resisting their loss (particularly convenience shops) in Local Centres.</p> <p>Unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, development at ground floor level should not lead to an over proliferation of non-retail use, namely those comprising Class A2, A3, A4 or A5 uses. The overall percentage of A1 retail uses should not fall below 50% of the total shopping units within the shopping centre.</p> <p>Along identified Primary Retail Frontages, the percentage of A1 units will not fall below 66%. The Council will actively encourage a higher proportion of A1 uses along these frontages. Uses other than the A1, A2 and A3 uses, as identified by the Use Classes Order, will not be permitted in Primary Retail Frontages.</p> <p>In shopping centres non A use classes will not normally be permitted at ground floor level, although development for community uses and sui generis uses with a strong retail element will be permitted provided that such uses meet objectives a) and b) above.</p> <p>Where it is practical and viable we will encourage the introduction of pop-up shops and other appropriate temporary uses within retail centres in order to support their long-term vitality and viability.</p> <p>Where it has been demonstrated that environmental or amenity impacts prevent residential use, A2, B1 (a) and</p>		Primary Retail Frontages to not fall below 66%	<p>Kingston Road / Ruxley Lane Centre 16/00841/FUL 350 Kingston Road, COU from A1 (retail) to D1 (nursery). Refused under policies CS15 and DM28</p> <p>16/00216/FUL 350 Kingston Road, COU from A1 (retail) to D1 (educational tuition centre). Refused under DM28 and CS15</p>	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>other non-commercial uses may be acceptable at first floor level or above.</p> <p>Measures to improve Epsom town centre, including new development, will be encouraged especially where they help it to adapt and reinforce its role in meeting the needs of the local community and acting as a focus for a range of activities (including retail, cultural, business, leisure and residential) and where they recognise and build on the distinctive character of the place.</p> <p>Development should contribute to the following key objectives for the town centre:</p> <p>Creating a diversity, richness and balance of uses which will contribute to a flourishing day-time and night-time economy, help satisfy community needs and enhance environmental quality and sustainability;</p> <p>Ensuring that physical and land use changes recognise and build on the distinctive character different parts of Epsom town centre already have, and contribute to conserving and developing a “sense of place”;</p> <p>Improving the pedestrian and cyclist environments by creating new links and developing a street network which is designed with their needs in mind, and which reduces the adverse impact roads and traffic have on the town;</p> <p>Ensuring the town has a clear spatial structure for future growth and change and that development can be used to protect and enhance that pattern;</p> <p>Developing a greater sense of safety and security for users, both during the day and at night, and improving the perception of the town as active, inclusive and safe.</p>				
<b>DM29</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 29 Major New Retail Developments</b></p> <p>Further major retail developments and retail warehousing will only be permitted within Epsom Town Centre shopping area. Where it has been demonstrated</p>	Planning applications for new retail floorspace- granted and refused	No target identified	There were no applications for major retail developments during the AMR reporting year.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>that there are no suitable sites, preference will be given to a site on the edge of Epsom Town Centre Primary Shopping Area or within the Borough's other retail centres, and only then to local centres that are in locations accessible by a choice of means of transport.</p> <p>In sites outside the Epsom Town Centre shopping area, permission will only be granted provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) either in isolation or in combination with similar developments in the vicinity, the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality or viability of other shopping centres;</li> <li>(ii) a demonstrable need exists in terms of estimated growth in expenditure within the catchment area; and</li> <li>(iii) the impact on overall travel patterns and car use is to reduce the need to travel, to reduce reliance on the car and to facilitate multi-purpose trips.</li> </ul>				
<b>DM30</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 30 Existing Out of Centre Retail Facilities</b></p> <p>We will maintain and enhance the vitality and viability of Epsom's identified town and local centres. Proposals seeking to extend or improve the attractiveness of the retail offer at existing out of centre retail facilities will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The proposal satisfies the policy approach set out in national planning policy* including proposed changes to the type of goods sold or type of activity.</li> <li>b) Viability and vitality of Epsom's existing centres are not harmed. Where appropriate we will introduce planning conditions on</li> </ul>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	No relevant planning applications.	n/a

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>applications, to ensure that proposals do not have a significant impact on the vitality and viability of existing town and local centres. Such conditions may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Prevent the amalgamation of small units to create large out-of-centre units;</li> <li>ii. Limit internal development to specify the maximum amount of floorspace permitted;</li> <li>iii. Control the type of goods sold or type of activity.</li> <li>iv. Require the introduction of on-site car park management and charging regimes.</li> </ul>				
<b>DM31</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 31 Safeguarding Small-Scale Retail Provision</b></p> <p>We will support isolated shops and small groups of shops which serve local needs, and will seek to ensure that there is provision of essential daily goods within reasonable walking distance around the Borough.</p> <p>Changes of use away from retail will not be permitted unless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) The unit is within 400 metres of a designated frontage or</li> <li>(b) The retail use is inappropriate in terms of access or neighbourliness or</li> <li>(c) The proposed use would provide a community service or function.</li> </ul> <p>Before accepting the loss of any local shop unit, the Council will require satisfactory evidence of full and proper marketing normally for at least 2 years, and will need to be satisfied that reasonable endeavour has been made to find new occupants for a full range of appropriate uses. If the retention of the shop use is proven to not be possible then other compatible uses that are demonstrated as making a positive contribution to the local economy will be considered.</p>	No of planning permissions granted resulting in the loss of small- scale retail provision	No loss of small-scale retail provision	There were no applications involving isolated small scale retail provision during the AMR reporting year.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
<b>DM32</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 32 Parking and Servicing at Existing Retail Centres</b></p> <p>In order to maintain lively, vibrant and viable shopping centres we will continue to work with Surrey County Council and other partners to implement the Borough Parking Strategy.</p> <p>Proposals for new development within the identified shopping centres that generates vehicle trips will take full account of the Strategy.</p> <p>Parking associated with new retail proposals will adhere to the management and charging regimes set out within the Strategy.</p> <p>In order to ensure an appropriate level of provision and access, planning permission will not be granted for proposals which involve the loss of existing public car parking facilities and rear servicing roads in the Borough's shopping centres.</p>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	No relevant applications	
<b>DM33</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 33 Visitor Accommodation</b></p> <p>Proposals for new hotels should be located within identified town or local centres.</p> <p>Where a town centre location is not achievable, a proposal may be acceptable either within the built-up areas of the Borough or upon sites identified for mixed use development, where it can be demonstrated that no sequentially preferable site is available and suitable. Such sites will be within 300 metres of defined town centres and/ or locations with good access to railway network.</p> <p>Proposals for other smaller-scale tourist accommodation will be acceptable where the proposal:</p> <p>a. is on a site within the existing built-up area of the Borough or</p>	Number of applications approved for new hotels or visitor accommodation and their location	No target identified	<p>15/01839/FUL The Comrades Club The Parade Epsom Surrey KT18 5BT</p> <p>Demolition of existing Comrades Club facility and erection of new four-storey building comprising a 57-bed hotel (Use Class C1) with ancillary restaurant/bar and new Comrades Club facilities.(Amended drawings received 26.05.2016) Permitted 22/6/16</p>	This proposal is ideally located within the Town centre boundary

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>within a specific site allocation or sites identified in the Local Plan for mixed-use development; or</p> <p>b. provides accommodation of an appropriate nature and scale to meet the needs of an existing tourist facility or attraction; or</p> <p>c. is for the conversion or replacement of suitable existing buildings in the countryside and the proposal complies with other relevant policies</p> <p>Proposals for touring caravan or camp sites will be acceptable where:</p> <p>d. the site is adjacent to an existing settlement; or</p> <p>e. well-related and with good links to an existing settlement; and</p> <p>f. no adverse visual impact is caused on the surrounding landscape; and</p> <p>g. the site is, or can be served by adequate water and sewerage services; and</p> <p>safe physical access can be achieved.</p> <p>The occupation of new tourist accommodation will be restricted through the use of conditions or legal agreements to ensure tourist use and not permanent residential use.</p>				
<b>DM34</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 34 New Social Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Planning permission will be given for new or extensions to existing social infrastructure on the basis that:</p> <p>a) it meets an identified need;</p> <p>b) it is delivered, where practicable, in multi-use, flexible and adaptable buildings or co-located with other social infrastructure uses which encourage dual use and increase public access;</p> <p>c) it is in a location that is accessible by public</p>	<p>Core Strategy Indicator: Net change in the type and number of community, cultural and built sports facilities provided each year within the Borough.</p>	<p>No net loss of community facilities</p>	<p>Planning permission was granted 7/6/2016 at Salesian College Sports Ground, Old School Lane for the following:</p> <p><i>Demolition of existing buildings. Erection of a part 2 /part 3 storey building to be used as a 60 unit Extra Care facility (Use Class C2) with associated communal and ancillary facilities, including car and cycle parking and landscaping. Re-laying of sports pitches including an all weather surface, the erection of a two storey pavilion and provision of associated car and cycle parking. Provision of altered access onto Old Schools Lane.</i></p> <p>To compensate for the loss of playing fields at this location, the development is to construct a new sports pavilion and upgrade the remaining playing fields. This includes surface level uniformity and improved drainage which is intended to increase the quality and usage of the playing fields</p>	



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>transport, walking and cycling;</p> <p>d) it is of high quality design providing inclusive access for all;</p> <p>e) it does not have a significant adverse impact on residential character and amenity; and</p> <p>f) it makes an appropriate provision for on-site car parking, access to public transport, cycling and walking, and the effect on traffic movement and highway safety is in accordance with Policy CS16.</p> <p>We will resist the net loss of community facilities unless:</p> <p>h. the proposal is supported by clear and robust evidence that demonstrates that the facility is no longer needed;</p> <p>ii. where appropriate, it has been vacant and marketed for a community use without success for at least 18 months ; or</p> <p>it can be re-provided elsewhere or in a different way.</p>			<p>Other Social Infrastructure Applications:</p> <p>There were two other applications relating to social infrastructure:</p> <p>16/01338/COU 46 Salisbury Road COU from D1 (doctors surgery) to C3 (residential). Permit. Loss was justified on the basis that the doctors surgery serves only a small number of patients whom could easily be accommodated at other local practices.</p> <p>16/01041/FUL Sutton &amp; Epsom Rugby Club, Rugby Lane, Cheam. Part of sports pavilion to D1 (children's nursery). Permit. Gain of 144sqm</p>	
<b>DM35</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 35 Transport and New Development</b></p> <p>The impact of new development on the transport network will be assessed against other plan policies and transport standards.</p> <p>All planning applications for major developments should be accompanied by a Transport Assessment. Smaller developments should be accompanied by a Transport Statement where appropriate.</p>				As this policy is concerned with the approach to assessing applications rather than the delivery of specific development outcomes, no monitoring is proposed.
<b>DM36</b>	<b>DM 36 Sustainable Transport for New Development</b>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	<p>No appeals received.</p> <p>There are two refusals quoting this policy (at the same address):</p>	This policy is concerned with the approach to assessing applications rather than the delivery of specific development outcomes.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>In order to secure sustainable transport patterns and usage across the Borough we will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. require all major new development, including new homes, commercial and community uses to develop and implement a proportionate, robust and effective Travel Plan in accordance with Surrey County Council's adopted Travel Plan Good Practice Guide;</li> <li>b. prioritise the access needs of pedestrians and cyclists in the design of new developments, protect and enhance pedestrian and cycle access routes to, and where possible, through development sites, including the protection or enhancement of the strategic cycling and walking networks; and</li> <li>c. require new development to provide on-site facilities for cyclists as appropriate, including showers, lockers and secure, convenient cycle parking, in accordance with standards.</li> </ul>			<p>16/01724/FUL 16/01056/FUL</p> <p>4 Chase Road Epsom Conversion of property into 4 bedsits Refused. <i>The proposed development would have insufficient on-site car parking which would result in additional on-street parking pressures within the adjacent residential streets to the detriment of highway safety and convenience of other car drivers.</i> <i>There is also no provision made for cycle parking. The proposal would thus be contrary to Policy CS16 of Core Strategy 2007 and Policies DM36C and DM37 of the Development Management Policies 2015.</i></p>	
<b>DM37</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 37 Parking Standards</b></p> <p>Developments, redevelopments, conversions and extensions will have to demonstrate that the new scheme provides an appropriate level of off street parking to avoid an unacceptable impact on on-street parking conditions and local traffic conditions. Applicants will be required to demonstrate how their proposals will meet the objectives of the Epsom &amp; Ewell Borough Parking Strategy.</p> <p>Car parking standards and cycle parking standards are set out in Annexe 2 - Parking Standards for new development. These take into account bus and rail accessibility as well as local highway and traffic conditions including demand for on-street parking.</p>	% of residential and commercial developments (complete) that meet car parking and cycle standards	All new developments to meet car parking and cycle parking standards	<p>There have been 15 refusals quoting this policy. These are generally based around inadequate/ insufficient parking.</p>	<p>The monitoring procedures to determine whether every complete development has met parking standards is not in place. It is reasonable to assume that as we are refusing applications on the grounds of inadequate parking, the applications that are being approved are most likely to meet at least minimum standards.</p>



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	New development proposals will meet these standards. We will consider exceptions to this approach if an applicant can robustly demonstrate that the level of on-site parking associated with their proposal would have no harmful impact on the surrounding area in terms of street scene or the availability of on-street parking.				
<b>DM38</b>	<p><b>Policy DM 38 Rear Servicing</b></p> <p>The Council will work with its partners to reduce traffic congestion caused by obstructions on the highway, specifically by illegally parked cars and delivery vehicles.</p> <p>Rear servicing of premises in shopping and office areas will be sought. Where rear servicing is demonstrated as not being possible, practical or viable we will secure alternative solutions that ensure that delivery and servicing vehicles do not cause an obstruction to the surrounding highway network.</p>	Percentage of planning appeals allowed overturning Council's decision	None (0%)	No applications refused on these grounds	This policy is concerned with the approach to assessing applications rather than the delivery of specific development outcomes.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
------------------	--------	-----------	--------	-----------------------	---------------------------

Plan E Implementation Table

Policy number	Policy	Indicators	Targets or specific actions (where applicable)	2016/17 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
E1 Town Centre boundary	<p>The Town Centre boundary identifies the area to which the Plan E policies and Core Strategy policy CS14 principally apply.</p> <p>In principle, Town Centre uses will be permitted within this area, subject to other relevant policies. These uses will include retail, employment, higher density housing and community facilities. Mixed use proposals are encouraged, although single use schemes will be permitted where it can be demonstrated they will make a positive contribution and will not harm the vitality and viability of the town centre.</p>	Town Centre Health Check (This will provide a comprehensive overview as to how the town centre is performing, drawing on many sources of information)	Health check to be carried out every 5 years. Base date 2009	<p>A Retail Study Update was prepared by GCA Grimley on behalf on the Borough Council and published in August 2015. This can be viewed on our Website:</p> <p><a href="#">Retail Study Update</a></p> <p>The study concludes that overall, Epsom continues to perform well and that the approach to the Town Centre outlined in Plan E should continue.</p>	The Retail Study should be updated on a regular basis as stated in Plan E.
E2 Housing capacity	<p>New development will deliver between 635 and 775 new residential units within the Town Centre during the period between 2010 and 2026.</p> <p>The key opportunity sites, as defined on the Proposals Map, will deliver a significant proportion of this as follows:</p> <p>Upper High Street and Depot Road site: Approx 130 units Gas Holders site, East Street: Approx 250 units Epsom Station site: Approx 100 units</p> <p>The remainder of the target will be delivered by the other opportunity sites identified by Plan E and existing housing commitments.</p>	<p>Net additional housing units delivered within the town centre and number of affordable (<i>Core Output Indicators H2(b) and H5</i>)</p> <p>The Density of dwellings delivered (to monitor the most efficient use of PDL).</p> <p>Number of housing units delivered on key opportunity sites</p> <p>Sources of supply - EG upper floors/ conversion/ new development</p>	<p>To be on track to meet target by 2026 and inline with Core strategy affordable housing policy CS9</p> <p>Figures to be in line with those identified E14, E15 and E16</p>	In 2016/17 there were 175 completions with Town Ward. This includes completions at The Lintons Centre redevelopment.	Many of the Town Centre opportunity sites are yet to come forward for redevelopment, however part of the Depot Road and Upper High Street site has recently received permission for a mix of retail and housing. The station opportunity site was redeveloped a few years ago.
E3 Retail capacity	Epsom will maintain its position in the shopping hierarchy as a secondary	Rank in the retail hierarchy (Experian	Maintain Epsom's relative position	There have been no significant retail floorspace additions for the 2016/17 reporting year.	The Depot Road and Upper High Street site has been allocated to deliver 2,000 sqm of retail floor space.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>regional centre. Its retail offer will reflect that of a quality market town. The amount of retail growth in the town centre will be guided by the following:</p> <p>Convenience goods: there is capacity for an additional 2,466 sq m by 2026. This is broken down into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1,448 sq m by 2013</li> <li>1,767 sq m by 2018 and</li> <li>2,466 sq m by 2026.</li> </ul> <p>Comparison goods: there is capacity for an additional 7,730 sq m by 2026. This is broken down into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1,676 sq m by 2018 and</li> <li>7,730 sq m by 2026.</li> </ul> <p>Prior to 2013 there is no capacity identified for additional comparison floorspace. It should be noted that projections beyond 2018 should be treated with caution.</p>	<p>data, national rankings)</p> <p>Amount of completed retail floorspace (<i>Core Output Indicator BD4</i>)</p> <p>Other indicators within the Town Centre Health Check, for example turn over and vacancy rates of retail units</p>	<p>in the retail hierarchy in relation to other London Fringe Centres</p> <p>To be inline with quantities set out in policy E3</p>	<p>A recent (2018) publication by Experian has ranked Epsom 4<sup>th</sup> in a list of the UK's multi-channel shopping hotspots (following Guildford, Tunbridge Wells and Horsham). <a href="http://www.experian.co.uk/marketing-services/news-retailscape-uk-retail-centres-best-placed-to-thrive.html">http://www.experian.co.uk/marketing-services/news-retailscape-uk-retail-centres-best-placed-to-thrive.html</a></p> <p>This means that shoppers within Epsom's catchment are embracing retailers' multi-channel shopping offers.</p> <p>The Town Centre Retail Health check (2015) identified that the vacancy rate in Epsom has remained consistently low and that there "is currently no significant clustering of vacant units within Epsom Town Centre".</p>	<p>The Experian retail hierarchy data needs to be purchased. However, data which is freely available from Experian seems to indicate that Epsom town centre is performing well.</p> <p>A low vacancy rate for retail units in the town centre is also positive.</p>
E4 Town Centre retail area / primary & secondary frontage	<p>Town Centre Retail Area</p> <p>This area, as defined on the Proposals Map, will serve as the Town Centre's core shopping area. The area incorporates the Primary and Secondary Retail Frontages. Retail uses will form the dominant use within this area. The Council will actively encourage new retail to locate within this area.</p> <p>Primary Retail Frontages</p> <p>Within these frontages, as defined on the Proposals Map, the percentage of A1 uses will not fall below 66%<sup>2</sup>. The Council will actively encourage a higher proportion of A1 uses within these frontages. Uses other than the A1, A2 or A3 uses, as identified by Use Classes Order, will not be permitted.</p> <p>Secondary Retail Frontages</p>	<p>Location of completed retail floorspace</p> <p>Changes of Use in Primary and Secondary retail frontages</p> <p>Applications within the town centre retail area that seek to change the use of A1 to A2, A3, A4, A5 use classes and their impact on retail frontage designation</p> <p>Other indicators within the Town Centre Health Check</p>	<p>Provision to be located in accordance with a sequential approach</p> <p>Primary retail frontages – number of A1 units to remain above 66%</p> <p>No additional A5 uses within primary or secondary frontages</p>	<p>There have been 4 applications for a change of use within the primary shopping area as defined in Plan E. Of these, three were permitted and one refused, with all making reference to policy E4. These applications were:</p> <p>16/00648/FUL: 1-3 South Street COU from A1 to D1 secondary retail frontage (permit)</p> <p>16/00263/FUL: 68 High Street COU A1 to A2 primary retail frontage (refused)</p> <p>16/00215/FUL: 93-95 High Street A1 to A1/A3 primary retail frontage (permit)</p> <p>16/01156/COU: 5 Waterloo Road COU from A1/taxi office to taxi office only (permit)</p>	<p>The most recent Retail Frontage survey was carried out in 2015. It is recommended that, resources allowing, such surveys be conducted on an annual basis to ensure accurate information is available to inform decision making by the DM team. This would contribute to the continued success of the implementation of policy E4.</p>

<sup>2</sup> This is a common approach for maintaining concentrations of A1 retail uses within defined primary retail frontages, on the basis that 66% is the minimum threshold required to maintain the viability of these frontages.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Within these frontages, as defined on the Proposals Map, new A1 A2 and A3 uses will be permitted. A5 uses will not be permitted.</p> <p>Other uses will be permitted provided they demonstrate that they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will not harm the predominantly retail character and appearance of the frontage</li> <li>Contribute to the vitality and viability of that part of the Town Centre</li> <li>Will not result in an over concentration of such uses, so as to create a significant break in the retail frontage</li> <li>Will not result in an increase in anti-social behaviour</li> <li>Are compatible with the neighbouring uses.</li> </ul> <p>This policy does not affect the continued operation of existing non-retail uses already present within the town centre retail area.</p>				
E5 Employment floorspace provision	<p>Policy E5</p> <p>New development will deliver between 6,000 – 7,000 sq m of new employment floorspace within the Town Centre during the period until 2026.</p> <p>Within the Town Centre boundary, as defined on the Proposal Map, the loss of existing employment floorspace will be resisted.</p> <p>Proposals that seek to redevelop aging upper floor office floorspace for retail, other commercial A class uses or non-commercial uses will be considered providing the following are demonstrated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That there is a sufficient supply of high density employment floorspace within the Town Centre to meet the needs generated by future population growth</li> <li>That the proposal site is no longer fit for purpose as Town Centre office stock</li> </ul>	<p>Amount of employment floorspace (B1, B2, B8 uses) lost and gained (<i>Core Output Indicator BD1</i>)</p> <p>Location of losses and gains of employment floorspace</p> <p>Other indicators within the Town Centre Health Check</p>	<p>No net loss in employment floorspace</p> <p>An overall increase in the town centre of up to 6,000-7,000 sq m</p>	<p>There have been 5 applications involving employment floorspace within the town centre boundary. All but one of these involve the loss of B1 (office) floorspace to C3 use (residential), with 3 being permitted development prior approval applications. (i.e. beyond the influence of most local policies). Application details are below:</p> <p>15/01913/PDCOU: 10 West Street COU B1 on ground and 1<sup>st</sup> floor to C3 (4 units)</p> <p>16/00501/PDCOU: Rosebery Lodge 61 South Street COU B1 to C3 (9 units)</p> <p>16/00504/PDCOU: 85 East Street COU B1 to C3 (16 units)</p> <p>16/00688/FUL: 84-90 East Street COU D1 to B1</p> <p>16/00215/FUL: 93-95 High Street COU of part 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> from B1 to C3 2 units)</p> <p>There have been no applications for additions of employment floorspace.</p>	<p>The general trend is for employment floorspace to be redeveloped for higher density residential use. The PDCOU applications (permitted development) are beyond the influence of most local policies. However for non PD applications, policy E5 will help to ensure losses are appropriately managed.</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the existing office use has been subject to an active marketing exercise lasting at least twelve months, prior to alternative uses being considered.</li> </ul>				
E6 Leisure, cultural & community facilities provision	<p>The overall level of leisure provision within the Town Centre will be maintained and in specific locations enhanced.</p> <p>Leisure and cultural facilities, and other family friendly uses that contribute to the evening economy will be supported.</p> <p>Suitable locations for such uses include South Street and Derby / Oaks Square.</p>	<p>Losses, gains and co-location of private and public leisure, cultural and community facilities provision</p> <p>Other indicators within the Town Centre Health Check</p>	No net loss in provision. Increase in provision desirable particularly in South Street and Derby / Oaks Square	An application (15/01851/FUL) was approved in July 2016 for a number of public realm improvements to Derby Square, which has been rebranded 'Epsom Square'. Now implemented, these improvements have had a positive impact on the square, adding interest and helping to increase its usage.	
E7 Building heights	<p>The areas where there are opportunities for higher buildings, up to a maximum height of 16 metres<sup>3</sup>, are defined on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>Elsewhere within the Town Centre Boundary, buildings will be a maximum of 12 metres<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>The above maximum heights are defined as the distance between ground level and the buildings eaves/ gutter.</p> <p>Above the maximum heights, the roof of the building will be no higher than 4 m and the slope of the roof will be no greater than a 45° pitch.</p> <p>Building up to the maximum heights stated may not be appropriate in every location. In addition it may not be appropriate for the roofspace to be utilised as an additional storey. Proposals must respect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The character and context of the surrounding locality, particularly in relation to</li> </ul>	Height and location of new buildings in the Town Centre	To be within the maximum height standards set out in Policy E7	The approved redevelopment of the Comrades Club (15/01839/FUL) for a 57 bed hotel (C1) ancillary restaurant/bar and new Comrades Club facilities is to be 15.2 metres at its highest point. This is site H allocated in Plan E as a development site, but not within a higher building zone.	The justification for a higher building in this location is based on an appeal that was previously allowed on the same site.

<sup>3</sup> The broad equivalent of a commercial scale four storey building

<sup>4</sup> The broad equivalent of a commercial scale three storey building



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>existing building heights and roofscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on the streetscene and views</li> <li>The Conservation Area (where appropriate)</li> <li>Listed buildings and the setting of listed buildings</li> <li>Topography</li> </ul>				
E8 Energy generation	<p>Future development proposals within the Town Centre will fully assess the potential to incorporate decentralised or renewable energy generating sources and where feasible, these sources will be provided as part of new developments.</p> <p>New decentralised and renewable energy sources will be designed to have the capability to contribute to a wider local energy network and/ or the National grid.</p> <p>Where community Combined Heat and Power (CHP) schemes are demonstrated as not being viable, new developments will be designed and built with the capability to connect into such a network at a future date.</p>	<p>Production of a Climate Change Plan</p> <p>Town Centre developments built incorporating CHP or low carbon energy generation, or with the capability to connect to such a network at a future date</p>	<p>Production of Climate Change Plan by 2012</p> <p>No current target for individual sites (to be identified through Delivery DPD). Requirements for CHP on the three strategic opportunity sites</p>	<p>The approved redevelopment of the Comrades Club (15/01839/FUL) for a 57 bed hotel (C1) ancillary restaurant/bar and new Comrades Club facilities will include air source heat pumps to provide at least 10% of the energy requirements from renewable sources on site.</p>	
E9 Public realm	<p>The Council will work with partners to ensure a high quality, well designed and well connected public realm, to improve the character, appearance and overall attractiveness of the Town Centre.</p> <p>Proposals for new development will, where appropriate deliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rationalisation of existing street furniture and paving</li> <li>Biodiversity enhancement, particularly through planting and the creation of green corridors</li> <li>Public art at prominent locations throughout the Town Centre and through the design of new buildings</li> </ul>	<p>Rationalisation of signage and street furniture</p> <p>The introduction of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An agreed uniform palette of street furniture/ materials</li> <li>A shop front / signage strategy</li> </ol> <p>Biodiversity enhancements and increases in greenery in the Town Centre (for example,</p>	<p>Audit and rationalisation of signage and street furniture by 2012</p> <p>Identification of palette of material and production of strategy by 2012</p> <p>Service level agreement between Surrey County Council and EEBC to adhere to</p>	<p>Working in partnership with Surrey County Council funding of £2.7m has been awarded from the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to implement a package of 'Plan E' improvements. Funding has also been provided from EEBC via the Community Infrastructure Levy. The improvements scheme will involve changing the road layout in South Street to help reduce congestion and implementing a number of improvements to the town centre's appearance. The improvements aim to reduce congestion and promote economic growth by making it easier for shoppers to negotiate the town centre and provide an attractive business environment, encouraging investment and supporting the creation of jobs. Works commenced in early 2017 and are due to be completed in late 2018.</p> <p>Further funding will be required to extend the programme of works further along the High Street (north) to the quadrant junction.</p> <p>An application (15/01851/FUL) was approved in July 2016 for a number of public realm improvements to Derby Square, which has been rebranded 'Epsom Square'. Now implemented, these improvements have had a positive impact on the square, adding interest and helping to increase its usage.</p>	<p>The commencement of the Plan E improvements scheme has demonstrated the benefits of partnership working and having a comprehensive plan to direct and manage future change in the Town Centre. Plan E has been the catalyst for helping to identify and successfully attract funding to deliver such improvements</p>

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to the visual attractiveness and use of public open space,</li> <li>Improvements to the visual appearance of buildings in the town centre, particularly those within the Conservation Area in line with the Conservation Area Appraisal &amp; Management Plan.</li> </ul> <p>The Council has produced a schedule of public realm improvements for the Town Centre as part of Plan E's Infrastructure Delivery Plan. New development proposals within the Town Centre boundary will make a financial contribution to these public realm improvements.</p>	<p>additional tree planting, shrubbery, green roofs, green corridors, green walls, open space)</p> <p>Number of new public art initiatives (in particular those involving and engaging partners IE UCA, youth groups and local artists)</p> <p>Developer contributions towards public art</p> <p>Other indicators within the Town Centre Health Check for example shopper/retailer satisfaction levels, potentially linking in with commercial satisfaction surveys</p>	<p>comply with the strategy</p> <p>Create green links through the town centre</p> <p>Increased public art in the town centre.</p> <p>Each town centre development to make a contribution towards public art</p>		
E10 Cycle & public transport improvements	<p>The Council will work with partners to improve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cycle access both into and throughout the town centre, and</li> <li>The availability of cycle parking facilities across the town centre</li> <li>Accessibility to public transport, particularly through improvements to Epsom Station and its links with the surrounding areas</li> <li>Developers will contribute towards the delivery of the above policy, where appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>Additional improvements to current dedicated cycle routes across the Town Centre</p> <p>Level of cycle parking provision in the town centre</p> <p>Regeneration of Epsom Station</p>	<p>Provide a contra-flow lane through Station Approach and shared cycle path and footway along East Street</p> <p>An increase in provision overall in the town centre by 20%<sup>5</sup></p> <p>Redevelopment of Epsom Station by 2016</p>	Epsom Station has been redeveloped.	

<sup>5</sup> E10: In the Surrey LTP 2 a target is to increase the average number of cycle trips by 20% between 2004 and 2010. It is reasonable to assume that this increase could translate into an increase in cycle parking provision.



Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
E11 Deliveries to premises	<p>The Council will work with its partners to reduce Town Centre traffic congestion due to obstructions on the highways, such as illegally parked cars and delivery vehicles.</p> <p>New developments will provide new rear servicing access arrangements to ensure that delivery vehicles visiting the site do not cause an obstruction to the Town Centre highway network.</p>	<p>Traffic flows in key locations across the town centre (effectiveness of the SCOOT system)</p> <p>Traffic parking enforcement (frequency of patrols and / or use of cameras). This indicator should be considered alongside the levels of illegal parking</p> <p>Levels of illegal parking (amount of parking fines). This indicator should be considered alongside traffic parking enforcement</p> <p>Traffic orders in relation to servicing</p>	<p>Reduction in average journey times</p> <p>Increase levels of traffic parking enforcement by 2016</p> <p>Reduced levels of illegal parking in the Town Centre</p> <p>Review traffic orders in relation to servicing arrangements</p>	The Plan E improvements scheme will facilitate the servicing of the shop units along South Street through the introduction of servicing bays.	
E12 Parking strategy	<p>The Council will work with Surrey County Council and other partners to prepare a parking strategy for the Town Centre.</p> <p>New development that generates vehicle trips will take full account of this strategy once produced. New Town Centre parking provision will adhere to the management and charging regimes set out within this strategy.</p>	Development and implementation of parking strategy (management and charging regimes)	Commence work on a parking strategy by 2010	A Borough wide Parking Strategy was produced in June 2012. The Parking Standards for Residential Development SPD was adopted in the December 2015, the previous AMR reporting year.	Target complete.
E13 Changes to the road network	<p>The Borough Council will work closely with Surrey County Council and other partners to investigate alterations to the highways network to help reduce the impact of traffic passing through the Town Centre. This will involve detailed testing of returning two- way traffic to South Street.</p> <p>In the interim, development proposals that would prejudice the return of</p>	<p>Modelling of traffic schemes</p> <p>If identified as feasible, implementation of traffic scheme (South Street two-way)</p>	<p>Detailed modelling of returning South Street to two-way</p> <p>Implementation of traffic scheme</p>	Following detailed testing of returning two way traffic to South Street and package of highways and environmental improvements have been identified known as the Plan E Improvements Scheme. Working in partnership with Surrey County Council funding of £2.7m has been awarded from the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) to implement the scheme. Funding has also been provided from EEBC via the Community Infrastructure Levy. The improvements scheme will involve changing the road layout in South Street to help reduce congestion and implementing a number of improvements to the town centre's appearance. The improvements aim to reduce congestion and promote economic growth by making it easier for shoppers to negotiate the town centre and provide an attractive business	The commencement of the Plan E improvements scheme has demonstrated the benefits of partnership working and having a comprehensive plan to direct and manage future change in the Town Centre. Plan E has been the catalyst for helping to identify and successfully attract funding to deliver such improvements

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	South Street to two way traffic will not be permitted.			environment, encouraging investment and supporting the creation of jobs. Works commenced in early 2017 and are due to be completed in late 2018. Further funding will be required to extend the programme of works further along the High Street (north) to the quadrant junction.	
E14 Depot Road / Upper High Street	<p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the Depot Road and Upper High Street strategic site, as defined on the Town Centre Proposals Map, will require delivery of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A total of 2,000 sqm of retail floorspace that will allow for a mix of small retail units and a small-medium sized foodstore;</li> <li>2. A minimum of 130 new dwellings, including at least 52 new affordable homes to meet local needs (see Core Strategy Policy CS 9);</li> <li>3. Replacement of the existing 28 homelessness prevention flats;</li> <li>4. A new medical centre that serves the wider Town Centre;</li> <li>5. A new place of worship;</li> <li>6. Relocation of the following existing on-site uses, CMB Motors, HSP holistic health centre and Work Action;</li> <li>7. At least 425 spaces of public long stay car parking provision that will serve the wider Town Centre and adhere to a unified Town Centre wide parking management strategy and charging regime;</li> <li>8. Rear service access arrangements for all new developments;</li> <li>9. Improvements to the pedestrian crossing arrangements at the Quadrant junction as approved by the Highway Authority;</li> <li>10. Traffic calming and management measures within the development site and locality as approved by the Highway Authority;</li> </ol>	<p>Preparation of a development brief (once produced, the Development Brief will be subject to an additional monitoring regime)</p> <p>Redevelopment of site: assessed against policy requirements</p>	<p>Development brief to be prepared for Depot Road / Upper High Street site</p> <p>Development to meet the criteria set out in policy E14</p>	No applications have been received for this site in the AMR 2016/17 reporting year.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	11. Integrated footpath and cycleway networks that provide connections to existing networks on Upper High Street and Church Street; 12. The retention of important existing trees, provision of additional tree planting and landscaping, involving the planting of native species; 13. Surface water flood risk mitigation measures that meet the requirements Council's Surface Water Management Plan and the Environment Agency; 14. An on-site decentralised heat and power generation source that has the capacity to serve the wider area and contribute to the National Grid.				
E15 Utilities Site, East Street	Proposals for the redevelopment of the Utilities site, to the north of East Street, as defined on the Town Centre Proposals Map, will require delivery of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A minimum of 5,000 sq m of employment floorspace</li> <li>2. A minimum of 250 dwellings, including at least 100 affordable homes to meet local needs (See Core Strategy Policy CS9);</li> <li>3. Approximately 0.24 ha of public open space within the development with the potential to be used as formal outdoor provision for the Rainbow Leisure Centre;</li> <li>4. The retention of community facilities and existing on-site formal open space provision for youth groups to be incorporated within the redevelopment of the Linton's Lane Centre site;</li> <li>5. New access arrangements onto the site from East Street and Hook Road as approved by the Highway Authority;</li> </ol>	Preparation of a development brief (once produced, the Development Brief will be subject to an additional monitoring regime)  Redevelopment of site	Development brief to be prepared for the Utilities site, East Street  Development to meet the criteria set out in policy E15	No applications have been received for this site in the AMR 2016/17 reporting year.	The Lintons Centre part of the site was granted permission for redevelopment in previous years, however there appears to have been limited interest from landowners in bringing forward the remainder of the site. The Council may need to be more proactive in facilitating the redevelopment of this centrally located opportunity site.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>6. Traffic calming and management measures within the development site and locality as approved by the Highway Authority;</p> <p>7. Integrated footpath and cycleway networks that provide connections to existing networks on East Street and Hook Road, with a shared route providing a link between Hook Road and Stones Road;</p> <p>8. The retention of important existing trees, provision of additional tree planting and landscaping, involving the planting of native species;</p> <p>9. Appropriate mitigation measures to counter any adverse on-site impacts caused by contamination from previous uses;</p> <p>10. Adequate mitigation measures to create noise and visual barrier between the residential components of the site and the adjoining railway line;</p> <p>11. Surface water flood risk mitigation measures that meet the requirements of the Council's Surface Water Management Plan and the Environment Agency;</p> <p>12. An on-site decentralised heat and power generation source that has the capacity to serve the wider area and contribute to the National Grid.</p>				
E16 Epsom station site	<p>Policy E16</p> <p>Proposals for the redevelopment of Epsom Station, as defined on the Town Centre Proposals Map, will require delivery of the following:</p> <p>1. An improved railway station principally comprised of a new entrance, ticketing office and concourse;</p>	Redevelopment of site	Development to meet the criteria set out in policy E16	Site has been fully redeveloped.	

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>2. A public transport interchange, facing the Station with access onto Station Approach. This will comprise a new bus stop and shelter, a taxi rank and a passenger dropping-off point;</p> <p>3. A minimum of 100 dwellings, including at least 40 affordable homes to meet local needs (see Core Strategy Policy CS9);</p> <p>4. A minimum of 1,500 sq m of commercial floorspace, with the potential to be developed for the following uses – office space, hotel accommodation or commercial healthcare uses;</p> <p>5. A maximum of 1,000 sq m of ground floor retail provision, which could include a café or restaurant;</p> <p>6. The retention of 27 off-street parking spaces for use by Station customers, that will adhere to a unified Town Centre wide parking management strategy and charging regime;</p> <p>7. The establishment of a residents car club, which will form a component of the wider on-site travel plan;</p> <p>8. A minimum of 250 secure cycle parking spaces located within the Station building and along the external concourse for use by customers;</p> <p>9. Traffic calming and management measures within the development site and locality as approved by the Highway Authority;</p> <p>10. Integrated footpath and cycleway networks that provide connections to existing networks on Station Approach and Waterloo Road;</p> <p>11. Improvements to existing pedestrian footpaths linking the Station and the Old Town,</p>				

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	<p>Market Place and Hook Road car park. These improvements will include enhanced signage, use of unified paving materials and lighting;</p> <p>12. Adequate mitigation measures to create a noise and vibration barrier between the residential components of the site and the adjoining railway line;</p> <p>13. The retention of important existing trees, provision of additional tree planting and landscaping, involving the planting of native species;</p> <p>14. An on-site decentralised combined heat and power generation source that will serve the mix of on-site uses and have the capacity to serve the wider area and contribute to the National Grid.</p>				
E17 Other opportunity sites	<p>Proposals for the redevelopment of the following areas, as defined on the Town Centre Proposals Map, to a mix of uses specified under each site as set out in the following sections, will be permitted.</p> <p>Provided that future development proposals demonstrate that their scale, massing, layout and design will positively enhance Epsom Town Centre's distinctive character and appearance, with particular regard to heritage conservation, the townscape and roofscape and biodiversity enhancement. Proposals will deliver enhancements to accessibility, including servicing arrangements, and to the public realm.</p> <p>a. Market Place, High Street b. Former Woolworth's Store, High Street c. Pickard House, Upper High Street d. Former Magistrates and County Court site, The Parade/ Ashley Road</p>	Development and / or enhancement of the opportunity sites	Development and / or enhancement of site inline with the criteria set out in policy E17	<p>a) Market Place Changes will be made to the market place as part of the Plan E improvement scheme. These are scheduled to take place in 2018.</p> <p>b) Former Woolworths Store, High Street No applications have been brought forward for this site. The unit is now occupied by Poundland.</p> <p>c) Pickard House, Upper High Street Site has been fully developed.</p> <p>d) Former Magistrates and County Court site, The Parade / Ashley Road Site has been fully developed</p> <p>e) Global House No applications have been brought forward for this site.</p> <p>f) TK Maxx Store, High Street No applications have been brought forward for this site.</p> <p>g) Emergency Service Uses, Church Street Pre-application advice has been sought in respect of the former police station. No other applications have been brought forward for the other parts of the site.</p> <p>h) Comrades Club, The Parade</p>	Progress has been made in bringing some of the allocated opportunity sites forward for redevelopment.

Policy Reference	Policy	Indicator	Target	2016/2017 Performance	Recommendations/ Analysis
	e. Global House, Ashley Avenue f. TK Maxx Store, High Street g. Emergency Service Uses, Church Street h. Comrades Club, The Parade i. Land to rear of The Albion Public House, South Street j. Town Hall Square and car park, rear of Town Hall  Developers will resolve any issues related to contaminated land, surface water flood risk and service utilities.			Site has received planning permission (15/01839/FUL) for a 57 bed hotel (C1) ancillary restaurant/bar and new Comrades Club facilities  i) Land to the rear of The Albion Public House, South Street No applications have been brought forward for this site.  j) Town Hall Square and car park, rear of Town Hall No applications have been brought forward for this site.	
Pedestrian movement		Implementation of specific improvement schemes (particularly ease of access and highways safety)	Improvements to the accessibility of key junctions	The Plan E improvements scheme will improve pedestrian movement within the Town Centre.	
Management and promotion of Epsom town centre		Appointment of town centre manager  Investigation into the establishment of a Town Centre BID		Work is underway to establish a Town Centre BID	



## Annex 1: Housing Completions

Application No	Address	Application Type	Units Proposed	Units Complete	Units Lost	Net Change	Status
<b>2016/17</b>							
<b>Quarter1</b>							
14/01194	68 Larkspur Way, West Ewell	FUL	1Hx3B	1Hx3B	0	1	small windfall
14/00868	West Hill Court, Court Lane, Epsom	FUL	2Fx1B (aff)	2Fx1B (aff)	0	2	small windfall
13/00656	33 High Street, Ewell	PDCOU	1Fx2B	1Fx2B	0	1	small windfall
12/00500	Kings Mill Cottage, Epsom	FUL	1Hx5B	1Hx5B	1	0	small windfall
13/01082	Nelson House, 1A Church Street, Epsom	PDCOU	3F	3F	0	3	small windfall
14/01213	Novellus Court, 61 South Street, Epsom	FUL	23F (under PD)	23F	0	23	Medium Windfall
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 82	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 81	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 80	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 68	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 67	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 45	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	Allocation
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot 5	Land at Reigate Road	OUT	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 1	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48 (Pri 11Hx3B, 17Hx4B, 1Hx5B) (Aff 4Fx2B, 6H x 2B, 9Hx3B)	1Hx4B	0	1	Large windfall

Annex 1: Housing Completions

14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 3	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx4B	0	1	Large windfall
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 40	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx4B	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 41	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx4B	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 42	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx4B	0	1	Allocation
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 2	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx4B	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 4	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx4B	0	1	Large windfall
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 1	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 69	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 70	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 71	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 72	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 73	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 74	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 75	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation

# Annex 1: Housing Completions

13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 76	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 77	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 78	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
13/00250 (NHBC) Plot 79	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Allocation
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 26	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx3B	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 27	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx3B	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 28	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx3B	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 29	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Hx3B	0	1	Large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot 6	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot 7	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot 8	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot 9	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC) Plot11	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	Large windfall
14/01255 (also 14/01796/RES ) (NHBC) Plot1	24 Ruxley Close, West Ewell	OUT	4 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	small windfall

Annex 1: Housing Completions

14/01255 (also 14/01796/RES ) (NHBC) Plot2	24 Ruxley Close, West Ewell	OUT	4 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	small windfall
14/01255 (also 14/01796/RES ) (NHBC) Plot3	24 Ruxley Close, West Ewell	OUT	4 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	small windfall
14/01255 (also 14/01796/RES ) (NHBC) Plot4	24 Ruxley Close, West Ewell	OUT	4 dwellings	1Hx3B	0	1	small windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 35	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 36	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 37	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC) Plot 38	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1Fx2B (affordable)	0	1	Large windfall
13/00804	The Water Tower, Longland Place, Epsom	FUL	1F x 3B	1F x 3B	0	1	small windfall
				<b>22 affordable</b>		<b>74</b>	
<b>Quarter 2</b>							
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	10Hx3B, 3Hx2B (aff) 2Hx3B (private)	0	15	Large Windfall
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	4Hx4B (private)	0	4	Large Windfall
15/00310 (NHBC)	Former Royal British Legion, 21 West Street, Epsom	FUL	6Fx2B	6Fx2B	0	6	small windfall
05/00772	43 The Avenue, Worcester Park	FUL	1H x 5B	1	0	1	small windfall

Annex 1: Housing Completions

15/00098	NESCOT Agricultural Land, Reigate Road, Ewell	FUL	91Hx2,3,4,5 bed	5Hx4B, 4Hx3B, 2Hx2B		11	Allocation
15/00577	47 Northcroft Road, West Ewell	FUL	2Fx3B	2	1	1	small windfall
15/00493	Kings Lodge, 28 Church Street, Epsom	FUL	1Hx3B	1	0	1	small windfall
				<b>13 affordable</b>		<b>39</b>	
<b>Quarter 3</b>							
11/01197	Land to the north of 2 Burnet Grove, Epsom	REN	2Hx3B	2	0	2	small windfall
11/01198	Land Adj to No 1 Burnet Grove, Epsom	REN	1H	1		1	small windfall
15/00347	113 Ruxley Lane, West Ewell	FUL	2Hx3B	2	1	1	small windfall
14/00833	Land at Teddington Close, Epsom	FUL	14Fx2B, 2Fx1B	16	0	16	large windfall
13/00250 (NHBC)	The Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane, Epsom	FUL	85 dwellings	3Hx3B, 3Hx2B, 2Hx2B aff	0	8	Allocation
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	5Hx4B	0	4	large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC)	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	1Hx5B	0	1	large windfall
16/00504/PDC OU	85 East Street, Epsom	PDCOU	16F	0	16	16	PDCOU- medium windfall
14/01837	Acer House 97 - 101 East Street, Epsom	FUL	13	0	14	13	Medium windfall
11/00986 (NHBC)	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	3Hx5B, 1Hx4B	0	4	large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	4Hx4B. 2Hx2B(aff)	0	6	large windfall
11/00986 (NHBC)	Land at Reigate Road	FUL	15 dwellings	3Hx6B	0	3	large windfall
15/01366	24 Ruxley Close, West Ewell	FUL	2Hx2B	2	1	1	small windfall
14/00957	129 East Street, Epsom	PDCOU	C3	A1		1	small windfall

Annex 1: Housing Completions

11/00075	Land Adjacent to 2 Queensmead Avenue, Ewell	FUL	1Hx5B	1	0	1	small windfall
15/00634	26 Amis Avenue, Ewell	FUL	1Hx 4B 1H x1B	2	1	1	small windfall
14/01240	Formerly Bytes Technology Group, Headway House, 15-17 Chessington Road, Ewell	PDCOU	11F	11	0	11	medium windfall
15/00508/FUL	405 Kingston Road Ewell	FUL	1 Sudio apprt	1	0	1	small windfall
						91	
<b>Quarter 4</b>							
13/00575	Highridge Court, Highridge Close, Epsom	FUL	3H x 3B	3	0	3	small windfall
14/01034	Hewitt Bacon & Woodrow, Rosebery House, 55 East Strerr	FUL	30 units and B1	13 units and B1	0	13	medium windfall
14/01034	Hewitt Bacon & Woodrow, Rosebery House, 55 East Strerr	FUL	30 units and B1	17 units	0	17	medium windfall
13/01546	413A Kingston Road, Ewell	FUL	1F -Studio 1Fx 2B	2	1	1	small windfall
14/00176	121 East Street, Epsom	FUL	1Fx1B	1	0	1	small windfall
12/01258	47 Upper High Street, Epsom	FUL	1F x 1B	1	0	1	small windfall
14/00727	38 The Avenue, Worcester Park	FUL	1H	1H	1	0	small windfall
15/00674	137 Riverview Road, Ewell	FUL	1H		0	1	small windfall
14/00606	Crossways House & Bradford House 39/39A East Street	FUL	97 student beds/ 4F	4		4	small windfall - NB plus 97 Student units.
14/01522	Rutland House, 57-59 South Street, Epsom	PDCOU	25Fx1B, 7Fx2B	25Fx1B, 7Fx2B	B1	32	medium windfall
15/00705	51 Dorking Road, Epsom	FUL	1Fx2B	1	0	1	small windfall
15/01335/FUL	93 Ruxley Lane, West Ewell	FUL	1H	1	1	0	small windfall
12/00924	13-15 High Street, Epsom	FUL	9Fx 1B 2 Studio	8	0	8	small windfall
13/01613 (BC)	Heron Court, Alexandra Road, Epsom	FUL	1Hx4B, 1Hx3B, 6Fx2B	0	8	8	medium windfall
15/00340	39 Salisbury Road, Worcester Park	FUL	2H	1	1	1	small windfall

# Annex 1: Housing Completions

14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1H x 4B	0	1	large windfall
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	48	1H x 4B	0	1	large windfall
15/01448/FUL	41 Green Lanes	FUL	1Hx3B	1	0	1	small windfall
15/01860/FUL	44 Dorking Road, Epsom	FUL	1H x 2B	1	0	1	small windfall
14/01218 (also 15/00344/RES )	168 East Street, Epsom	OUT	4Fx2B, 2Fx1B, 2Hx2B, (1 office)	8	1	7	small windfall
06/00972	Land at The Lodge, West Street, Ewell	FUL	1H x 4B	1	0	1	small windfall
14/00825 (NHBC)	Ethel Bailey Close, Epsom	FUL	1H x 5B	1	0	1	large windfall
						104	

**Total 308**

57 affordable



Source of supply	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022- 2027	2027-2032	Total
Delivered (522 homes) 2015-2016/17	199	308								507 (2015-17)
Under construction (253 homes)			159	84	10					253
Planning Permissions (177 homes)			33	64	80					177
Small SHLAA sites (5-10)				5		34		86	18	143
Medium SHLAA sites (11-19)							26	94	15	135
Large SHLAA sites (20+)										
Tesco Site, Depot Road/ Upper High Street				30						30
Spread Eagle Shopping Centre, High Street				15	10					25
Former Police Station, Church Street				10	11					21
Phase 2, Sycamore Gardens, former NESCOT land				30	30	20				80
Epsom Baptist Church, Church Street								41		41
TA Centre, Welbeck Close									62	62
Longmead Road/ Gibraltar Crescent								50		50
Church Street Conservative Club, Epsom Club and United Reform Church								40		40
Dairy Crest Ltd								20		20
32 Waterloo Road/ BRM Coachworks									30	30
Epsom and Ewell High School								130		130
29-37 East Street, Gas and Water Works Site								165		165
Hope Lodge Car Park,									30	30
The Organ & Dragon, London Road								40		40
Fire Station, Church Street								25		25
EEBC Town Hall, The Parade									30	30
Swail House, Ashley Road								150		150
Depot Road car park									30	30
Priest's Hill Sports Centre, Cheam Road								20		20
Grafton Stables								40		40
Linden House, 9 College Road								25		25
South of Salisbury Road								20		20
Lower Mill								20		20
Home Base, 23 Reigate Road									50	50
Ewell Esso Express, 26 Reigate Road									17	17
Watersedge Estate Regeneration/ Ash Court								110		110
TK Maxx Store								65		65
Health Clinic and Ambulance Station, Church Street								25		25
Remaining West Park Site								150		150
Windfall								135	100	235
<b>Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1451</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>2991</b>
<b>Cumulative Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>937</b>	<b>1078</b>	<b>1132</b>	<b>1158</b>	<b>2609</b>	<b>2991</b>	
Cumulative target	418	836	1254	1672	2090	2518	2926	5016	7106	
Cumulative target + 5% buffer	439	878	1317	1756	2195	2634	3073	5268	7463	
Cumulative Core Strategy Target	181	362	543	724	905	1086	1267	1448	1629	

**Annex 3: Five Year Housing Land Supply 2017**

a) The housing requirement 2015-2032 (This includes the 5% implementation reduction for PP and a 15% for SHLAA sites)

		Dwellings	Average Dwellings Per Annum	Dwellings 5% buffer	Average Dwellings Per Annum
<b>a)</b>	Housing requirement 2015-2032 (17 years)	<b>7,106</b>	<b><u>418</u></b>	<b>7,461</b>	<b>439</b>

b) Net addition to stock 2015-17

<b>b)</b>	Net additions to stock 2015-17	Dwellings	Average (mean) dwellings per annum
	2015/16	199	
	2016/17	308	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>507</u></b>	<b>254</b>

c) Residual requirement for 2017-2032

<b>c)</b>	a-b/ years remaining	7461-507/ 15	<b>464</b>
-----------	----------------------	-----------------	------------

d) Requirement for five years 2017-2022

<b>a)</b>	Housing requirement 2015-2032	7,461	439
<b>b)</b>	Net additions to stock 2015- 2017	507	254
<b>c)</b>	Residual requirement for 2017-2022 (a-b)	6954	464
<b>d)</b>	Requirement for 5 years 2017-2022	<b>2320</b>	<b>(464 x 5)</b>

**Sources of supply**

Source of supply	Total 2017-2022
Sites Under Construction	253
Sites with planning Permission (5% reduction)	168
Small, Medium and Large SHLAA sites (15% reduction)	188
<b>Total</b>	<b>609</b>

**5 year supply**

<b>1) Comparison of 5 year supply and requirement 2017-2022</b>	
Deliverable Supply	609
Requirement	2320
Surplus/ Deficit	<b>1711</b>
Percentage supply	<b>26%</b>
Representative number of years supply	<b>1.3 years</b>

Annex 4 2016/17 Affordable Housing Completions

2016/17 Affordable Housing Completions						
	Address	Affordable Rented	Social Rented	Shared Ownership	Other	Total
<b>Quarter 1</b>						
13/00250	Lintons Centre,		5HX3B, 1FX2B	10FX2B		16
14/00825	Ethel Bailey Close	4FX2B				4
14/00868	West Hill Court				2	2
<b>Quarter 2</b>						
14/00825	Ethel Bailey Close	6HX3B, 2HX2B		4HX3B, 1HX2B		13
<b>Quarter 3</b>						
13/00250	Lintons Centre, Lintons Lane		2Hx2B			2
14/00825	Ethel Bailey Close	1HX2B		1HX2B		2
11/01197	Land at north of 2 Burnet Grove	2Hx3B				2
14/00833	Land at Teddington Close, Epsom	16F				16
<b>Quarter 4</b>						
	None					
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>57</b>

	Open Market Housing	Affordable Units	Percentage	Total (gross)
2016-17	251	57	19%	308
2015-16	107	102	49%	209
2014-15	142	58	29%	200
2013-14	203	77	28%	280
2012-13	315	207	40%	522

Annex 5

DM22 Housing Mix. Table showing permissions granted for four or more new housing units and the % of b bed units.

Application	Address	Net change	% 3bed
16/00378/PDCOU	Bank House, 42 High Street, Ewell	4	0
16/00501/PDCOU	Rosebery Lodge, 61a South Street, Epsom	9	0
16/01106/PDCOU	Ryebrook Studios	9	0
15/01913/PDCOU (also 14/00540)	Apex House, West Street, Epsom	4	0
16/01401/FUL	The Roveries 59 - 63 Cox Lane West Ewell	7	25
16/00296/FUL	The Roveries, 59-63 Cox Lane	10	20
		12	0
15/01532/FUL	Ashley House, Ashley Road		
16/00348/FUL	School Bungalow, Longmead Road, Epsom	5	0
16/00215/FUL and 16/01624/COND	93 - 95 High Street, Epsom	4	0
15/01323/FUL	Berridale, 15 College Road	9	0

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Making Efficient Use of Land - Optimising Housing Delivery**

<b>Report of the/contact:</b>	Interim Head of Planning, Viv Evans
<b>Urgent Decision?(yes/no)</b>	No
<b>If yes, reason urgent decision required:</b>	N/A
<b>Annexes/Appendices (attached):</b>	None
<b>Other available papers (not attached):</b>	National Planning Policy Framework Draft National Planning Policy Framework Core Strategy Development Management Policies Document Plan E Epsom Town Centre Area Action Plan Issues & Options Consultation 2017

### **Report summary**

The adopted Core Strategy commits to delivering sustainable development and this includes the efficient use of development land. Through the new Local Plan, the Borough Council seeks to positively respond to the significant need for new homes and the challenge posed by the constraints of Green Belt, the generally low-rise nature of existing development in the Borough and the limited supply of housing land in Epsom & Ewell.

Changes in national planning policy are placing a greater emphasis on local planning authorities and developers responding positively to increases in housing delivery.

This national and local context in relation to housing need and housing land supply, require the development potential of housing sites be optimised. This is material planning consideration. This will mean that where proposals for new development and/or redevelopment are acceptable in principle the opportunity should be taken to optimise housing supply notwithstanding current policies in existing adopted policy documents and a more flexible approach to housing density and building heights so that the capacity for future homes in the Borough can be optimised.

This report advises Members of the material considerations when assessing planning applications against the current adopted policies in relation to conflicting demand from different use, densities and building heights. This advice should be reflected in the decisions of the Planning Committee.

### **Recommendation (s)**

**That the Committee:**

- (1) Considers the current situation relating to this matter following the publication of changes in national planning policy; and**
- (2) Acknowledge the national and local material considerations in relation to housing need, housing land supply and the need to optimise development land and that due weight be attached to these matters when assessing planning applications against current adopted local policies.**

## **1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy**

- 1.1 The Local Plan provides the spatial planning mechanism for implementing the vision set out by the Key Priorities. The delivery and implementation of the Epsom & Ewell Local Plan contributes towards all the Council's Key Priorities. The Local Plan review process will set out how sustainable growth will be delivered during the next plan period.

## **2 Background**

- 2.1 Nationally there is a much greater emphasis upon appropriate, or higher densities from new housing developments. The draft revision to the NPPF seeks to make the most effective use of development land. The most important change for the Borough comes at NPPF Para 123, which states –  
  
“Where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs, it is especially important that planning policies and decisions avoid homes being built at low densities, and ensure that developments make optimal use of the potential of each site.”
- 2.2 The preparation and production of the emerging update to the Local Plan and its supporting evidence base has identified a new challenge for the Borough. Following the publication of the Borough wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment, the Strategic Housing Land Availability and Green Belt Study it is clear that the Borough has a high objectively assessed housing need, yet lacks a sufficient supply of available, developable and deliverable housing sites to meet that need in full. Crucially, the Council currently cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply to meet housing need. This is a material consideration when assessing the planning applications against adopted policy.



- 2.3 The Borough Council's Core Strategy provides a strategic policy context for this issue. The overarching principle of Core Strategy is set out in Policy CS1 which states that the Council will expect the development and use of land to contribute positively to the social, economic and environment improvements necessary to achieve sustainable development- both in Epsom and Ewell, and more widely.
- 2.4 More specifically, Core Strategy Policy CS7 commits the Borough Council to "seek to ensure sufficient housing is provided to meet the Borough's housing requirements....". In addition, Core Strategy Policy CS5 seeks to protect and enhance the visual character and appearance of the Borough's built environment. This sets out to achieve this objective by securing high quality and inclusive design. Critically in respect of this issue it clearly states that all development should make efficient use of land and have regard to the need to develop land in a comprehensive way.
- 2.5 The Borough Council's approach towards housing density and taller residential buildings is set out under Development Management Policies DM11 and DM13 respectively. These policies seek to manage the intensity of new development by limiting new housing developments (in most cases) to densities of 40 dwellings per ha or fewer, and buildings heights up to a maximum of 12m. The exception to this being Epsom Town Centre, where Plan E Policy E7 allows for buildings up to a maximum height of 16m in certain locations. This could serve to restrict the 'capacity' of sites located within the existing built areas.

### **3 Proposals**

- 3.1 In light of the above, it is considered that to achieve sustainable development on those sites that are available, deliverable and developable, housing should be fully optimised to ensure that the Borough responds positively to the requirement to provide as a minimum for its objectively assessed needs for housing and other development. Ultimately, this is likely to result in developing some sites at higher densities and which could involve taller buildings.
- 3.2 Members, as decision makers, should attribute weight to the wider national and local material planning considerations when assessing residential development schemes against current local adopted policy. This will ensure that sound and balanced decisions on planning applications are reached and that future development in the Borough positively contributes to achieving sustainable growth.
- 3.3 When reaching a balanced decision greater weight maybe attributed to the need to deliver new homes and subject to conformity with other relevant policies. For example, this may result in development that exceeds the density and / or height parameters of Policy DM11, Policy DM13 and Plan E Policy E7.

- 3.4 Similarly, a constrained land supply may lead to conflicting demand from different uses. The local plan evidence is demonstrably clear that the major need is for new homes and the decision-maker will need to consider whether the proposed use of a site represents the most effective. This could result in an increase in mixed -use schemes. Alternatively, the decision maker may consider that those proposals that fail to optimise the potential capacity of a site, or prejudice the developability of a wider site area to be developed for housing should not be positively considered. In those cases, the decision maker should consider deploying Core Strategy Policy CS5, alongside the NPPF as grounds for refusal. Given the Borough's high objectively assessed housing need and limited supply of available, deliverable and developable sites this is considered a robust ground for refusal.
- 3.5 This will also prove positive at the forthcoming Local Plan 'examination in public' where it will need to demonstrated that the Council is responding positively to the challenge of housing delivery not only in policy making but also in decision making on individual planning applications.
- 3.6 Members and residents (through the Issues & Options Consultation on the new Local Plan (2017) have expressed a desire to consider opportunities to optimise capacity of development sites. This could include increased densities and building heights whilst responding to the Borough's special visual character and appearance.
- 3.7 Potential locations for higher buildings and densities have already been identified through the recent Issues & Options Consultation and the draft NPPF. These locations include town centres, sites in proximity to railway stations; and sites located along transport corridors.
- 3.8 Through the preparation of the Local Plan Members will be able to be set a locally derived design vision for the Borough and the design expectations for future schemes. This would also guide the designing of higher density schemes so that they complement the distinctive character of the Borough and achieve other key design objectives including community safety and provision of adequate amenity space.
- 3.9 Officers are considering the merits of producing a master plan document to form part of the Local Plan evidence base. This could explore suitable place-making concepts and develop new typologies for residential development within Borough that respond Epsom & Ewell's distinctive character.

#### **4 Financial and Manpower Implications**

- 4.1 There are no financial or manpower implications generated by this report. All implications will be managed within existing budgets

**5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)**

- 5.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides that “if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise”
- 5.2 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that “in dealing with an application for planning permission or permission in principle the authority shall have regard to
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,....
  - (b) any other material considerations.”
- 5.3 This can include emerging Local Plan evidence base documents. Similarly, national planning policy can be communicated in many forms, including circulars, ministerial statements, White Papers, appeal decisions and other means. National policy takes on a particularly important role in the plan preparation process and should be given significant weight, often overriding weight, unless other considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.4 ***Monitoring Officer’s comments:*** *None arising from the report.*

**6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications**

- 6.1 Meeting local housing needs is a key component of securing a sustainable pattern for new development across the Borough. The Local Plan evidence clearly demonstrates a high demand for new homes that significantly exceeds the current supply of housing land. Current national planning policy (NPPF Paragraph 14) and the emerging revisions to the NPPF (Paragraph 11) sets out the basis for presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 6.1 Objections to higher density schemes and taller buildings often include concerns about their impact on levels of anti-social behaviour and crime. However, well-designed and well-integrated higher density schemes, using tools such as Secure by Design will assist in creating practical, safe and desirable residential environments. The principles of these tools will inform any forthcoming place- making masterplan for the Borough.

**7 Partnerships**

- 7.1 The Borough Council will need to pro-actively engage with the development industry; architects, planning agents, house builders and registered providers to encourage the submission of development schemes which optimise the capacity of each site. This will be primarily through the Council’s pre-application service.

## **8 Risk Assessment**

- 8.1 The Core Strategy's current housing target is considered out of date and Council does not have a 5 year housing land supply or sufficient sites to meet its Objectively Assessed Housing Need figure. Work is progressing to update the Core Strategy and produce a new housing target and housing supply policies to deliver sustainable growth.
- 8.2 By taking a proactive approach to optimising development sites within the plan making and decision making process and identifying where it should and should not go, we will place ourselves in a stronger position to resist unsustainable levels of growth in the wrong locations.
- 8.3 The weight attached to material considerations in reaching a decision is a matter of judgement for the decision maker, however, the decision maker is required to demonstrate that in reaching that decision that they have considered all relevant matters. Failure to take into account of relevant material matters such as those outlined in this report may result unsound decisions and affect the Council's appeal performance.

## **9 Conclusion and Recommendations**

- 9.1 The Local Plan evidence base has identified that the Borough has a high Objectively Assessed Housing Need figure and there is a significant shortfall of deliverable and developable housing sites within the Borough. Nationally there is a drive to deliver more homes, faster as well as achieving the effective use of development land.
- 9.2 Therefore, in light of the Borough's housing land supply position, those sites that are available, deliverable and developable should be fully optimised to positively respond to our objectively assessed housing need.
- 9.3 Whilst every planning application will be assessed on its own merits, decision makers will need to carefully balance the current policy requirements with the material planning considerations outlined in this report. This may result in development proposals seeking to optimise the capacity of a proposal site by developing to a higher density (greater than 40 dwellings per ha) or exceed the maximum building height being considered positively.
- 9.4 It is considered that this approach will prove to be a positive policy position at the forthcoming Local Plan 'examination in public' where the Council will have to demonstrate that it is responding positively to the challenge of housing delivery not only in policy making but also in decision- making on individual planning applications.
- 9.5 The report highlights the national and local material considerations in relation to housing need and housing land supply and that due weight should be attached to these matters when assessing planning applications against current adopted local policies.

**Ward(s) affected:** (All Wards);

## Consultation on Draft National Planning Policy Framework

**Report of the/contact:**

Interim Head of Planning, Viv Evans

**Urgent Decision?(yes/no)**

No

**If yes, reason urgent decision required:**

**Annexes/Appendices (attached):**

**Annexe 1:** Draft response to NPPF draft revisions

**Annexe 2:** Commentary on draft National Planning Policy Framework

**Other available papers (not attached):**

[Draft revised National Planning Policy Framework – draft text for consultation](#)

[Draft revised National Planning Policy Framework – open consultation](#)

Supporting housing delivery through developer contributions

Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places: Report to L&PPC 26 October 2017

The Housing White Paper 2017: Report to L&PCC 20 April 2017

### Report summary

The government has published its draft revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for consultation. The deadline for responses is 5 May 2018. It is proposed that the final version of the revised NPPF will be published in the Summer 2018.

Alongside the NPPF publication, the government has published, an additional consultation proposal titled ‘supporting housing delivery through developer contributions’ to explore the potential for further Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) reforms.

### Recommendation (s)

The Committee considers the draft comments to the government’s proposals and that this, subject to any changes, forms the basis of the Council’s response to the consultation.

**1 Implications for the Council's Key Priorities, Service Plans and Sustainable Community Strategy**

- 1.1 The proposals contained within the consultation paper have significant implications for the Council's key priorities, particularly in terms of meeting its housing needs, how it delivers affordable housing, how it works with its neighbours on strategic matters, providing essential community infrastructure to support growth. It especially has implications in terms of the likely impact of higher level of development on the Borough's visual character and appearance. The proposals will also have a significant impact on many of the Council's other key priorities including economic vitality, quality of life, visual appearance and sustainability.
- 1.2 The Epsom & Ewell Borough Local Plan assists in the spatial delivery of the objectives of the Sustainable Community Strategy and the Council's Key Priorities. The effectiveness of these policies, and by extension the effective delivery of the Local Plan, will be compromised by the proposed changes.

**2 Background**

- 2.1 The government has published its draft revisions of national planning policy (the NPPF), which build upon other recent consultations relating to national planning policy. Members will recall that the Borough Council made strong representations to these previous consultations raising particular concerns in relation to the proposed approach towards delivering growth. The draft revisions build on the previous proposals and, as such, many of the Council's earlier concerns remain.
- 2.2 In developing the draft revisions the Government has also sought to incorporate changes to planning policy implemented through Written Ministerial Statements since the publication of the NPPF in 2012, the effect of case law on the interpretation of planning policy since 2012 and improvements to the text to increase coherence and reduce duplication.

**3 Proposals**

- 3.1 The key thrust of the draft revisions is for planning policy to underpin the delivery of the Government's ambition to improve the supply and delivery of new homes. Critically the changes introduced in the draft NPPF seek to ensure that more land is brought forward for development, the use of the land is optimised (primarily for new homes) and that permissions are turned into homes as quickly as possible.
- 3.2 The draft NPPF incorporates policy proposals on which the government has previously consulted and additional new proposals on which this document is consulting. The Government has been clear that the presumption in favour of sustainable development remains at the heart of the framework.

- 3.3 Many of the proposed changes build upon the Housing White Paper (February 2017), the Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation (September 2017) and the Budget 2017. The proposals include:
- a) A new document structure of 17 topic based chapters reflecting the government's priorities – with a focus upon resolving the housing crisis;
  - b) Clarification on the presumption in favour of Sustainable Development and amendments to the tests of soundness for local plans;
  - c) A new standard methodology for the calculation of local housing need;
  - d) New definition of affordable housing and a focus on affordable home ownership products;
  - e) Promotion of the role of small sites and their exclusion from affordable housing contributions;
  - f) Introduction of the Housing Delivery Test;
  - g) Greater emphasis on effective and optimal use of land, particularly brownfield land. Promotion of minimum density policies, upward extensions, conversions and reallocation of sites to deliver housing;
  - h) Requirement to set out a clear local design vision and expectations;
  - i) Continued strong protection for the Green Belt and clarification of the exceptional circumstances in which release may occur;
  - j) Strengthened protection for ancient woodland and other irreplaceable habitats; and
  - k) New plan-led approach to viability, seeking standardisation and transparency.
- 3.4 Some of these proposals in relation to housing land supply and delivery are lengthy and complex. A concise summary and commentary of the proposals is included under **Annexe 2**.
- 3.5 A draft response to the consultation has been prepared and is included under **Annexe 1**. The draft response seeks to maintain the Council's robust position, particularly when responding to those proposed changes that have the potential to have a significant impact on the Borough. The Government has explicitly stated that it does not want respondents to repeat or reiterate comments that they have previously made. The draft response is mindful of this statement.



- 3.6 Whilst the proposed changes to the NPPF remain the subject of public consultation (until May 2018), the Government has stated that it will be publishing the final version of the new NPPF during summer 2018. The Borough Council must take this into account when considering the likely impacts that the new NPPF will have upon the emerging Local Plan. Local Plan Inspectors are already making reference to the draft NPPF.

#### **4 Financial and Manpower Implications**

- 4.1 The new requirement for local plan authorities to review plan policies every five years will have a significant impact upon resources. The Planning Policy Team will need to be appropriately resourced in order to respond. It now appears likely that at the very least the current staff complement will need to be maintained and possibly reinforced.
- 4.2 The possibility of a new cycle for producing local plans (every five years) will require regular examinations in public; with all of the financial implications that process brings. It is unclear from the draft NPPF as to whether such a costly outcome is inevitable. The Borough Council will need to carefully monitor the proposed changes and how their implementation impacts upon the plan making process – responding accordingly as our budget allows.
- 4.3 The introduction of the Housing Delivery Test and the potential consequences for ‘substandard’ delivery will require the Borough Council to take a greater and more involved role in monitoring housing completions and build out rates beyond the current local plan annual monitoring regime. Depending upon performance it is possible that our local plans could very quickly become out-of-date and require an early reviews. This may require that Officers are more flexible in resourcing this critical area of work.
- 4.4 **Chief Finance Officer’s comments:** *Additional funding from the 5 percent admin fee element of Community Infrastructure Levy receipts was agreed to fund up to £80,000 in total over two years to support the delivery of the Local Plan. Any request for the use of any additional funding will need to be agreed by the Strategy and Resources Committee.*

#### **5 Legal Implications (including implications for matters relating to equality)**

- 5.1 No specific implications.
- 5.2 **Monitoring Officer’s comments:** *No comments arising from this report*

#### **6 Sustainability Policy and Community Safety Implications**

- 6.1 The scale of the future housing need being imposed by the national standard methodology threatens to undermine the Borough’s ability to plan for and deliver sustainable development. Equally, the continued quantitative approach focused on home ownership threatens the delivery of the right homes in the right places, particularly in terms of affordable housing, to meet the qualitative housing needs of the community.

6.2 Notwithstanding this, the requirement for all of the Local Plan policies to have been subject to sustainability appraisal remains. These sustainability appraisal will themselves be subject to public consultation.

6.3 There are no significant Community Safety implications.

## **7 Partnerships**

7.1 The proposed requirement for Statements of Common Ground on strategic matters including responding to unmet development needs, between *neighbouring* planning authorities has implications for partnership working.

7.2 To date, the Borough Council has already begun relationships with its Housing Market Area partners (Elmbridge, Mole Valley and the Royal Borough of Kingston), not all are geographic neighbours. The robustness of this approach may be undermined by the government's latest proposals. In that respect, the Borough Council may need to re-examine how it considers and responds to strategic cross boundary issues.

7.3 In responding to the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) and the increased emphasis on delivery of new homes, the Borough Council will need to undertake more proactive engagement with the housebuilding industry. The Borough Council cannot by itself deliver new housing. The development industry has a responsibility to shoulder much of the burden being introduced by the changes to NPPF and as consequence their role should not be underplayed.

## **8 Risk Assessment**

8.1 The proposed revisions to the NPPF are the subject of consultation and the deadline for responses is 5 May 2018. However, the government intends to publish the final version of the revised NPPF during Summer 2018. The short period between the close of the consultation and intended publication of the final version is a likely indicator that they do not anticipate making many changes, if any. On that basis the Council should expect the final version of the new NPPF to be very similar to the current draft.

8.2 The transitional arrangements state that for the purpose of examining plans, those plans submitted on or before six months after the date of final frameworks publication will be considered against the policies in the previous framework. The current Local Plan Programme envisages that submission will be within these transitional arrangements. This suggests that the Council could seek to submit a housing target based upon the OAHN figure contained within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment. However, the Government's remit is clear and from relevant local plan examinations, there appears to be one direction of travel concerning responding to OAHN. On that basis, even if the Council were to submit within the transitional period it is likely that local plan would very quickly become out of date.

- 8.3 The draft revisions place emphasis on producing local plans that deliver and the Borough Council will be accountable for delivering the resultant housing target. It is highly likely that the resultant target will be significantly greater than what has ever been achieved before within the Borough. The consequence of substantial under delivery against an authority's housing requirement as determined through the HDT could result in the plan being considered out of date. This result in planning applications being determined using the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. There is a risk that could happen during the first few years of adoption.
- 8.4 The current evidence demonstrates that it will be extremely challenging for the Borough Council to meet its OAHN figure. If the Council cannot meet all need then it will need to demonstrate to an Inspector how it has tried to do the best to meet as much need as sustainability possible. This will require the Council to robustly demonstrate that it is optimising our land supply and have assessed all reasonable, available, deliverable and developable housing options.

## **9 Conclusion and Recommendations**

- 9.1 The Committee is asked to note the proposed revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 9.2 The Committee is asked to consider the draft responses to the consultation paper and subject to any amendments and additions agree that these form the basis of the Borough Council's response.

**Ward(s) affected:** (All Wards);

## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **Q1 Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 1?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make in relation to Chapter 1.

## **Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development**

### **Q2 Do you agree with the changes to the sustainable development objectives and the presumption in favour of sustainable development?**

The Borough Council supports and agrees with the objectives of sustainable development.

The draft revisions seek that, as a minimum, strategic and local plans should provide for an area's housing and other development needs, as well as any that cannot be met within neighbouring area, where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development. The Borough Council's understanding is that this acknowledges that there is likely to be areas where there is unmet. However, this would be a conflict with first requirement for plan to meet all identified needs, as a minimum. Similarly, paragraph 11(b) advises that plans should provide for development need unless "the application of policies in this framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area".

The Borough Council would welcome further clarification and guidance from the government on the matter of unmet development needs when determining its housing requirement (target). The Borough Council hopes that the government will adopt a realistic and pragmatic approach to this issue.

The Borough Council raises strong concern over the Housing Delivery Test as a monitoring tool for which the Local Planning Authority has limited control and modest influence on performance. The presumption in favour of sustainable development will unfairly penalise local authorities in areas, such as Epsom & Ewell, where the identified need figure is significantly higher (and continues to raise through the standard methodology) than previous targets and where the availability of deliverable land is limited (especially during plan preparation). The Borough Council has been working hard to respond positively to the housing crisis and is progressing an update to its Local Plan accordingly; however, this positive response will not be recognised in the mechanisms such as the Housing Delivery Test.

### **Q3 Do you agree that the core principles section should be deleted, given its content has been retained and moved to other appropriate parts of the Framework?**

The Borough Council is supportive of the revised structure and the integration of the core principles into the relevant topic based chapter. We acknowledge that the draft document is more coherent.

**Q4 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 2, including the approach to providing additional certainty for neighbourhood plans in some circumstances?**

The Borough Council is disappointed that there remains a conflation between preparing a housing need requirement, alongside the identification of a deliverable and sustainable housing requirement (target).

**Chapter 3: Plan- making**

**Q5 Do you agree with the further changes proposed to the tests of soundness, and to the other changes of policy in this chapter that have not already been consulted on?**

The Borough Council maintains that developing high growth strategies based purely on an overly simplified demand assessment is not sound planning. We raise strong disagreement to the level of weight being placed upon the plan's ability to meet the objectively assessed housing need to render it positively prepared and ultimately (notwithstanding, satisfying the remaining tests) sound.

The Borough Council is working hard to ensure that its Local Plan positively contributes to responding to the nation's housing crisis and is pursuing an approach to meeting as much as its development needs as possible consistent with achieving sustainable development. This includes considering all reasonable options in doing so.

Despite this, the evidence is indicating that there will be unmet housing need and the Borough Council is working closely with its HMA partners, many of whom are neighbouring authorities, to seek agreements to accommodate this unmet need beyond our own administrative boundaries. However, these authorities also share in this significant challenge of meeting housing need with a constrained land supply. There is a real risk that the issue of unmet need will not be addressed or accommodated beyond the land plan boundary as it will not be practical to do so and would not be consistent with achieving sustainable development. No Statement of Common Ground will resolve this matter.

The draft revisions do not appear to lead themselves to such a situation occurring. Therefore, the Borough Council seeks assurances that a pragmatic approach would be taken in such instances and that the importance of a securing an up to date local plan and the benefits of doing so will be fairly balanced against the Government's desire to deliver new homes.

**Q6 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 3?**

The Borough Council has no further comments to make.

## Chapter 4: Decision-making

**Q7 The revised draft Framework expects all viability assessments to be made publicly available. Are there any circumstances where this would be problematic?**

The Borough Council fully endorses that viability assessments should be publicly available and cannot foresee any circumstance where this would be problematic.

**Q8 Would it be helpful for national planning guidance to go further and set out the circumstances in which viability assessment to accompany planning applications would be acceptable?**

Yes. The Borough Council welcomes further guidance. However, the Borough Council considers that such circumstances must be truly exceptional. We also consider that circumstances of significant market change should take account of both up and down turns in market conditions. Consequently, improved market conditions may trigger viability testing that makes greater requirement of the house building industry. The Borough Council considers that inclusion of such circumstances within the guidance would limit the risk of misinterpretation during S78 appeals.

**Q9 What would be the benefits of going further and mandating the use of review mechanisms to capture increases in the value of a large or multi-phased development?**

The Borough Council considers that there would be significant benefits of mandating review mechanisms. This could allow of the collection of valuable contributions to delivery of much needed affordable homes that might otherwise been lost.

**Q10 Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 4?**

The Borough Council is supportive of the efforts to tighten the 'viability loophole' and shares the view that issues of viability should be the exception and not the norm. The Borough Council welcomes a standardised and transparent approach, however, is disappointed that the guidance is much stronger than the proposed policy itself. The Borough Council would question in practice whether the proposed reforms are significant enough to prevent manipulation and secure much needed contributions.

The Borough Council continues to advocate a procedure that allows for greater and flexible scrutiny of submissions supported by pre and post completion assurances. Indeed, the Borough Council has increased its own scrutiny of submitted viability assessments to ensure they are assessed robustly.

## **Chapter 5: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes**

### **Q11 What are your views on the most appropriate combination of policy requirements to ensure that a suitable proportion of land for homes comes forward as small or medium sized sites.**

The Borough Council welcomes the continued encouragement of small and medium sized sites. Reflecting local circumstances the Borough Council has historically acknowledged the valuable contribution small and medium sites make to housing delivery in its own housing trajectories. The Borough Council currently considers small sites in Epsom & Ewell to be those that could accommodate 5-10 units; medium sites 11-19 units and large sites would be able to deliver 20 units plus. We highlight that 60% of planning permissions for new homes in Epsom & Ewell are generated by developments on small sites.

The Borough Council considers that the proposed policy approach in relation to small sites needs to have sufficient flexibility to reflect local circumstances and land supply. It should be within the gift of the local planning authorities to determine their appropriate strategy/ targets for delivering on small and medium sites that reflect local circumstances and based on sound local evidence. Nationally prescribed requirements in terms of size thresholds and proportion of allocations/ housing delivery may unfairly penalise some authorities, such as Epsom & Ewell, because the resulting targets will not be compatible with local circumstances. One size does not fit all. Such an inflexible approach will inevitably impact on optimal delivery from this source of land supply.

### **Q12 Do you agree with the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery is below 75% of the housing required from 2020?**

The Borough Council is committed to the delivery of new homes but strongly disagrees with the introduction of the Housing Delivery Test in its current format. The proposals places an inequitable accountability for the delivery of new homes on local planning authorities.

Furthermore, we maintain the view that any increase in the availability of land supply would not result in a corresponding increase in delivery of new homes. Similarly, such 'tests' are a distraction and undermine the stability that a Local Plan brings.

### **Q13 Do you agree with the new policy on exception sites for entry-level homes?**

The Borough Council supports initiatives to assist first time buyers. However, we question whether an exception sites approach will deliver inclusive communities. We ask the government to note that the requirement is contrary to all evidence, which indicates that there is no requirement for affordable housing ownership products in Epsom & Ewell.

Furthermore, in Epsom & Ewell, such exception sites (outside of the settlement area) would ultimately be located within the Green Belt and therefore be in conflict with the



principles protecting the openness of Green Belt land. This weakens the protection of Green Belt land.

**Q14 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 5?**

The Borough Council would welcome clarity on what the Government would consider exceptional circumstances as to justify an alternative approach to the standard methodology. For example, the Borough Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) published in 2016 incorporated current and future demographic trends and market signals.

In addition, the SHMA identified the size, type and tenure of homes for different groups of the community. The Borough Council notes the requirement remains and there is absence of a proposed standard methodology for undertaking such an assessment. We raise strong concerns as to the soundness of an approach that will require the disaggregation of the standard methodology figure derived from a simple formula to identify the qualitative housing needs of communities.

The amended definition of affordable housing reflects the Government's focus on delivering affordable home ownership products rather than support for the rental market. Such products will only be suitable for those able to secure mortgage finance. In contrast, the Borough Council's own evidence (SHMA 2016) shows an acute need for affordable rental homes in the Borough and outlines the affordable needs of our residents by type. The primary requirement is for social rented (94%) followed by affordable rent (6%), there is no requirement for intermediate products which would be akin to the Government's proposed affordable home ownership offer. There is a real risk that a continued focus on affordable home ownership, a product preferred by developers would severely limit the Borough Council's ability to deliver the type of homes in greatest need.

The Borough Council is extremely disappointed that the draft revisions preclude local authorities from applying affordable housing policies to small sites (less than 10 units or 1,000sqm floor space). With a significant proportion of housing delivery expected on small sites, this will constrain affordable housing delivery within Epsom & Ewell in the immediate future. The Borough Council would be supportive of the introduction of flexibility to reflect local circumstances and land supply.

The Borough Council considers the wording and requirements of the proposals to maintaining supply and delivery convoluted and at best confusing. The Borough Council continues not to support the proposal to introduce annual position statements and cannot see the short term 'benefit' of reaching a 1 year agreement given the 10 % uplift required. Notwithstanding the resource implications for local planning authorities in producing a position statement, the Borough Council awaits confirmation that the Inspectorate will be able to fulfil its role in a timely manner and commit to a consistent approach to examination.

The proposed 'tests' based on land supply and delivery will disadvantage authorities such as Epsom and Ewell that have a strong record of past delivery (181 pa) and are now faced with a significant uplift in their housing need figures (418 -579 pa) due to national changes in how that need is calculated.

The Borough Council is disappointed there has been softening in the Government's thinking with regards to ensuring that the industry plays its part in delivery, in fact there appears to be little consequence for its failure to deliver.

## **Chapter 6: Building a strong, competitive economy**

### **Q15 Do you agree with the policy changes on supporting business growth and productivity, including the approach to accommodating local business and community needs in rural areas?**

The Borough Council is supportive of the proposed changes that highlight the importance of supporting business growth.

### **Q16 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 6?**

The Borough Council would have expected a greater focus on the importance of planning for and retaining jobs / employment opportunities in the right places. There is a risk that the housing dominant agenda could lead to dormitory towns especially in areas where housing need is greatest and the land supply limited. Ultimately, this will lead to less sustainable communities, centred on outward commuter patterns. Inevitably such 'commuter settlements' will place significant demands upon strategic transport infrastructure. Evidence demonstrates that in Epsom & Ewell the infrastructure funding gap, to meet current growth levels, runs into tens of millions. It is anticipated that meeting future strategic transport needs, using existing available funding streams, will be challenging.

## **Chapter 7: Ensuring the vitality of town centres**

### **Q17 Do you agree with the policy changes on planning for identified retail needs and considering planning applications for town centre uses?**

The Borough Council considers the proposal for policies and site allocations for town centres to look at least ten years but not necessary over the full plan period is a sensible approach. However, it is important that this flexibility does not lead to the loss of commercial sites in sustainable locations in the long term, especially in areas where land for housing is in short supply.

### **Q18 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 7?**

The Borough Council does not agree with the expectation that office developments over a certain floor space threshold outside of designated town centres are not subject to an impact assessment. The removal of a sequential approach could lead to office uses in less sustainable locations or on sites that would be better utilised by other forms of development, such as housing.

The Borough Council welcomes the increased flexibility offered as part of the proposed removal of a fixed time scale for considering the availability of alternative retail and leisure sites within the sequential approach.

## **Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities**

### **Q19 Do you have any comments on the new policies in Chapter 8 that have not already been consulted on?**

The Borough Council supports the additional recognition of the role that planning can play in promoting social interaction and healthy lifestyles and fully endorses the new policy in relation to promote public safety.

### **Q20 Do you have any other comments the text of Chapter 8?**

The Borough Council has no further comments.

## **Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport**

### **Q21 Do you agree with the changes to the transport chapter that point to the way that all aspects of transport should be considered, both in planning for transport and assessing transport impacts?**

The Borough Council agrees and notes the increased emphasis on the importance of sustainable modes of transport. It is also encouraged that the assessment of transport impact includes an emphasis on highway safety as well as capacity and congestion. However, there remains limited guidance on when capacity and the realistic prospect of securing adequate funding would constrain the delivery of sustainable housing growth.

### **Q22 Do you agree with the policy change that recognises the importance of general aviation facilities?**

Yes-The Borough Council agrees.

### **Q23 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 9?**

As the Borough Council seeks to respond positively to the challenges of its identified development needs, the evidence shows there is acute pressure on its own local highway network and there is limited capacity for expansion. As a consequence it is likely that only cost effective strategy to respond to growth will be to promote sustainable modes of transport for local (cross Borough) journeys.

However, given the level of growth required and the scale of the capacity gap identified the impact upon the highway network is likely to be considered by communities as severe and ultimately not sustainable. To that end, the Borough Council is disappointed that there remains no definition of 'severe' impact.

## **Chapter 10: Supporting high quality communications**

### **Q24 Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 10?**

The Borough Council welcomes the acknowledgement that reliable communications infrastructure is essential for social wellbeing as well as for economic growth.

## **Chapter 11: Making effective use of land**

### **Q25 Do you agree with the proposed approaches to under-utilised land, reallocating land for other uses and making it easier to convert land which is in existing use?**

Whilst there is some logic in the proposed approach, especially in regards to under-utilised land we consider that it is important that any decision to reallocate or convert land / buildings is informed by a long-term view of achieving sustainable growth. Once a site or building is reallocated or converted into housing, it is highly unlikely to be available for alternative uses in the future and this must be weighed against the benefits of achieving housing delivery in the short term.

### **Q26 Do you agree with the proposed approach to employing minimum density standards where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?**

The Borough Council very much supports the approach to seek effective use of land and to ensure that the optimal development is achieved. However, the Borough Council advocates a cautious approach in using minimum development densities that were solely based on housing need. For example, the optimal use of a site may be for specialist accommodation that may not necessarily lend itself to high density.

### **Q27 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 11?**

As indicated in the above responses, the weight given to brownfield land and the concept of optimising densities is welcomed in principle. However, the Government's narrow focus on increasingly higher densities (and thus the delivery of smaller units) is likely to fail to provide for the varying types of homes required. Indeed our Local Plan evidence base shows that within Epsom & Ewell 47% of the homes needed should be 3 or more bedrooms.

The Borough Council is concerned over the industry's appetite and readiness to make effective and optimal use of development sites, especially when this could mean a deviation from their current offer to the market. Indeed as part of its own plan preparations, the Borough Council has been challenging site promoters, planning agents, developers and house builders to increase yields on sites suitable for housing. Unfortunately, the response from the industry has been varied and it is clear that not all share the desire for higher density (certainly beyond 70 dwelling per hectare) or an interest in pursuing mixed-use schemes that contain housing. The Borough Council would question whether the development industry is able to adapt to the proposed revisions and deliver in the short term.

## **Chapter 12: Achieving well-designed places**

### **Q28 Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 12 that have not already been consulted on?**

The Borough Council has no further comments.

### **Q29 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 12?**

It is vital that development representing an effective use of land including high-density proposal are of a high quality design that supports the distinctive character of an area. The Borough Council welcomes the opportunity to provide more detailed design guidelines within its plans as well as setting out a local derived clear design vision and expectations. However, a design led approach from the local planning authority will require investment in skills not currently held in some smaller authorities.

## **Chapter 13: Protecting the Green Belt**

### **Q30 Do you agree with the proposed changes to enable greater use of brownfield land for housing in the Green Belt, and to provide for the other forms of development that are 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?**

The Borough Council strongly disagrees with the more flexible approach to the "openness" test where development involves affordable housing on previously developed land. This appears to build on the Government's assumption that all previously developed land in the Green Belt is not well performing, this is simply not the case. However, the introduction of such development schemes will undermine its performance in Green Belt terms.

Furthermore, such development would be incremental and unplanned growth in the Green Belt, contrary to the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy and indeed the purposes it serves.

### **Q31 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 13?**

The Borough Council welcomes the introduction of the criteria that should be satisfied before 'exceptional circumstances' are used to change Green Belt boundaries. However, further guidance on what would constitute 'all other reasonable options' is required.

Alongside this, the Borough Council would welcome a more explicit stance within the NPPF as when to amend Green Belt boundaries and how plan makers should balance the tension between conserving well-performing Green Belt and meeting housing need in full. This is particularly prevalent in highly constrained areas such as Epsom & Ewell where there is a significant shortfall in the supply of deliverable and developable housing sites within the existing urban area.

The Borough Council does not agree that first consideration should be given to previously developed land within the Green Belt as it may still perform strongly against the purposes of Green Belt. Consequently, it would be illogical to consider such sites ahead of poorly performing sites which are not previously developed.

The current and draft NPPF restricts opportunities for new equestrian development in the Green Belt except in very special circumstances. However, failure to include equestrian buildings from the exclusions within definition of previously developed land could lead to greater pressure on valuable equestrian and race horse training stables and facilities from development. In areas such as Epsom & Ewell, such facilities make a vital economic, social and environmental contribution not only to the local economy but also in the case of Epsom to the national economy and to the country's reputation as a world class centre for equestrian and racehorse activity. The combined impact of Green Belt and landscape designations mean that there is limited land available for development and high demand for new homes. This is leading to these valuable racehorse training facilities being lost forever.

The Borough Council advocates that the government makes it explicit in the revised NPPF that greater protection be afforded to existing racehorse training facilities in the Green Belt and the wider countryside and also to recognise that very special circumstances exist with respect to this rural industry to enable new training facilities to be created to support and bolster the racehorse industry in key locations such as Epsom.

## **Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change**

### **Q32 Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 14?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make but welcomes the incorporation of the Written Ministerial Statement on sustainable drainage systems as well as the need to have regard to the cumulative impact of flood risk rather than just to and from individual development sites.

### **Q33 Does paragraph 149b need any further amendment to reflect the ambitions in the Clean Growth Strategy to reduce emissions from buildings?**

The Borough Council has no specific comment to make.

## **Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the nature environment**

### **Q34 Do you agree with the approach to clarifying and strengthening protection for areas of particular environmental importance in the context of the 25 Year Environment Plan and national infrastructure requirements, including the level of protection for ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees?**

Yes- the Borough Council warmly welcomes the strengthened protection for ancient woodland and other irreplaceable habitats.

**Q35 Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 15?**

The Borough Council has no further comments on Chapter 15.

**Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment**

**Q36 Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 16?**

The Borough Council welcomes the clarifications proposed in Chapter 16. However, we consider that further links with Chapter 12 (achieving well-designed places) and Chapter 16 should be made.

**Chapter 17: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals**

**Q37 Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 17, or on any other aspects of the text of this chapter?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make and refers to the response of Surrey County Council as the Mineral Planning Authority.

**Q38 Do you think that planning policy on minerals would be better contained in a separate document?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make and refers to the response of Surrey County Council as the Mineral Planning Authority.

**Q39 Do you have any views on the utility of national and sub-national guidelines on future aggregates provision?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make and refers to the response of Surrey County Council as the Mineral Planning Authority.

**Transitional arrangements and consequential changes**

**Q40 Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?**

The Borough Council considers the proposed transitional arrangements more sympathetic than that proposed in the previous consultations. However, the Borough Council is concerned that there is no transitional arrangements in relation to introducing the Housing Delivery Test. This could prove to be an unnecessary distraction to local planning authorities in the latter stages of preparing new local plans or undertaking reviews.

In relation to the Statement of Common Ground, the Borough Council raises no objection to exclusion of a transitional period as the requirements largely reflect those of the Duty to Co-operate. We would welcome consideration of a template or standard format to assist in the speed of their production.



**Q41 Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in this document? If so, what changes should be made?**

The Borough Council welcomes the clarity provided by the inclusion of travellers (outside of the Planning Policy for Travellers definition) within the list of different community groups in paragraph 61 but does not consider there to be a need for a specific change to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites.

**Q42 Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Waste as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in this document? If so, what changes should be made?**

The Borough Council has no specific comments to make and refers to the response of Surrey County Council as the Waste Planning Authority.

## **Glossary**

**Q43 Do you have any comments on the glossary?**

The Borough Council raises strong concern over the new definition of affordable housing and the focus on affordable home ownership products. The removal of the differentiation between affordable and social rent is disappointing and concerning.

The Borough Council's evidence (SHMA 2016) shows an acute need for affordable rental homes in the Borough and outlines the affordable needs of our residents by type. The primary requirement is for social rented (94%) followed by affordable rent (6%), there is no requirement for intermediate products which would be akin to the Government's proposed affordable home ownership offer. There is a real risk that a continued focus on affordable home ownership, would severely limit the Borough Council's ability to deliver the type of homes in greatest need.

**Introduction and overview**

The structural changes are considered an improvement to the usability and coherence of the document. Increasing housing land supply and the delivery of new homes are at the forefront of the Government's agenda and the re-ordering of the document reflects this. The introduction of the Housing Delivery Test and the ability to grant planning permissions with shorter time limit conditions places a greater focus on housing completions with accountability to the local plan although limited accountability would be with the house building industry itself.

There is greater emphasis on efficient and optimal use of land, in particular on brownfield sites within the urban area. The role of small sites is promoted as well as pursuing high-density housing in accessible locations, while reflecting the character and infrastructure capacity.

There is continued strong protection for the Green Belt but clarification of the exceptional circumstances to which release may occur. This primarily relates to responding to housing need. Alongside there is a strengthening of protection for ancient woodland and other irreplaceable habitats. Within both plan and decision making there will need to be a careful balancing of these potential competing priorities.

The Government has been clear that it is not seek views on proposals they have previously consulted on. To this end, they have published their response to the Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation. This current consultation proposal provides a chapter-by-chapter summary of the proposed revisions to the NPPF and consultation questions are asked throughout. Attached in Annexe 2 is the proposed responses to the consultation questions, they seek not duplicate the comments already made to the previous consultations. A synopsis of the key changes along with officer commentary has been provided below.

**Plan-making**

The importance of having a plan-led system has been emphasised, with some additional requirements imposed. Planning authorities are required, as a minimum, to have adopted a plan which addresses the strategic priorities for their area (Chapter 2, paragraph 17). The policies which are considered 'strategic' have to be made explicit in the Plan, and should look ahead over a minimum 15 year period. Strategic policies should be reviewed at least once every five years, and updated as necessary (Chapter 3, paragraph 21-23).

**Statements of common ground**

Authorities will be required to prepare and maintain statements of common ground, which document cooperation and joint working between them to address cross-border planning issues, and how development needs that cannot be met within a particular area could be met elsewhere (Chapter 3, paragraph 29). Guidance of the form and content of statements of common ground is expected to be issued shortly.

**As a *minimum* seek to meet development needs and more**

A standard methodology for calculating local housing need will be introduced and should be used "unless there are exceptional circumstances that justify an alternative approach". Clarity on what would determine *exceptional circumstance* has

not been provided, although it should be noted that the housing need figure of the Draft London Plan is based on an assessment that deviates from the proposed standard methodology. As Epsom & Ewell is continuous with and cannot be disentangled from greater London, it could be considered sound and reasonable to follow suit. Further details relating to the standard methodology are expected to be published within the Planning Policy Guidance (PPG).

Although there remains the requirement for local planning authorities to identify the size, type and tenure of homes for different groups of the community. There is concern as to the soundness of an approach that will require the disaggregation of the standard methodology figure derived from a simple formula to identify the qualitative housing needs.

The draft revisions seek that, as a **minimum**, *strategic* and *local* plans should provide for an area's housing and other development needs, as well as any that cannot be met within neighbouring area, where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development. This would be established through a requirement to produce Statements of Common Ground between neighbouring councils. These will be prepared and maintained as evidence (where appropriate) of the statutory duty to co-operate in order to meet the test of soundness.

This appears to acknowledge that there is likely to be areas where there is unmet housing need but this would then conflict with first requirement for plans to meet all identified needs, as a minimum.

Similarly, paragraph 11(b) advises that plans should provide for development need unless "the application of policies in this framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area". A defined list (replacing examples) of policies which provide a specific reason for restricting development are set out in footnote 7, this now includes Ancient Woodland and aged or veteran trees.

To meet the draft revised tests of soundness, plans should form "an appropriate strategy", compared with the current requirement for them to constitute "the most appropriate strategy" for the area. This avoids the need to demonstrate that a strategy is optimal. Strategies and policies are to be based on proportionate, relevant and up to date evidence, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned that take account of relevant market signals.

It is disappointing that there is a continued conflation between the assessed development needs, in particular the housing need figure with constituting a housing target. Repeatedly, the needs figure is referred to as the *minimum* a plan should seek to deliver.

### **A new kind of affordable housing**

The draft revisions advise that 'where the need for affordable housing is identified, planning policies should specify the type of affordable housing needs, and except it to be met on site'.

It is proposed that the definition of affordable housing is significantly changed. The proposals remove the differentiation between affordable and social rent and introduces starter homes and discounted market sales housing as well as setting out other affordable routes to home ownership. There is limited detail relating to these products and further clarification is required.

The amended definition of affordable housing reflects the Government's focus on delivering affordable home ownership products rather than support for the rental market. Indeed the draft revisions sets a requirement for at least 10% of homes on major housing site (10 or more homes) to be available for affordable home ownership.

In contrast, the Borough Council's evidence (SHMA 2016) shows an acute need for affordable rental homes in the Borough and outlines the affordable needs of our residents by type. The primary requirement is for social rented (94%) followed by affordable rent (6%), there is no requirement for intermediate products which would be akin to the Government's proposed affordable home ownership offer. There is a real risk that a continued focus on affordable home ownership, a product preferred by developers would severely limit the Borough Council's ability to deliver the type of homes in greatest need.

To date the Borough Council has continued to pursue its current adopted Core Strategy Policy CS9 Affordable Housing that requires contributions from proposals of five or more dwellings. The justification and evidence of the continued application of the policy was set out in the Borough Council's Statement on the Exceptional of Small Sites from Development Contributions (Affordable Housing) (December 2017).

Disappointingly, the draft revisions preclude local authorities from applying affordable housing policies to small sites (less than 10 units or 1,000sqm floor space). The proposed wording does not appear to allow any flexibility to reflect local circumstances and, as such, the current policy requirements of CS9 would conflict with the proposed national policy. The proposed revision will constrain affordable housing delivery in the immediate future.

### **Promoting sustainable transport**

The draft revisions do not propose any significant changes in relation to transport but it does highlight the need for transport planning to be considered early in the plan and decision making process. Specifically, there is more emphasis importance of sustainable modes of transport, which is welcomed. However, in contrast paragraph 107 states that maximum parking standards should not be applied as a matter of course unless there is a clear and compelling justification. This would imply that minimum standards should be sought be default.

It is disappointing the draft revisions fail to include a definition of 'severe' residual cumulative impact on the road network or road safety.

### **Identifying land for homes and making effective use of land**

The draft revisions require that policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. In addition there would be a requirement for at least 20% of the sites identified for

housing to be on small sites of half an hectare or less. This makes a bold assumption that this quantity of small sites are available in the Borough and will be continue to be in the future.

The draft revisions introduces a new chapter titled 'making effective use of land'. This chapter combines existing policy with a number of proposal from the Housing White Paper. Local Plans should include a 'clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or brownfield land'. Policies and decisions should seek to make more intensive use of existing land and buildings with substantial weight is to be given to the use of brownfield land within urban areas.

The proposals would require planning policies and decisions to avoid homes being built at low densities and ensure that development makes optimal use of the potential of each site'. Paragraph 123c proposes that local planning authorities should refuse applications which fail to make effective use of land, in areas where there is an existing or anticipated shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs.

The draft revisions introduces the expectation of minimum densities policies, particularly in town and city centres and locations with good public transport accessibility in areas where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs.

The weight given to brownfield land and the concept of optimising densities is welcomed in principle. However, a narrow focus on increasingly higher densities (and thus the delivery of smaller units) will fail to provide for the varying types of homes required. Indeed the SHMA 2016 identified that within Epsom & Ewell 47% of the homes needed should be 3 or more bedrooms.

Furthermore, it is vital that development representing an effective use of land including high-density proposal are of a high quality design that adds to the distinctive character of the Borough. Unfortunately, from experience many of the high-density schemes currently proposed in the Borough by the industry often fail to inspire.

The draft revisions (Chapter 12, paragraphs 124-130) would offer an opportunity for the Borough Council to provide more detailed design guidelines, setting out a local derived clear design vision and expectations, which could be supported by visual tools such as design guides and codes. This is a contrast to the previous stance, which sought to avoid unnecessary prescription. Officers are already exploring different development typologies to assist in identifying what *optimal* developments could look like in Epsom & Ewell.

The draft revisions implement the Housing White Paper proposal that design should not be used as a reason to object to development where the scheme complies with local policies. It also places additional emphasis on the importance of pre-application discussions in securing good design

The current ability and willingness of house builders to deliver *optimal* development is uncertain. Our evidence of current market signals from site promoters, house

builders and developers with interest in the Borough indicates that the appetite for higher density schemes is not shared by all.

The draft revisions also propose a flexible approach to policies or guidance that could inhibit making effective use of a site and specifically refers to daylight and sunlight issues. This could be interpreted as a downgrading of the importance of the residential amenity of existing occupants when weighed against the benefits of delivering new homes.

The draft revisions seek to make it easier to convert and reallocate retail and employment land for housing, where there is high housing demand and providing it does not 'undermine key economic sectors or the vitality and viability of town centres'.

To date, the Borough Council has proactively sought to protect and retain its employment land reflecting its valuable contribution to the local economy and sustainable place making. In essence, the proposals would result in less protection for undesignated employment land; a reflection of the Government's dominant housing agenda.

### **Vitality of town centres**

There is a minor change to the sequential approach to town centre development, whereby suitable sites in a town centre or edge-of-centre includes not just those sites which are 'available' but also those 'expected to become available within a reasonable period' (Chapter 7, paragraph 87).

### **Protecting Green Belt Land and establishing a need for changes**

The draft revisions seek continued strong protection for the Green Belt and provide clarification of the circumstances in which release may occur. Specifically, paragraphs 136-137 implement the Housing White Paper proposals that certain criteria should be satisfied before 'exceptional circumstances' are used to change Green Belt boundaries.

There would be a requirement to fully examine "all reasonable options" for meeting identified development needs before releasing Green Belt. This will be assessed through the examination of the plan, considering whether the proposed strategy;

- a) Makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land;
- b) Optimising the density of development, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres, and other locations well served by public transport; and
- c) Has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development as demonstrated through the statement of common ground.

Where Green Belt is released first consideration should be given to land which has been previously-developed or which is well served by public transport. Plans should also set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be

offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land.

For decision-taking the general presumption against inappropriate development remains unchanged. The list of limited exceptions for development that is considered appropriate in the Green Belt is also largely unchanged other than it now also includes facilities for burial grounds and allotments as long as they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it; and in the case of affordable housing on previously-developed land, would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt (Chapter 13, paragraph 144).

### **Maintaining and ensuring land supply and the delivery of homes**

Housing delivery is a high priority for the Government. The draft revisions would allow the Borough Council to consider imposing planning conditions requiring development to be brought forward within two years, unless this could hinder viability or deliverability. It also encourages consideration of why major sites have not been built out when considering subsequent planning applications. This is a significant softening of the Government previous proposal that a developer's 'track record' should be considered when deciding whether to grant planning permission.

When granting planning permission the draft revisions seek to restrict the use of 'unnecessary' planning conditions, introducing a requirement that all pre-commencement conditions to be agreed in writing with the applicant (Chapter 4, paragraph 56). Whilst this may speed up implementation of a permission, it may present challenges to achieving timely decisions.

It should be noted that the revised text warns against opposing national policies through imposition of local planning controls unless there are good arguments for such action. The use of Article 4 directions should be limited to situations where it is necessary to protect local amenity or the wellbeing of the area. Planning conditions should not be used to restrict national permitted development rights unless there is clear justification for doing so (Chapter 4, paragraph 54).

Local Planning Authorities continue to be required to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites through a recently adopted plan or an annual position statement. As per the current NPPF, failure to demonstrate a five-year housing supply triggers the presumption in favour of sustainable development. The draft revisions propose a mechanism to allow the five-year land supply position to be agreed for a one-year period, subject to a 10% buffer 'to account for any fluctuations in the market during that year'.

It is intended that the implications of the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) will follow one day after the publication of the results, expected in November 2018. Based on the proposed HDT calculation as outlined in the Draft Measurement Rule Book, Officers have estimated that delivery of housing in Epsom & Ewell would be classified as 'substantial under-delivery'.

The draft revisions introduces the policy consequence of the HDT (see Paragraphs 74(c), 75, 77 and Footnote 29). The results of the HDT can be a trigger for the



operation of the presumption favour of sustainable development. If delivery is less than 95% of the housing requirement, then an action plan will be needed, the presumption in favour applies from 2020 if delivery falls below 75%. However, the circumstances to which it will be concluded that a Council has failed to 'step up' to delivery and therefore placed into special measures including be stripped of its right to decide planning application is not included in the draft revisions.

The HDT will increase the Local Plan's accountability for delivering new homes. As a result, we will need to place a greater emphasis on ensuring that our housing sites are genuinely deliverable. Officers are already considering how they could engage with developers and landowners to gain confirmation of realistic timeframes for commencements, site capacities and build out rates.

### **Reviewing plans**

Plan reviews will be required every five years following the date of adoption, with updates, if necessary to reflect changing circumstances. The draft revisions advise that at this stage Councils should consider reallocating land where there is no reasonable prospect of an application coming forward for the allocated use and set out how alternative uses should be considered ahead of a plan review.

### **Going Further**

Under the heading 'Going Further' within the consultation proposals, the Government notes that in order to put England on track to deliver 300,000 new homes a year more needs to be done (beyond the package set out in the Housing White Paper and the draft revisions to the NPPF).

As a consequence, the Government is considering further planning reforms that could explore the opportunities through new permitted development to 'make sure that we are using the space we have available efficiently and reduces the need to build out'. This builds up the Written Ministerial Statement of 5 February 2018, which made clear that planning policies and decisions should allow the use of airspace above existing residential and commercial premises to create new homes.

Furthermore, as there will are locations where meeting local needs through more efficient use of urban land is not possible, there will be a need to find extra land. To this end, the Government will explore wider measures to support farm diversification and housing in the rural economy. Further consultation is expected as these proposals are developed.

### **A New Approach to Viability**

The Government is seeking to tighten the 'viability loophole' and to that end, issues of viability should be the exception and not the norm when determining planning applications. The draft revisions propose that where policy requirements have been tested for viability at the plan making stages, such issues should not usually need to be visited again at the planning application stage. The proposals would allow the Borough Council to identify the circumstances in which viability assessments will be required in their Local Plans. It will also be within their gift to identify review mechanisms that could be used to amend developer contributions to help account for *significant* changes in costs and values. Specifically, the guidance also makes clear that overpaying for land cannot be used to justify a failure to comply with policy.

Where viability assessments are needed, the new guidance sets out a standardised approach and a requirement for them to be made publicly available.

Officers welcome a standardised and transparent approach, however, the guidance is much stronger than the proposed policy itself. It is considered that the proposals fail to amount to the significant reforms needed and it is unlikely they will result in an end to viability assessments or renegotiations of planning obligations.

**Implementation**

The consultation on the revised text of the NPPF runs until 10 May 2018, with current expectation that the final document will be published before the Parliamentary recess at the end of July 2018.

Transitional arrangements include that plans submitted for examination within six months of the final document being published will be assessed against the existing NPPF; in all other cases plans will be expected to conform to the new policy wording.

The Housing Delivery Test will apply from the date that the first data results are published, expected to be November 2018, with a phased three-year introduction where there is substantial under-delivery.

Statements of common ground will be expected to have been agreed within six months of the final NPPF being published.

**Supporting House Building through Developer Contributions**

Alongside the publication of the draft revisions to the NPPF, the Government has also published an additional consultation to explore the potential for further Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) reforms. The premise is to reduce complexity, increase certainty, improve transparency and increase market responsiveness.

Interestingly the consultation propose that combined authorities and joint committees with strategic planning authority will be able to charge a Strategic Infrastructure Tariff equivalent to the London Mayoral CIL in place to fund Crossrail.

In addition, the consultation considers the potential for affordable housing and infrastructure contributions to be set nationally and to be non-negotiable. Given the wide disparity of land values across England, it is unclear how a meaningful nationally prescribed contribution tariff could be achieved.