

And now.....

The **KEY** Arguments in
Greater Detail

'Exceptional Circumstances' Are Needed to Change the Green Belt

EBC justification to build on **Green Belt** is based on:

- SHMA guesstimate of housing needs for next 20 years (how often do such projections prove to be incorrect?).
- EBC choosing to build on **Green Belt** so as to avoid higher housing densities in urban areas.

The NPPF says **unmet housing need is not a justification**, so have EBC really demonstrated 'Exceptional Circumstances'?

'The Support of Local People' is also Needed to Change the Green Belt

- 'Exceptional Circumstances' and your support for doing this are required.
- If you do not support the removal of our local Green Belt then please tell Elmbridge.

Green Belt – The Five Purposes

as in: National Planning Policy Framework

1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
2. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another.
3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.
5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Green Belt Boundary Review – The Scoring System

Assessing 'parcels' of GB land v. the 'Five Purposes'

- Approach used by other Councils and generally accepted.
- Depends on correct identification of communities.
- Depends on a degree of subjective judgement by the assessor.
- Prone to questionable outcomes (i.e. my view v. yours).
- Only 2 of 5 Purposes apply locally – Purposes 2 and 3.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) - Purpose 2 of the Green Belt.....

'To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'.

The GBBR identified 'settlements' as its 'towns'.

- Our settlement sits in Oxshott/Cobham
- Next settlement is Leatherhead/Fetcham
- Stoke d'Abernon does not exist for the GBBR
- Therefore Parcel 14 scores 1 out of 5!
- But EBC's own Flood Risk Assessment recognises Cobham, Downside, Oxshott and Stoke d'Abernon as **separate** communities.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) -

Purpose 2 of the Green Belt.....

Stoke d'Abernon.....

- Is mentioned in the Domesday Book.
- Has the oldest Parish in the area.
- Has a Grade 1 church with Saxon origins that is probably the oldest church in Surrey.
- Is home to a world renowned music school.
- Is headquarters for one of the top Premier League football clubs.
- Has a unique and special character.

.....Yet is not recognised in the GBBR!

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) - Purpose 3 of the Green Belt.....

'To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'.

- GBBR states that:
 - land less than 3% built upon and/or having strong unspoilt rural character would score 5, or
 - If 3% to 5% built upon would score 4.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) - Purpose 3 of the Green Belt.....

Parcel 14 is 2.5% built upon and GBBR admits buildings are widely dispersed, yet says it is:

- semi-urban,
 - has weak links to rest of Green Belt and is
 - 'almost completely enclosed by Cobham/Oxshott'.
-
- The 'weak links' are solely due to Blundel Lane and the railway line.
 - This results in a GBBR score of 2 out of 5.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) –

Why is Community Amenity not a Green Belt Purpose?

- Approx 22 acres of Parcel 14 are owned jointly by two local Scout Councils.
- The facility is heavily used – some 1,400 scouts and other groups (e.g. D of E Awards) every year.
- Highly valued and very difficult to replace.
- Owners are not interested in selling this land.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) - Final Judgement

Parcel 14 failed to score 3 or more for either Purpose, therefore it is classified as:

Weakly Performing the Green Belt Purposes and can be removed from the Green Belt.

THIS ASSESSMENT IS THE **ONLY** JUSTIFICATION FOR GREEN BELT REMOVAL.

Green Belt Boundary Review (GBBR) - 'Absolute Constraints'

- Would limit or even prevent development.
- Parcel 14 contains areas of Ancient Woodland
- Commons (Littleheath) and Village Greens
- Topography - steeply rising in parts.
- Rainwater run off - Blundel Lane has moderate to high flooding probability now.
-not to mention lack of local infrastructure.

Elmbridge says Absolute Constraints apply to only 17% of Parcel 14

Are There Any Alternatives?

- **Brown Field Sites?** Is there any evidence these have been fully explored? e.g. Molesey Sewage Works? Any others?
- **GB Parcels** with more developable acreage?
- **Existing Urban Areas?** Elmbridge has chosen to build on the **Green Belt** instead, yet urban areas are better able to deal with extra housing, e.g.:
 - Better road networks and transport links.
 - Schools, doctors, dentists, hospitals, etc., in place.
 - Opportunities for employment closer to home.

OPEN DISCUSSION