

Sandown Park Racecourse, Portsmouth Road, Esher

Green Belt Planning Statement - Table 1: Appropriate¹ Development in the Green Belt

| Site | Site Area (ha) | Existing Land Use | Proposed Land Use | Previously Developed Land | Indicative change in built form on site (existing/proposed) | Impact on Openness – Spatial/Visual | Appropriateness ¹ of Development |
|------|----------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| A | 2.27 | Outdoor Recreation Operational area and facilities for the racecourse including stable blocks, pre-parade ring and enclosures and hardstanding areas | Outdoor Recreation Operational area and facilities for the racecourse including stable blocks, pre-parade ring and enclosures and hardstanding areas | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures and associated fixed surface infrastructure within the curtilage of the racecourse | Footprint (m ²) 1,899/2,500 Floor area (m ²) 1,927/2,900 Volume (m ³) 4,800/8,900 *Excludes existing Sandown Park Lodge which is located on the boundary with Site 2 (see below) | Development proposed would not change the perception of openness within the Racecourse overall, nor would it reduce the perceived “essential gap” between Esher and developed land to the north of the Racecourse. | Appropriate ¹ . Appropriate outdoor recreation facility. There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site located to the south-west of the existing Grandstand which separates it from the main areas of the Racecourse. The proposals, being of an appropriate land use, would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| B | 0.3 | Outdoor Recreation Predominantly an area of hardstanding serving the racecourse | Hotel (to serve outdoor recreation) A hotel, albeit to meet a site specific need generated by the racecourse | Yes – site accommodates fixed surface infrastructure associated within the curtilage of the racecourse | Footprint (m ²) 0/1,700 Floor area (m ²) 0/6,997 Volume (m ³) 0/27,950 | The site is located adjacent to the existing Grandstand. Development in this location would not lead to the perceived coalescence of settlements, albeit reducing the location very slightly from which views of the northern boundary of the Racecourse can be seen from Portsmouth Road. As such, the perceived “essential gap” between Esher and developed land to the north of the Racecourse would remain. | Appropriate ¹ . Supporting appropriate outdoor recreation facility. There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site being well-related to existing built context. While development of the site would restrict views to the northern boundary of the Racecourse to a degree, it would not lead to the perceived coalescence of settlements. Further, the proposals represent a relocation of a hotel that already benefits from an implementable planning permission. The proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |

Footnotes:

1. “Appropriate”/“Inappropriate” as identified in Paragraph 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019

| Site | Site Area (ha) | Existing Land Use | Proposed Land Use | Previously Developed Land | Indicative change in built form on site (existing/proposed) | Impact on Openness – Spatial/Visual | Appropriateness ¹ of Development |
|------|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| C | 3.6 | Outdoor Recreation A kart track, hard surfaced parking area and associated permanent structures | Outdoor Recreation A family/community zone | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures and fixed surface infrastructure | Footprint (m ²) 1,065/700 Floor area (m ²) 1,065/700 Volume (m ³) 3,000/2,500 | Given the scale of the development proposed, being similar to that of the existing built context, with the beneficial effect of replacing large areas of hard-standing with surfacing with a softer aesthetic, namely Grasscrete or similar, there would not be a material increase in built form within the central areas of the racecourse from that of the existing baseline. | Appropriate ¹ . Appropriate outdoor recreation facility. Reduction in built form within the Site. The proposed development would largely be seen to replace existing built form, including the replacement of a large area of hardstanding in the form of an existing go-kart track. The site is considered previously developed land and the proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| D | 4.2 | Outdoor Recreation A hard surfaced parking area serving the golf centre to the north, and grassed area used for parking during race meetings (and, as such, in the curtilage of the racecourse) | Outdoor Recreation An improved car parking facility to serve outdoor recreational activities within the larger racecourse site | In part – the hard-surfaced area is fixed surface infrastructure in the curtilage of the golf centre | Footprint (m ²) 0/0 Floor area (m ²) 0/0 Volume (m ³) 0/0 | Given the scale of the development proposed, being similar to that of the existing built context, with the beneficial effect of replacing large areas of hard-standing with surfacing with a softer aesthetic, namely Grasscrete or similar, there would not be a material increase in built form within the central areas of the racecourse from that of the existing baseline. | Appropriate ¹ . Appropriate outdoor recreation facility. No built form proposed. The proposed development would largely be seen to replace existing built form, including the replacement of a large area of hardstanding. The site is considered previously developed land and the proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| E | 0.68 | Outdoor Recreation Divided into two parts. Site E1 is currently used as part of the overflow car parking on race days. E2 is adjacent to the golf course. Both areas are grassed, and in the immediate setting of the racetrack | Outdoor Recreation Both parts of Site E will become part of the racetrack, as a result of track widening | No | Footprint (m ²) 0/0 Floor area (m ²) 0/0 Volume (m ³) 0/0 | Given the nature of the development proposed, being similar to that of the existing built context, there would not be a material increase in built form within the central areas of the Racecourse from that of the existing baseline. | Appropriate ¹ . Appropriate outdoor recreation facility. The proposed development would extend the existing race track. The site is not previously developed land and no built form is proposed, therefore, the proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |

Footnotes:

1. “Appropriate”/“Inappropriate” as identified in Paragraph 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019

| Site | Site Area (ha) | Existing Land Use | Proposed Land Use | Previously Developed Land | Indicative change in built form on site (existing/proposed) | Impact on Openness – Spatial/Visual | Appropriateness ¹ of Development |
|------|----------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| F | 3.68 | Outdoor Recreation Mainly a formal and semi-formal parking area in the use, and curtilage of, the racecourse. Part of the site is also used as the broadcasting compound on race days | Outdoor Recreation An improved car parking facility to serve the racecourse, including relocation of the existing broadcasting compound and turnstiles. A new ring main unit will also be installed (however, given its use and scale, it will be de minimus in the context of the proposal) | Yes | Footprint (m ²) 0/3 Floor area (m ²) 0/3 Volume (m ³) 0/9 | Development proposed would not change the perception of openness within the Racecourse overall, nor would it reduce the perceived ' <i>essential gap</i> ' between Esher and developed land to the north of the Racecourse. | Appropriate ¹ . Appropriate outdoor recreation facility. A previously developed site located to the south-east of the existing Grandstand. The proposals, being of an appropriate land use, would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| 1 | 0.24 | Outdoor Recreation Existing overflow stables and vehicular access to the racecourse | Residential Circa 15 residential units Will contribute to provision of affordable housing (at Site 2) | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures and associated fixed surface infrastructure within the curtilage of the racecourse | Footprint (m ²) 540/660 Floor area (m ²) 540/1,200 Volume (m ³) 2,200/5,300 | Development proposed would not change the perception of openness within the Racecourse overall, nor would it reduce the perceived " <i>essential gap</i> " between Esher and developed land to the north of the Racecourse. | Appropriate ¹ . Redevelopment of previously developed land/contributing to affordable housing (at site 2). There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site located to the south-west of the existing Grandstand which separates it from the main areas of the Racecourse. The proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |

Footnotes:

1. "Appropriate"/"Inappropriate" as identified in Paragraph 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019

| Site | Site Area (ha) | Existing Land Use | Proposed Land Use | Previously Developed Land | Indicative change in built form on site (existing/proposed) | Impact on Openness – Spatial/Visual | Appropriateness ¹ of Development |
|------|----------------|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | 0.42 | Outdoor Recreation The lodge and other structures, and parking and access for the racecourse | Residential Circa 49 residential affordable units Will provide affordable housing for local community needs | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures and associated fixed surface infrastructure within the curtilage of the racecourse Further, planning permission was granted for a hotel on the site in 2011, and this was partially implemented and can be completed at any time | Footprint (m ²) 469*/(1,188)/3,400 Floor area (m ²) 932*/(4,058)/6,336 Volume (m ³) 2,800/(11,200)/18,100 Figures (in brackets) refer to extant hotel consent on site *Includes Sandown Park Lodge which is located on the boundary with Site 2 | The site is well-related to the urban context or Esher. Development proposed would not change the perception of openness within the Racecourse overall, nor would it reduce the perceived “essential gap” between Esher and developed land to the north of the Racecourse. | Appropriate ¹ . Affordable housing for local community needs/redevelopment of previously developed land. There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site located to the south-west of the existing Grandstand which separates it from the main areas of the Racecourse. Further, the site is subject to an implementable planning permission for a hotel. The proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| 3 | 0.42 | Outdoor Recreation/Residential Existing accommodation for racecourse staff and car parking, access to the racecourse | Residential Circa 114 residential units Will contribute to provision of affordable housing (at Site 2) | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures providing residential accommodation and associated fixed surface infrastructure within the curtilage of the racecourse | Footprint (m ²) 199/4,050 Floor area (m ²) 586/9,450 Volume (m ³) 1,750/33,750 | Due to the increased intervisibility with the nearest ‘settlement edge’, namely the perceived northern built context of Esher being formed by the Grandstand, there would be a degree of a reduction in the sense of openness within the Racecourse. However, with the retention of a gap of approximately 480m, the Racecourse’s function in providing an “essential gap between settlements” would remain. | Inappropriate ¹ . There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site with some separation from the existing built context by mature landscape features. Proposed development would have a greater impact on openness to that of the existing built context. Overall, the proposals are considered inappropriate in spatial/visual terms. |

Footnotes:

1. “Appropriate”/“Inappropriate” as identified in Paragraph 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019

| Site | Site Area (ha) | Existing Land Use | Proposed Land Use | Previously Developed Land | Indicative change in built form on site (existing/proposed) | Impact on Openness – Spatial/Visual | Appropriateness ¹ of Development |
|------|----------------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 4 | 0.5 | Outdoor Recreation This site is within the curtilage of the racecourse, but does not accommodate any permanent structures or fixed surface infrastructure | Residential Circa 72 residential units Will contribute to provision of affordable housing (at Site 2) | No | Footprint (m ²) 0/1,500 Floor area (m ²) 0/8,454 Volume (m ³) 0/30,050 | Site adjoins an existing perceived settlement edge and is not divorced from it. The presence of mature landscape features on its northern boundary creates a soft settlement edge. The site itself, located to the south of these mature landscape features, does not contribute to the perceived separation between settlements and development of it would not change the perception of openness within the wider setting. | Inappropriate ¹ . There would be an increase in built form within the Site. Although the site is well-related to existing built context and does not contribute to the perceived separation between settlements, it is not previously developed land and would be considered new building in the Green Belt. However, overall, the proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt and the function of the Racecourse as an 'essential gap between settlements'. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |
| 5 | 0.94 | Children's Nursery/Outdoor Recreation Occupied by a children's nursery, a coach park for the racecourse and the locally listed Toll House | Children's Nursery/Residential Re-provision of existing nursery facility and circa 68 residential units Will contribute to provision of affordable housing (at Site 2) | Yes – site accommodates permanent structures, including a children's nursery, as well as associated fixed surface infrastructure within the curtilage of the racecourse | Footprint (m ²) 323/2,150 Floor area (m ²) 397 / 559 5,743 Volume (m ³) 1,200/18,150 | Site adjoins an existing perceived settlement edge and is not divorced from it. The presence of mature landscape features on its northern boundary creates a soft settlement edge. The site itself, located to the south of these mature landscape features, does not contribute to the perceived separation between settlements and development of it would not change the perception of openness within the wider setting. | Appropriate ¹ . Redevelopment of previously developed land/contributing to affordable housing (at site 2). There would be an increase in built form within the Site. However, it is a previously developed site being well-related to existing built context and does not contribute to the perceived separation between settlements. The proposals would not harm the openness of the Green Belt. Overall, the proposals are considered appropriate in spatial/visual terms. |

Footnotes:

1. "Appropriate"/"Inappropriate" as identified in Paragraph 145 and 146 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019