



Ellie Fowler
HGH Consulting

Date: 17 September 2025

Our Ref: M22/0514.10

Your Ref: 2023/1281

By email only: efowler@hghconsulting.com

Dear Ellie

RE: NUTFIELD GREEN PARK, THE FORMER LAPORTE WORKS, NUTFIELD ROAD, NUTFIELD, SURREY

I am responding to your email of 8th September which you provided with comments back from Surrey County Council's Senior Commissioning Manager dated 21 August with further queries over the older persons housing element of this scheme.

I have taken those comments and set them out in this letter (the original comments in blue for ease of reference) with our detailed responses below in blue for ease of reference.

- Paragraph 3.15 - the applicant contends that the SHOP@ methodology "had been supported in numerous appeal decisions as an appropriate method for calculating future need". The applicant should set out these appeal decisions together with the appeal dates to evidence this.

Before even getting onto the matter of planning appeals it is worth considering what the PPG notes in the section entitled 'Housing for older and disabled people.' It notes the following: *"The age profile of the population can be drawn from Census data. Projections of population and households by age group can also be used. The future need for specialist accommodation for older people broken down by tenure and type (e.g. sheltered housing, extra care) may need to be assessed and can be obtained from a number of online tool kits provided by the sector, for example the Strategic Housing for Older People Analysis Tool (SHOP@), which is a tool for forecasting the housing and care needs of older people. Evidence from Joint Strategic Needs Assessments prepared by Health and Wellbeing Boards can also be useful. The assessment of need can also set out the level of need for residential care homes. (Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 63-004-20190626)"* (my emphasis added)

That is therefore a clear recognition that the government recognise @SHOP as one toolkit to calculating future need.

Turning to the matter of appeals I have set out a table below of some of the relevant appeals where the matter of need and thus methodology have been discussed. This is not an exhaustive list but is useful

Site	Date	Pins ref:	Nature of scheme
Land to the rear of 237-259 London Road, West Malling	19/12/2018	APP/H2265/W/18/ 3202040	79 extra care units
Beechmoor Garden Centre, Whitchurch Road, Great Boughton	17/07/2019	APP/A0665/W/18/ 3203413	110 extra care units
Land to the east of Reading Road, Lower Shiplake	14/10/2019	APP/Q3115/W/19/ 3220425	65 extra care units
Land to the rear of Burston Garden Centre North	09/01/2020 31/01/2022	APP/B1930/W/19/ 3235642 & APP/B1930/W/21/ 3279463	64 bed care home and 125 extra care units 124 extra care units

Orbital Road, Chiswell Green			
Homebase Site, New Zealand Avenue, Walton on Thames	21/06/2021	APP/K3605/W/20/ 3263347	222 extra care units
Little Sparrows, Sonning Common	25/06/2021	APP/Q3115/W/20/ 3265861	266 extra care units
Homebase Site, Pines Way, Bath	02/09/2021	APP/F0114/W/21/ 3268794	Extra care units
Royal Cambridge Home, 82-84 Hurst Road, East Molesey	18/10/2021	APP/K3605/W/20/ 3257109	32 bed care home and 60 extra care units
Kent & Surrey Golf Club, Crouch House Road, Edenbridge	02/11/2021	APP/G2245/W/21/ 3271595	Extra care units
163-187 High St, Bottisham	07/04/2022 & 13/02/2024	APP/V0510/W/21/ 3282241 & APP/V0510/W/23/ 3324141	Extra care units
Land South of Arlesey Road, Stotfold	31/08/2022	APP/P0240/W/21/ 3289401	Extra care units
Land at Sandown Park, Royal Tunbridge Wells	02/09/2022	APP/M2270/W/21/ 3289034	180 extra care units
Land off Coombe Road, Norbiton	02/11/2022	APP/Z5630/W/22/ 3293957	128 extra care units
Land West of Wroslyn Road, Freeland	18/01/2023	APP/D3125/W/22/ 3301202	160 extra care units
Land off Ellesmere Road, Hencote	02/03/2023	APP/L3245/W/22/ 3306381	75 bed care home and 164 extra care units
Land to the south & east of the former Chimes Garden Centre, Nazeing	11/11/2024	APP/J1535/W/24/ 3342224	65 extra care units
Land East of Vicarage Road, Sunbury-on-Thames	22/11/2024	APP/Z3635/W/24/ 3342657	60 bed care home and 164 extra care units
Land South of Leighton Road, Stanbridge	24/12/2024	APP/P0240/W/24/ 3347529	66 bed care home and 99 extra care units
Former North Hill Sawmill Yard, Baddesley Road, Chandlers Ford	04/03/2025	APP/C1760/W/23/ 3328784	65 bed care home or 48 extra care, and 101 extra care units
Former Hook Estate and Kennels, Coopers Lane Road/Firs Wood Close, Northaw	25/03/2025	APP/C1950/W/24/ 3354772	Extra care units

What is relevant to also note is that in many of these appeals the alternative 'Housing in Later Life' approach was used to calculate future need. The difference being that this approach adopts a higher level of provision rate for leasehold extra care provision than that set out in @SHOP. Both approaches are well evidenced on appeal and supported by the Inspectorate. One only has to have regard to the older peoples housing taskforce report from last year where it notes that: *"There is currently no consensus on the best way of evidencing need for OPH/LLH and there was frustration at this expressed from all quarters. LPAs who responded to the Taskforce's housing survey reported using multiple methodologies, including external consultants, census and survey data and the Housing LIN model (currently being updated). The inconsistent approaches and subsequent lengthy and costly appeal decisions have endorsed appellants' views that the standard toolkits underestimate need, are over complicated, are based on past data rather than aspiring to meet future needs, and are not always transparent or consistent.*

LPAs frequently underestimate need by extrapolating from past delivery, which means ignoring both previously unmet demand and the increased demand arising from the ageing population."

It is worth also noting that although dated, the Council's own approach to identifying need that is enshrined in policy CSP8 was itself based on an earlier version of the @SHOP toolkit.

- Paragraphs 3.16 and 4.7 – the applicant should elaborate on the “overall failure in policy terms to meet the housing needs of older people”, given Surrey County Council's plans to develop more affordable extra care housing in the Tandridge area in the years up to 2030. Paragraph 4.7 also appears to cast doubt on affordable extra care housing provision being increased in the local area before 2030 or 2035, despite the plans Surrey County Council has for the land it owns in the area.

The Council's principal policy for delivering specialist older persons housing derives from the Core Strategy 2008 and policy CSP8. This is a policy that I am particularly aware of as it derived from a Statement of Common Ground signed between the Council and Retirement Villages during the course of the examination in public process to ensure that the council positively sought to address the needs of older people. Crucially that policy noted in the opening paragraph that it would: *“provide for the development of at least 162 units of Extra Care Housing in the period up to 2016 and additional units in the period 2017-2026 following an updated assessment of need”*

That provision by 2016 was never met with the only application approved delivering 83 units (again a scheme I am familiar with as I was the agent for that scheme). That has meant that since the adoption of the policy the Council has never managed to meet even the lowest level of potential need. Indeed, the withdrawn Local Plan had no clear approach to meeting need merely identifying a single site for 24 units as I recall. There has therefore been a compelling historic failure of the Council to meet a clearly identified need and that need is greatest in the leasehold or private rental sector, meaning that the efforts of the County Council will do nothing to meet this.

It is interesting to note that the County Council's own profile assessment considers that the only approved scheme providing extra care (operational or with consent) is the Audley scheme in Lingfield for 150 units. It makes no reference to Charters Village in Dormansland which is an extra care development that has been operational for many years and has been counted by the district council as an extra care development delivered against policy CSP8. That indicates that the County Council's own assessment is failing.

- Paragraph 3.17 - when identifying the number of beds in the Tandridge District area, the applicant should use the lists produced by the [Care Quality Commission](#) as the regulator of residential care homes and nursing care homes. The figures in [Planning guidance for accommodation with care for older people - Tandridge](#) analysed the CQC lists and established that there were 328 residential care home beds registered for older people and 644 nursing care home beds registered for older people as at January 2024:

Location Name	Care homes beds	Care home type
Longmead House	23	Residential
Courthill Care Home	6	Residential
David Gresham House	29	Residential
Cherry Lodge Rest Home	19	Residential
Burntwood Lodge	6	Residential
Ridgeway Manor Residential Care Home	43	Residential
College of St Barnabas	28	Residential
Spring Park	4	Residential
Greenways	6	Residential

Oakleigh	51	Residential
Elizabeth Court	59	Residential
Champions Place	14	Residential
Mill Green	6	Residential
Woodview (Active Prospects)	9	Residential
Rainscombe House	3	Residential
Rainscombe Bungalow	6	Residential
Wolfe House Care Home	16	Residential
Glebe House Care Home (Nursing)	43	Nursing
Coombe Dingle Nursing Home	35	Nursing
Windmill Manor	60	Nursing
Woodside View	26	Nursing
Buxton Lodge Care Home	44	Nursing
Tupwood Gate	35	Nursing
Charters Court Nursing and Residential Home	60	Nursing
Heatherley - Care Home with Nursing Physical Disabilities	43	Nursing
Cranmer Court	62	Nursing
Greathed Manor Nursing Home	40	Nursing
King's Lodge Centre for Complex Care	64	Nursing
Tandridge Heights	75	Nursing
Oakhurst Court Nursing Home	57	Nursing

The figures show a very different picture to that presented by the applicant, and a new version of the planning profile for Tandridge (to be published shortly) will reveal minor changes to the bed numbers as at April 2025.

The list of operating care homes that we used was sourced via <https://housingcare.org> and is a well-used resource for such assessments. Those homes of course only include provision of care for those aged 65 and over which is of course the focus of our proposed development.

Looking at the longer list provided here when reviewing Courthill Care Home (Courthill Care Home, 2 Court Road, Caterham, Surrey CR3 5RD) it clearly notes that admission criteria is for those aged 18-65 thus not specifically tailored for older people. That is the same for Greenwys. Mill Green is similarly listed as providing primary care for those with learning disability/ autism and being younger adults. Rainscombe House care home provides care for those both over and under 65 but focussed again on those with learning disability/ autism. Regardless, it is worth noting that this site along with Rainscombe Bungalow have been closed. Kings Lodge Centre is a specialist home for those with "Neuro-disability or neurodegenerative disorder, including acquired brain injury, MS, Parkinson's, Huntington's Disease or Epilepsy" whilst our focus was more on general care needs.

Looking at the list and only considering those that provide care for the over 65s the provision is therefore not that dissimilar in the wider context. Spring Park appears to be the only standard home that would

be otherwise added, which would only result in 4 additional bed spaces being added to the current provision thus not drastically altering our assessment.

- Paragraph 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 – while arguments can be made on the definition of an Integrated Retirement Community, the applicant will still need to demonstrate that the proposed specialist housing units should be argued for a C2 planning use rather than C3. This reflects on the NPPG for [Housing for older and disabled people - GOV.UK](#), which presents “extra care housing or housing-with-care” as a separate typology of specialist housing to “Residential care homes and nursing homes”, noting that “any single development may contain a range of different types of specialist housing.” In order to argue for a C2 planning use, the services provided to people living in the specialist housing units will need to be either regarded as indivisible from the functions of the care home (as without it the specialist housing would no longer be C2). Alternatively the communal facilities, existing outside the care home and forming part of the specialist housing submission, must be in place to primarily support the residents and so form part of the C2 use class, and substantial enough to be far beyond what is normally found in older people’s housing, i.e. clearly for people in need of care.

This is incorrect and appears to be recognised in a later point below when referring to the ARCO standard s106 which clearly establishes that when restricting occupation of extra care to those who are aged 65 and over and in receipt of care that is sufficient of itself to constitute a class C2 use. That is a position supported in the appeals that I have referenced above. It is therefore our position that subject to the imposition of an age qualification on entry (typically set at a minimum of 65 and over) and for such qualifying residents to also be in receipt of the minimum care package (that being set at 2 hours per week) the extra care element of the scheme would fall within a C2 use class.

The extra care would still operate separately to the care home due to the CQC registration requirements. The definition of use class has little to do with the wider communal facilities provided on site and more to do with the definition and provision of the care package – this is relevant as the range of communal facilities clearly differs across schemes depending on tenure and scheme size. As shown in the later extract in this letter defining what IRCs are, typical facilities are listed but the additional facilities that are proposed in this scheme go beyond that and are not essential to defining the C2 element.

- Paragraph 4.10 – as stated above the applicant has not referred to the CQC’s list of care homes which are registered to support older people. As a result they have not included the care homes highlighted in the above list.

This has been dealt with above.

- Paragraph 4.11 – while it should be noted that the CQC ratings for the significant majority of the care homes in the above list have been rated as “Good” or “Outstanding” for the quality of their care, there is no correlation between the facilities at each care home and these ratings. In addition, the statement that “these older care homes are under the greatest pressure to deliver suitable accommodation to meet the needs of older people and are more likely to come forward for conversion or redevelopment” suggests that improvements in the local market for care homes with regard to facilities may come from existing sites being redeveloped, rather than through the building of new care homes on the Green Belt.

This is an opinion that I, and many others who undertake similar assessments, have formed over the many years of undertaking this work as with all of the regulations needed now to maintain the highest level of care the smaller older homes are struggling to keep up and provide viable provision, hence pressures to cease operating.

The following remain as queries from my previous correspondence of 16 June:

- The undertakings which the applicant would need to make in order to evidence the suitability of a C2 planning use for the “extra care facility beds”. The proximity of the care home is not enough to evidence this – the operation of both the proposed care home and relevant housing units need to be intertwined to the extent that they, together, form what the applicant describes as an “integrated retirement community”. For background to this the applicant is invited to examine the outcome of

appeal [Reference: APP/Q3115/W/19/3220425](#), in particular paragraph 43, and to consider ARCO's model s106 which sets out what should be expected for a housing setting to be regarded as C2: [Model Section 106 Agreement for Integrated Retirement Communities | ARCO](#). The applicant should note that the care home will operate in a very different fashion to a housing with care setting, being solely regulated by the Care Quality Commission and placing restrictions on many residents' activities when meeting their needs, and the care home's facilities will need to be substantial enough to accommodate both the needs of its residents but also people living in the housing with care units nearby.

It is telling the appeal that has been referenced given that I was the agent for this case and presented evidence to the inquiry itself on the matter of use class and the restrictions necessary through a s106 to warrant a C2 use. What is perhaps more notable is that this appeal was then followed by another appeal where the C2 use wasn't supported resulting in the subsequent Rectory Homes high court judgement that provided clarification on the approach to affordable housing provision from such specialist schemes.

Whilst all that is noted by means of background I am not entirely sure what is meant by drawing attention to paragraph 43. Lower Shiplake was only related to the provision of extra care, there was no care home on site. ARCO itself defines Integrated Retirement Communities with no specific mentioning of the provision of Care Homes, indeed they are listed separately when having regard to their definitions of the typologies of specialist provision as shown below.

How are IRCs different from other types of older people's housing?		
Retirement Housing	Integrated Retirement Communities	Care Homes
 <p>Also known as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sheltered housing Retirement flats or communities 	 <p>Also known as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extra care Retirement villages Housing-with-Care Assisted living Independent living 	 <p>Also known as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nursing Homes Residential Homes Old People's Home
 <p>Offers self-contained homes for sale, shared-ownership or rent</p>	 <p>Offers self-contained homes for sale, shared-ownership or rent</p>	 <p>Communal residential living with residents occupying individual rooms, often with an en-suite bathroom</p>
 <p>Part-time warden and emergency call systems. Typically no meals provided</p>	 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24-hour onsite staff Optional care or domiciliary services available Restaurant / Cafe available for meals 	 <p>24-hour care and support. Meals included</p>
 <p>Typical facilities available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communal lounge Laundry facilities Gardens Guest room 	 <p>Typical facilities available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restaurant and Café Leisure Club including: gym, swimming pool, exercise class programme Communal lounge and/or Library Hairdressers Gardens Guest room Activity (Hobby) rooms Social event programme 	 <p>Typical facilities available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communal lounge Laundry facilities Gardens Guest room
 <p>Typically 40 - 60 homes</p>	 <p>Typically 60 - 250 homes</p>	 <p>Sizes vary considerably</p>

It is therefore entirely wrong to indicate that the extra care and care home need to be intertwined. The provision of care in a care home is regulated by the CQC and relates to the care and the accommodation, within extra care the care provision is separate to the accommodation in a registration sense.

- If any additional facilities are to be presented as supporting the C2 planning use for the “extra care facility beds”, then they need to come under the C2 planning use as they are there to support the residents, with only an ancillary function in providing services to the wider community. Use classes of E(e) and F2 would be used for outwardly focused services and be treated separately, with no bearing on a C2 planning determination, simply because they can continue to operate without the “extra care facility beds”.

Given the above position regarding how to correctly define the use class of the extra care units it is our position that the proposed E(e) and F2 facilities would be free to operate independent of the C2 uses themselves and thus not be deemed an ancillary function to that use. The proposed uses would of course compliment the operation of the C2 element but similarly serve the residents of the C3 element of the development and where relevant any wider community.

In this instance the flexibility to allow such separate uses is preferred to identify operators who may have specific requirements that might be more constrained if subsumed within the overall C2 use class.

- I suggest, given the wording on affordable housing in Tandridge's Local Plan documentation, that the applicant evidence how the extra care units cannot deliver affordable housing through the submission of a viability assessment

Extra care accommodation cannot readily be split between market and affordable on a single site when factoring in the need for all residents to pay an annual service charge in respect of the communal services and the local allowance grant, which typically does not cover such charges. Market residents cannot subsidise the use of the communal facilities and it is not appropriate either to exclude those in the affordable units from accessing the facilities either. This is why where there are policies requiring consideration of affordable housing provision this is addressed by way of commuted sum.

However, in this case the proposal is that the need for affordable is met through provision across the wider site. The proposed scheme seeks to provide a total of 103 affordable units with the final split of provision to be determined through the s106 and subsequent Reserved Matters scheme(s).

It is feasible that such provision could be provided as a mix of both C3 and C2 accommodation. It is of course relevant to note that the current adopted policy makes no distinction in regards use class for dwellings for when affordable housing is to be applied such that even as a C2 use the council can seek to require an affordable contribution, as set out in the Rectory Homes high court judgement [High Court Judgment Template](#).

However, through a flexible approach within the s106 if no provider can be identified to operate the C2 element as mixed tenure then all 103 units could otherwise be provided from the proposed C3 element of the application. Such an approach would still ensure 50% of all the accommodation, save from the C2 care home, would be secured as affordable housing. Alternatively of course, it could be the case that a provider seeks to deliver all 41 extra care units as affordable tenure such that only 62 of the proposed C3 units would need to come forward as affordable housing to deliver the 50% split across the whole site.

- Clarity on the range of alternative transport options for the care home, extra care housing residents, visitors and staff

Such matters can be secured by way of a s106 in relation to any provision of a village transport scheme as well as through requirements for a Travel Plan to be monitored whilst the scheme is operational. Such matters are likely to be more detailed once an operator is onboard to deliver the site hence the reasoning for reserving such matters until the detailed design process.

I trust the above provides the necessary detailed responses to those matters raised by Surrey County Council in their most recent submission.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Iain Warner', written in a cursive style.

IAIN WARNER BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI
SENIOR DIRECTOR

For and On Behalf Of
TETLOW KING PLANNING

cc. Richard Henley (email only)
Rose Adams (email only)