RUNNYMEDE 2030 LP EXAMINATION

MATTER 5: LONGCROSS GARDEN VILLAGE

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF ST EDWARD

Pegasus Group
Columbia | Station Road | Bracknell | Berkshire | RG12 1LP
T 01344 203265 | W www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | DESIGN | ENVIRONMENT | ECONOMICS

©Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited 2011. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited
CONTENTS:

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. MATTER 5.2 2
APPENDIX 1: DELIVERY RATES 1
1. **Introduction**

1.1 This Statement is submitted on behalf of St Edward, and follows representations made on their behalf throughout the emerging Local Plan process.

1.2 St Edward are a joint venture company owned by the Prudential Assurance Company and Berkeley and have an interest in an omission site at North East Ottershaw (referred to as Site 46 in the SLAA). Representations have been made previously setting out the merits of the site, but this Statement focusses only upon the specific questions asked by the Inspector.
2. **Matter 5.2**

Is the expected rate of housing complications within 5 years of the adoption of the Plan (740 dwellings, 2019/20 – 2023/24) and the target of at least 1700 completions by 2030 justified by robust evidence, including progress to date on master planning, outline and full planning permissions, and market evidence of achievability and deliverability? Have any potential barriers to delivery been identified? Is there sufficient flexibility to address them?

2.1 As explained within the Reg 19 submissions on behalf of St Edward, it is considered that the suggested rate of delivery as set out in the Local Plan, is unlikely to be achieved. The reason for this is as follows;

2.2 The SLAA (Jan 2018) refers to 108 dwellings being delivered by the end of 2018/19. This relates to phase 1 of Longcross North and it is understood that these properties are under construction, albeit whether all 108 dwellings will be delivered within the next couple of months is something the promoter will need to confirm.

2.3 It is however clear that Phase 2 will not be delivered within the timescales assumed by the Council. The SLAA assumes delivery of 90 dwellings from Phase 2 by the end of 2019/20, ie in just over a year’s time. However, there are still conditions to be discharged in connection with the approved scheme for 88 dwellings, which relates to Phase 2. Whilst it is possible that development may commence prior to the end of 2019/20, it is inconceivable that all dwellings will be delivered within little over a year.

2.4 Turning to Phase 3 of Longcross North, the The Longcross Garden Village (LGV) website (http://www.longcrossvillage.info), prepared by the developers in 2017, refers to an application for Phase 3 (200 units) being submitted at the end of 2017. The website advises that this will enable completion of all 3 phases of residential development at Longcross North (398 dwellings) by 2020/21. It is understood that an application for Phase 3 has still not been submitted to the Council, and inevitably this will mean completions from it will not be achieved by 2020/21. If applying similar timescales to those achieved to progress Phase 1, which took 4 years from the submission of an application to commencement of
delivery, this would mean even if an application for Phase 3 is submitted in 2019/20, delivery is unlikely to commence until 2023/24.

2.5 With regards to delivery from Longcross South, it is understood, and understandable, that no planning applications have been submitted, but a Scoping Opinion was agreed for up to 1400 dwellings in 2017. There is clearly no indication that any delivery from Longcross South will make up for the reduction in delivery from Longcross North (compared to that assumed by the Council) over the next few years.

2.6 The relevance of this deficit in provision over the next few years, against assumptions by the Council, is that there is no ‘slack’ in the delivery expectations up until the end of the Plan period. The SLAA assumes that the site will deliver 150 dwellings every year from 2020/21 until 2029/30 (other than in 2021/22 when 200 dwellings are assumed). This is already at the upper limits of what could be expected from a site such as this and means there is no ability to ‘catch up’ once a deficit beyond expectations is established in any year. For reasons explained above, such deficits will take place over the next few years, and even if the rest of the development progresses without further delay (which is unlikely for a scheme of such scale), there will not be the opportunity to make up for the lost numbers within the Plan period. Even with a positive outlook on future progress, the 1,700 dwellings are unlikely to be completed prior to 2032/33.

2.7 For reasons set out above, it would be unreasonable to assume that the site can deliver the number and rate of housing as currently assumed by the Local Plan, over the Plan period. Based upon information available and typical timescales for progressing planning applications and build rates, the table at Appendix 1 illustrates why a reduction of approximately 422 dwellings should be assumed over the Plan period. It is recommended that in order to be sound, that relevant aspects of the Plan are amended to reflect this.

2.8 With regard the Inspector’s query about potential barriers to delivery, reference was made on Day 2 of the Stage 1 Hearings by Mr Miles to concerns regarding SPA/SANG matters. It is understood that this related to the likelihood of future residents at LGV being more likely to access Chobham Common, which forms part of the SPA, directly to the west of the LGV site, rather than using the SANG required as part of the LGV development. If this is the case, it would appear to
have implications with regards how appropriate the proposed layout is, and the ability to accommodate the number of dwellings proposed. In particular, the higher density residential development (without private gardens) proposed in Phase 3 of the Masterplan appears to be in closer proximity to Chobham Common (SPA) than the intended SANG. It is recognised this will be addressed under Matter 5.3 (f) but is flagged now as it could also impact the ability to deliver housing as questioned in 5.2.

2.9 Given the inability of LGV to deliver the Council’s assumed number of dwellings during the Plan period, additional site allocations will be necessary to provide for the Council’s housing requirement in order for the Plan to be found sound. For reasons set out in previous submissions by St Edward, the identification of land at NE Ottershaw would represent an appropriate allocation, and would provide the required number of dwellings to address the expected deficit from LGV over the Plan period.
## APPENDIX 1 : DELIVERY RATES

<table>
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<td>Completions</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGV (Suggested By Council)</td>
<td>1718</td>
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<tr>
<td>Resulting Deficit</td>
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