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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Barton Willmore LLP is instructed by Crest Nicholson (CN) and Commercial Union, General Accident and Norwich Union (CGNU) to submit this written Hearing Statement in response to the Inspector’s Matters and Questions for Stage 2 of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan Examination. These representations expand upon the representations submitted on behalf of CN & CGNU in response to the consultations for the RBC Local Plan 2030 Regulation 19 Parts 1 and 2.

1.2 CN & CGNU own the former DERA site at Longcross, Surrey, which is proposed for allocation and removal from the Green Belt in the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan under Policy SD10 (Longcross Garden Village).

1.3 The site was designated by the DCLG (now Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, MHCLG) as a Locally Led Garden Village (LLGV) in January 2017. Part of the north of the site to the north of M3 Motorway (the western edge, now referred to as ‘Longcross Park’) is designated as part of the EZ3 Enterprise Zone.
RESPONSE TO MATTER 5 - LONGCROSS GARDEN VILLAGE

5.1 Overall, is the geographical extent of the proposed allocation and quantity of development justified? Is it based on a clear, robust, consistently applied site selection process, properly informed by the Green Belt review, sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment? Are there exceptional circumstances that are sufficient to justify the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundary?

The Geographical Extent of the Allocation

5.1.1 Yes, the geographical extent of the proposed allocation and quantity of development is justified.

5.1.2 The geographical extent of the proposed allocation is set out in Figure 2 of the plan. Figure 2 identifies the land edged red which is allocated for development. The boundaries of the allocation follow existing physical features, namely: Longcross Road to the south; Kitsmead Lane to the east; and the Railway Line to the north. The western boundary of the site is formed by the administrative boundary with Surrey Heath Borough Council (SHBC).

5.1.3 The LGV allocation includes Longcross Barracks site, which is outside of our clients’ ownership or control. Recent discussions with RBC have established that any proposals for this part of the site are expected to be brought forward separately. CN & CGNU will ensure that the development of its land – comprising the substantial majority of the LGV allocation - does not prejudice the development of Longcross Barracks and would enable appropriate connections to the site, as reflected in RBC’s proposed minor modification 42 (CD_001A).

5.1.4 In addition, Figure 2 identifies the land edged and hatched purple which is allocated as SANG, and land edged and hatched green as publicly accessible open space. These areas will contribute towards meeting the requirements set out in Policy SD10.

---

1 SHBC is currently reviewing its Local Plan. Representations have been submitted to SHBC on behalf of Crest Nicholson & CGNU promoting the release of the part of the LLGV from the Green Belt, as an anomalous, previously developed parcel of Green Belt land, once the remainder of the LLGV has been removed through Runnymede’s Local Plan.
2 The land identified as SANG in Figure 2 already benefits from planning permission.
5.1.5 With regard to the quantity of development as set out in Policy SD10, similarly, this is also justified. It has been informed, principally, by the quantum of development secured through the hybrid planning permission, and through the ongoing site appraisal and masterplanning work as part of ongoing pre-application discussions between CN & CGNU and RBC and consultees. We provided further detail in our response to Q5.2 below.

Site Selection Process

5.1.6 Yes, the proposed allocation is based upon a clear, robust and consistently applied site selection process, consistent with the requirements set out in paragraph 158 of the NPPF (2012). is set out in RBC’s Site Selection Methodology Assessment December 2017 (SD_012B). Informed by the wider suite of evidence base documents which underpin the Local Plan, SD_012B comprehensively appraises all reasonable alternative sites including the proposed allocation of LGV.

5.1.7 The appraisal of the proposed allocation set out in SD_012B, is considered to be a useful composite appraisal, clearly set out, and robust. The reasons for selecting the site, through a sieving process, are justified. The assessment (SD_012B) considers the existing accessibility of the site is assessed as ‘low’ which is a judgement that we do not necessarily agree with. Importantly, we agree with the assessment which acknowledges that the site could be made to be accessible with a range of sustainable travel choices delivered to support its development (as set out on pages 31 and 61 of SD_012B). Further details regarding proposed sustainable transport enhancements are provided in our response to Q5.3e) below.

5.1.8 Insofar as they inform the proposed allocation of the site, the Green Belt review, sustainability appraisal and habitat regulations assessment undertaken by RBC are all adequate. Through our representations at regulation 19 stage and in our written statements for Stage 1, we have identified points of detail in respect of each of these assessments. We acknowledge however that these would not alter the outcome in each instance, but simply reinforces RBC’s decision to include the site as a proposed allocation.

Exceptional Circumstances

5.1.9 We agree with RBC that there are clear exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of the site from the Green Belt.
5.1.10 RBC’s position regarding the ‘local level’ exceptional circumstances to justify the site’s removal from the Green Belt is set out in its Exceptional Circumstances Addendum Report April 2018 (SD_004Y). We broadly agree with this assessment and consider that the following material considerations should further contribute towards the exceptional circumstances for the site’s release:

- The previously developed status of the site;
- The site’s proximity to the existing Longcross Station;
- The Government’s selection of the site as a LLGV;
- The provision of SANG including Chertsey Common as a major new recreational asset; and
- The site’s fundamental importance to the delivery of the Local Plan, taken as a whole.

5.1.11 In conclusion, the approach taken by RBC is consistent with national policy and is clearly justified.

5.2 Is the expected rate of housing completions within 5 years of the adoption of the Plan (740 dwellings, 2019/20-2023/24 (SD_023G, July 2018)) 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?

5.2.1 On behalf of CN & CGNU, an indicative trajectory for the development of the site was submitted in our response to the Regulation 19 consultation and is appended for convenience (Appendix 1). It appears that RBC’s expectations as set out in SD_023G) are based upon that trajectory.

5.2.2 The delivery of residential development from the site is already coming forward through the development of Upper Longcross. Delivery on Upper Longcross is underway, with 72 completions recorded in 2017/18. In total, a minimum of 400 dwellings are expected to be delivered on Upper Longcross by 2021/22.
5.2.3 A planning application for Longcross South is in preparation and has been subject to extensive ongoing pre-application discussions with RBC, SCC (Highways and Education), Natural England, Historic England, Environment Agency, Network Rail, South Western Railway, local residents and community representatives. The timing for completing and submitting this planning application will be informed by the progress of the Local Plan through to adoption. It is currently anticipated that the application will be submitted in spring/summer 2019.

5.2.4 The development of Longcross South is likely to comprise approximately 1,350 dwellings. This capacity is based upon the extensive work which has been undertaken on behalf of CN & CGNU over the past 7 to 8 years, preparing more detailed proposals for this part of the site. As a result, the capacity of the site for new housing is informed by a range of detailed surveys and assessments. The estimated capacity reflects the emerging proposals which have been the subject of extensive pre-application discussions and consultation with Design South East.

5.2.5 The development is likely to be delivered through three, and at its peak, potentially four outlets. As such, our (and RBC’s) rate of delivery of circa. 150 dwellings per annum is a conservative estimate. This most clearly demonstrated through the first year of completions on Upper Longcross and the forecast completions for 2018/19, through a single outlet. On Longcross South, whilst the expectation that first completions by 31st March 2021 is optimistic, it is not unrealistic. Overall, it is very likely that an accelerated rate of delivery from this site will be achieved.

5.2.6 As stated above, the capacity of the site to accommodate and deliver a minimum of 1,700 dwellings is based upon robust evidence. All constraints have been considered and are reflected in the masterplanning work which is now at an advanced stage of preparation.

5.2.7 Turning to any other potential barriers, it is acknowledged that further work is currently being undertaken by RBC and its transport consultants Arcadis on the A320 Study. Alongside this additional assessment, we will continue to engage with RBC and SCC on agreeing the mechanism for proportionate contributions to be made by developers, including our clients, towards a package of agreed mitigation measures.

5.2.8 The statement for Matter 10 (Infrastructure) to be submitted on behalf of CN & CGNU will address this in more detail.
5.3 Are the detailed requirements of Policy SD10 justified and deliverable? Do they strike the right balance between specificity and flexibility as appropriate? In particular:

a) Do they provide a clear, achievable policy framework to help deliver a high quality, distinctive garden village?

5.3.1 CN & CGNU are broadly supportive of Policy SD10 and its requirements. We have welcomed the opportunity to comment on, and influence, the policy wording through the regulation 19 consultations. Our remaining objections are addressed below and principally relate to the following matters:

- The requirement for Gypsy and Traveller provision;
- Overall scheme viability; and
- The application of the TCPA’s “Garden City” principles.

5.3.2 Generally, the policy framework in Policy SD10 strikes the right balance between specificity and flexibility.

5.3.3 CN & CGNU are firmly committed to the site being delivered as a Garden Village development. Crest Nicholson will draw upon its extensive experience as a developer of Garden Village communities which include the Arborfield Garrison and Tadpole developments.

5.3.4 CN & CGNU were not involved in the preparation and submission of RBC’s LLGV Expression of Interest in July 2016. The submission did, however, incorporate plans and illustrative material which had been produced on behalf of our clients in preparing detailed proposals for the site. In our view, this further demonstrates the commitment by both our clients and RBC to deliver a high quality, distinctive garden village at Longcross.

b) Is the mix of uses, including employment and local facilities and services, justified and deliverable at the right time?

---

4 https://runnymede.gov.uk/gardenvillage
5.3.5 CN & CGNU are satisfied that the mix of uses identified in Policy SD10 is justified. It is based upon, inter alia, the scope of the extant hybrid planning permission which includes the employment provision identified within criterion c), plus the potential for C1 Hotel use.

5.3.6 The local facilities and services which are identified in criterion d) have been identified through pre-application discussions. They will include the Discovery Building which has already been completed as part of the Upper Longcross development and the principal community centre to be provided within Longcross South.

5.3.7 Criterion h) of Policy SD10 requires a “phased approach” to the delivery of development. A phasing plan will be provided as part of future planning application submissions for development at LGV. The indicative phasing of infrastructure provision is provided within RBC’s 2018 IDP Schedules (SD_007O). The phasing is considered realistic, albeit the detailed triggers for the delivery of the local facilities and services including the primary school will be agreed through a planning condition or obligation being imposed on the planning permission(s) for the site.

5.3.8 Our statement for Matter 9 addresses the delivery of employment at Longcross.

5.3.9 Yes, in respect of the remaining phases of development which have not yet been brought forward and benefitting from planning permission, we consider that there is adequate evidence to justify the range of residential accommodation sought in Policy SD10.

5.3.10 The percentage of affordable housing represents an increase in the proportion currently sought by RBC. CN & CGNU confirm that the delivery of 35% on the remaining phases of development is viable, subject to agreement to the full s106 package (please also refer to our response to Q5.4 below).

5.3.11 Our response to Q5.2 above states that the development of LGV is anticipated to be delivered in full within the plan period. This includes the full range of residential accommodation identified in Policy SD10.
d) Can further detail be provided about how and when the policy requirement for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation will be met? Should provision be made for more than 10 pitches, given the potential level of unmet need in the Borough?

5.3.12 Policy SD10 requires the LGV to deliver a "at least 10 serviced pitches and/or plots for Gypsies and Travellers in groupings of at least 3 pitches in accordance with SL22". Policy SL22 provides flexibility for off-site provision of pitches where required as part of site allocations (including LGV).

5.3.13 CN & CGNU support the principle of a flexible approach, however as currently drafted, the flexibility provided by Policy SL22 is unnecessarily restrictive and therefore is not justified or effective.

5.3.14 The representations submitted on behalf of CN & CGNU in response to the Local Plan Regulation 19 (Part 2) consultation set out our objections to Policy SL22 and recommended modifications to make the policy sound (Appendix 2).

5.3.15 Through a future planning application for Longcross South, CN & CGNU will seek to secure appropriate flexibility through the S106 legal agreement, via a mechanism for alternative off-site provision to be secured by CN & CGNU, in lieu of provision on-site.

5.3.16 Furthermore, taking account of RBC’s proposed modification 108 (CD_001A), which we support, there is a realistic prospect that the need for Gypsy and Traveller sites could be accommodated elsewhere in the Borough. Thus, a flexible approach through Policy SL22 as we propose to be amended (and linked with the requirement in Policy SD10), should include a review mechanism in the S106 Agreement which requires a demonstrable need for pitch provision at the point of delivery.

5.3.17 We also question whether RBC’s approach to accommodating pitch provision within allocated sites, and in the case of LGV, their “pepper potting”, will align with the specific needs and preferences of the Gypsy and Traveller community. In this regard, proposed modification 108 which provides for additional pitches being delivered through expansion of existing traveller sites is considered more likely to meet the preferences.
5.3.18 Finally, there is no methodology underpinning the Council’s apportionment of gypsy and traveller pitches to the Local Plan residential site allocations, other than a judgement of apportioning a greater number of pitches to the larger allocations. The distribution is therefore arbitrary.

\( e) \) With regard to criterion e) of Policy SD10, are the requirements sufficient to provide for sustainable transport choices, and are they realistic and achievable over the Plan period? Can there be reasonable confidence that criterion h), including the Council’s proposed minor modification 44 (CD_001A), will be effective in this regard?

5.3.19 Yes, the requirements for sustainable transport choices, i.e. non-car modes of transport, are realistic and achievable over the plan period.

5.3.20 LGV will open up an area which has been previously inaccessible to the general public and the network of footways and cycleways it will provide will enhance pedestrian and cycle connectivity.

5.3.21 A focus for LGV is to secure enhanced links to/from the Longcross Station, which lies on a rail line which already accommodates regular passenger services between Reading and London Waterloo. At present, around 28 trains per day stop at Longcross railway station, with a commitment having been provided from the operator, South Western Railway (SWR), that this will increase to 35 services in May 2019.

5.3.22 A further submission by SWR to Network Rail (NR) was made in November 2018 to increase stopping provision further in December 2019, as was specified in the Section 106 agreement for Longcross North. It is understood that a Letter of Intent will be provided by SCC to the examination.

5.3.23 This service pattern would see a daily half-hourly frequency being established Monday-Saturday (increasing to around 60 services), and hourly on Sundays. This is supported by contribution from the development of Upper Longcross which has already been secured by SCC, in addition to a separate contribution which would be used to improve facilities at the Station.
5.3.24 Sustainable transport measures will be monitored through a Travel Plan, which will also require the roll-out of electric charging points and establishment of local bus routes, through extension of existing routes as well as provision of a new route to a major service centre outside the borough.

5.3.25 The residual effect of these measures will be to minimise the effects of car-borne movements on the local highway network with highway mitigation delivered where necessary. Where other strategic junctions have been included in the A320 Study and included in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), financial contributions will be made to mitigate the impacts of LGV.

5.3.26 As stated above, CN & CGNU are confident that the phased approach required by criterion h) including proposed modification 44 is an effective approach. Further detail relating to the A320 corridor will be provided in our Matter 10 statement.

f) Based on the Plan’s requirements, will the proposed development provide satisfactorily for the protection and enhancement of the natural environment, especially in regard to the SPA and SAC?

5.3.27 Yes, LGV will deliver SANG at a rate in excess of 8ha per 1000 new residents, as described in paragraph 5.99 of the RLP, to avoid any impact on the Thames Basin Heath SPA through increased recreational pressure, in addition to the usual contributions toward Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) on the SPA. Planning permission exists for just over 30 ha of SANG at Trumps Farm (known as ‘Chertsey Common’), the first phase of which has already been constructed in association with the approved first phase of development at Longcross North, and a further c. 2.67ha of SANG at the Eastern Woodland, again at Longcross North.

5.3.28 CN & CGNU have been engaging with NE with respect to the impact avoidance and mitigation strategy required to ensure the protection of the Thames Basin Heaths SPA and the Thursley, Ash, Pirbright and Chobham SAC, for several years. NE has agreed ‘in principle’ to the key requirements for this strategy, including the extent of the main SANG areas, and has been kept up to speed with changes to the layout of proposed new on-site SANG areas at Longcross South as masterplanning has progressed (most recently during a site meeting held in November 2018, following which NE confirmed in a letter dated 28 November 2018 that the proposed new SANG areas were acceptable, subject to detailed design).
5.3.29 The results of the extensive ecological survey work carried out over several years have been used to inform the layout and design of the proposals emerging under proposed Policy SD10, to ensure that impacts on features of ecological importance will be avoided, mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated.

5.3.30 Net gains in biodiversity will also be delivered, in particular through habitat creation and restoration relevant to the targets associated with Surrey Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) TBH 01 and 02, which are referenced in the fifth bullet point of part f) of proposed Policy SD10. Significant areas of newly created and restored habitats will be delivered within the network of SANG areas, which will then be subject to positive management in perpetuity, but other opportunities to integrate habitats within the development itself are also available.

\textit{g) Are the proposals viable?}

5.3.31 Yes, the development of the remainder of LGV is viable. Our representations submitted at regulation 19 stage included a critical review of the LGV Viability Assessment undertaken for RBC by Aecom (SD_007P). In these respects, we do not agree with the methodological approach used. Our clients would have welcomed the opportunity to have discussed these areas of concern with Aecom with the aim of agreeing a more robust assessment of viability.

5.3.32 Notwithstanding the above, Crest Nicholson & CGNU confirm that the development of the remainder of LGV should be viable based upon the reasonable expectations of the total s106 package, taking account of the position established through the s106 agreement attached to the planning permission for Upper Longcross and ongoing discussions with RBC and SCC relating to Longcross South. Subject to further clarity in respect of the level of financial contribution towards A320 mitigation which will be required, the development is likely to support the full requirement of 35% affordable housing and other obligations which have been identified.

5.4 \textit{Overall, do the Plan’s proposals for Longcross Garden Village align with the key principles that guided its identification as a Locally-Led Garden Village by the Government in 2017? Are they an appropriate reflection of the TCPA’s principles as set out in paragraph 5.90 of the Plan?}
5.4.1 The key principles that guided the identification of LGV as a LLGV by the Government in 2017 were as set out in the Government’s Prospectus document (Appendix 3). This included ‘Prioritisation Criteria’ which can be taken as the principles which all LLGV sites were assessed against.

5.4.2 More recent guidance criteria published by the TCPA ‘Understanding Garden Villages: An Introductory Guide’ (January 2018) is useful as it applies to Garden Villages of 5,000 homes or fewer (Appendix 4). The guide provides the TCPA’s interpretation of its Garden City principles and how they should be applied at a village scale. The guidance acknowledges that the Garden City principles provide a framework for designing Garden Villages, but that they are not a prescriptive guide.

5.4.3 The TCPA suggest that modern Garden Village developments strive to achieve broader goals, as listed below:

- Being holistically planned
- Being small in scale
- Being planned for healthy living
- Making provision for a vibrant social life
- Designed with high quality materials and attention to detail
- Designed to provide affordable homes close to employment
- Making provision of services for day to day needs in walking distance of homes
- Land ownership and long-term stewardship

5.4.4 Based on the more up to date TCPA Guidance (January 2018), we do not consider the inclusion of “Garden City” principles in the supporting text (paragraph 5.89) to be justified. In our view, they should be deleted or, alternatively, replaced with the TCPA’s more recent “Garden Village” principles.
Appendix 1

Longcross Garden Village Housing Trajectory (Extract from Regulation 19 Part 1 Local Plan representation submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson and CGNU)
that the masterplan for the site is evolving based on the known site constraints. For consistency, we recommend that Policy SD2 should be revised to reflect Policy SD10. CGNU and CN also raise significant concern with the requirement in Table 1 for 10 traveller pitches to be delivered in Longcross. This point is covered in more detail as part of the comments under Policy SD10, below.

**Policy SD3: Site Allocations**

3.12 CGNU is supportive of the inclusion of Longcross Garden Village as one of the RBC Local Plan Site Allocations but would again highlight the discrepancy between the requirement in Policy SD3 for ‘a minimum of 1718 residential units’ and the requirement under Policy SD10 (Longcross Garden Village) for ‘around 1,700 net additional dwellings’. As stated above, CGNU’s draft masterplan for Longcross South demonstrates that Longcross South can accommodate up to 1,320 dwellings. This figure, combined with planning permission reference RU.13/0856 for 200 dwellings at Longcross North, and a further 200 dwellings planned to come forward as part of a future Phase 3 for Longcross North, amounts to ‘around 1,700 dwellings’ as proposed in the LP. The policy wording should therefore be amended to ‘around 1,700 dwellings’in line with Policy SD10 to allow for flexibility as the masterplan evolves.

3.13 With regard to phasing, the proposed housing trajectory for the delivery of the whole site (comprising Longcross North and Longcross South) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Longcross North</th>
<th>Longcross South</th>
<th>Cumulative Total no. of dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017/2018</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018/2019</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021/2022</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022/2023</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023/2024</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024/2025</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025/2026</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026/2027</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027/2028</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028/2029</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029/2030</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
<td><strong>1320</strong></td>
<td><strong>1718</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Comments on Policy SL22 (Extract from Regulation 19 Part 2 Local Plan representation submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson and CGNU)
service in the policy could be construed as creating an absolute requirement for the
developer of the Site - which is considered to be unduly onerous and cannot invariably
be achieved long-term, or at least without the possibility of some interruption. CGNU will
make the necessary contribution via a s106 agreement to provide a platform for a
permanent service but cannot be held responsible for its provision in perpetuity. At the
third bullet point, we therefore suggest the deletion of the word “permanent”.

2.25 We also suggest an amendment to the fourth bullet of criterion e) as follows:

“A network of safe and wherever possible segregated cycling and walking links within the village which provide
direct connectivity between different land uses within the village, with existing settlements (including facilitating
links with the Longcross Barracks site) and the existing routes beyond the village boundaries, subject to the
strategy of minimising impact to the Chobham Common and reinforcing the purpose of the SANG.”

2.26 The additional wording is required as CGNU and CN are only able to provide links with
the Barracks site to their Site boundary and cannot control the links within the Barracks
site which is outside of their control. Moreover, the additional wording seeks to ensure
that any connections that are required to the wider settlement do not compromise the
purpose of the SANG.

Policy SL22: Meeting the Needs of Gypsies and Travellers

2.27 CGNU and CN’s concerns with Policy SL22 and the associated part of the Local Plan
evidence base (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment, January 2018) were
submitted as part of the previous consultation and will not be repeated. The comments
set out below relate to the proposed amendments to the policy wording which are set
out as tracked changes in the Local Plan 2030 Part 2 consultation document and
distinguished by the bold text, below.

2.28 CGNU and CN welcome RBC’s recognition that there may be exceptional circumstances
where Local Plan site allocations are unable to accommodate their gypsy and traveller
pitch requirements within their site boundaries and may, as a result, need to secure
offsite provision. CGNU and CN therefore support the flexibility now proposed in Policy
SL22.

2.29 The principle of adding criteria to the policy which addresses the suitability of an ‘offsite’
location to accommodate gypsy and traveller pitches is supported in principle. However,
CGNU and CN raise concern with the draft criteria (‘tests’) set out within Policy SL22 to be applied to offsite locations.

Criteria for Allocated Sites

2.30 The additional policy wording states that in exceptional circumstances, if a site allocation cannot provide for its gypsy and traveller pitch need within the site itself, an alternative site may be considered acceptable subject to a set of criteria. The first of that criteria then asks for the ‘exceptional circumstances’ to be demonstrated to prove that on-site provision is not feasible.

2.31 The association of ‘Exceptional Circumstances’ with feasibility suggests a physical inability to provide the pitches within the site allocation, which may be the case for some sites, but this does not make an allowance for what may be other legitimate reasons why provision cannot be achieved on-site. Matters of viability should be a material consideration in the context of providing gypsy and traveller pitches within a residential development. Where a site is physically able to accommodate the pitches within its allocated boundary for example - but matters of viability mean that off-site provision is more feasible - the first bullet point of Policy SL22 cannot be met. Legitimate reasons for engaging the policy may be various.

2.32 CGNU and CN question whether there is a need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances where gypsy and traveller sites cannot be accommodated within the site allocation, given that bullet points 2-5 effectively test the suitability of the offsite location. Introducing specific criteria under a heading of exceptional circumstances risks unnecessary ambiguity as to what circumstances are sufficient to engage the policy (i.e. what is the test if is something more or other than meeting the listed criteria?). Criteria 2-5, with our suggested amended wording as set out below, provides what are considered to be appropriate criteria for assessing the acceptability of the offsite location. Therefore, if criteria 2-5 are satisfied, CGNU and CN would argue (for the reason stated above) that there should not be a requirement to demonstrate ‘exceptional circumstances’, as the objective of accommodating the requisite number of pitches will be achieved, regardless of whether that is within or outside of the site allocation.

2.33 The last four bullet points in the amended wording of Policy SL22 are supplemental to the exceptional circumstances required under the first bullet. Therefore, satisfying the ‘off-site’ test under Policy SL22 will always be subject to the planning suitability and
2.34 We therefore suggest that the first bullet point is deleted and proposed minor amendments to criteria 2-5, as set out at the end of this section.

Criteria for Non-Allocated Sites

2.35 In addition to meeting the tests set out in the first part of the policy, the second part of the policy then introduces a further 6 tests that the alternative location (i.e. the non-allocated site) if deemed acceptable, must meet. The policy is drafted to apply to additional gypsy and traveller sites that are not allocated within the Local Plan. However, the policy is worded such that these tests will also apply to the ‘off-site’ pitch locations that arise through the first test in the policy, i.e. where exceptional circumstances (the test as currently drafted) are successfully demonstrated to prove that the Local Plan Site Allocations cannot deliver pitches within their allocation boundaries.

2.36 As a result, if an alternative (off-site) location is deemed acceptable and bullet points 2-5 (of the first policy test) are met, that site will also be required to meet tests i) to vi) in the second half of the policy, which applies to all other (non-allocated) sites. CGNU and CN consider that in combination, these requirements (whether intentionally combined or not) will be unduly difficult to satisfy.

2.37 In turn, Policy SL22 as drafted may result in a number of the Local Plan site allocations (LGV included) being unable to satisfy their respective policy requirement due to the in combination effects of both sets of criteria – which would defeat the purpose of a policy that should be drafted to create flexibility around the mode of compliance for allocated sites.

2.38 CGNU and CN would argue that if the number of pitches required by the site allocation policy can be provided on another site which satisfies criteria 2-5 in the first half of the policy, there is no need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances or additionally meet criteria i-vi as the objective is to deliver the number of pitches to meet the demand identified in the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), not to deliver the pitches in a certain location.

Proposed Amendment to Policy SL22
2.39 CGNU and CN suggest that the policy is amended so that the first set of criteria applies to Allocated Sites in the Local Plan. These criteria would then deal with instances where these sites cannot accommodate their gypsy and traveller pitch requirement, and the suitability of their surrogate site. In addition, the second set of criteria should be clear that it only applies to Non-Allocated Sites, and does not apply to sites that are found as a suitable alternative to the Non-Allocated sites (as these are subject to the first set of criteria).

2.40 CGNU and CN therefore propose the following amendments to the wording of Policy SL22 to introduce more flexibility and less prescriptive criteria (additions and amendments shown as struck through and underlined).

**Policy SL22: Meeting the Needs of Gypsies and Travellers**

Over the lifetime of the Local Plan the Council will plan to deliver 112 Gypsy/Traveller pitches and 19 Travelling Showmen Plots which will be expected to come forward as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2015-2022</th>
<th>2023-2027</th>
<th>2028-2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitches</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plots</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The need for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation will in part be addressed through the site allocations identified in this Plan and the granting of planning permissions.

**If a site allocation is required to make on-site provision for traveller accommodation and is unable to do so, offsite provision will be considered. Offsite accommodation will only be considered appropriate where all of the following criteria are met:**

- The exceptional circumstances demonstrating on-site provision is not feasible are proven
- The alternative site provides for at least the same quantity of provision as required by the relevant allocation policy
- The alternative site is considered to be as sustainable in with regard to access to services, location and size as allocation on site;
- The alternative site complies with the other relevant policies of this Plan; including Green belt policies, and
- The site can be developed within the timeframe of the housing allocation.

The Council will also be working proactively to bring 48 existing pitches which are authorised for occupation for gypsies and travellers but which are not currently being used for this use back into use for gypsies and travellers.

**Other proposed sites for planning permission for Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation will be granted planning permission provided that all of the following criteria are met:**

(i) the site is suitably connected by sustainable and active modes of transport to a settlement with existing health care, retail, and school facilities.
(ii) the impact of development would not result in significant harm to landscape character.

(iii) the site can be safely accessed by pedestrians, vehicles and caravans to and from the highway.

(iv) the site is located in flood zone 1 as shown on the Policies Map or in flood zone 2 if it can be demonstrated that both the sequential and exception tests can be passed.

The following criterion applies additionally to Travelling Showpeople accommodation only:

(v) the site should be suitable for the storage and maintenance of show equipment and associated vehicles without causing harm through conflict with other policies in the Plan.

(vi) the site can be suitably connected to clean and foul water utilities.

Due to the nature of this housing need, there will be continuing co-operation with neighbouring Local Planning Authorities to ensure that the appropriate demand is identified and provision made across the wider area.

Where traveller pitches are required to be provided on sites allocated through the Local Plan, the Council will secure their delivery through the imposition of a planning condition attached to any planning approval granted or (if more appropriate) by means of a planning obligation.

The loss of authorised pitches and plots for gypsies, travellers and travelling showmen to other uses will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus supply of traveller pitches and plots for gypsies and travellers in the Borough.

2.49 Policy SL22 also states that where traveller pitches are required to be provided on sites allocated through the Local Plan, the Council will secure their delivery through the imposition of a planning condition attached to the planning consent. Whilst compliance with the policy may in most cases be adequately secured through the use of a suitable condition, the circumstances of individual sites may militate in favour of the use of a planning obligation. We would therefore suggest that the policy wording be amended as above so that it can adopt a more flexible approach to how the requirement can be secured.
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Foreword

We were elected on a promise to get Britain building and help more people achieve their dream of home ownership. We are delivering. Housing starts and completions are at their highest level since 2008, and reforms to the planning system are helping speed up development across the country. Schemes like Help to Buy and Shared Ownership have helped over 270,000 families realise their dreams and become homeowners.

We have set out the most ambitious housing programme for more than a generation, doubling the housing budget so we can meet our ambition of delivering a million new homes over this Parliament.

As part of this, and to ensure that strong communities are at the heart of new development, we made a commitment in our manifesto to support locally-led garden cities and towns in places where communities want them.

We are supporting a new wave of garden cities, towns and communities in Bicester, Basingstoke, Didcot, Ebbsfleet, North Essex and North Northamptonshire. Together, these have the potential to deliver over 100,000 homes with strong communities at their heart.

Each place is unique, but they all offer big opportunities for transformational long-term housing growth. This will ensure that the real and important benefits that people rightly expect are secured from the outset - quality design with cutting-edge technology, local employment opportunities, accessible green space near homes, high quality public realm. Great places for great communities.

These garden towns and cities are crucial towards meeting our long-term housing needs but we want to go further. This prospectus extends our offer of support which, until now, has been focused on new garden communities of at least 10,000 homes, to help those areas which also want to create new garden villages, towns and cities.

This country is building again, and we are committed to delivering a lasting legacy of new, beautiful places, with the homes that people rightly want, and expect. We encourage local areas and local communities who want to make new garden villages, towns, or cities, a key part of their offer on housing growth to read and respond to this prospectus.

The Rt Hon Greg Clark MP
Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Brandon Lewis MP
Minister for Housing and Planning
Introduction

1. This government is taking action on a range of fronts to ensure the homes this country so badly needs, get built: speeding up the planning system; ensuring land for housing is available and gets built out; ensuring that we maximise the use of brownfield land; providing new opportunities for custom and self-builders; backing SME builders; providing more opportunities for home ownership through Help to Buy and our Starter Homes programme.

2. We are making good progress. We have delivered a net supply of over 170,000 homes up to December 2015 – a 25% increase compared to the year before. Housing starts have also risen 23% up to the same period. But we know if we are to achieve our target of one million new homes by 2020, we need to support and enable house building at all scales.

3. Large new settlements have a key role to play, not only in meeting this country’s housing needs in the short-term, but also in providing a stable pipeline of housing well into the future.

4. We want to encourage more local areas to come forward with ambitious locally-led proposals for new communities that work as self-sustaining places, not dormitory suburbs. They should have high quality and good design hard-wired in from the outset – a new generation of garden villages, towns and cities.

5. We know that there is interest at the local level in how developing new garden villages, towns and cities can be a suitable way of meeting local housing need, rather than building on to existing settlements. We are taking important steps to support local areas who want to move in that direction.

6. We are proposing to strengthen national planning policy to provide a more supportive approach for new settlements. We are committing to legislate to update the New Towns Act 1981 to ensure we have a statutory vehicle well-equipped to support the delivery of new garden cities, towns and villages for the 21st century.

7. This prospectus extends our existing offer to support local areas who want to create garden communities on a smaller scale. It offers tailored support to local areas which want to deliver a new garden village, town or city. It is divided into two parts covering expressions of interest for different scales of development.

8. The first part of the prospectus invites expressions of interest by 31 July 2016 for new ‘garden villages’ of between 1,500 to 10,000 homes. Our intention at this stage is to support up to 12 new garden village proposals.

9. The second part of the prospectus invites expressions of interest on a rolling basis in new garden towns and cities of more than 10,000 homes. Recognising the exceptional nature of development at this scale, we expect to add to the garden towns and communities we are currently supporting at Ebbsfleet, Bicester, Basingstoke, Didcot, and in North Northamptonshire and North Essex.
What do we mean by garden villages, towns and cities?

10. We do not consider that there is a single template for a garden village, town or city. It will be important for the new community to establish a clear and distinct sense of identity. We want to see local areas adopt innovative approaches and solutions to creating great places, rather than following a set of rules.

11. Equally, we are clear that this prospectus is not looking to support places which merely use ‘garden’ as a convenient label. Rather, we will support local areas that embed key garden city principles to develop communities that stand out from the ordinary. We do not want to impose a set of development principles on local areas, and will support local areas in developing their own vision for their communities. But, we will want to see evidence of attractive, well-designed places with local support.
Garden villages

Eligibility criteria

12. To be considered for government support under this section of the prospectus, proposals for a new garden village must meet the following criteria:

Size

13. For the purposes of this prospectus, we are defining garden villages, to include proposals that are not eligible under our existing offer, which is restricted to new garden towns and cities of over 10,000 homes. Therefore, to be eligible under this section of the prospectus, proposals must be for a new settlement of 1,500 – 10,000 homes.

Free-standing settlement

14. The garden village must be a new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes.

Local authority-led

15. To support wider housing and growth ambitions, expressions of interest must be led by local authorities. We also welcome expressions of interest which include support from private sector developers and/or landowners.

Prioritisation criteria

16. There is no single model for the garden villages that we expect to support. Our intention is to support a range of proposals at different scales and in diverse locations that may, for example, be on land currently allocated for housing or currently outside the Local Plan. The factors we expect to take into account in deciding which expressions of interest to support include those set out in paragraphs 17 to 29.

Local leadership and community support

17. New garden villages should have the backing of the local authorities in which they are situated. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. They should also set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help ensure local support.

18. For those new settlements on the larger scale, it will be desirable for the Local Enterprise Partnership to be supportive of the proposal. This is to ensure that the potential economic benefits have been considered.
Quality and design

19. Good design is essential if we are to create sustainable places where people want to live and be part of the local community. It will be important for expressions of interest to demonstrate how the garden village, will be well-designed, built to a high quality, and attractive. Use of qualitative and quantitative research on local public opinion will be welcomed on issues around design and community.

Public sector and brownfield land

20. We encourage expressions of interest which make effective use of previously developed land (brownfield land) and/or public sector land.

Local demand

21. It is important that new garden villages are built as a response to meeting housing needs locally. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the new settlement is part of a wider strategy to secure the delivery of new homes to meet assessed need.

Viability and deliverability

22. Expressions of interest need to demonstrate how the new settlement, including the necessary infrastructure, will be delivered. Effective land value capture can play an important role in funding infrastructure costs. We would encourage proposals that set out how land costs can be minimised, or land receipts deferred.

23. Whilst expressions of interest should be ambitions in their aims, they must also demonstrate a credible route to delivering quality places without additional public subsidy.

Additional or accelerated delivery

24. We will want to support expressions of interest that offer a strong prospect of quantified early delivery, a significant acceleration of housing delivery, and genuinely additional housing supply. We welcome expressions of interest that demonstrate how build-out of the garden settlement can be achieved at pace, for example by providing a good mix of tenures and multiple outlets.

Starter homes

25. High quality starter homes, to be offered at least a 20% discount for young first-time buyers, have a place within well-designed new communities. Like other major developments, it is our intention for new garden villages to be subject to our new statutory requirement in the Housing and Planning Bill, and provide a proportion of starter homes as part of their section 106 agreements (details of which we will be consulting on).
26. We welcome expressions of interest that show the greatest ambition to ensure that first-time buyers enjoy the benefits of home ownership, and have the opportunity to be an important part of the community.

Support for small and medium enterprise home builders

27. We encourage expressions of interest which provide opportunities to promote a diverse range of house builders, including small and medium sized firms, in the delivery of the garden village.

Innovation

28. We encourage expressions of interest that include innovative forms of delivery such as off-site construction, self-build, custom-build and a direct commissioning approach. We will also consider expressions of interest from local authorities who wish to be innovative in ways which we may not have anticipated.

Infrastructure

29. We would like to ensure that infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

Government support package

30. We recognise that each new garden village will be unique and each proposal will vary in the support required from government. Local authorities will therefore want to consider what aspects of the package set out in paragraphs 31 to 44 will help enable delivery.

Delivery enabling funding and support

31. To support local authorities in realising their vision for new garden settlements, we can provide a tailored package of support that could include a limited amount of funding. That funding could for example be used to ensure the local authority has the right skilled staff in place or pay for key studies and assessments. This funding is available in 2016-17 and 2017-18, with further funding subject to review.

32. In addition, direct support can also be provided by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), including through their Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS). The assistance provided would be bespoke to each local authority, but might typically have a focus on providing expertise around planning for delivery.

Brokerage

33. The garden villages we commit to supporting will be a priority for delivery. We can play a key role across government in helping local authorities overcome barriers to delivery, and broker solutions to unblock any issues that arise.
Access to government housing funding streams

34. There are a number of funding streams which, subject to eligibility, could be open for successful expressions of interest to secure priority access. These include:

35. *Starter Homes Fund*: there is an opportunity to access funding for more starter homes from our £2.3 billion funding for starter homes if the additional starter homes are built out by 2020.

36. *Affordable Housing*: new proposals will also have an opportunity to access funding to deliver shared ownership, rent to buy and supported housing by 2020/21.

37. *Help to Buy: Equity Loan* will be available until March 2021, offering an equity loan of up to 20% of the purchase price, and enabling people to buy a new-build home with a deposit as low as 5%. This would provide the opportunity for people unable to save for a large deposit, but able to make regular mortgage payments, to realise their dreams of owning their own home.

38. We will also work with places we are supporting to help them navigate and seek funding from other sources of government funding, for example, the Home Building Fund, the free schools programme, and other roads and rail capital programmes.

Financial flexibilities

39. We welcome ideas about how additional financial flexibilities could unlock the delivery of garden villages. Where we support expressions of interest with ambitious proposals, we stand ready to explore options to improve viability and cashflow.

Planning freedoms

40. We are interested in working with local authorities which have a good track record of housing delivery who are prepared to commit to delivery of housing over and above their objectively assessed housing need through the creation of new garden villages.

41. In exchange for guaranteed housing delivery, we will work with you to identify and deliver planning freedoms to support housing growth including, for example, ensuring that there is greater ability to resist speculative residential planning applications, and to continue protecting the Green Belt.

Delivery vehicles

42. A dedicated delivery vehicle may, in some circumstances, be beneficial to lead on the planning, development, and building of the new garden village.

43. There are many forms that this could take, from publicly-led arm’s length bodies, public-private partnership arrangements such as joint venture companies, or, for particularly complex proposals, a statutory development corporation. We are
committed to legislating to update the New Towns Act 1981 to ensure there is a fit for purpose vehicle for the delivery of new garden villages.

44. We are not prescribing any particular model, but we can support local authorities consider what the most appropriate delivery arrangements will be to ensure that the main partners are able to take key decisions effectively.

Application process

Who can apply?

45. An expression of interest must be submitted by a local authority. We would welcome bids that are supported by private sector developers and/or landowners.

How to apply

46. Expressions of interest must be submitted by 31 July 2016 through the Homes and Communities Agency at garden.villages@hca.gsi.gov.uk. The HCA, both through their operating area network and ATLAS, is available to provide support in developing expressions of interest.

47. Expressions of interest must be able to demonstrate clearly that they meet the requirements set out in this prospectus. They should provide an indication of the tailored government support they are seeking and key issues that may require brokerage from government.

48. We are not prescribing a particular format for expressions of interest, but we would expect them to articulate a clear vision for the new garden village, with reference to the prioritisation criteria outlined above, and include specifically:
   - a map setting out the proposed site boundary
   - a general description of the proposal, including both policy aims and technical aims so far as they can be known (such as housing numbers, likely delivery methods, retail and other commercial space, extent of green space, timescale for delivery etc)
   - evidence which demonstrates that the scheme responds to issues of local affordability, and that there is strong growth potential over the medium to long-term
   - information on the specific advice and technical research that will be undertaken should the bid be successful
   - available evidence on scheme viability, including infrastructure costs and any abnormal costs
   - if available, any analysis/data evidence on the financial, social and economic benefits of the proposals
   - evidence on design and local consultation
any information on transport infrastructure projects underway or committed around the proposed area

**Shortlisting stage**

49. The HCA will consider expressions of interest taking account of the criteria set out above.

50. Final decisions on which expressions of interest to support will be made by DCLG ministers in the light of advice from HCA and DCLG officials. All applicants will then be informed of the outcome.

**Further information**

51. For further information please contact the Homes and Communities Agency at garden.villages@hca.gsi.gov.uk
Garden towns and cities

Criteria for support

52. In considering whether to provide government support to expressions of interest for new garden towns and cities under this section of the prospectus, we will take account of the criteria set out in paragraphs 53 to 67. For the most part, these mirror those set out for garden villages in the previous section, but with some changes to reflect the scale of proposals:

Size

53. The new garden town, or city, must provide at least 10,000 new homes. This may be on a new site away from existing settlements, or take the form of transformational development, both in nature or in scale to an existing settlement.

Local authority-led

54. Expressions must be led by local authorities. We also welcome expressions of interest which include support from private sector developers and/or landowners.

Local leadership and community support

55. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate a strong local commitment to delivery. New garden towns and cities should have the backing of local authorities in which they are situated, including the county council in two-tier areas. To ensure that the potential local economic impacts and benefits have been considered they should also have the explicit support of the Local Enterprise Partnership(s).

56. Expressions of interest should set how the local community is being, or will be, engaged at an early stage, and strategies for community involvement to help win local support.

Quality and design

57. Good design is essential if we are to create sustainable places where people want to live and be part of the local community. It will be important for expressions of interest to demonstrate how the garden town, or city, will be built to a high quality, well designed and attractive. Use of qualitative and quantitative research on local public opinion will be welcomed on issues around design and community.

Public sector and brownfield land

58. We welcome expressions of interest which make effective use of previously developed land (brownfield land) and/or public sector land.
Strategic fit

59. The delivery of a garden town, or city, will be a long-term project which is likely to have implications for how housing need is met locally, inform future decisions around strategic transport and other infrastructure, and impact on the location of future employment growth. We expect expressions of interest to demonstrate how the delivery of the new settlement fits with wider strategies for housing growth to meet assessed need, creating new jobs and the delivery of infrastructure to underpin growth.

Viability and deliverability

60. We recognise that the successful delivery of a new garden town, or city, is a complex project. We do not expect expressions of interest to provide a full set of answers about how the settlement will be delivered, but we will want to see clear thinking and ambitious proposals about how private sector finance can be leveraged in, opportunities to capture land value to fund infrastructure, and future infrastructure needs.

61. We will review with local areas the need for additional investment in infrastructure to support the full delivery of the garden town over time, but we would expect to see credible proposals for significant development without the need for further public subsidy. We welcome proposals that are located with good access to either existing or planned strategic transport infrastructure to provide local and national connectivity.

Additional or accelerated delivery

62. We will want to support expressions of interest that offer a strong prospect of quantified early delivery, a significant acceleration of housing delivery, and genuinely additional housing supply. We welcome expressions of interest that demonstrate how build out of the garden town can be achieved a pace, for example by providing a good mix of tenures and multiple outlets.

Starter homes

63. High quality starter homes, to be offered at least a 20% discount for first time buyers, have a place within well-designed new communities. Like other major developments, it is our intention for new garden towns and cities to be subject to our new statutory requirement in the Housing and Planning Bill, and provide a proportion of starter homes as part of their section 106 agreements (details of which we will be consulting on).

64. We welcome expressions of interest that show the greatest ambition to ensure that first-time buyers enjoy the benefits of home ownership, and have the opportunity to be an important part of the community.
Support for small and medium enterprise home builders

65. We welcome expressions of interest which provide opportunities to encourage a diverse range of house builders, including small and medium sized firms, in the delivery of the garden town.

Innovation

66. We encourage expressions of interest that include innovative forms of delivery such as off-site construction, self-build, custom-build and a direct commissioning approach. We will also consider expressions of interest from local authorities who wish to be innovative in ways which we may not have anticipated.

Infrastructure

67. We would like to ensure that, where possible, infrastructure needs are clearly assessed and met as part of any proposal.

Government support package

68. We recognise that each new garden town and city will be unique, and each proposal with vary in the support required from government. Local authorities will want therefore, to consider which aspects of the package set out in paragraphs 69 to 82 will help enable delivery.

Delivery enabling funding and support

69. To support local authorities in realising their vision for new garden towns, we can provide a tailored package of support that could include a limited amount of funding. That funding could for example be used to ensure the local authority has the right skilled staff in place or pay for key studies and assessments. This funding is available in 2016-17 and 2017-18, with further funding subject to review.

70. In addition, direct support can also be provided by the Homes and Communities Agency, including through their Advisory Team for Large Applications (ATLAS). The assistance provided would be bespoke to each local authority, but might typically have a focus on providing expertise around planning for delivery.

Brokerage

71. We can play a key role across government in helping local authorities overcome barriers to delivery and broker solutions to unblock any issues that arise. The garden towns we commit to supporting will be a priority for delivery and we will escalate issues that stand in the way of securing that, with a view to securing their prompt and effective resolution.
Access to government housing funding streams

72. There are a number of funding streams which, subject to eligibility, could be open for successful expressions of interest to secure priority access. These include:

73. **Starter Homes Fund**: There is an opportunity to access funding for more starter homes from our £2.3 billion funding for starter homes if the additional starter homes are built out by 2020.

74. **Affordable Housing**: New garden towns will also have an opportunity to access funding to deliver shared ownership, rent to buy and supported housing by 2020/21.

75. **Help to Buy: Equity Loan** will be available until March 2021, offering an equity loan of up to 20% of the purchase price, and enabling people to buy a new-build home with a deposit as low as 5%. This would provide the opportunity for people unable to save for a large deposit, but able to make regular mortgage payments, to realise their dreams of owning their own home.

76. We will also work with places we are supporting to help them navigate and seek funding from other sources of government funding, for example, the Home Building Fund, the free schools programme, and other roads and rail capital programmes.

Financial flexibilities

77. We welcome ideas about how additional financial flexibilities could unlock the delivery of garden towns and cities. Where we support expressions of interest with ambitious proposals, we stand ready to explore options to improve viability and cashflow.

Planning freedoms

78. We are interested in working with local authorities which have a good track record of housing delivery who are prepared to commit to delivery of housing over and above their objectively assessed housing need through the creation of new garden settlements.

79. In exchange for guaranteed housing delivery, we will work with you to identify and deliver planning freedoms to support housing growth including, for example, ensuring that there is greater ability to resist speculative residential planning applications, and to continue protecting the Green Belt.

Delivery vehicles

80. Delivering a new garden town of over 10,000 homes will need strategic long-term thinking and robust delivery arrangements. There are many forms that this could take, from publicly-led arm’s length bodies, public-private partnership arrangements such as joint venture companies, or statutory development corporations. We are committed to legislating to update the New Towns Act 1981, to ensure there is a fit for purpose vehicle for the delivery of new garden towns available.
81. We consider that a New Town Development Corporation may be a good option for delivery at this scale. It will be able to focus on resolving complex co-ordination challenges, can compulsorily purchase land under the ‘no scheme’ rules, and will be able to provide long-term planning certainty that is likely to be attractive to private sector investors and landowners.

82. We are not prescribing any particular model. We are happy to help local authorities consider what the most appropriate delivery arrangements will be to ensure that the main partners are able to take the key decisions effectively.

Application process

Who can apply?

83. An expression of interest must be submitted by a local authority.

How to apply

84. Expressions of interest for new garden towns are invited on an ongoing, rolling basis from interested local authorities, rather than being subject to any fixed deadline. We would accept the submission of a formal expression of interest to have been preceded by a period of engagement with DCLG and HCA.

85. Expressions of interest must be able to demonstrate clearly that they meet the requirements set out in this prospectus. They should provide an indication of the tailored government support they are seeking and key issues that may require brokerage from government.

86. We are not prescribing a particular format for expressions of interest, but expect them to articulate a clear vision for the new garden town with reference to the criteria outlined above and include specifically:

- a map setting out the proposed boundary of the garden town or city
- a general description of the proposal, including both policy aims and technical aims so far as they can be known (such as housing numbers, likely delivery methods, retail and other commercial space, extent of green space, timescale for delivery etc)
- evidence which demonstrates that the scheme responds to issues of local affordability and the wider strategic needs of the local area, and that there is strong growth potential over the medium to long-term
- information on the specific advice and technical research that will be undertaken should the bid be successful
- available evidence on infrastructure costs and any abnormal costs and how it is anticipated these will be met
- if available, any analysis/data evidence on the financial, social and economic benefits of the proposals
• evidence on design and local support
• any information on transport infrastructure projects underway or committed around the proposed area

87. Expressions of interest should be made by email to DCLG at locallyledgardencities@communities.gsi.gov.uk.

Selecting sites for support

88. Final decisions on which expressions of interest to support will be made by DCLG Ministers in the light of advice from DCLG and HCA officials.

Further information

89. For further information please contact DCLG at locallyledgardencities@communities.gsi.gov.uk.
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In recent years there has been a renewed interest in the idea of the Garden City, and how the principles that underpin that idea (set out in Box 1 on the next page) can be used to inform the delivery of new communities today. When planning for the supply of new homes local authorities are required by national policy1 to consider the Garden City approach, and many local authorities, developers and housing associations are exploring opportunities to address housing and growth needs through new communities at a range of scales. The TCPA has produced a suite of guidance documents on planning for, designing, and delivering new communities at a range of scales.2 These documents should be read alongside this guide.

The Garden City approach provides an opportunity to create innovative, resilient and inclusive places that will stand the test of time. Planning at scale offers the chance to think holistically about how a place will work, and to understand what mechanisms need to be put in place to help turn an ambitious vision into a real place. The term ‘Garden City’ carries with it not just an opportunity but also a responsibility to create exemplar world-class new communities.

**Why garden villages?**

In January 2017 the government announced its support for 14 new ‘garden villages’ – new communities of 1,500-10,000 homes which meet criteria set out in the 2016 Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities prospectus.3 These projects are to be supported alongside ten larger ‘garden towns’.

Like the idea of the Garden City, the garden village concept is not new. Garden villages form an important part of Britain’s urban development history, and have been used to describe a

---


2 The TCPA’s suite of guidance and research on delivering new communities following Garden City principles is available from the TCPA website, at [https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/garden-cities](https://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/garden-cities)

range of smaller new communities built in various forms in a period stretching from the Industrial Revolution to beyond the creation of the second and last Garden City at Welwyn in the 1920s. Many places that may be called the ‘original garden villages’ still thrive today, and provide an important source of learning for the development of new garden villages.

The original garden villages were based on a strong foundation of industry and employment, with their developers seeking to create well designed, healthy places and affordable homes. Garden villages built today should apply the same principles, but in a 21st century context, to create vibrant, diverse and affordable communities. Without providing the right employment, community facilities and range of housing, new garden villages risk becoming dormitory commuter suburbs – the antithesis of the Garden City idea.

The purpose of this publication

*Understanding Garden Villages* highlights the key characteristics of historical ‘model’ and garden villages, to help inform the design and delivery of new garden villages today. It is designed to provide inspiration for the planning, design and long-term management of new places, and to help local authorities and private sector delivery partners to understand what makes a successful garden village and what distinguishes it from a larger new community.

**Box 1**

**The Garden City principles**

A Garden City is a holistically planned new settlement that enhances the natural environment and offers high-quality affordable housing and locally accessible work in beautiful, healthy and sociable communities. The Garden City principles are an indivisible and interlocking framework for delivery, and include:

- Land value capture for the benefit of the community.
- Strong vision, leadership and community engagement.
- Community ownership of land and long-term stewardship of assets.
- Mixed-tenure homes and housing types that are genuinely affordable.
- A wide range of local jobs in the Garden City within easy commuting distance of homes.
- Beautifully and imaginatively designed homes with gardens, combining the best of town and country to create healthy communities, and including opportunities to grow food.
- Development that enhances the natural environment, providing a comprehensive green infrastructure network and net biodiversity gains, and that uses zero-carbon and energy-positive technology to ensure climate resilience.
- Strong cultural, recreational and shopping facilities in walkable, vibrant, sociable neighbourhoods.
- Integrated and accessible transport systems, with walking, cycling and public transport designed to be the most attractive forms of local transport.

Further information and an extensive set of policy and practical resources on Garden Cities can be found at [http://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/garden-cities](http://www.tcpa.org.uk/Pages/Category/garden-cities)
Like the term ‘Garden City’, defining the term ‘garden village’ is complex because it has been used over time to describe many developments which, to varying degrees, aspire to the principles of Garden Cities, albeit at a smaller scale.

**Britain’s heritage of model and garden villages**

Britain has a long history of smaller planned communities which may be associated with the term ‘garden village’. Emerging from a long-standing utopian tradition, the earliest significantly relevant examples are the ‘model villages’ developed by philanthropic industrialists and social reformers in the 19th century, when the rapid expansion of Britain’s towns and cities caused severe housing, health and social problems.

Enlightened employers such as Robert Owen (who managed New Lanark from 1800), Titus Salt (who founded Saltaire in 1851), George Cadbury (who founded Bournville in 1879), the Lever brothers (who founded Port Sunlight in 1888) and Joseph Rowntree (who developed New Earswick from 1902) built carefully planned new villages, providing homes for not only their workers, but also for poverty-stricken families in nearby towns and cities. These developments were all small, self-contained new communities that were linked to, but separate

---

4 The Garden City principles are a distillation of the key elements that have made the Garden City model of development so successful, articulated for a 21st century context. Taken together, the principles form an indivisible and interlocking framework for the delivery of high-quality places – see [https://www.tcpa.org.uk/garden-city-principles](https://www.tcpa.org.uk/garden-city-principles)

from, a larger town or city – New Lanark was near Glasgow, Port Sunlight near Liverpool, Bournville near Birmingham, and New Earswick near York. The developers of these model villages aimed to alleviate poverty through the provision of good-quality housing, access to green space and fresh air, and the provision of community activities and facilities. Some also recognised the commercial benefits of a happier, healthier workforce. At New Earswick and Bournville, the Joseph Rowntree Trust and Bournville Village Trust, respectively, were formed to manage the land and homes and invest in the community development of the villages.

These social reformers had an important influence on Ebenezer Howard and his book *To-Morrow – A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, published in 1898, which presented the Garden City model, drawing on some of the ideas underpinning the industrial model villages but envisaging a much more radical approach and a much more ambitious scale. Not only did the approach of these social reformers to delivery and management influence the Garden Cities, but their designers did too. Garden City pioneers Barry Parker and Raymond Unwin went directly from designing New Earswick in 1902 to the masterplanning the first Garden City at Letchworth in 1903.

Howard’s book had a rapid, direct and profound impact on urban development. Not only did the Garden City Association (founded to promote Howard’s ideas) begin the development at Letchworth Garden City just four years after *To-Morrow’s* publication, but countless developments across the world were created that borrowed from the Garden City ideals. By the end of the First World War, when work on the the second Garden City at Welwyn was about to begin, some of the Garden City pioneers were arguing for ‘garden suburbs’ – smaller developments, directly linked to larger towns, which applied the Garden City principles. The idea had been explored in several places, notably the co-partnership suburb at Brentham in Ealing in 1901 and by Henrietta Barnett at Hampstead in 1906, for whom Raymond Unwin designed Hampstead Garden Suburb. But despite these projects, the garden suburb idea alarmed some Garden City purists, who felt that there needed to be a minimum size to meet key principles such as long-term stewardship and local employment. Meanwhile, the Housing, Town Planning, &c. Act 1919 introduced the first wave of council housebuilding in Britain, with many sprawling estates being given the name ‘garden’. This was accompanied by a wave of private sector developers promoting small housing developments across the country that adopted the term due to its popularity, with developments of all shapes and sizes termed ‘garden villages’ or ‘garden suburbs’, whether or not they applied the principles on which the Garden City movement was founded. The majority of these developments were suburbs or extensions to existing towns or cities.

In the 1990s, the Urban Villages Forum promoted the idea of ‘urban villages’, highlighted earlier in the 1980s by Leon Krier, as a means to renew Britain’s existing towns and cities. This movement drew on the village characteristics of ‘security, sociability and economic purpose’, to promote the renewal of towns and cities through the creation of thriving and attractive urban districts. More recently, terms such as ‘sustainable urban neighbourhoods’ have been used to describe new communities. These terms describe smaller new communities, which are usually within or extensions to existing settlements. They are different from larger-scale new communities such as New Towns, eco-towns and Garden Cities, which have a parallel but distinctive history of their own.

---

6 E Howard: *To-Morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*. Swann Sonnenschein, 1898. Reprinted (with commentary by Peter Hall, Dennis Hardy and Colin Ward) by Routledge, 2003
7 For further information on Brentham, see the Brentham Garden Suburb website, at [https://brentham.com/brentham-garden-suburb/history/](https://brentham.com/brentham-garden-suburb/history/)
8 For further information on Hampstead see the Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust website, at [http://www.hgstrust.org/the-suburb/history-of-the-suburb.shtml](http://www.hgstrust.org/the-suburb/history-of-the-suburb.shtml)
9 P Neal (Ed.): *Urban Villages and the Making of Communities*. Taylor & Francis, 2003
Greatly influenced by his Quaker beliefs, George Cadbury had a deep-seated social concern for the way that people were forced to live in the overcrowded back streets of Birmingham. Conditions were so poor that healthy living was almost impossible, and at the end of the 19th century life expectancy was about 40 years. He and his older brother, Richard, had made a success of their father’s chocolate business, moving from Birmingham city centre to its present site (which was then in the country) in 1879. The area around the new ‘factory in a garden’ was named Bournville. ‘Bourn’ was the name of the local stream, and ‘ville’ was apt because of the French rivalry in chocolate-making at the time.

Richard never lived to see Bournville fully develop as he died from diphtheria in 1899. This was to have a profound effect on George, leading him to create Bournville Village Trust (BVT) on 14 December 1900, with a gift that included 313 houses on 330 acres of land. The Trust deed was a far-sighted document, setting out the objectives of the founder, but allowing today’s trustees effective control of the village.

George Cadbury’s vision was of a mixed community: Bournville was conceived for people from a wide range of backgrounds, not only for the workers at the chocolate factory. Today, the Bournville estate, situated four miles south-west of Birmingham, covers over 1,000 acres, 10% of which is parkland and open space. There are almost 8,000 houses, of mixed tenure, on the estate, which is home to about 25,000 people. Many have credited the model village with laying the foundations for the development of Garden Cities and introducing the benefits of open space into modern town planning. Further detail on the operation of Bournville Village Trust today is provided on pages 18 and 19.

Port Sunlight

**Founded:** 1888, by William Hesketh Lever  
**Location:** Bebington, Wirral  
**Current population:** 2,065

Having expanded his family grocery business into an industrial empire based upon his successful ‘Sunlight’ soap, William Hesketh Lever purchased a site on the Wirral with good transport connections to be the location of a new and larger factory, taking the opportunity to build a workers’ village at the same time.

Lever aimed to develop high-quality housing at Port Sunlight, believing that this was the right approach for an employer to take, while also ensuring that he had a healthy and efficient workforce. Port Sunlight had allotments and public buildings, including an art gallery, a cottage hospital, a school, a concert hall, an open-air swimming pool, a church, and a temperance hotel. Between 1889 and 1914, 800 houses were built to house 3,500 people.

The village also gave Lever the chance to express his interest in architecture, and over 30 architects were involved in the creation of the village. A wide variety of styles were used, giving the impression that the village had developed over four centuries, rather than within 25 years. Contrasting styles were often placed alongside each other to create interest, and no two cottages are identical. Roads were made wide enough for the architecture to be enjoyed from the front elevation rather than from an oblique view as in many towns.

Lever introduced welfare schemes and provided for the education and entertainment of his workforce, encouraging recreation and organisations which promoted art, literature, science and music. He claimed that Port Sunlight was an exercise in prosperity-sharing, but rather than share profits directly he invested them in the village.

In 1930 Lever Brothers merged with the Dutch Margarine Union Ltd to form Unilever, and from the 1960s onwards the company carried out a modernisation programme on Port Sunlight’s cottages. Originally, occupancy of the houses was restricted to employees of Lever Brothers,
but in the early 1980s residents were given the option to buy the properties they rented. Port Sunlight became a designated conservation area in 1978, with nearly every building Grade II listed, and two sections of the landscape are included in Historic England’s Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest. It welcomes more than 300,000 visitors a year.

In 1999, Unilever created Port Sunlight Village Trust (PSVT) to take on responsibility for the preservation and promotion of the conservation area. All parks, gardens, monuments and memorials were transferred over to PSVT, along with the majority of public buildings and nearly a third (just under 300) of the houses. PSVT continues to care for this internationally significant heritage site today, supporting 2,000 residents and welcoming over 300,000 visitors annually.

For further information on Port Sunlight, see the Port Sunlight Village Trust website, at [http://portsunlightvillage.com/](http://portsunlightvillage.com/)

---

**New Earswick**

*Founded: 1902, by Sir Joseph Rowntree and family*

*Location: York*

*Current population: 2,737*

New Earswick was developed by Joseph Rowntree, a local cocoa manufacturer, grocer and philanthropist, who purchased the land for the village in his own name rather than that of his firm. He was committed to understanding the causes of poverty in order to create a
better society. The garden village on the outskirts of York was revolutionary at the time of its building; Rowntree had the advantage of learning from earlier experiences, such as Cadbury’s at Bournville. The village was designed by Raymond Unwin, a pioneer of the Garden City movement.

The village was not intended to be exclusively populated by Rowntree’s employees but to provide high-quality and healthy housing conditions for working-class families in a green setting. Each home would have its own garden and fruit tree. The first 28 houses were built between 1902 and 1904, when the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust was established to continue building and manage the new village.

New Earswick was intended to be a self-governing village following the formation of a democratically elected village council in 1907 – a clear indication of Rowntree’s commitment to local democracy and to residents’ control of their own environment. An abundance of green space, schools, churches and recreational facilities were provided within the village. The Folk Hall was built in 1907 and became the social hub. An extension to the hall had to be built in 1935 to allow it to accommodate larger groups and many societies and gatherings for the villagers. It remains a social hub today, offering a range of community activities, such as a junior youth club and keep-fit classes.

The Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust continues to manage New Earswick, which today hosts a thriving mixed-income community and a wide range of community facilities. Its broad mix of housing tenures suits all circumstances, and includes specially designed homes for the elderly and adults with physical and learning difficulties, plus six eco-homes. It aims to maintain an inclusive neighbourhood that addresses loneliness, dementia, poverty and digital exclusion, and involves people of all ages. Research conducted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 2003 found that two-thirds of New Earswick respondents thought the village was a very good place to in which to live. The research also commented on the high levels of trust and a sense of community within the village.

For further information on New Earswick, see the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust ‘New Earswick’ webpage, at: https://www.jrht.org.uk/community/new-earswick-york
Historic garden villages span a range of developments, from industrial model villages and co-partnership suburbs, to villages designed by the Garden City pioneers themselves. Although each is unique, there are common characteristics that made historic garden villages successful.

They were holistically planned
- Historic garden villages were holistically planned; i.e. through a masterplan that included jobs, community facilities and local services alongside homes.

They were small in scale
- Historic garden villages were small in size, usually no more than a few hundred homes. When they were built, many more people lived within a single household, so a few hundred homes accommodated more people than they would today.

They were planned for healthy living
- Residents were provided with access to green space, nature, fresh air, walking and cycling, sports and outdoor leisure activities, and opportunities to grow local food.

They provided for a vibrant social life
- Historic garden villages featured active community societies, and their stewardship organisation would organise local sports, arts and community events.

They were designed with high-quality materials and attention to detail
- Historic garden villages placed a huge emphasis on the use of high-quality and often local materials. Attention to detail and the use of architects resulted in homes and communities that remain desirable today.

They were designed to provide affordable homes close to employment
- Homes were designed to be genuinely affordable for the local workforce, and close to employment. Garden villages supported their residents through employment offered from a large industrial base.

They provided services for day-to-day needs within walking distance of homes
- Historic garden villages provided not just homes and jobs but a wide range of amenities and community facilities, meeting day-to-day needs without requiring frequent travel to the surrounding or larger towns or cities.

They were in single land-ownership, with a long-term stewardship organisation
- Land remained in single ownership, and a charitable trust or organisation was established to look after the development and its residents, funded through a service charge or income from leaseholds. Stewardship may include physical maintenance and improvement of the public realm, managing the public realm, and organising community activities.
The latest chapter in the garden village story is the result of the government’s policy interest in the role of new communities in tackling the nation’s housing shortage. Emerging from the Wolfson Economics Prize 2014 (on how best to deliver a new Garden City which is visionary, economically viable and popular), the renewed interest in smaller ‘garden community’ developments, in the form of garden villages, has become part of a wider government programme of support for garden communities in sizes ranging from 1,500 to 10,000+ homes.

**Government policy on new garden villages**

In 2016 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) published a prospectus for new ‘locally-led garden villages, towns and cities’. As well as continuing the package of support for new ‘garden towns’ of 10,000 homes or more, which has been offered since...
2014, the prospectus also invited local authorities to bid for support for new garden villages, which it defined as:

- 1,500-10,000 homes in size;
- a ‘new discrete settlement, and not an extension of an existing town or village. This does not exclude proposals where there are already a few existing homes’;
- local authority led, with support from the community and the Local Enterprise Partnership;
- ‘well designed’, ‘high-quality’ and ‘attractive’; and
- embedding key Garden City principles to develop communities that ‘stand out from the ordinary’ and do not ‘use ‘garden’ as a convenient label’.

Over 50 local authorities submitted proposals, and in January 2017 14 projects were announced as receiving support under the policy\(^\text{11}\) (see Fig. 1).

**The government definition of garden villages**

The 2016 *Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities* prospectus\(^\text{12}\) suggests that local authorities should decide themselves how to define what a garden village is:

> ‘We do not consider that there is a single template for a garden village, town or city. It will be important for the new community to establish a clear and distinct sense of identity. We want to see local areas adopt innovative approaches and solutions to creating great places, rather than following a set of rules.’

But it also encourages local authorities to be ambitious:

> ‘Equally, we are clear that this prospectus is not looking to support places which merely use ‘garden’ as a convenient label. Rather, we will support local areas that embed key garden city principles to develop communities that stand out from the ordinary. We do not want to impose a set of development principles on local areas, and will support local areas in developing their own vision for their communities. But, we will want to see evidence of attractive, well-designed places with local support.’

**New garden villages and the Garden City principles**

The TCPA has promoted the use of the Garden City principles as a framework for good place-making and the delivery of high-quality places which provide good outcomes for people and the environment and are underpinned by a financial model that pays for these positive outcomes in the long term. What these principles mean, and how they can be achieved in new developments at a range of scales, and in the current policy environment, is set out in the TCPA’s series of Practical Guides, which should be read alongside this publication.\(^\text{13}\)

The Garden City principles are not a blueprint or rigid set of rules for creating new places. They are simply a framework for good place-making, delivery and management, within which innovation and imagination should be applied to the specific context of individual projects and locations. The *Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities* prospectus encourages local authorities applying for funding to embed the Garden City principles within their proposals. However, demonstrating that all the principles will be applied is not a pre-requisite of receiving support through the programme. Without standards or policy


\(^{13}\) The full set of the TCPA’s Garden City Standards for the 21st Century: Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities are available at [https://www.tcpa.org.uk/guidance-for-delivering-new-garden-cities](https://www.tcpa.org.uk/guidance-for-delivering-new-garden-cities)
requirements in place, it is up to those delivering the developments to commit to these principles in practice and ensure that they meet the commitment to quality, affordability and sustainability that their name implies.

This is challenging for local authorities who are under pressure to deliver at speed and who are faced with challenges such as the viability test in the National Planning Policy Framework. The viability test makes it hard to uphold high standards and often results in developments with lower levels of key Garden City requirements, such as genuinely affordable housing and early provision of high-quality community facilities.

As a result, while many places are being ambitious in their intentions and innovative in their approaches, some are finding it difficult to commit to delivering even the key Garden City principles. Meanwhile – as occurred in the 1920s – many developers are adopting the term ‘garden village’ in the branding of their developments, regardless of the extent to which there is a commitment to deliver in line with the Garden City principles. This is a disappointment to those – such as local residents and other stakeholders – who have an expectation that certain standards will be met.

**An opportunity for ambitious councils and delivery partners**

The application of key Garden City principles to new garden villages, as encouraged by the prospectus, should be used by local authorities as a baseline from which to create ambitious policies and influence decisions that will lead to better places. The viability test presents a challenge, but there is clear evidence of the value of good place-making (such as how designing for healthy living environments can reduce the costs of social care). There is also no doubt that a combination of robust development plan policy and skilled officers is crucial to ensuring that good decisions are made. Councils should not be deterred by the fragmented policy environment in relation to place-making and should instead seek to establish policy to provide an opportunity so as to once again create a legacy of world-leading new communities.
Creating new garden villages

The TCPA has written extensively on how to deliver new communities at a range of scales. There are specific opportunities and challenges when planning and delivering at scale. While the government’s programme has identified garden villages as being between 1,500 and 10,000 homes in size, this guide focuses on the smaller scale, of around 5,000 homes or less, although many of the principles apply at all scales of development. Drawing on learning from the original model and garden villages, this section sets out some key principles for success for the creation of new garden villages.

The TCPA definition of a new garden village

The TCPA defines a garden village as a new community that is designed, delivered and managed in accordance with the Garden City principles, but tailored for a smaller scale than new Garden Cities (which are likely to be more than 10,000 homes in size). It may be developed within existing settlements (as an urban village or suburb) or as a sustainable urban extension. New garden villages may be developed as ‘distinct settlements’ only where there are sufficient employment and community facilities provided within the development to support the population and where there is an affordable and easily accessible public transport system linking the new garden village with its ‘parent’ town or city. In addition, identification of new garden villages should be undertaken through a planned approach that considers development at a range of scales. For further information on planning for growth, see the TCPA’s Guide 1: Locating and Consenting New Garden Cities.

Principles for success

The world is very different from that of George Cadbury, Joseph Rowntree and Ebenezer Howard, but the principles of the movements they headed are now more relevant than ever. Today, application of the Garden City principles can help to address climate change and tackle challenges such as obesity. Drawing on learning from the original garden villages, and from the TCPA’s work on delivering new Garden Cities at a range of scales, key principles for success are set out here.

Planning for new garden villages

The identification of the need for, and locations of, new garden villages should be undertaken as part of a strategic consideration of growth options and location assessment.

Designing new garden villages

The Garden City principles provide the best framework for designing new garden villages. It is also worth reflecting on the characteristics of historic model and garden villages outlined on page 10 of this guide, and what they might mean for garden villages today:

- **Holistically planned:** New garden villages should be holistically planned, with a strategic framework (masterplan) which is comprehensive enough to guide investment but flexible enough to evolve over time. For further information on design and masterplanning, see the TCPA’s Guide 3: Design and Masterplanning.
Small in scale: The government is supporting a broad range of development scales under the umbrella term ‘garden village’. There is no ‘one size fits all’ approach to managing growth, and the right approach will be different in each area. What is important is that the whole range of scales and options for accommodating growth is considered, alongside a long-term view of what is the right option.

It is impossible for a new community of a smaller scale to be a distinct and separate settlement: it will always be part of a hierarchy of settlements. When considering a new community at a small scale, the right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns.

Whatever scenario authorities are planning for growth within, the process must be underpinned by: a strong evidence base, compiled using a range of assessments and capacity studies and using tools such as sustainability appraisal, incorporating the requirements of strategic environmental assessment at an early stage of plan preparation; an organisational approach that includes strong local leadership, thinking beyond the Local Plan boundary, and taking a long-term view of growth requirements; and a set of locational criteria covering the scale and spatial options for growth, good connectivity, and the maximisation of opportunities to deliver sustainable development and bridge regional inequalities. For further information on scale and location, see the TCPA’s Guide 1: Locating and Consenting New Garden Cities.17

Planned for healthy living: Planning for healthy communities is integral to the creation of new places today. New garden villages should foster healthy and active communities by encouraging walking and cycling and by providing a comfortable, stimulating and therapeutic environment, bringing together the best of the urban and natural environments, for people of all ages. Key considerations for active design and a more detailed examination of how to plan for healthy communities in new Garden Cities are set out in the TCPA’s Guide 8: Creating Health-Promoting Environments.18

---

- **Provision for a vibrant social life:** New garden villages should be characterised by their social and cultural vibrancy. This calls for a clear and long-term artistic and cultural strategy and a flexible approach to design and delivery, to accommodate changing needs. Other key principles related to planning for culture and the arts in new Garden Cities can be found in the TCPA’s *Guide 6: Planning for Culture and the Arts.*

- **Designed with high-quality materials and attention to detail:** The creation of a new garden village provides an opportunity to set a framework for design and development that is both sensitive to local character and creates distinctive neighbourhoods. This means that a garden village designed for Cornwall is likely to look and feel very different from one designed for Norfolk. Both will reflect the unique materials, designs and landscape of their locality. Garden villages must be exemplary in high-quality and innovative design, featuring the application of the highest sustainability standards, innovative use of local and sustainable new materials, and high-quality imaginative architecture, making use of expert craftsmanship. They should have ‘postcardability’ – a distinct and recognisable character, with imaginative and varied architecture forming part of a collective and harmonious ‘whole’.

- **Designed to provide affordable homes close to employment:** New garden villages should meet the full range of housing needs and aspirations through a diversity of housing opportunities, having particular regard to the needs of older people and the provision of plots for self-/custom-building. Homes in new Garden Cities must be accessible, flexible and sustainable to meet demographic realities. There must be decent minimum space standards applicable across all tenures. Self-/custom-build homes are an important part of the housing mix in Garden Cities and should be made affordable for people on middle and low incomes: land should be made available for this purpose, potentially provided as serviced plots. Homes should be designed for flexible working, as well as being located a short distance from a range of employment opportunities and local facilities.

- **Provision of services for day-to-day needs within walking distance of homes:** New garden villages should provide a sustainable urban structure of walkable neighbourhoods.
based around a network of mixed-use town and local centres in which residents can meet most of their day-to-day needs.

**Land ownership and long-term stewardship:** Unless the new community is being delivered by a New Town Development Corporation, which is unlikely for smaller-scale new communities (see below), the land for a new garden village will probably not be in single ownership. However, delivering a successful new community requires a clear understanding of how assets generated by the development process will be managed in perpetuity. New garden villages must demonstrate how such management will be undertaken on behalf of the community. The stewardship task goes beyond the management of green space to cover the broadest range of community assets, including the active and positive management of everything from arts provision to commercial estates and utility companies. Putting local people at the heart of this process can generate increased local support, creativity, and entrepreneurialism. For new garden villages of a smaller scale, approaches to stewardship may differ from that taken for a much larger community, and the economics make matters more challenging. However, a range of opportunities remain, including models specifically designed for smaller-scale development, such as community land trusts or housing co-operatives. For further information on land ownership and long-term stewardship, see the TCPA's *Guide 9: Long-Term Stewardship*.20

**Delivering new garden villages**

Successful new community-building requires the right delivery body, with a skilled and dedicated team. The ability to work to key Garden City principles such as land value capture and long-term stewardship is directly linked to the form of delivery body used. Modernised New Town Development Corporations can be the most effective vehicle for larger-scale development, but they may not be the right model for smaller garden villages. However, there are a range of models and partnerships available. These are set out in the TCPA’s *Guide 2: Finance and Delivery*.21

---


Applying Garden City principles at a smaller scale

There are specific opportunities to apply the Garden City principles to larger-scale developments, but there are also a wealth of contemporary examples of projects that have applied key principles at the smaller scale. The examples below demonstrate how some of the organisations that delivered the original garden villages are applying the principles to new communities today.

Garden village stewardship in the 21st century – Bournville Village Trust

Bournville Village Trust (BVT) is one of the longest-established housing associations in the country. Founded in 1900 by the chocolate manufacturer George Cadbury, BVT now looks after some 8,000 mixed-tenure properties in Bournville, in inner-city Birmingham, and in Shropshire at the new communities of Lightmoor and Lawley. As well as being a not-for-profit housing association providing rented housing, BVT manages supported housing, community facilities and landscaped areas on the Bournville estate, and an agricultural estate. Stewardship across its estates can be defined by a number of key objectives:

- Manage communal areas and open spaces to a high standard.
- Protect the visual amenity of the estates.
- Promote and foster a sustainable community spirit.
- Operate a development control function.
- Provide and develop affordable, sustainable housing.
- Promote and encourage resident involvement in BVT’s decision-making processes.

BVT’s estate management and stewardship services cost around £850,000 per year (based on 2016 figures). Services are funded through an annual management charge applied to each household (freehold titles include a covenant to pay the charge). Annual management charges are set at approximately £250-£300 per household per annum. The maintenance charge to residents has been in operation for some time and also allows for the development of a sinking fund for future capital repairs and replacements. BVT also helps to maintain a high-quality public realm through design covenants. Any alterations which significantly alter the external appearance of a home must comply with BVT’s design guide.

BVT retains accountability through involving residents through its Estates Committee, meetings of village councils and resident associations, the Bournville Freeholders and
Leaseholders Association, and a ‘village voices’ scrutiny panel. Each year it sends a ‘what your charge pays for document to each household.

Further information: http://www.bvt.org.uk/

Long-term stewardship at Lightmoor, Telford – Bournville Village Trust, with Homes England

Today, Bournville Village Trust is using its experience to create, in partnership with Homes England, a thriving new 21st-century garden village in Telford, modelled on Bournville. Once complete, Lightmoor Village will feature 1,000 homes, including a quarter for affordable rent ‘pepper-potted’ across the development. As at Bournville itself, a strong emphasis is placed on providing the infrastructure needed to promote health and wellbeing and create a flourishing mixed community. It has a school, shops, parks, and a community centre – essential ingredients in developing a sustainable and successful garden suburb. Dwellings must reach EcoHomes ‘Excellent’ standard, and all homes owned and managed by the Trust are being built to Lifetime Homes standards. BVT’s commitment to community development and management sets it apart from the mainstream, and its stewardship model is the vehicle used to meet this commitment.

BVT owns the land, and properties are being sold freehold and leasehold, with covenants in place. These covenants include a maintenance charge (that goes towards delivering community services as well as a ‘wear and tear’ fund), obligations to maintain the properties, and a requirement to seek permission from the Trust for certain alterations. Stewardship is a long-term commitment to the management and maintenance of a place, to ensure that it continues to flourish in 100 years’ time and beyond. It forms an integral part of how Lightmoor Village is managed, and characteristics of the model include a design guide to control building alterations, a commitment to public and open space, and resident involvement and empowerment in decision-making – including through the Lightmoor Village Estate Management Committee.

In 2015, BVT held over 100 community events, and it plants a tree in the community orchard every time a child is born in the village – a nod to George Cadbury’s original initiative at Bournville, where every garden was provided with a fruit tree.

Further information: http://www.bvt.org.uk/our-business/lightmoor/
Applying garden city principles to a small urban extension at Derwenthorpe, York – Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust, with David Wilson Homes

Built in partnership by the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust and David Wilson Homes, Derwenthorpe is a 540-home development on the outskirts of York. It continues the theme of sustainable mixed communities which was one of the main drivers for the development of New Earswick, a garden village in York designed by Raymond Unwin and Barry Parker for Joseph Rowntree. At Derwenthorpe the properties are much larger than average, feeding into Rowntree’s original aim of everyone having a good-quality home to live in, regardless of their wealth. Social housing is ‘pepper-potted’ throughout the development – resulting in every street containing people of mixed financial circumstances. The properties are well insulated, and so more affordable to heat, and benefit from large windows – maximising natural light and reducing the reliance on electricity for lighting. Each property has been designed with eco-friendly features, including communal heating from a central biomass boiler and a drainage system that prevents flooding.

In 2013, Derwenthorpe won the ‘completed’ category at the Housing Design Awards. The homes are surrounded by mature landscaping, including a large public pond and play areas. White-painted brickwork and rubble walls echo the Arts and Crafts style of nearby New Earswick. Some include enclosed balconies or ‘winter-gardens’ which provide light, amenity and privacy. A connection to a Sustrans cycle route minimises the need for short car journeys.

Derwenthorpe has attracted a high proportion of residents who have one or more family members with a disability. Each house is built to Lifetime Homes standards, and so can be more easily and cheaply adapted for people in a wide variety of circumstances. The Super Sustainable Centre (SSC) at Derwenthorpe supplies energy to surrounding homes and is also taking a role at the heart of the community, hosting regular resident events such as art classes, children’s groups, yoga classes and coffee mornings, making it a hub of social activity.

Further information: http://www.jrht.org.uk/communities/derwenthorpe
Further information

The history of garden villages

- Bournville Village Trust
  https://www.bvt.org.uk/

- Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust
  https://www.jrht.org.uk/
  Research on the experience of early communities at Derwenthorpe is available at
  https://www.york.ac.uk/media/yesi/researchoutputs/life_at_derwenthorpe_full_report_Jan2016.pdf

- Port Sunlight Village Trust
  http://portsunlightvillage.com/

- Brentham Garden Suburb
  https://brentham.com/

- Hampstead Garden Suburb Trust
  http://www.hgstrust.org/


Creating new Garden Cities

The TCPA has produced a suite of guidance outlining practical steps for all those interested in making 21st-century Garden Cities a reality. Guidance provides detail and case studies on a wide range of key issues, including planning, investment, land assembly, delivery, and long-term stewardship:

Garden City Standards for the 21st Century: Practical Guides for Creating Successful New Communities

- Guide 5: Homes for All (2016)
- Guide 8: Creating Health-Promoting Environments (2017)

All available at https://www.tcpa.org.uk/guidance-for-delivering-new-garden-cities
Other resources

■ Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation
  http://www.letchworth.com/

■ Homes England
  https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/homes-england
Homes England (formerly the Homes and Communities Agency) can provide specific advice on large-scale development and the government’s Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities programme. For further details on the programme, contact Fionnuala Lennon at Fionnuala.Lennon@homesengland.gov.uk

■ National Community Land Trust Network
  http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/home

■ National Custom and Self Build Association
  http://www.nacsba.org.uk/

■ Planning Advisory Service
  https://www.local.gov.uk/pas

■ TCPA New Communities Group (NCG)
  https://www.tcpa.org.uk/new-communities-group