Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to update the Committee on progress on the Garden Village and to consider the recommendations from the Project Board that:

1. The working title for the new village should be Tresham Garden Village;
2. The work programme for completing and consulting upon the Masterplan and Delivery Framework is agreed;
3. The Urban Design Framework establishing principles in relation to the landscape and movement structure and the position of key land-uses is endorsed; and
4. That a bid is made for further DCLG Capacity Funding for 2017/18.

Attachment(s)

Appendix 1: Programme
Appendix 2: Draft Urban Design Framework (UDF)
Appendix 3: UDF explanatory note
Appendix 4: Proposed capacity funding bid 2017/18

1. **Background**

1.1 Policy 14 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) identifies the potential to create an exemplary Garden Village at Deenethorpe Airfield. It sets out the criteria that must be met in order for the proposal to be acceptable, and requires this to be tested through the preparation of a Masterplan and Delivery Framework.

1.2 The Council established the Deenethorpe Airfield Village Project Board to work with the promoters in shaping and testing the Garden Village proposals. Capacity support was secured from the Government in March 2017 to progress the Garden Village as one of 14 initial projects across the country. This support has comprised £228k capacity funding (for staff capacity, specialist advice, technical studies etc.) and assistance from the Homes and Communities Agency on viability issues. A key element of specialist input to ensure exemplary design standards has been masterplanning advice from TransForm Places (the centre for better neighbourhoods) and independent design review through OPUN (the architecture centre for the East Midlands). There will be an opportunity to bid for further funding for 2017/18.
2. **Working title**

2.1 The Deene Estate has requested that the village be named Tresham to commemorate the historic links between the Brudenell and Tresham families. The Project Board supported this name, subject to it being referred to as “Tresham Village” to avoid any confusion with Tresham College. This proposal was consulted on for six weeks. A press release was issued by ENC and received coverage in local press and on radio and television. Comments were invited from the Royal Mail and Parish Councils, and the Deene Estate secured confirmation from Tresham College that it was happy with the proposed name. The press release emphasised that giving a working name to the proposed Garden Village does not prejudge the outcome of the planning application process that is to come.

2.2 Limited response to the proposed name was received by the 30th April deadline. The Royal Mail stated that it has no objection. One anonymous objection was received but did not demonstrate that the name would result in wider public offense, be misleading, or cause confusion.

2.3 Separate to the formal consultation process, discussions with DCLG have highlighted the importance of referring to the new villages supported by Government as “Garden Villages” (and the SUEs as part of the North Northamptonshire “Garden Community”). In view of this, the Project Board recommends that the working title for the project is “Tresham Garden Village”. The Estate is comfortable with this but has made clear its preference, in the long term, is for the village to be referred to as simply “Tresham”.

3 **Programme Update**

3.1 The proposed programme for completing the masterplan and delivery framework is provided at Appendix 1. This involves reporting the draft Masterplan and delivery Framework to the Full Council on 16th October, rather than July as indicated in the report to PPC on 20th February 2017. This gives additional time for technical work, including the consideration of viability/delivery issues. It will also allow consultation to take place in the autumn rather than over the summer.

3.2 The programme remains ambitious but, having considered various risks that may result in delay, the Project Board considers that it should be pursued in order to maintain momentum and to demonstrate clear progress to the Government.

4 **Progress on Masterplanning**

4.1 The concept, approach and rationale for the design of the village have been refined through the process of producing an urban design framework (UDF). The purpose of the UDF is to establish a robust structure for Tresham GV so that the long-lasting elements of the place (landscape, movement and land-uses) can be agreed prior to the development of more detailed design work through the Masterplan. The preparation of the UDF has involved collaborative working between the promoters’ consultancy team and the Council/JPDU, technical workshops involving a wide range of stakeholders, and independent design review through OPUN. It has taken on board feedback from the Project Board, notably in relation to the number/nature of access points onto the A427
and in relation to the scale and location of employment opportunities within the village.

4.2 The draft UDF is provided at Appendix 2 and explanatory note at Appendix 3. The Project Board recommends that this is endorsed as the basis for further detailed design work. The Council’s masterplanning advisors TransForm Places endorse the UDF. In particular, they consider that:

- The landscape and movement structures are clearly expressed, providing a robust spatial framework for the village and the basis of a strong and distinctive identity for the Garden Village. The landscape strategy in particular holds great potential to shelter the village from prevailing winds and to provide a unique and varied green setting for Tresham GV, with accessible greenways for everyday movement and leisure as well as a productive landscape.

- The village centre seems to be optimally located within the existing and proposed route network, as shown by the Space Syntax spatial analysis carried out by TransForm Places. The movement network gives equal or greater weight to accessibility on foot and cycle as it does to motorised movement, with all parts of the village being within the 10 minute walking distance.

4.3 There will be further minor adjustments to the primary and secondary movement routes within the village, particularly as the finer mesh of local routes is added. Detailed street design will need careful consideration by the masterplanning team and highway authority, which has currently indicated that it would not support crossroads on main routes through the site.

4.4 It is recommended that the UDF is endorsed as a basis for more detailed design work. This will assist the promoter and masterplanning team to meet the exacting programme for completing the masterplan and delivery framework.

4.5 The OPUN Design Review Panel will be considering progress on the Garden Village proposals on the 24th July and the PPC will be updated on any issues arising. Members are welcome to attend as observers (please contact the JPDU if you wish to do so).

5. **Local engagement**

5.1 The Garden Village proposal has received extensive media coverage over the last couple of years and formal public consultation was undertaken through the JCS process. More focused public consultation is scheduled to take place in October/November when there should be clear proposals to consult on in the form of the masterplan and delivery framework.

5.2 In advance of wider engagement, local input is being provided through the representation on the Project Board of Benefield and Deene and Deenethorpe Parish Councils. Glapthorn and Weldon PCs have also been provided with updates on the project. The Deene Estate has met with the PCs and with Corby Borough Council to explain the emerging proposals and to understand local issues and concerns.

5.3 Key issues raised through this local input to date include:
• Potential impacts of additional traffic using the A427 through Benefield and Weldon;
• Potential impacts of additional traffic using the Benefield to Cotterstock route passing through Glapthorn to reach the A605 to Peterborough/ A1;
• Cumulative impacts in the A43 corridor arising from the Garden Village in combination with Priors Hall, Weldon Park, and other planned developments in Corby;
• Concerns that local flood events will increase in incidence (linked to past events at the villages of Deenethorpe, Upper and Lower Benefield);
• Public interest in affordable, custom and self-build housing opportunities on site as determined though feedback provided to JPDU to date.

5.4 These issues need to be assessed through proportionate evidence at each stage in the planning process. For instance, in relation to transport impacts, the County Council’s Northamptonshire Strategic Transport Model provided the reassurance at the JCS stage that the road network should be able to cope with the traffic arising from a new village in this location. More detailed traffic modelling has now been commissioned by the promoters to look in finer detail at the likely distribution of traffic arising from the village, so that necessary off-site highway improvements and other mitigation measures including improved public transport can be identified. The headlines of this work are needed for the masterplan and delivery framework to ensure there are no “show-stoppers” and that potential costs of off-site works are factored into the viability assessment. However, the full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan for the Garden Village will not be finalised until the planning application stage.

6. **Government capacity support**

6.1 The 2016 expression of interest submitted by the JPU in response to the Government’s prospectus on Locally-led Garden Villages sought £650k over 2016/17 and 2017/18. The funding award for 2016/17 was £228k and CLG has indicated that the 14 initial Garden Villages will be invited to bid again in July for a share of a further £3 million available for 2017/18.

6.2 The initial CLG funding has been used for capacity support, including the commissioning of design input, and for specific studies/ advice in relation to:

- Delivery mechanisms to provide reassurance that this development can be delivered as an exemplary Garden Village from physical, economic and social perspectives (Garden City Developments CIC)
- Frameworks for management of public realm, including models for long term revenue and capital options (The Land Trust);
- A43 highway corridor study, looking at the relationships between the various major developments and associated infrastructure components to help coordinate and resolve issues including phasing and triggers of highways improvement works, delivery of cycle infrastructure/ pedestrian routes and crossings, public transport provision, and speed limits and design standards (to be commissioned);
- How “ecosystem services” such as carbon storage, pollination, air purification, water supply and agricultural production can be enhanced by the Garden Village (Natural Capital Solutions and Lockhart Garratt);
The mix of house sizes, types and tenures needed to address identified needs and create “a balanced and mixed community” as sought in JCS Policy 14, while also optimising viability and build rates (Housing Vision);

- Promoting Custom and Self-Build housing in the Garden Village (Right to Build Task Force)

6.3 It is recommended that a bid is made for further capacity funding in 2017/18 as summarised in Appendix 4. This is based on items in the original successful bid plus landscape design expertise to ensure that public realm issues can be addressed in detail, and funding towards the additional costs arising from the updating of the Northamptonshire Strategic Transport Model in order to assess the Garden Village proposal.

7. **Equality and Diversity Implications**

7.1 There are no equality and diversity implications arising from this report

8. **Legal Implications**

8.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

9. **Risk Management**

9.1 There are no significant risks arising from this report.

10. **Resource and Financial Implications**

10.1 There are no resources or financial implications arising from this report.

11. **Constitutional Implications**

11.1 There are no constitutional implications arising from this report.

12. **Implications for our Customers**

12.1 There are no customer service implications arising from this report.

13. **Corporate Outcomes**

13.1 How would the recommended decision help deliver the corporate outcomes? You should only cite reference to outcomes applicable to your proposal and then explain how your proposal will contribute to the delivery of the Corporate Outcomes.

The Corporate Outcomes are:

- Good Quality of Life – sustainable development, strong communities, high quality built environment, improved housing and public health;
- Effective Partnership Working – effective joint working with neighbouring local planning authorities in accordance with the statutory “Duty to Cooperate” and with Town/Parish Councils and neighbourhood planning groups to ensure a flow of information with a view to informing proposals accordingly;
- Effective Management – contributing towards attainment of housing land supply and attainment of local housing needs as well as the opportunity to generate additional economic growth;
Knowledge of Customers and Communities – ensuring that an appropriate mix of housing is delivered, including affordable dwellings, to address local needs.

14. **Recommendations**

14.1 It is recommended that the Planning Policy Committee:

1. Agrees that the working title for the new village should be “Tresham Garden Village”;
2. Agrees the updated work programme at Appendix 1;
3. Endorses the Urban Design Framework set out in Appendix 2 and 3;

*Reason: To enable the Garden Village proposal to be progressed in accordance with Policy 14 of the JCS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other considerations: National Planning Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (July 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Background Papers:**

**Person Originating Report:** Andrew Longley, Head of North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit

Φ 01832 742359  AndrewLongley@nnjpu.org.uk

**Date:** 13th July 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masterplan programme</th>
<th>May-17</th>
<th>Jun-17</th>
<th>Jul-17</th>
<th>Aug-17</th>
<th>Sep-17</th>
<th>Oct-17</th>
<th>Nov-17</th>
<th>Dec-17</th>
<th>Jan-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week Commencing</strong></td>
<td>1  8  15 22 29</td>
<td>5  12 19 26</td>
<td>3 10 17 24 31</td>
<td>7 14 21 28</td>
<td>4 11 18 25</td>
<td>2  9 16 23 30</td>
<td>6 13 19 27</td>
<td>4 11 18 25</td>
<td>1  8 15 22 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPUN Design Review Panel meetings?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Steering Group meetings</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Board</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy Committee/ Wider Member update</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of draft Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise viability Assessment &amp; Delivery Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Board agrees draft Masterplan &amp; Delivery Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council to agree draft Masterplan for consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder launch event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider response &amp; refine Masterplan &amp; DF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Board considers Masterplan &amp; DF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special PPC recommends Masterplan &amp; DF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council adopts Masterplan &amp; DF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amended 13-7-17
The Urban Design Framework seeks to integrate:

**Landscape structure** | how the proposed village will sit in the landscape;

**Movement structure** | how the connections to the surrounding road, footpath and bridleway networks inform an internal street pattern;

**Land-use pattern** | the location of different land-uses and how, combined with landscape and movement, a variety of public squares, greens and parkland might be created within the village.

**Landscape**
- The main runway is on the ridge line – turning part of this into a tree-lined avenue will provide a tree canopy above the rooftop.
- Watersheds to the east and west of the ridge line are expressed through ditches/streams and balancing lakes on the lower slopes.
- The microclimate on an exposed site is modified by elevated woodland pasture on the northern edge of the village.
- It is proposed to introduce the surrounding landscape to the west, north-east and south into the heart of the village, meeting at the existing spinney. This green infrastructure has the potential to accommodate diverse habitats such as wet woodland, food production such as community orchards and also recreation, including a cricket field. At the very centre is proposed a focal structure’ such as a look-out tower’ for the use of community or visitors.
- The layout is intended to take advantage of stunning panoramas over valleys to the west east and south.

**Movement**
- All existing footpaths and bridleways are connected to the village and also a new long distance cycleway connection is proposed to the north.
- The primary road connection is to the A43 with minor connections to the A427. It is intended that these have the character of country lanes. The Western connection to the A427 will provide early connection to the A427. Once phase 1 is complete it will become bus only.
- Internal streets generally align with contours or occasionally run perpendicular to contours to reveal the topography.
- The orientation of the street layout will facilitate passive solar design of homes.
- The ends of streets are open where meeting the edge of the village affording a visual connection to the surrounding countryside.
- Five and ten minute walking distances are shown on the plan.
- The bus route(s) will follow the primary and secondary streets which will place most homes within 200m of bus-stop and all homes within 400m.

**Land-use**
- A through-school is planned with a building entrance at the village centre and playing fields looking over the valley to the east
- It is proposed that homes fronting the market square and village greens have flexible uses on the ground floor (by design and consent) to facilitate live-work
and home working, so encouraging a use of the village during the working day.

- The two areas of existing employment buildings at each end of the village will be retained and reused with the intention of moving from B2, B8 towards B1 use. Subject to phasing, a Construction Skills Centre would start life at the Western end and move to a permanent home at the Eastern end.
- A majority of the dedicated, incidental and mixed use employment will be spread along the primary through route or distributed at local nodes.

Tresham is planned as a working village with opportunities for market gardening embedded in its landscape, enterprise initiatives focussed around the village square and other prominent frontages and also extending the tourism offer of Deene Park.
### Updated bid for Garden Village Capacity Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Requested capacity support/ technical studies</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
<th>2017/18</th>
<th>Spend 2016/17</th>
<th>Committed/ Required 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery enabling funding and support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Project management/ planning capacity</td>
<td>£50k</td>
<td>£70k</td>
<td>£40k&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£80k&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Design capacity/ design review</td>
<td>£40k</td>
<td>£50k</td>
<td>£19k&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£73k&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design competition for initial parcels</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£30k&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity and integration study</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£40k&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Delivery mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>£5k&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>£23k&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Viability support</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£15k&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highways and development management capacity</td>
<td>£50k</td>
<td>£60k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£80k&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Infrastructure Delivery Plan</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>£10k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£20k&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Community engagement &amp; mitigation assessment</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>£30k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£30k&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Biodiversity/ Ecosystem Services support</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£40k&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Housing strategy</td>
<td>£40k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£40k&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£320k</td>
<td>£330k</td>
<td>£64k</td>
<td>£459k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 2016/17 and 2017/18</strong></td>
<td><strong>£650k</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£523k</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

a. JPU costs 2016/17
b. Transform Places, Opun, WSP, Studio REAL
c. Garden City Developments initial advice
d. Estimated JPU costs design & planning input
e. Opun Design Review & capacity support, Transform masterplan input
f. A43 corridor study including contribution to transport modelling
g. Garden City Developments, Land Trust, legal input
h. Specific advice to LPA for s106 – supplementing GVA work
i. ENC development management & NCC highways capacity
j. Specification and feasibility of community buildings
k. Natural Capital Solutions & Lockhart Garratt, NCC ecologist
l. Housing Vision, Right to build Task Force, feasibility advice, focus groups
m. To address issues raised by OPUN re contemporary interpretation of local vernacular

NNJPU July 2017