



Council – 15th October 2018

Tresham Garden Village – Masterplan and Delivery Strategy

Purpose of report

The purpose of this report is to consider the Masterplan and Delivery Strategy (MDS) for Tresham Garden Village (TGV). The draft MDS is provided at [Appendix 1](#). A member site visit was undertaken on 20th September 2018.

The Tresham Garden Village Project Board endorsed the draft MDS at its meeting on 13th September 2018. It is recommended that the MDS should be agreed by the Council, with delegated authority given for agreement of final edits and revisions as technical work is completed. Agreement of the MDS will pave the way for the submission of a planning application for TGV.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Deenethorpe Airfield is owned by the Deene Estate. For over a decade, the Estate and its development partner Land Acquisitions and Promotions (the “promoters”) have championed a vision for a new village at the airfield, with exemplary standards of infrastructure and design. An enabling policy (Policy 14) in the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy (JCS) was supported by this Council and endorsed by the JCS Planning Inspector. The JCS was adopted in July 2016. Policy 14 sets out the criteria that must be met for the proposal (now known as Tresham Garden Village) to be acceptable and requires this to be tested through the preparation of a master plan and delivery strategy (MDS).
- 1.2 The Tresham Garden Village (TGV) Project Board, comprising elected members from the district, county and parish councils, has worked with the Deene Estate and promoters to shape and test the proposals. The Government has provided capacity support for work on TGV as one of 14 initial Garden Village projects. This has provided funding for staff capacity (including through the Joint Planning and Delivery Unit), specialist advice and technical studies, together with assistance from Homes England on viability issues. Independent design review has been undertaken at each stage of the project by OPUN (the architecture centre for the East Midlands).
- 1.3 Paragraph 5.34 of the JCS states that *“If the masterplan demonstrates to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that the criteria and standards set out in Policy 14 can be met in a viable development, it will be used as the basis for either a Part 2 Local Plan or other development plan*

document.” In practice, rather than incur significant delay, the intention, based on the extensive work and consultation undertaken to date, is for the proposal to progress directly to a planning application if the MDS is agreed by the Council. A similar approach is envisaged in the JCS for the Rushden East SUE.

- 1.4 If agreed, the MDS will not have the legal status of a development plan document or supplementary planning document, but it will be an important material consideration in determining applications at Deenethorpe Airfield by demonstrating compliance with JCS Policy 14. The MDS belongs to the promoters and will form part of the initial planning application, to be taken forward through planning conditions and the s106 agreement. Approval of the MDS will confirm the Council’s support for the vision it sets out but will not pre-judge the consideration of detailed matters at the planning application stage.
- 1.5 The Council considered progress on the MDS at its meeting in November 2017 and gave delegated authority for the draft document to be finalised for consultation. A revised MDS was subsequently endorsed for consultation by the Project Board at its meeting on 20th February 2018. Following public and stakeholder consultation on the draft MDS in March/ April 2018, the TGV Project Board has met on a further four occasions to consider the consultation feedback and revisions to the MDS. It endorsed the revised MDS at its meeting on 13th September 2018. It is recommended that the revised MDS at Appendix 1 should now be agreed by the Council, subject to resolution of final revisions under delegated authority.
- 1.6 The MDS is part of the ongoing process of testing and refining the TGV proposal. Its agreement will be a key milestone, providing the promoters with confidence to proceed with a planning application, and strengthening their position, and that of the council, in bidding for resources such as Housing Infrastructure Funding to enable the delivery of an exemplary development.
- 1.7 The key consideration for the Council at this stage is whether it is satisfied that the masterplan and delivery strategy demonstrate that the criteria set out in Policy 14 can be met in a viable development. This report outlines the considerable progress made in designing an exemplary and deliverable garden village, but also highlights some areas that have yet to be finalised. These include elements of highway design and energy and waste water strategies, where further technical work is ongoing. It is considered that these outstanding issues do not fundamentally affect the MDS and can be addressed at the planning application stage. This pragmatic approach is considered necessary to progress this complex project, which is already running around 12 months behind the original programme. Delays to date have been in part due to limited resources/ capacity within the promoter’s team. Agreement of the MDS should assist with this by providing the promoters with greater confidence to invest in outstanding work.

2.0 Community and stakeholder engagement

- 2.1 JCS paragraph 5.51 states that, based on Policy 14, “...the site promoters will work with the local planning authority and relevant Parish Councils (in particular, Deene and Deenethorpe, Benefield and Weldon) to prepare a masterplan for the new village, in consultation with local communities and other stakeholders including Corby Borough Council...”. This requirement has been met by the promoters and Estate working closely with the TGV Project Board, and through the engagement and consultation during the preparation of the MDS and on the draft proposals in March/ April 2018.
- 2.2 Capacity support has enabled the Council to play a proactive role in supporting the preparation of the MDS and ensuring that the emerging proposals address the requirements of Policy 14 and reflect good practice elsewhere. The OPUN design review panel has provided independent critique and expertise on specific issues throughout the project. The input of the JPDU has been augmented by experienced masterplanners (Roger Evans at Studio REAL and Sue McGlynn at Transform Places) and a range of other consultants.
- 2.3 Consultation on the draft MDS started with a launch event and site-tour for key stakeholders on February 26th. Lord Matthew Taylor, author of the influential Policy Exchange report on Garden Villages, provided an opening address. The launch was featured on BBC Look East. Public exhibitions subsequently took place at Benefield Village Hall, Weldon Cricket Club and Deene and Deenethorpe Village Hall. These were publicised through adverts in the local press and through a leaflet drop to residents. The exhibition panels were then displayed at East Northamptonshire Council offices. A dedicated website (www.treshamvillage.uk) provided information on the proposal and a bespoke survey was created to gather feedback.
- 2.4 A total of 215 people attended the exhibitions and 122 completed a survey questionnaire (either at the exhibition or online). Detailed feedback was received from technical consultees such as the highway authority and from organisations including Corby Borough Council and the Council for the Protection of Rural England. The Planning Policy Committee considered the draft MDS on the 23rd April, when, subject to some detailed points of feedback, it supported the draft proposals as being in general conformity with Policy 14 of the JCS.
- 2.5 The report on the questionnaire feedback is available at Appendix 2. Of those responding to specific questions:
- 67% of people supported the development proposals and 15% were opposed (18% don't know at this stage);
 - The main benefits of the development were considered to include the extensive tree-planting; the spacious development, including family houses and apartments and bungalows for older residents; and the wide range of other local facilities including a village hall, community

café and sports provision;

- The most common concern cited was increased traffic and pressure on the road network. This was followed by noise and disruption during and after construction, the need for adequate health facilities, and concern that what is being promised may not be delivered.

2.6 The Parish Councils of Benefield and Deene and Deenethorpe have been represented on the Project Board and have confirmed that they are largely satisfied with what is proposed for TGV. They have, however, provided a joint statement ([Appendix 3](#)) setting out concerns relating to traffic impacts (noise, air pollution and safety) on the A43, A427 and Benefield Road. They are aware that these impacts need to be addressed through the planning application process but feel that it is important at this stage to high-light to the Project Board and Council the concerns of local residents that are not yet covered in the MDS. It should be noted that some of these issues are addressed in the revised version of the MDS endorsed by the Project Board (see paragraph 3.2 below).

2.7 The views of Corby Borough Council (CBC) are particularly important given the proximity of TGV to Weldon and Corby. The response from CBC recognises TGV's distinctive offer and contribution towards achieving the goals of the Government's garden village initiative. However, it suggests that the proposal consulted upon does not fully satisfy the full requirements of JCS Policy 14 (TGV) and 19 (Delivery of Green Infrastructure). This is particularly in relation to links with the Weldon and Priors Hall Park SUEs including green linkages, support services related to education and health, retail, employment and connectivity. The response highlights the potential impacts on highway network particularly Weldon Village and the A43, which require further work including tested proposals concerning the delivery of public transport. It also notes that initial proposals regarding the provision of healthcare and Secondary School contributions are at a very early stage, with much more work needed with the relevant providers to develop this from conceptual proposals.

2.8 The OPUN design review panel has helped to shape the MDS. At its meeting in April 2018 it concluded that the MDS contained many positive revisions, including an appealing 'vision' for the new garden village, the arrangement of the retirement housing, the design approach to the streets and the emerging proposals for Tresham Hill (the access road from the A43), which are helping to establish a sense of place and character. It did however identify issues that it felt still needed to be addressed including to:

- Strengthen the Energy Strategy to demonstrate how the village has been designed to minimise energy use, including the implications on building and urban design;
- Clarify how the envisaged synergy of the new village within an established parkland can come to fruition;
- Confirm the approach to the adoption / non-adoption of streets including

ensuring that the proposals which promise character and identity are deliverable, and;

- Embed an effective Community Land Trust model within the development, with the facility to generate regular income.

2.9 The consultation feedback has been considered by the promoters and by the Project Board in revising the MDS. The schedule at Appendix 4 provides the promoter’s responses to issues raised by key consultees. Capacity funding has enabled the Council to assist the design team in addressing some of the outstanding issues. Most recently, a specialist design and engineering team (hta and Ramboll) has been appointed to act as critical friend in reviewing and enhancing the energy strategy for TGV, and Lockhart Garrett has been employed to assess options for green infrastructure routes to link TGV with Oundle and Weldon for pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders.

2.10 The OPUN design review panel met on 10th September to review progress on the MDS. It reiterated its support for the vision for TGV; the urban design framework including the three neighbourhoods separated by ‘Y’ shaped green infrastructure; and the mix of land uses including employment and retirement housing. It did however note that some of the issues identified through previous reviews have yet to be resolved. This includes the energy strategy and outstanding details of highway design and parking. These outstanding matters are being addressed through ongoing technical work.

3.0 Designing an exemplary garden village in accordance with the criteria and standards set out in Policy 14

3.1 JCS Policy 14 sets out a range of criteria that TGV must meet. These are, for the most part, the components of the garden village that were put forward by the Estate and promoters when making the case for the proposal to be included in the JCS. Table 1 below provides a summary assessment of the compliance of the MDS with Policy 14 and its supporting text, as considered by the Project Board. A tick indicates that a policy requirement is addressed to satisfactory degree in the MDS, although further detail will still need to follow in the planning application and reserved matters applications. A question-mark flags an issue where further information will be required to confirm policy compliance. There are no crosses that would indicate a failure to address a policy requirement.

Table 1: Summary of compliance with JCS Policy 14	
JCS Policy 14 - First Paragraph	
The masterplan will assess environmental impacts, including upon heritage assets, and will identify phasing and funding requirements for the timely provision of infrastructure....the masterplan will need to demonstrate how the proposal will avoid, minimise and where necessary mitigate any adverse environmental impacts, and how it will meet all of the following criteria:	?

JCS Policy 14 - Criterion a)	
Create a model for sustainable rural living, with exemplary standards of design, construction and community facilities, made possible by the long-term commitment of the Deene Estate, including through the use of pre-set design codes;	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion b)	
Provide for the new village as a whole to be carbon neutral through:	
i. Buildings utilising contemporary construction techniques and exemplary construction standards and including systems to reduce their energy demand;	✓
ii. A bespoke energy strategy including the production of heat and electricity from renewable and low carbon sources to provide at least 80% of energy requirements on site;	?
iii. Investing in tree planting in the Rockingham Forest.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion c)	
Make effective use of previously developed land to restore despoiled landscape and remove the existing aviation activity and open storage uses.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion d)	
Support the rural economy through:	
i. The provision of land and buildings for owner occupiers of small and medium sized enterprises and service providers to build to their requirements within the design code;	✓
ii. Ensuring extra land will be made available under 10-year options to allow successful enterprises to expand;	✓
iii. Installation of super-fast broadband for all businesses and community facilities and also allow for all dwellings to support home working;	✓
iv. Use of mechanisms to deliver apprenticeships and training opportunities in association with the construction phases for the new village;	✓
v. Provision of community food production to serve local businesses.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion e)	
Providing nursery and primary education within the new village and identify how secondary education will be provided in a way that complements provision in neighbouring communities	?
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion f)	
Develop a balanced and mixed community, and address affordable housing needs through:	
i. Providing affordable housing including rented and shared ownership accommodation;	?
ii. Specialist provision to meet the needs of an ageing population;	✓
iii. Opportunities for bespoke individual and community custom-build projects including self-build housing subject to the design code.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion g)	
Maximise integrated transport choice and connections to services and facilities in neighbouring settlements through the preparation and implementation of a Travel Plan to achieve modal shift, including provisions for:	
i. A network of dedicated pedestrian and cycle links throughout the new village, with direct and clearly defined connections to neighbouring towns and villages;	✓
ii. A road network that allows the village to be served by public transport with the minimum possible diversion of services from the A427 to deliver viable public transport services to Corby and Oundle at the earliest possible opportunity;	✓
iii. Improving the highway network with a link between the A427 and A43; Comprehensive infrastructure and incentives to facilitate the use of electric vehicles.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion h)	
Provide a sustainable waste water treatment facility that means the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and secure improvements in water quality and surface water management.	?
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion i)	
Strengthen the Green Infrastructure (GI), to enhance the landscape, prevent coalescence with neighbouring villages, support biodiversity, provide accessible opportunities for recreation and contribute to the Rockingham Forest for Life and wider Green	✓

Infrastructure links to nearby settlements through:	
i. Provision of parks, allotments and large private gardens;	✓
ii. Provision of significant areas of connected GI including new woodland, woodland pasture, agricultural meadows, open space and creative nature conservation including re-connecting the ancient semi natural woodlands of Weldon Park Wood to Langley Copse;	✓
iii. Creating an extensive walking, cycling and riding network with the new GI across the Deene Estate and into the wider area of the Rockingham Forest.	✓
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion j)	
Help achieve good ecological status on the Willow Brook, in accordance to the requirements of the Water Framework Directive, through contributing to protection and enhancement of its river quality elements and protecting ground water.	?
JCS Policy 14 - Criterion k)	
Establish appropriate liaison and governance solutions by identifying the ways in which inclusive and continuous engagement, joint working and long-term stewardship can be secured to deliver on the unique and exceptional garden village development.	✓

- 3.2 As indicated above, the design of TGV is an ongoing process and it is not possible, in considering the MDS, to confirm detailed compliance with all aspects of Policy 14 or to resolve all the matters raised by consultees. An example of this is the level of detail appropriate within the MDS in relation to traffic impacts (the main concern raised by the Parish Councils and local residents). JCS Policy 14 and paragraph 5.51 requires the MDS to consider infrastructure requirements and measures for avoiding or mitigating environmental impacts. To address this, the revised MDS (pages 32) now includes information from modelling using the Northamptonshire Strategic Transport Model (NSTM), showing the likely distribution of trips to/from the village and those junctions where improvements may be required. This modelling, undertaken with the highway authority, indicates that there are no “show-stoppers” in terms of highway capacity but the Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application will need to address impacts and mitigation in more detail. The MDS (page 33) indicates how this will include more detail of traffic mitigation proposals, including measures to slow traffic passing through Upper Benefield and to deter through-traffic using Church Street in Weldon. The NSTM modelling does not predict a material increase in traffic using local roads through Glapthorn and Cotterstock but the MDS indicates that this will be monitored and funding provided for remedial action should problems arise. The detail of traffic impacts and remediation will need to be reviewed with the highway authority as part of the planning application process, including consultation with the affected communities. Agreement of the MDS does not pre-judge the acceptability of the details that will follow.
- 3.3 Table 1 above indicates that the draft proposals satisfy most of the Policy 14 criteria, to the extent that it is possible to do so at this stage. This is a significant achievement that would have been difficult to achieve without the resources provided by the Government and the productive joint working between the Estate/ promoters and the Council/ JPDU and its consultants. It is considered that TGV, delivered in accordance with the MDS would be exemplary in many respects. The main question-marks are currently in relation to the elements of the policy identified in paragraphs 3.4 to 3.11 below. In considering whether ongoing work to address these issues should

delay the agreement of the MDS, it is important to consider whether the masterplan can physically accommodate the various options under consideration, and the potential impacts on scheme viability:

- 3.4 The first paragraph of policy 14 states that the MDS will assess environmental impacts, including upon heritage assets. Desk top assessments have been made but the promoters have yet to undertake a geophysical survey of the site or trial excavations. It is considered that this can be deferred to the planning application stage, but it must be recognised that this carries a risk if archaeological remains are discovered in locations that impact upon the MDS. Based on desk-top surveys and local knowledge (including the extent of earth movement involved in laying out the airfield), the promoters appear to consider this risk to be acceptable.
- 3.5 Criterion b) of policy 14 indicates that proposals should provide for the new village to be carbon neutral through exemplary standards of construction and a bespoke energy strategy. The MDS (page 77) commits to all homes being built to Passive House equivalent standards to reduce energy demand and maximise thermal insulation. Pages 58 & 59 set out two high level options for the energy strategy; Green Gas or All Electric. The masterplan can physically accommodate whichever technologies are chosen. Capacity funding has been used to appoint consultants (hta and Ramboll) to act as critical friend in reviewing and enhancing the energy strategy. This work is ongoing, but it is already evident that an all-electric scheme focusing on high fabric performance, heat pump technology and solar generation with potentially battery storage, provides a solution which can deliver policy 14 requirements.
- 3.6 Meeting the requirements of criterion b) will result in significant additional development costs. There could also be some savings, for example the All Electric option would remove the need to supply gas to the village or for gas boilers in individual properties. Some of these costs (e.g. photovoltaic array) may be provided through investment by an Energy Service Company (ESCo) but others will fall on housebuilders (e.g. heat pumps) or the master-developer (e.g. grid connections). These costs may affect the viability of TGV and, unless absorbed in full by the landowner and promoter, could impact on the achievement of other elements of the proposals.
- 3.7 The promoters have been confident that technical solutions are available that will be commercially viable. The work commissioned from hta and Ramboll is testing this and will assist the promoters in firming up their energy strategy. Technology and market conditions are developing fast, with costs of many technologies likely to reduce. The optimum approaches to meeting policy requirements on later phases of TGV may differ from those adopted in early phases. Flexibility is therefore required in considering the detailed approach to meeting energy requirements as individual phases of TGV come forward for planning permission.

- 3.8 Criterion e) refers to TGV being a hub for rural services and indicates that the proposal should identify how secondary education will be provided in a way that complements provision in neighbouring communities. The MDS (pages 95, 96) outlines the intention to provide primary and secondary schools, leading to a possible all-through school. The masterplan identifies a site for this in the eastern part of the village (Great Tresham). It is, however, not yet clear that a small secondary school element would be feasible (financially or in terms of the educational offer) and the promoters are continuing to explore options, which could include a boarding school element or links to an existing school. An alternative off-site option could be to accommodate TGV pupils in a new secondary school in the east of Corby (for which there is already an identified need). It is not considered that these on or off-site options affect the spatial masterplan as adjustments can be made in due course if the site for the secondary school is not needed. The options also do not appear have a significant impact on the viability assessment as the costs of off-site contributions and travel are likely to be broadly equivalent to assumed cost of on-site provision. It is however noted that the absence of a secondary school element could make land available for alternative uses, which may assist with viability in the longer term. .
- 3.9 Criterion f) requires TGV to develop a balanced and mixed community and address affordable housing needs. This is to include provision for affordable housing, specialist provision for older people, and opportunities for custom and self-build housing. The MDS indicates (page 8) that the 1500 homes will include: 30% affordable; 200 “later life homes”; and 20% of plots for custom and self-build. The 30% affordable housing element is below the 40% target for rural areas set out in JCS Policy 30. However, the housing mix in the MDS takes account of research commissioned by the Council from Housing Vision and the Right to Build Task Force, balanced with the commercial view of the site promoter and the professional judgement of the Council’s housing strategy officers. Further information on housing type (apartments, maisonettes, houses, bungalows) and size will be required through a housing strategy supporting a planning application.
- 3.10 The housing mix does not have a significant impact on the physical form of the masterplan but will be important in determining the layout of development as individual parcels are brought forward. Housing mix does however have an important bearing on viability. The caveat (pages 63 and 110) regarding further consideration of affordable housing provision at planning application stage appears reasonable, but it is considered essential that the Council maintains a robust position in ensuring that the policy objective for a balanced and mixed community is met
- 3.11 Criterion h) requires the provision of a sustainable waste water treatment facility and improvements in water quality and surface water management. Linked to this, criterion j) seeks to help achieve good ecological status on the Willow Brook. The MDS provides a strong approach to Sustainable Drainage Systems (page 26) and to “ecosystem services” (page 28). For

example, it explains how water quality capacity will increase as arable fields, which present a high risk of sedimentation, are replaced with habitats with year-round plant cover, such as parkland, woodland and gardens. However, the approach to waste water treatment is less clear. Page 93 indicates that a localised waste water treatment facility is being explored and page 59 indicates that this could form part of the bespoke energy strategy for the village. The masterplan provides land area to accommodate a wastewater treatment facility but, as with the energy strategy, further work is needed to identify the preferred technology and to understand costs. It must be recognised that these costs may affect the viability of TGV and, unless absorbed in full by the landowner and promoter, could impact on the achievement of other elements of the proposals. This will need to be considered through the planning application process.

- 3.12 The MDS provided at Appendix 1 has been extensively revised since the March 2018 consultation draft to address issues identified by the Project Board, OPUN panel, other consultees, and the council's advisors. It is now considered to provide a strong, well-illustrated storyline of the vision, aspirations and design principles for creating an exemplary garden village. The most significant addition is the "built-form masterplan" at page 7, which shows how the exemplary development proposed in the MDS will be achieved. The built-form masterplan is the agreed plan and a 'best design' as at September 2018. Many things will change over the lifetime of project delivery, but this current masterplan should be treated as the baseline from which future changes need to be agreed.
- 3.13 It is not considered that the unresolved issues outlined in paragraphs 3.4-3.11 above should delay agreement of the MDS, as it will be possible to address these at a later stage. Officers have, however, identified some areas of the MDS where further detail/ clarification is required, for instance to ensure consistency between the built-form masterplan and other plans provided within the MDS. It is particularly important, given the promoters wish to have most, if not all, of the road network adopted, that the highway authority is content with the MDS. The highway authority is currently satisfied with the detail provided for the first phases of the development but considers that there are still issues to resolve in the built-form masterplan for later phases. This includes the area around the village centre to ensure servicing for the shops/businesses will work well; the rear lanes to make sure there is enough activity and surveillance; and some areas where specific bespoke solutions will be necessary but will be hard to deliver (specifically the small blocks around the allotments, the retirement and the hotel and stables). It is considered that the built-form masterplan provides a good basis from which to resolve these issues through more detailed design at the planning application stage.
- 3.14 The Council will be updated on highways issues and other points of detail/ clarification that have been raised with the project team. Subject to these updates, it is recommended that the Council should resolve to agree the MDS, with agreement of outstanding details/ edits being delegated to the

Executive Director, in consultation with the Chairman of the TGV Project Board, Chairman of Planning Policy Committee and the Leader of the Council. No planning application should be accepted before this final delegated 'sign-off' of the MDS has been completed. Any significant changes to the MDS would need to be referred back to the Project Board and Council.

4.0 Delivering a viable garden village

- 4.1 Paragraph 5.53 of the JCS requires that *“The masterplan will include a delivery strategy to identify how and when the development will be implemented to the exemplary standards that are being proposed and with the required infrastructure and services. The mechanisms identified in the delivery strategy must provide a high degree of certainty that the exemplary standards and provisions set out in the masterplan will be achieved on the ground. This will include design coding and provisions for long term management and stewardship, and opportunities for community governance, and the outline heads of terms for a legal agreement to deliver planned infrastructure and services.”*
- 4.2 The delivery strategy section of the MDS has been revised to take on board feedback from the council’s consultants and the Design Review Panel. The main changes relate to the Stewardship Structure and consideration of approaches to long term management of infrastructure, including establishment of a Tresham Village Trust and endowment fund. The revised proposals are considered to meet the requirements of the JCS, providing a good basis for delivering the garden village proposals with strong community input. The delivery strategy gives an outline of the content of the proposed Design Code but not yet of the heads of terms of a s106. The detail will continue to evolve so that formal arrangements are in place ahead of any s106 agreement being concluded.
- 4.3 The delivery strategy has been informed by viability modelling undertaken by Homes England’s consultant (GVA). The GVA viability model provides the best available evidence of scheme viability but is a snapshot of viability and only as reliable or advanced as the inputs, variables and assumptions used to inform the appraisal at a point in time. The model will continue to evolve as the scheme gets closer to being delivered and more detailed information becomes available. The important thing at this stage is that the key stakeholders can be satisfied that ‘within reason’ the proposed scheme appears to be viable in order for the scheme to progress to the next stage. Equally important is that the council has appropriate mechanisms in place to resist any dilution of JCS policy requirements for TGV that could erode its status as an exemplary development.
- 4.4 A site is viable if “the value generated by its development exceeds the costs of developing it and provides enough incentive for the land to come forward and the development to be undertaken” (National Planning Practice Guidance). GVA’s advice is that TGV is inherently viable if delivered at costs

typical of a standard volume-house builder development, but the proposed exemplary standards of design and infrastructure have a significant impact on the residual land value. The high up-front costs of infrastructure provision also mean that gap-funding will be required, potentially through Homes England. In parallel with work to refine the viability model, the Estate Trustees have been considering the land value that TGV will need to generate for the development to go ahead.

- 4.5 The council has used capacity funding to employ cost consultants to review the information provided by the promoters. These costs are now well understood, although some utility costs are estimates pending further input from providers, and work is ongoing to estimate the full costs of meeting exemplary energy and waste water standards.
- 4.6 Estimates of the potential value generated by TGV are as important as costs. The viability model assumes that value is generated primarily through the sale of land for residential development (parcels to SME builders and a retirement home operator, and plots to custom and self-builders). There is strong evidence that investing in place-making through high quality design and infrastructure will, over time, attract significantly higher values than in standard developments¹. The viability model has tested several scenarios of value uplift. The 'base case' assumes that homes at TGV will command a sales value per sqft similar to new-build developments in settlements such as Oakham, Stamford and Market Harborough. This is higher than sales values currently achieved at nearby Priors Hall Park, but less than achieved in some small developments in villages such as Benefield.
- 4.7 The promoters consider that the values in the base case are achievable over time but that early phases of TGV are likely to achieve values closer to those of other premium developments in the immediate locality. Strutt & Parker, acting for the Estate, consider that the assumed values are optimistic and, when coupled with the larger-than-average house sizes, would result in house prices that are too high compared to the local market. In the light of these concerns, GVA are undertaking further sensitivity testing. The Council will be updated.
- 4.8 The land deal underlying the TGV proposal is essentially a commercial matter between the Estate and the promoters. It is however important to note that JCS Policy 14 is effectively a "rural exceptions" policy that allows a scheme to come forward only if the exemplary standards set out in the JCS can be met (the council is not reliant on TGV to deliver its JCS housing requirement). This approach is designed to ensure that a significant proportion of the uplift in land value arising from consent for a garden village can be captured to pay for the exemplary infrastructure and high-quality design (which, as noted above, will in turn increase the value of the development).

¹ For example, see http://www.savills.co.uk/research_articles/229130/208531-0

- 4.9 The requirements of JCS Policy 14 should thus be reflected in the value of the land and it will be for the Estate to decide whether this, and any other sources of income generated by TGV, provide sufficient incentive to sell its land for development. The Estate has a target land value that it is seeking for the land taken for built development and roads, but not for the green infrastructure within and around the village, which would remain in its ownership. The target land value is based on the Estate's assessment of factors such as the existing use value of the airfield, potential value of alternative uses (which would be subject to planning permission), and the impact of TGV on the rest of the Estate. It also takes account of that fact that, aside from land sales, the Estate could benefit from income generating opportunities such as management of green infrastructure and commercial premises, and, in the long term, could benefit from any future development of the village. Importantly, the Estate is taking a 'patient capital' approach to help with viability by deferring receipts from land sales until the later phases of the development.
- 4.10 The base case in the GVA viability model presently indicates that the land value falls short of that sought by the Estate and, on this basis, it is understood that the Estate has not yet agreed the MDS. This shortfall is likely to increase when the full costs of meeting exemplary energy and waste water standards are included. The base case in the viability model does not therefore provide the high degree of certainty, sought in JCS paragraph 5.53, that all the exemplary standards and provisions set out in the masterplan will be achieved on the ground. Achieving a policy compliant scheme is primarily a matter for the promoters and landowner to resolve and the Council will want to see that all options to improve viability have been explored before considering any departure from policy requirements. Only then would it be appropriate to consider whether elements of JCS Policy 14 should be prioritised to allow TGV to proceed.
- 4.11 Scenarios tested through the viability model indicate that viability could be improved in a variety of ways. For example, the Estate's target land value would be exceeded if positive market conditions result in custom and self-build plots selling at 20% more than in the base case or overall sales values increasing by 5% between each phase of the development. Reducing affordable housing or increasing densities from the very low figure (<20 dwellings per hectare) currently proposed could also enable a viable scheme. Different approaches to infrastructure funding, potentially with Homes England support, could also assist.
- 4.12 It is not necessary to take a view on the probability/ acceptability of the above scenarios, but they serve to illustrate the sensitivity of the viability assessment to assumptions on market conditions and other factors. This highlights the need for the Council, the Estate, and the promoters to take a flexible and collaborative approach to assessing viability on a phase-by-phase basis as TGV proceeds. Subject to this approach, which has been agreed by the promoters, it is considered that the viability modelling gives

reasonable confidence that most aspects of JCS Policy 14 can be delivered as set out in the MDS. This falls short of the “high degree of certainty” sought in JCS paragraph 5.53 but reflects the uncertainties inherent in modelling the viability of a large, exemplary development that will take 15 or more years to deliver. There will be scope for the Council to weigh up different policy requirements if viability is still an issue at the planning application stage. This could entail considering the timing and mechanisms of infrastructure and affordable housing delivery and, if necessary, putting in place measures to defer/ review provision and/ or capture further contributions if viability conditions change. However, at the current MDS stage, it is important that the exemplary standards required by JCS Policy 14, including affordable housing provision, are not diluted. The flexible approach outlined above accords with new National Planning Practice Guidance, which supports the reassessment of viability over the lifetime of the development to “ensure policy compliance and optimal public benefits through economic cycles”.

5.0 Conclusions and next steps

- 5.1 Agreement of the MDS will be a key milestone in progressing the TGV proposal, paving the way for a planning application. The main consideration for the Council at this stage is whether it is satisfied that the MDS demonstrates that the criteria and standards set out in Policy 14 can be met in a viable development.
- 5.2 Work on the MDS has been informed by extensive stakeholder engagement, public consultation, and expert input supported by capacity funding from MHCLG. It has also benefited from independent design review. Feedback on the proposals has been broadly positive. The main concerns that have been raised by local communities are in relation to traffic impacts.
- 5.3 The design of TGV is an ongoing process and it is not possible, at the MDS stage, to confirm detailed compliance with all aspects of Policy 14 or other policies of the JCS. Some of this detail needs to follow at planning application and reserved matters stages. However, it is considered that the MDS addresses Policy 14 requirements at an appropriate level and that unresolved matters should not impact on the physical form of the masterplan. Overall, the MDS is now considered to provide a strong, well-illustrated storyline of the vision, aspirations and design principles for creating an exemplary garden village. The Council will be updated on progress in resolving outstanding issues.
- 5.4 The delivery strategy sets out a carefully considered structure for the long-term stewardship of the village, including the establishment of a Tresham Village Trust and endowment fund. This is considered to meet the requirements of the JCS. The detail will continue to evolve so that formal arrangements are in place ahead of any s106 agreement being concluded

- 5.5 The GVA viability model provides a snapshot of viability and will continue to evolve as the scheme gets closer to being delivered. At present, the baseline scenario in the viability model does not give a high degree of certainty that all aspects of Policy JCS can be delivered in a viable development. However, sensitivity testing indicates that there are various means by which viability could be improved if it is still an issue at the planning application stage. This underlines the need for a flexible and collaborative approach to assessing viability on a phase-by-phase basis as the development proceeds. Subject to this, it is considered that the viability modelling gives a reasonable level of confidence, at the MDS stage, that most aspects of JCS Policy 14 can be delivered in a viable development.
- 5.6 It is recommended that the Council agrees the revised MDS, subject to delegating the final revisions to the Executive Director, in consultation with the Chairman of the TGV Project Board, Chairman of Planning Policy Committee and the Leader of the Council. The final agreement of the MDS in accordance with this delegation will allow the submission of a planning application by the end of 2018. The promoters have indicated that this will be an outline application for the whole scheme, with details of the access roads from the A43 and A427.
- 5.7 It is important that the MDS should form part of the outline application. As indicated at paragraph 3.12 above, the built-form masterplan will be treated as the baseline plan that will be fleshed out with further detail (not simply an illustrative plan). A design code and street and public realm specification (including more information on trees and SuDS) for early phases will be required prior to any reserved matters applications, and would be best prepared whilst the outline application is being considered, allowing reserved matters applications to be considered in 2019. If approved, infrastructure work could commence in 2019, with the first homes being completed in 2020.
- 5.8 The TGV Project Board has provided an important partnership forum for shaping the MDS. Its Chairman is Cllr Roger Glithero and the Vice Chairman is Cllr Phil Stearn. The terms of reference agreed by the Council in December 2015 explain that the Project Board has no statutory role in agreeing planning policy or considering planning applications planning. Instead, its roles have included project planning; ensuring that the MDS meets policy requirements; and agreeing consultation and communication for the project. This has involved close liaison between elected Members of the District, County and Parish Councils, and representatives of the Deene Estate and its development partner. Site visits have been undertaken at Deenethorpe Airfield and a study tour is being arranged to the Duchy of Cornwall's development at Poundbury, from which the promoters are drawing inspiration for many elements of TGV.
- 5.9 If the MDS is agreed by the Council, there will be an ongoing role for a Project Board/ Liaison Forum to ensure local input as the TGV proposals progress. The terms of reference for the Project Board will be reviewed for

consideration at the next meeting of the Council. In the meantime, it is proposed that the TGV Project Board should continue to meet in its present form.

6.0 Equality and Diversity Implications

- 6.1 The MDS sets out design principles to meet the needs of all members of the community, with a focus on children, older people, and pedestrians and cyclists. It requires the provision of a mix of housing types and tenures to meet the needs of different groups, including those requiring affordable housing, in order to create a balanced and mixed new community.

7.0 Privacy Impact Implications

- 7.1 There are no privacy implications arising from this report. Data will be monitored in accordance with GHPDR regulations.

8.0 Legal Implications

- 8.1 The MDS will not have the legal status of a development plan document or supplementary planning document but will, nevertheless, be an important material consideration in determining applications at Deenethorpe Airfield. It will form part of the initial planning application and will be taken forward through planning conditions and the s106 agreement.
- 8.2 The purpose of this report is for the Council to satisfy itself that the MDS demonstrates how the requirements of Policy 14 of the JCS can be met in a viable development. It should be noted that agreement of the MDS does not commit the council to the agreement of any subsequent planning applications which, as well as complying with the MDS, should satisfy national and local planning policy requirements.

9.0 Risk Management

- 9.1 The key risks in relation to the project are monitored and managed by the Project Board. The key risks are:
1. Slippage in the MDS timetable could adversely impact on the Council's ability to secure ongoing capacity funding from Government and for the promoters to secure finance to progress the TGV proposals to the planning application stage. It could also impact adversely on prospects for securing infrastructure funding.
 2. Completion of geophysical surveys could reveal archaeology or other ground conditions that impact on the masterplan and/or scheme viability.
 3. Final energy and waste water technical solutions could impact on scheme viability.

10.0 Resource and Financial Implications

- 10.1 All costs incurred by the Council in relation to TGV have been covered by capacity funding from Homes England. There are no additional financial implications to this council arising from this report.

11.0 Constitutional Implications

- 11.1 Provision is included in Part 3 Section 1 of the Constitution for determination of matters that would otherwise fall within the remit of the Planning Policy Committee to be referred up to (full) Council for determination.

12.0 Implications for our Customers

- 12.1 Consultation on the draft MDS has allowed local people to comment on the design and delivery of one of the larger potential developments in this district. The consultation received wide publicity and has engaged local residents as well as technical stakeholders. The response has been broadly supportive of the proposals but has highlighted a range of issues that have been, or will be, addressed through further work.

13.0 Corporate Outcomes

- 13.1 Consultation on the masterplan has assisted in the delivery of the corporate outcome of Effective Partnership Working by facilitating dialogue between with communities and developers.

14.0 Recommendation

- 13.1 It is recommended that, subject to the updates to be provided by officers in relation to the latest technical information supplied by the promoters, the Council:

1. Agrees the revised Masterplan and Delivery Strategy as a material consideration in determining planning applications relating to Tresham Garden Village;
2. Delegates the resolution of outstanding technical details, and any consequent revisions to the MDS, to the Executive Director and Monitoring Officer, following consultation with the Chairman of the TGV Project Board, Chairman of Planning Policy Committee and the Leader of the Council; and
3. Agrees that the terms of reference of the TGV Project Board should be reviewed to ensure that appropriate partnership working arrangements are in place for future stages of the project.

(Reason: To enable the Garden Village proposal to be progressed in

accordance with Policy 14 of the JCS).

Legal	Power: Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 Other considerations: National Planning Policy Framework North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy July 2016
Background Papers:	Tresham Garden Village Masterplan and Delivery Strategy October 2018
Person Originating Report:	Andrew Longley, Head of the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning and Delivery Unit ☎ 01832 74(2359) ✉ andrewlongley@nnjpu.org.uk
Date: 04/10/2018	
CFO 04/10/18	
MO 04/10/18	
CX 04/10/18	