1. Introduction

1. This hearing statement submitted by Impact Planning Services Limited on behalf of Knightwood Trust Farms Ltd (KTF), develops the case made at the submission plan (Regulation 19) stage in light of the Inspector’s questions on this matter and issue. The representation reference is 1185198. At the outset it is necessary to be clear that this representation is completely in support of everything included within the Regulation 19 representations made by the Tandridge Developers Forum (ref ID: 1184994) by Judith Ashton Associates, except for the statement made in paragraph 5.10 of that representation.

2. Questions 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 2.10 and 2.16 are the most relevant to the submission on this issue made by KTF.

2. Statement

B: The housing requirement

3. This statement confirms that the answer to question 2.7 Is the plan justified in not meeting the full OAN for Tandridge and is it consistent with paragraph 14 of the Framework? is no. As explained in the Regulation 19 representation made by the Tandridge Developers Forum the restrictive approach adopted by the Tandridge District Council (TDC) by using the Green Belt Assessment (2015 & 2016) to limit the release of sites in the Plan is unjustified and a negative approach. It is inconsistent with paragraph 11b of the 2019 NPPF (which was paragraph 14 in the 2012 NPPF and this is the relevant version of the NPPF as explained in ID/5 V3). It is unjustified because the need for housing within Tandridge District amounts to an acute need. This together with the lack of agreement to meet the housing shortfall through the Duty to Co-operate and as the source of land supply within existing settlements is insufficient to meet the housing need, then these factors combine to represent an exceptional circumstance.

4. When the High Court judgment from Calverton Parish Council v Greater Nottingham Councils [2015] EWHC 10784 is considered, paragraph 51 of this judgment provides a helpful explanation of what exceptional circumstances are:

   i) the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need (matters of degree may be important); (ii) the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for
sustainable development; (iii) (on the facts of this case) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt; (iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and (v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent."

5. In respect of point (i), the Council’s OAN is significant and it is clear that an acute housing need exists. On the second point (ii) 94% of the District is Green Belt and as the Plan explains there are only limited opportunities for further development within settlements inset from the Green Belt. The Council’s SA (MDS) considers growth options that do not involve any release of Green Belt land. However, this is a very small part of the District (only 6%) and it is insufficient to accommodate the housing needs. Therefore point (iii) is addressed.

6. Another reason why the Plan is not justified in its failure to meet the OAN, is that the approach adopted in the Plan runs counter to the requirement in paragraph 47 of the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to ‘boost significantly the supply of housing’. TDC has no justification for exempting itself from this important requirement of the NPPF.

7. For question 2.8 Have all realistic options for meeting the OAN within Tandridge in full been exhausted? the answer is no. The case made on behalf of KTF at the submission stage made clear that additional land was required to assist the effective delivery of the homes proposed in the South Godstone Garden Community. While the additional land will assist in the delivery of housing it is important that the Plan allocates more land to meet the OAN as set out in the Tandridge Developers Forum (TDF) submission by Judith Ashton Associates, i.e. an annual requirement of 610 dwellings per annum compared with the Regulation 19 Plan figure of 330 dwellings per annum. This means that as well as confirming the full allocation of the South Godstone Garden Community site with the additional land proposed at the Regulation 19 stage (by BWB on behalf of our clients Knightwood Trust Farms Ltd), even more land will be required to meet the shortfall identified by the TDF. The selection of the additional sites will need to be made by TDC by way of Modifications which should be subject to SA and another round of public consultation.

8. The South Godstone Garden Community proposal should be confirmed. On 27th June 2019 James Brokenshire MP as Housing Secretary announced Government funding for a new round of Garden Villages and South Godstone was included in the list of recipients as reported in Planning Resource (see Appendix 1). If this proposal is subject to change then it should only be by the confirmation of the inclusion of our client’s additional land plus any other additional land which TDC considers appropriate to increase the capacity of the site and for medium size allocations only in the vicinity of South Godstone. The Area Action Plan will provide more detail and should include a clear phasing and infrastructure programme which ensures rapid delivery of housing on part of the site within the first five years of the Plan. The important benefit of the South Godstone Garden Community will be the long term sustained delivery of new homes and new employment.
9. In addition to this, other sites which have been identified in the HELAA 2017-2018, must now be reconsidered. To provide a more rapid uptake, it is suggested that an increase of small to medium sites is more likely to generate completions to boost the 5-year housing land supply (provided the sites are available, viable and have developer interest or ownership). Another strategic site on the scale of South Godstone will not provide the variety of sites required to significantly boost the supply of housing. If a medium scale site is necessary then it should be within or immediately adjacent to the broader area of search for the Garden Community. However, smaller sites (under 50 dwellings) which are in sustainable locations would assist in the delivery of the required housing.

10. Question 2.9 What are the consequences of not meeting the OAN within the HMA for delivering a wide choice of high quality homes, widening opportunities for home ownership and creating sustainable inclusive and mixed communities which meet the needs of different groups in the community? This will cause social, and economic problems for the District because of the lack of affordable homes which will deprive people from living in the area causing a distorted community mix and an unbalanced labour market. The relative cost of housing will rise and this will only increase the number of commuters to the city thereby increasing the role of the District as a dormitory suburban area. As the TDF representation makes clear, the under supply of new homes is widespread beyond Tandridge District and therefore the fact that the Plan proposes a significant shortfall of housing makes a bad situation even worse.

11. The comments made in the Tandridge Developers’ Forum representation on the Sustainability Appraisal at paragraphs 2.3 and 2.4, helpfully elaborate on the points made above.

12. The final question on this issue is question 2.10 Would and/or where would any unmet need arising in the Tandridge HMA during the Plan period be met? This relates to the Duty to Co-operate and, as explained above, from the information submitted with the Regulation 19 Plan and the examination, there is no explanation from TDC about how or where the shortfall of housing will be met. In essence, it is being written off. In these circumstances, the only way in which the unmet housing provision should be addressed, is within the TDC area. Without doing so, the Plan fundamentally fails to comply with national policy as expressed within paragraphs 178 to 181 of the 2012 version of the NPPF.

C: The overall supply of housing

13. On the question 2.16 Given that the proposed South Godstone Garden Community is intended to deliver around 1,400 new homes in the Plan period and the details of the development would be considered by an Area Action Plan (AAP), would it be effective to include in the Plan a Policy which commits the Council to a review of the Plan if the AAP is not adopted by a specific date in order to sustain the supply of housing? which is based on the issue about whether the proposed supply of housing is realistic, the comments made in
this hearing statement at paragraph 5 above, are also relevant here. It is accepted that the large strategic site at South Godstone conforms with paragraph 52 of the NPPF, but it will not be completed within 5 years. It is a large site of at least 4,000 new homes plus employment development, new schools and all of the associated infrastructure and, as developments of this scale take some time to complete, some of the homes planned within this Garden Community, may not be delivered until after the Plan period. The amended Tandridge Local Plan 2013-2033 Housing topic Paper (December 2018), confirms in Appendix 4, the accelerated delivery from the Garden Community and this changes the delivery from 200 dwellings per annum to 270 from the financial year of 2026/2027 onwards. This is regarded as deliverable and may be increased - subject to the Action Area Plan work.

14. It has been demonstrated that with a number of housebuilders on a strategic site where they are in direct competition can deliver up to 268 homes each per annum. This is based on the report ‘Start to Finish’ November 2016 from Lichfield’s (see extract in Appendix 2) which stated:

‘Eastern Expansion Area (Broughton Gate & Brooklands): Milton Keynes - The second highest average build out rates recorded in this analysis comes from the Eastern Expansion Area (Broughton Gate & Brooklands) site in Milton Keynes where an average of 268 dwellings per annum were delivered between 2008/09 and 2013/14. As is widely recognised, the planning and delivery of housing in Milton Keynes is distinct from almost all the sites considered in this research. Serviced parcels with the roads already provided were delivered as part of the Milton Keynes model and house builders are able to proceed straight onto the site and commence delivery. This limited the upfront site works required and boosted annual build rates. Furthermore, there were multiple outlets building-out on different serviced parcels, with monitoring data from Milton Keynes Council suggesting an average of c.12 parcels were active across the build period. This helped to optimise the build rate’.

15. Through the Area Action Plan, the phasing of the development and the provision of infrastructure based on the Milton Keynes model will establish the number and location of new homes within the Garden Community which can be delivered in the short term, taking into account land ownerships and the need for compulsory purchase.

16. In light of this, it may be appropriate to add a policy to require a review of the Plan should the AAP be delayed. The latest Local Development Scheme (March 2018), has a programme anticipating the adoption of the AAP by the first quarter of 2023/2024. This should be the date identified within such a policy.
Appendix 1

James Brokenshire speech 27 June 2019 – source ‘Planning Resource’

Brokenshire announces support for 19 new garden villages

28 June 2019 by John Geoghegan

Housing secretary James Brokenshire yesterday announced almost £3 million of government funding for an extra 19 garden villages across England, which he said have the potential to deliver 73,000 new homes.

A visualisation of garden community plans for Dunsfold Aerodrome in Surrey

A 10,000-home urban extension to Chelmsford in Essex, a 7,000-home settlement near Ashford in Kent, controversial plans for a garden community on green belt in Tandridge, Surrey, and a "dementia-friendly" village in Rutland, are among the proposals that have been supported.

A total of £2.85 million has been pledged by the MHCLG to "support the development of plans for housing", with each project receiving £150,000 "to progress planning applications and specialist reports needed before homes are built”.

The 19 new garden communities are:

- Berinsfield Garden Village (South Oxfordshire District Council) – the potential for up to 2,300 homes south of Oxford.
- Borough Green Gardens (Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council) – an opportunity to deliver up to 3,000 homes.
• Burtree Garden Village (Darlington Borough Council) – a project led by Hellens Group with the support of Darlington Borough Council, aiming to deliver up to 2,000 homes.

• Chilmington (Ashford Borough Council) – aiming to deliver up to 7,250 homes south-west of Ashford.

• Cyber Central (Cheltenham Borough Council) – aiming to deliver up to 3,000 homes and around 8,000 jobs, primarily in the field of cyber security.

• Dalton Barracks (Vale of White Horse District Council) – a free-standing proposal with the potential for up to 4,500 homes south of Oxford.

• Dunsfold Park (Waverley Borough Council) – an opportunity for up to 2,600 homes in the form of a new free-standing settlement by 2032.

• East of Biggleswade (Central Bedfordshire Council) – led by UK Regeneration, a free-standing project proposing up to 1,500 homes east of Biggleswade.

• Newton Abbot Garden Community (Teignbridge District Council) – the potential for up to 6,800 homes that provides the opportunity to regenerate the existing town centre.

• North East Chelmsford Garden Community (Chelmsford City Council) – the potential for up to 9,850 homes.

• North Dorchester (West Dorset District Council) – proposal for up to 4,000 homes to the north of Dorchester.

• Shapley Heath Garden Village (Hart District Council) – the potential for up to 5,000 homes by 2043 in the form of a new, free standing settlement.

• Skerningham Garden Community (Darlington Borough Council) – a project led by Skerningham Estates with the support of Darlington Borough Council, aimed at delivering up to 4,500 homes.

• South Godstone Garden Community (Tandridge District Council) – up to 4,000 homes on green belt.

• South Seaham Garden Village (Durham County Council) – led by Home Group, a free-standing project aimed proposing up to 1,500 homes.

• St George’s Barracks (Rutland District Council) – a new, free standing settlement proposing up to 2,215 homes near Rutland Water. This has been described by the MHCLG as "a dementia-friendly community village" that "would allow the elderly to live safely and independently in their own homes".

• Threemilestone Garden Village (Cornwall Council) – proposing up to 2700 homes to the west of Truro.

• West of Elvington (City of York Council) – up to 3,339 homes as part of a free-standing garden community.
• Whetstone Pastures (Blaby District Council) – a free-standing proposal for up to 3,500 homes in the heart of Leicestershire.

In his speech, Brokenshire said: "These new communities stretch from County Durham in the North, to Truro in the south west. Together they have the potential to deliver 73,000 new homes.

"We welcome the new homes these projects will bring, but this is about so much more than 'housing units'.

"It’s about supporting local areas that have the vision and drive to create great new places – with all the facilities, green space and transport to make a community that will thrive.

"And I’m really pleased that our plans include a specially designed community that would support the needs of people with dementia, as part of a new Garden Community at St George’s Barracks in Rutland."

The new garden villages are in addition to 24 garden cities, towns and villages already supported by the government.
Appendix 2

Lichfield’s report Start to finish 2016 extract

Size Matters

A key metric for build rates on sites is the number of sales outlets. Different housebuilders will differentiate through types or size of accommodation and their brands and pricing, appealing to different customer types. In this regard, it is widely recognised that a site may increase its absorption rate through an increased number of outlets.

Unfortunately, data limitations mean that the number of outlets is not readily available for the large sites surveyed within this research, and certainly not on any longitudinal basis which is relevant because the number of outlets on a site may vary across phases.

However, it is reasonable to assume that larger sites are likely to feature more sales outlets and thus have greater scope to increase build rates. This may relate to the site being more geographically extensive: with more access points or development ‘fronts’ from which sales outlets can be driven. A large urban extension might be designed and phased to extend out from a number of different local neighbourhoods within an existing town or city, with greater diversity and demand from multiple local markets.

Our analysis supports this concept: larger sites deliver more homes each year, but even the biggest schemes (those with capacity for 2,000 units) will, on average, deliver fewer than 200 dwellings per annum, albeit their average rate – 161 units per annum – is six times that of sites of less than 100 units (27 units per annum).

Of course, these are average figures. Some sites will see build rates exceeding this average in particular years, and there were variations from the mean across all categories (see Figure 8), suggesting that higher or lower rates than this average may well be possible, if circumstances support it.

Nevertheless, it is striking that annual average delivery on sites of up to 1,499 units barely exceeds 100 units per annum, and there were no examples in this category that reached a rate of 200 per annum. The highest rate – of 321 units per annum – is for the Cranbrook site, but this is a short term average. A rate of 268 per annum was achieved over a longer period at the Eastern Expansion Area (Broughton Gate & Brooklands) site in Milton Keynes. The specific circumstance surrounding the build rates in both these examples are explored as case studies opposite. It is quite possible that these examples might not represent the highest rate of delivery possible on large-scale sites in future, as other factors on future sites might support even faster rates.

Our analysis also identifies that, on average, a site of 2,000 or more dwellings does not deliver four times more dwellings than a site delivering between 100 and 499 homes, despite being at least four
times the size. In fact it only delivers an average of 2.5 times more houses. This is likely to reflect that:

- it will not always be possible to increase the number of outlets in direct proportion to the size of site – for example due to physical obstacles (such as site access arrangements) to doing so; and
- overall market absorption rates means the number of outlets is unlikely to be a fixed multiplier in terms of number of homes delivered.

**Cranbrook: East Devon**

The highest average annual build out rates recorded in this analysis comes from the Cranbrook site in East Devon where an average of 321 dwellings per annum were delivered between 2012/13 and 2014/15.

Delivery of housing only started on this site in 2012/13, with peak delivery in 2013/14 of 419 dwellings.

Cranbrook is the first new standalone settlement in Devon for centuries and reportedly – according to East Devon Council – the result of over 40 years of planning (this claim has not been substantiated in this research). It is the circumstances surrounding its high annual delivery rate which is of most interest, however.

Phase 1 of the development was supported by a £12 million repayable grant from a revolving infrastructure fund managed by the Homes and Communities Agency. The government also intervened again in the delivery of this site by investing £20 million for schools and infrastructure to ensure continuity of the scheme, securing the delivery of phase 2. The government set out that the investment would give local partners the confidence and resources to drive forward its completion.

The Consortium partnership for Cranbrook (including Hallam Land, Persimmon Homes (and Charles Church) and Taylor Wimpey) stated the following subsequent to the receipt of the government funding.

> “Without this phase 2 Cranbrook would have been delayed at the end of phase 1, instead, we have certainty in the delivery of phase 2, we can move ahead now and commit with confidence to the next key stages of the project and delivering further community infrastructure and bringing forward much needed private and affordable homes”.

Clearly, the public sector played a significant role in supporting delivery. The precise relationship between this and the build rate is unclear, but funding helped continuity across phases one and two of the scheme. More particularly, the rate of delivery so far achieved relates just to the first three years, and there is no certainty that this high build-out rate will be maintained across the remainder of the scheme.
Eastern Expansion Area (Broughton Gate & Brooklands): Milton Keynes

The second highest average build out rates recorded in this analysis comes from the Eastern Expansion Area (Broughton Gate & Brooklands) site in Milton Keynes where an average of 268 dwellings per annum were delivered between 2008/09 and 2013/14. As is widely recognised, the planning and delivery of housing in Milton Keynes is distinct from almost all the sites considered in this research.

Serviced parcels with the roads already provided were delivered as part of the Milton Keynes model and house builders are able to proceed straight onto the site and commence delivery. This limited the upfront site works required and boosted annual build rates. Furthermore, there were multiple outlets building-out on different serviced parcels, with monitoring data from Milton Keynes Council suggesting an average of c.12 parcels were active across the build period. This helped to optimise the build rate.