

Eco-towns Assessment Summaries Contents Page

Region	Scheme Name	Page Number
East Midlands	Pennbury (Stoughton)	3
East Midlands	Kingston	6
East Midlands	Grovewood	9
East Midlands	Burtoft	12
East Midlands	Manby	15
East	Land North of Harlow	17
East	Easton Park	20
East	The Cambridge Light Railway and Cambridge Heath, a sustainable country town.	23
East	North Weald	25
East	Boxted Wood Eco Town	28
East	NE Elsenham	31
East	Alconbury Airfield	34
East	Marks Tey	37
East	Marston	40
East	Peterborough EcoTown	43
East	Hanley Grange	45
East	Thorpe Wood	48
East	Tilbury	51
East	Mereham New Community	53
East	Sculthorpe Airfield	56
East	Waterbeach (Denny St. Francis)	59
East	Thurleigh North	62
East	Thamesgate	65
East	Coltishall	68
North East	Causey Park	71
North East	Stockton Eco Town	73
North East	Cambois	76
North West	Wardle	79
North West	Eco-Town Carrington	82
North West	Derwent Forest	84
South East	Airtrack Rail	86
South East	Redhill Aerodrome	89
South East	Dunsfold Park	92
South East	Bordon-Whitehill	94
South East	Sittingbourne	97
South East	Ford	99
South East	Greenway	101
South East	Micheldever Station Market Town (MSMT)	103
South East	Shipton Eco-town	105
South East	Weston Otmoor	108

South East	The Surrey/London borders EcoTown	111
South East	Westcott	114
South West	St Austell (China Clay)	117
West Midlands	Curborough	120
West Midlands	The Throckmorton Airfield Sustainable Community	123
West Midlands	Middle Quinton	125
Yorkshire & Humberside	Clifton Gate	128
Yorkshire & Humberside	Rossington	131
Yorkshire & Humberside	The Stainforth & Hatfield Eco Town Initiative	133
Yorkshire & Humberside	Thorp Arch	135
Yorkshire & Humberside	Willow Green	137
Yorkshire & Humberside	Micklefield*	139
Yorkshire & Humberside	The Greens	141
Yorkshire & Humberside	Darringfield	144

**Eco Towns Proposals
Summary Points from Cross-Govt Review Meeting
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	PENNBURY (STOUGHTON) The Co-operative Group Leicestershire City Council East Midlands
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Have sought initial views from Leicester County and City councils, Harborough DC, Oadby & Wigston BC and Stoughton Parish Council, ranges from unsupportive to reserving position .All have identified transport as a substantive issue.
Number of homes proposed.	12 -15,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Attractive countryside with a deserted medieval village and mapped historic parkland with local wildlife sites. No showstoppers, but the site will be critical for water issues (surface water management) in urban Leicester (Great Glen). Water supply and sewerage capacity is under capacity (Water Cycle Study required), and a waste management plan would need to be put in place. Possible radioactive contamination and hydrocarbon contamination from fuel depots. Brown trout population in local watercourses would need to be considered.
Heritage views (English Heritage)	Periods of occupation dating from the Mesolithic to the early medieval periods. The Pennbury development area preserves some significant blocks of ridge and furrow earthworks, notably around Great Stretton DMV, Stoughton, Houghton-on-the-Hill, around the fringes of Oadby and Great Glen. Therefore proposal could have a significant adverse effect on the historic environment especially ridge and furrow.

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No decent public transport infrastructure and surrounded by inaccessible housing. Road congestion into this part of Leicester is very bad and the A6 now has a congestion target imposed. Road pricing a possibility.</p> <p>Capacity problems south of Leicester on Leicester mainline service.</p> <p>Settlement not wholly free standing.</p>
	<p>Extensive new housing estates between site, city, A6 and rail line at Great Glen mean access very difficult to northwest and west; this will inhibit sustainable public transport options. If a new tram line promoted as an option - cost in hundreds £m.</p> <p>Capacity problems south of Leicester on East Midlands mainline service likely after 2015 could be exacerbated by station at Great Glen. Likely cost to remedy in hundreds £m.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Panel report suggests that housing could go round the urban area but public urban transport is essential. (GOEM).</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C/D</p>

Final Assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	B/C environment, C Transport (EA – C to B, Transport D to C, Defra combined B/C)
---	--

**Eco Towns Proposals
Summary Points from Cross-Govt Review Meeting
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	KINGSTON Banks Development Rushcliffe BC Three Cities sub region – East Midlands
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	LA has not wanted to be seen supporting specific sites.
Number of homes proposed.	6,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Site within Green Belt and contains woodlands. Could be downstream impacts on the River Soar. No showstoppers. Kingston Brook borders the south of the site. Water resources zone is under capacity. May be an impact on Pennbury as well in terms of water supply. Sewerage capacity also needs to be addressed Good population of cyprinid fish in river – need to protect
Heritage views English Heritage)	Conservation areas, listed buildings and scheduled ancient monuments are to be found around the site and a rich seam of archaeology exists within and around the site. There are Grade I listed churches at Kingston on Soar, Gotham and East Leake, and a Grade II* listed church at West Leake. Conservation areas cover Sutton Bonnington, West and East Leake and Thrumpton. There is a Grade II listed building at Kingston Fields Farm within the site. There are major concerns regarding the landscape and archaeological impact of a new settlement.

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No problems with capacity on rail line and Parkway station being built at Radcliffe on Soar.</p> <p>A453 corridor to Nottingham is congested, with service buses already being forced to divert to country roads.</p>
<p>Final Assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>Impact of housing growth at Clifton will add to problems. Capacity provided by planned dualling of A453 will be negated if residents of settlement use it to commute.</p> <p>Improvement of M1/J24 (the main motorway hub in the area) will improve journey times north to Sheffield and south to Leicester, Northampton etc.</p>
	<p>Strong temptation therefore to commute from this settlement rather than work there.</p> <p>In the long term a fixed link by tram, from Clifton, to the airport is likely to be called for but would be very costly (hundreds £m). Also likely will increase demand for Kegworth Bypass.</p> <p>More information about sustainable transport policy required.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Panel recommended the removal of green belt at this site. History to the site although Rushcliffe not keen. Town is too small and modest and difficult to steer away from commuter settlement. (GOEM).</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C/D</p>
--	-------------------

**Eco Towns Proposals
Summary Points from Cross-Govt Review Meeting
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	GROVEWOOD Banks Development East Midlands – three cities sub region South Derbyshire DC & Derbyshire CC
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Contact with South Derbyshire DC, Derbyshire CC, EMDA, HA and National Forest Company.
Number of homes proposed.	5,700
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	NE - Adjacent to Green Belt , with existing areas of woodland, and within the National Forest; National Forest Council have written in opposition. Requirement for road brings its own complications.
Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	EA – Flood risk re surface water (SFRA required) but no showstopper. Study required on sewage network capacity and already a water supply problem in the area. Water Cycle Study will be required. Waste management plans are needed.
Heritage views English Heritage)	EH - Walton-on-Trent, which lies a little to the west, has 7 listed buildings, including two Grade II* (Church and Hall). Grove Farm (Grade II) lies close to the western edge of the area; Cauldwell to the south has 4 listed buildings, including Cauldwell Hall Grade II*, and Castle Gresley motte and bailey (SAM) lies to the SE. Royle Farm (Grade II) lies within the site.

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>DfT/HA – Transport issues are not developed in depth and this is a badly served area for public transport. Ivanhoe rail line could re-open but would cost £000'sm.</p> <p>Widening of the A38 may involve demolition.</p> <p>Transport issues are not developed in</p>
	<p>any depth and will need to be assessed in a full study. This area is badly served by public transport.</p> <p>'Ivanhoe' rail line could be re-opened to passenger traffic but would cost hundreds £ms.</p> <p>Widening of the A38 may involve demolition.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Panel recommended consideration for a joint study including transport improvements. Settlement very close to Swandlicote which causes significant concerns from a planning perspective. East Staffs and South Derbyshire have not been approached (GOEM). Concern at cumulative impact in area (GOWM).</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C</p>

Final Assessment at initial stage
(breakdown of any changes)

C



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (February 2008)**

BURTOFT

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Anthony Carter East Midlands – Eastern Sub Region Boston Borough Council
Local authority initial views from officers	Not given. Have approached Environment Agency and Severn Trent Water and they would be a key partner. Other partner organisations – GM Procure and Harvest Housing Group (social housing providers), and also Valueworks (expertise in creating supply chains).
Number of homes proposed.	6,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	269ha site mid way between Boston (and accessible to Boston Port) and Spalding (option for more land if needed). Able to serve local communities (e.g., Sutterton, Drayton). Housing density, 30-50dph and expect a high level of affordable housing Submitted to East Midlands Regional Assembly as part of the RSS.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Highest level of code for sustainable homes and BREEAM excellent for non-residential buildings. Water conservation includes grey water recycling. Could use CHP, perhaps with a district heating system or provide biomass boilers. Woodland planting.</p> <p>Not given – bid was not taken forward for cross-Govt Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Local materials and local architecture. Cite Poundbury.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Facilities on site would be accessible by cycle/ walking. Rail services not good, but would provide an express commuter coach to transport nodes at Boston and Spalding.</p> <p>Not given – bid was not taken forward for cross-Govt Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Proposing site for new hospital, doctors and dental surgery.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Economic impact for East Midland and neighbouring East Anglian Regions. Could create 5,000 non-agricultural jobs. Targeting green industries and setting up an Eco Business Park, which would be capable of attracting international companies.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Not Green Belt and AONB restrictions. Private ownership 140ha. Could be mobilised in 6months. Proposals for woodland and landscaping.</p>

<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>To be provided at a later stage, though would be based on community ownership through trusts.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Consider it could be built before 2016 – timing details can be provided.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Significant flood risk issues and poor transport offer – the scheme had previously been submitted for RSS review and few changes had been made.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Summary Points from Cross-Govt Review Meeting
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	MANBY East Lindsey DC
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Sites put forward by Council.
Number of homes proposed.	5,000 at either site.
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Needs explanation of landscape issues. Coastal Strategy needed initially, and there may be an effect on the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB and the Lincolnshire Coastal Grazing Marshes. No designated sites but little information about how an open airfield site can be integrated. Positive on flood risk (as would alleviate pressure on Mabelthorpe). Sewage treatment and water supply need studies as does waste management. A significant opportunity.
Heritage views English Heritage)	The area around both of these sites, which are close by to each other, is rich in archaeology, particularly related to the medieval period. There are also listed buildings, including a number of Grade I and II* churches. Woodthorpe Hall (Grade II), which lies immediately to the south of Strubby Airfield.
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	Settlement 50 miles from strategic road and 15 miles from station. Need for bus links to be developed.

Other comments	Has a lot of potential; preference for Manby where DC and EA offices are located. (GOEM).
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	A/B
Final Assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	<p>A/B</p> <p>(B on environment due to uncertainty until water and waste studies can be scoped)</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Summary (March 2008)**

Land North of Harlow

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Land North of Harlow – Ropemaker, Land Securities, Places for People, E Herts and Harlow, Essex
Local authority views and level of support	Promoted in RSS – a growth area location
Number of homes proposed.	10,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Urban extension to the N of Harlow in LSCP growth corridor.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	Not given in detail – an ‘energy hierarchy’
Views of Depts/Agencies	Not given – not taken forward for Review

Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Lifetime Homes and balanced community
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network	Modal shift and use of existing /planned infrastructure
Views of Depts/Agencies	Not given – not taken forward for Review
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	Working with stakeholders on community structure
Approach to employment (p17)	Research to identify new employment opportunities.
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Ropemaker/Places for People joint ownership. Some Green Belt, proposed review in East of England plan
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Community Stewardship,
Proposed timescale for development?	
Overall vision of	This is an existing growth area location supported by

proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	growth funding, and not suitable as an eco-towns proposal.





**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (February 2008)**

EASTON PARK

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Barton Willmore/Land Sec/BDP Uttlesford DC East –Cambridge Sub-Region
Local authority initial views and level of support	Do not support this location
Number of homes proposed.	7,500 – 9,000 – 30-50% affordable. Additionality 350DPA.
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	. Adjacent to sewage works, Old WWII airfield. . N of A120 – close to Stanstead and partly affected by new runway noise contours. Mini RSS review scheduled for the area.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts-environmental exemplar and opportunity	Country Park proposal. CHP unit proposed. Not given – not taken forward for Review

Views of Depts/Agencies	
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	No evidence of design other than reference to a country park and exploring the layout of the original Easton Park.
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network	Well located M11/A120 – Claim that traffic using the site would not need to use unsatisfactory roads. Road links from Stansted. Fast bus scheme to Bishops Street.
Views of Depts/Agencies	Close to Stansted so may impact on runway proposals.
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	None outlined. Poor.
Approach to employment (p17)	B1/B8 users attracted to Easton park due to proximity to STN. Currently insufficient supply of appropriate locations.
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Single ownership of 655 hectares at Easton Park by Land Sec. Greenfield – partly brownfield with some concrete landing strips present.
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	To retain freehold of Easton Park and managed as an ongoing asset.
Proposed timescale for development?	None indicated.

<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Health, design, sustainable construction. Very little detail and also other local locations are better placed</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	The Cambridge Light Railway and Cambridge Heath, a sustainable country town SM Trustees Cambridge City
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No
Number of homes proposed.	14,000 (existing small village)
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	No capacity on required scale in existing infrastructure for public water supply and waste water treatment. No significant watercourses to accept new STW discharge. Water resources limited headroom in this CWC Water Resource Zone. Chalk aquifer may restrict soak away. Problems if more than one eco-town goes ahead as Water Resource Zone is reaching limits of capacity. Arable land so some disturbance but not significant. Potential to create green infrastructure.
Heritage views English Heritage)	Landscape characterisation important around this area and archaeological assessment. Bid contains no mention of historic environment issues. At N of the site – 12 scheduled bowl barrows and Romano–British settlement. This is not suitable for a golf course. Site contains Grade II* listed windmill to south of

	proposed school.
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Significant A14 improvement needed, with developer contributions. New station not viable – single carriage train at present. Additional track would be needed. DfT and Network Rail do not support the developers proposal to convert the existing railway line to Light Rapid Transit</p>
Other comments	<p>masterplan developed to some limited degree but site appears to be totally greenfield in private ownership; also very limited evidence of how settlement would perform as an eco-town above and beyond any normal development. Transport issues appear to be a major constraint.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B on environment (C – EA)</p> <p>D on transport – offer is unrealistic- potential showstopper</p> <p>C/ ?D overall</p>
Final Assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	C/ ?D



**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

NORTH WEALD

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	North Weald Lend Lease Harlow/Epping
Local authority views sought and level of officer support	Harlow Borough Council support, but not Epping Forest District Council. Has had support from EERA and EP during discussions of draft East of England plan (but the new settlement has been withdrawn from the Plan).
Number of homes proposed.	6,000 – but consider that there is potential for 12,000 if medium density model used.
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	At EIP there were concerns about the impact on the regeneration of Harlow (remove housing numbers from Harlow). Lend Lease consider that this will not impact on Harlow and will support the growth of the sub region. Located in the growth region Harlow/ Stansted/ Cambridge. Well located to London, Stansted Airport and Cambridge.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	Could be impacts from proximity of M11, though considered that these can be dealt with through Masterplanning (screening). Would provide on site CHP, renewable energy and recycling grey water. [EDF and Transco have confirmed electricity and gas supplies).
Views of Depts/Agencies	Not given, not taken forward for Review

<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Refer to mixed communities/ tenures, and setting design standards. Residential development post 2010 to at least achieve Code level 4, and to generally achieve Government targets [no specifics].</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p>	<p>Maximise walkability/ cycling opportunities within the development.</p> <p>Propose to introduce a guided bus to Epping by opening up the former Central Line link between Epping and Chipping Ongar.</p> <p>Served by M11, J7 (runs through the middle of the site – propose a linking bridge) – and links to M25 [might be capacity issues]. “Short drive” to A414? Highways works needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A414 junction works • M11 J7 works • B181 and B1393 works
<p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Not given, not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Refer to community events and a Community Development Programme. Education facilities integrated with Community uses.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Refer to large scale industrial and distribution uses, as well as retail and small business.</p>

<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Land owned by Padfield Family (mainly arable) and Lend Lease have a development agreement with the family, and Airfield owned by Epping Forest District Council (might need to compulsory purchase).</p> <p>No significant flooding issues, 5% of site identified as 1:200 flood risk.</p> <p>Propose green space for leisure and wildlife zones to promote ecological diversity.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Would explore potential for joint working with local authority, but ff no local authority support suggest that some form of LDV be set up, possibly a UDC.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Delivery could start early in the eco-town timeframe.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>would impact strongly on planned growth in this area funded through GAF</p>
	<p>.</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

BOXTED WOOD ECO TOWN

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Boxted Wood Eco Town Galliard Braintree and Uttlesford Districts
Local authority initial views sought	Currently being promoted through the Local Delivery Framework. Discussions have taken place with Essex County Council
Number of homes proposed.	Up to 10,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Up to 50% of housing will be affordable. Up to 60% of housing will be 2,3, or 4 bed houses The town would be located in Mid Essex between great Dunmow and Braintree
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	Developers aim to produce outstanding landscape quality. The location already has a lake and a biodiversity priority area which would be preserved. 25% of the scheme would be open space.
Views of Depts/Agencies	Not given – not taken forward for review

Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Flood risk and water resources scoping assessment Landscape and visual resource appraisal Draft outline movement study Archaeological appraisal
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network	Close to the A120 Plan to use existing buslinks and develop these Braintree has an existing rail link All public transport will be developed
Views of Depts/Agencies	Not given – not taken forward for review
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	Aim to create community groups Will develop plans more fully if shortlisted
Approach to employment (p17)	Create business space Encourage home working approach not developed
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Unclear from bid. Mainly use farmland.
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Not clear from bid. Bidders do mention the possibility of the introduction of a town council
Proposed timescale for development?	4,500 by 2016, 5,500 by 2027

Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Unclear from the bid how this fits into regional picture. Not clear if the additional 5,500 homes can actually be delivered as land not acquired. Location is remote and the transfer offer needs work.



**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	NE ELSENHAM Fairfield Partnership Uttlesford
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Not given at this stage.
Number of homes proposed.	5-8,000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>.</p> <p>Waste water issues, 2 catchments (Thames/Anglian). Would require a water cycle study. Alternative discharge into headwaters of the Cam (a salmonid river) would require high water quality</p> <p>Site is near to Bishops Stortford, the works there (which will probably receive the sewage from the proposed development) are being upgraded. Also surface water issues.</p> <p>The site is in a water scarce area, so it must be demonstrated through a water cycle study that there is sufficient capacity to supply this development within existing commitments.</p> <p>good proposal, little impact on sites/species, subject to site study. Increased recreation around Hatfield Forest –mitigation could resolve.</p>

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Uttlesford is a district of exceptional historic interest where recent additions to the main settlements of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow have put pressure on their historic quality and character Area of pressure overall and would not want to see the impact of development being spread elsewhere, particularly to Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Good location, Stansted issues being dealt with. Capacity to upgrade rail line. . M11 issues around capacity are being reviewed separately by DfT;. Capacity to upgrade rail line. May be local road issue around vehicle access to New Hall Road GO expressed concern over access and capacity of local road network if up to 8,000 homes are proposed in this area particularly in relation to access to the site (New Hall Road) and connections with the strategic network.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Check additionality with Uttlesford as Core Strategy Preferred options includes 3,000 at this location, with 1,200 proposed to be delivered by 2016, so need to query number of homes proposed and the level to be delivered by 2016 to ascertain whether this complies with criteria. . Concerns over potential impact of an eco-town in this location on regeneration and growth strategy that has been agreed for the wider area. on regeneration and growth strategy</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>A on transport</p> <p>B/C on environment (could move to B with assurances from EA).(Defra)</p>
<p>final assessment at initial stage</p> <p>(breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>B/C</p> <p>EA C.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
REVIEW ASSESSMENT SUMMARY
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	ALCONBURY AIRFIELD (Prologis) Huntingdonshire DC/Cambs CC
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Possible support by North Norfolk Council (near where the site is located), but this is potentially linked to other potential proposals for the site which it thinks to be worse (eg possible immigration centre, prison proposal). Not aware of support or objection by the Greater Norwich councils of Broadland / Norwich City / S Norfolk.
Number of homes proposed.	6,000 minimum
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Concerns over foul water treatment capacity and limited capacity of water courses to receive discharges. Parts of former airbase site likely to be contaminated, remediation measures needed The proposed site is an SSSI and county wildlife site. Traffic pollution likely. Increased recreational pressure on Monks Wood SSSI which is to the North of the site. The biodiversity issues make the site very difficult to progress as an eco-town

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Some existing Cold War structures within the site are grade II* listed and are therefore a major constraint. There is a scheduled ancient monument between the airstrip and the railway line which is likely to be affected. A number of smaller villages to the south, east and west could be compromised as these contain several listed buildings and conservation areas. Possible impact on the historic market town on Huntingdon in terms of the existing town's vitality. There is need for appraisal work to assess the impact of proposed eco-town on the historic environment of the airfield and surrounding area.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No capacity on A1. Planned rail capacity upgrade. Concerns about new station. Alternative is guided bus.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Vision/overall proposal still not fully developed (lack of concept or master plan). Fits with regional picture to the extent that it is within an existing growth area and would make good use of publicly-owned PDL – however, very limited evidence of how settlement would perform as an eco-town above and beyond any normal development. Several ancient monuments and listed buildings. . Poor public transport offer. Would need more assurances from developer. Several ancient monuments and listed buildings.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C on transport and environment.</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

MARKS TEY

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Marks Tey Consortium and Taylor Wimpey (represented by ASP)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Hoping to work with Inspire East. Representations to Structure and Local Plan and East of England RSS (para 15 of RSS provides for a new settlement).
Number of homes proposed.	5,000 (the minimum)
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts /Agencies EA, NE, Defra	No direct impacts on any designated sites, but there are many known sites for protected species in and especially around the site. NE would require provision of green infrastructure as mitigation to divert additional people pressure away from coastal European sites. Also require a water cycle study to ensure no adverse effects on European sites downstream.

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p> <p>Dft, Highways Agency</p>	<p>Proposal is located south east of Marks Tey in a triangular area formed by the A120 to the north and the railway line and A12 trunk road to the South East. The proposal is close to Marks Tey railway station and on a direct corridor (part A120) through to Colchester</p> <p>The proposal is currently not viable in terms of existing highway accessibility as access would be required off the existing A120 trunk road and this road currently operates close to or at capacity. The interchange between the A120 and A12 at Marks Tey is not to current design standards and also operates near to capacity.</p> <p>There are proposals for an upgrade to the A120 Braintree to Marks Tey to dual 2 standard. The optimal solution appears to be to provide a new route to the south of the existing A120 with a new connect to the A12, thereby relieving congestion on the A120 and probably enabling this project to be accessible. However delivery of this is post 2016 -earliest likely to be post 2019.</p> <p>Marks Tey station is on the very busy Great Eastern rail route from Liverpool Street to Colchester / Ipswich etc and the route is already running at maximum capacity and little scope to provide more peak capacity and infrastructure for trains longer than 12 cars would cost over £1billion.</p> <p>The developers talk about seeking additional funding to improve the train service between Marks Tey and Colchester Town station, but this is not the main station for Colchester, and is not on the main line (the nature of the rail infrastructure and train services in the area make it difficult to serve by rail and it is therefore only served by a few trains and this is not likely to change)</p>
---	--

Other comments	
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	C/D
Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	D?

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	MARSTON 2 separate bids, Gallagher/O&H (have interests in both) Marston Vale/New Marston
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No.
Number of homes proposed.	7,000 Marston Vale (split sites), 15,400 New Marston
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Land is available in FZ1 for this location in line with PPS25. Requires a water cycle strategy and revisited SFRA. Surface water issues – group has been set up to assess developments in the area. Water resources investigation needed and possible contamination issues from location’s waste management history.</p> <p>Number of designated sites, SSSIs. Protected species, risks associated with cumulative development, although not insurmountable with good management, and there is a track record in this area.</p>
<p>Heritage views</p> <p>English Heritage)</p>	<p>Significant industrial heritage and a complex area with a number of heritage constraints including listed buildings, conservation areas, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks/gardens. The recently grade II listed Stewartby brickworks is important (and also forms part of a conservation area) and would need to be protected (it is currently shown as “residential” on one of the submission documents). Concern over the impact on the historic environment of nearby settlements. Appraisal work will need to be undertaken to ascertain whether this is a suitable location for an eco-town from a historic environment perspective.</p>

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No major concerns from HA-A421 upgrade scheduled for 2010. Schemes look to have underestimated on-site traffic generation and accessibility issues. Slow rail line is not flexible as suggested. Need to substantially revise transport offer. . Proposal to focus housing around four local stations on the Bedford - Bletchley route is inconsistent with the proposed East - West Rail scheme which currently envisages reducing the hourly rail service at these stations to one train every two hours (plus an hourly express service between Bedford and Bletchley). DfT would prefer to see development focussed around one station which could be served by the express service</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Concerns over sprawl towards Milton Keynes and M1 Preferable to concentrate on the Northern Marston Vale where development will be more Bedford focussed. Now that SoS has decided not to call in the NIRAH application there will be an opportunity to put together a very attractive and comprehensive proposal which will take forward the MKSM agenda.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B/C on transport B on environment</p> <p>B/C overall</p>

Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	B/C
---	-----

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	PETERBOROUGH ECO TOWN Wharf Land Investment
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No
Number of homes proposed.	20,000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Proximity to Great Fen project one of England's largest wetland restoration projects, serious concerns about wetland habitats and implications for water quality . Site includes low points below 0 metre contour , and surface water drainage into Fen watercourses below 0 metre contour is an issue. High flood risk in parts of site – would require review with Hunts DC in SFRA. Also potential flood risk impact on existing Fens communities in lower catchment.</p> <p>These are not issues the promoter is likely to be able to overcome if further investigation confirms they are problems</p>
<p>Heritage views</p> <p>English Heritage)</p>	<p>Grade I listed church at nearby Conington and a scheduled ancient monument to south near Bruce's Castle Farm (the latter is ignored by submission document). Flat landscape is important and any new settlement would impact significantly on the setting of nearby villages. There would be a need for analysis work on the historic environment impact, including landscape assessment.</p>

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>A1(M) not problematic here, although junction improvements may be needed. Rail not an issue. New station, new track, cost around £20m, neither Network Rail nor DfT are funded to deliver the new station and track</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Question the fit with the wider sub-regional strategy for location of development and likely knock-on effects on transport network. Vision/proposals still not fully developed (lack of concept or master plan).</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C on transport, potential D on environment (see also Alconbury).</p> <p>?D overall</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>D</p> <p>(EA- D)</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

HANLEY GRANGE

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Jarrow Investments Ltd (promoted by Sellwood Planning)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Put forward at East of England RSS and also part of the broad area promoted by TCPA at the RSS.
Number of homes proposed.	About 8,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Concerns on hydrological and protected/notable species issues as site is adjacent to the River Cam, a county wildlife site and important chalk river for biodiversity, and the arable land supports diverse flora and fauna. Potential impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater and spring flows to nearby wetland SSSI e.g. Sawston Hall Meadows, Dernford Fen, Thriplow Peat Holes, Thriplow Meadows, Fowlmere Watercress Beds. Development will place additional pressure on an overstretched system. The river has faced reduced flows in recent summer droughts. • Surface run-off and pollution into the River Cam would reduce water quality, and provide pathways for eutrophication of aquatic and riparian habitats as well as SSSI. • The river and surrounding land supports a wide range of protected species and it is likely that the standard suite of Cambridgeshire protected species will be present (great crested newts/bats/badger/water vole/otter/reptiles). The chalk substrate in the area is quite a hot-spot for scarce arable plants, and a prime location for enhancement to encourage stone curlew back into the

	<p>Cambridgeshire.</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Number of historic sites. Brent Ditch scheduled monument in NE corner should be protected, including its setting. Major archaeological interest likely – early assessment required. Hinxton Grange and Pampisford Hall both listed buildings, grade II, and Pampisford Historic Park Grade II*. Several historic environment constraints and significant sites and settings potentially compromised. Bid does not provide information on historic environment, and appraisal work is needed in advance of a decision on suitability/capacity of the site.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>This site is adjacent to the A11, which currently operates well within capacity. Both the A505 and A1301, which form the other boundaries of the site, connect to the A11. As these junctions are only 4Km apart another junction onto the A11 would be resisted.</p> <p>There are two existing rail stations Whittlesford and Great Chesterton on the Cambridge Liverpool Street route and extra capacity expected to be provided on this route by 2014 through train lengthening from 8 to 12 cars (this should accommodate the rail patronage from the town).</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Proposal would need a comprehensive water cycle study and a green infrastructure master plan (this would take forward the recommendations of the Cambridgeshire GI strategy.)</p> <p>DfT would require an assessment of the impact of on the road junctions. Also would expect the developer to fund improvements to the two rail stations as deemed necessary by Network Rail / the Train Operator / the local authority. This</p>

	could include platform lengthening
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>NE – C</p> <p>DfT - B</p>
<p>Final Assessment</p> <p>(breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>B</p> <p>(B on environment)</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

THORPE WOOD

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Thorpe Wood, Thorpe & Felthorpe Trust Broadland DC
Local authority consultation and level of support	No. Paper is a response to Broadland DC's issues and options consultation
Number of homes proposed.	7,500 – 15,00
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	In response to LDF - Line of settlements including Urban Extension and new settlement
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of	Sustainability strategy including: Reduced emissions, Waste, Transport, Materials, Water, Biodiversity

Depts/Agencies	
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Use of Enquiry by Design and Princes Foundation Materials
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network Views of Depts/Agencies	Norwich transport strategy and walkable neighbourhoods
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	Community asset management
Approach to employment (p17)	33ha given over to employment in addition to existing Broadlands Business Park
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Sustainability strategy including: Reduced emissions, Waste, Transport, Materials, Water, Biodiversity
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Not given
Proposed timescale for development?	Not given

Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Urban extension. Not updated since 2006. Bid subsequently withdrawn





**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Tilbury

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Tilbury Thurrock Council and Thurrock Thames Gateway Development Corporation (LA/UDC –led bid)
Local authority consultation and level of support	Local council involved in the bid
Number of homes proposed.	3,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	To build 3,000 new homes in Tilbury town. No details on affordable housing. Linked through existing transport infrastructure to local amenities. Bid will redevelop existing retail space.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	No information except outline of benefits of reducing flood risk for the area.
Views of Depts/Agencies	Wholly in Flood Zone 3, and mostly in the high hazard zone. As above, defences currently to 1: 1000 but would degrade around 1:200 if not improved. Reliant on water resource transfers. This scheme would probably require additional work to Tilbury STW on waste water treatment.

Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Not given
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies/Depts	
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	No information beyond a statement in the bid that local partnerships and stakeholder engagement would be sought from existing networks,.
Approach to employment (p17)	No information. Bid does refer to increased employment in its ambitions section.
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	On brownfield land.
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	No information.
Proposed timescale for development?	Completion in 2016.
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Tilbury is identified for regeneration in local plans. Bid is not free standing, being an urban extension. Bid is too small. Very little information supplied. This fails on eco-towns criteria of freestanding or additional housing, but has been referred to Thames Gateway unit.



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

MEREHAM

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Mereham, Multiplex/ Barton Wood. East Cambridgeshire DC, Cambridgeshire DC & Cambridgeshire Sub Region.
Local authority consultation and level of support	No- planning appeal against a refusal is currently in progress.
Number of homes proposed.	5,100
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Focus is on Northstowe, Sub Regional report of RSS identifies the need for one or more settlements. West of Cambridge, near Wilburton and Streatham 8,000 sq/m retail & supermarkets 2 district centres Schools Open space considerations
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Code level 4 to begin with 20% renewable generation Technology exemplar Food production SUDS</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>High standards of architecture Urban design competitions Masterplanning</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Widening of A10 , HQPT- Park and Ride, New footpaths, Travel Plan, Car Pool, Car Park</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Community Development officers Management of assets</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Links to other settlements Economic strategy Promotion of home working & Wi-Fi</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Biodiversity Programme, Single landowner site, Green grid, Nature reserve</p>

Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Management company, Community sustainability officer, CDT to follow
Proposed timescale for development?	Not given
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Addresses criteria, not strong on alternatives to care use or employment,. Needs to be considered in terms of other sites in the region. Ongoing planning appeal.



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

SCULTHORPE AIRFIELD

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Sculthorpe Airfield Humberts, Coggins, Defence Estates, North Norfolk.
Local authority consultation and level of support	No.
Number of homes proposed.	9,000 (3,500 by 2016)
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Refer to Growth Centre of Fakenham 30-50% affordable housing Up to 9,000 homes on RAF site, linked to A148 to Kings Lynn. Not in Plans
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>CHP exemplar/ waste plant , Level 5/6 homes, Rainwater harvesting , aim for 50% reduction in water use</p> <p>Not Given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Active design principles using CABE Urban Design Compendium</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Car reduction Encourage/ prioritise existing public transport Nothing on impacts – very little detail.</p> <p>Not Given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Community assets empowerment Public consultation on site if going to shortlist, also health care facilities.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Employment zones Cottage industries</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Still owned by the RAF</p>

Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Long term management structure leading to community trust
Proposed timescale for development?	3500 by 2016
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Insufficient detail and vision set for transport. Some regeneration of RAF buildings. Very little owned by Coggins- the main issues are land release and the remoteness and connectivity of the location.

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	WATERBEACH (DENNY ST FRANCIS) RLW Estates, S Cambs DC
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No
Number of homes proposed.	10,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Water resources, supply – cumulative impacts with existing planned growth around Cambridge. The CWC Water Resource Zone has limited headroom. Need to speak to water companies about provision and extraction. Further investigations of these issues needed. Also possibly water quality problems – no watercourses in the locality so a potential problem in discharging effluent. Problems if more than one eco-town goes ahead as Water Resource Zone is reaching limits of capacity Close to Cambs Wash SSSI, county wildlife site and Wickham Fen SSSI and SAC, water quality impacts. Loss of arable land will impact on birds/habitats. GI strategy needed to help mitigate.

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Impact on setting of Denny Abbey, scheduled monument of outstanding interest, in English Heritage guardianship and open to the public. Essential to preserve rural nature of surrounding landscape. Historic interest also reflected in 4 listed buildings: church and refectory are grade II*. High archaeological potential within development area. Earlier proposals to develop land close to the Abbey rejected following public inquiry in 1990 due to impact on rural setting of the monument.</p> <p>Development up to line shown not suitable – would compromise historic context of the site - this would therefore be a showstopper.</p> <p>To help safeguard the open landscape setting of Denny Abbey development should be restricted to the barracks site and the southern half of the airfield, subject to an historic landscape assessment of these areas being carried out. This would mean a distance of about 1 km from the scheduled monument.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Major capacity issue A10, plans to improve by 2014. Rail difficulties – single track, Additional station at Chesterton. Concern about extension to guided bus.</p> <p>DfT does not support the proposal to retain the existing station at Waterbeach and open a new station so close to it. Also that if the new station at Chesterton on the Northern edge of Cambridge goes ahead, calling trains at Waterbeach may require costly track doubling works on the line between Ely and Kings Lynn</p>

Other comments	Have increased offer since RSS. Generally well-developed bid. Some transport issues and land availability (Defence Estates). Deliverability and potential local opposition could be issues
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	C- on transport and environment /deliverability
Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)	C



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

THURLEIGH NORTH

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Thurleigh North St Modwen Bedford/Mid-Bedford
Local authority consultation and level of support	Not given
Number of homes proposed.	10,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Runway as recreational focus, separate neighbourhoods. 2km from Thurleigh, links to Bedford by high quality public transport.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts/Agencies	CHP, Waste management , Woods management On site energy efficiency, zero carbon. Not a widely developed bid.

Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	5 key components of design, e.g. 'solar hub'.
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network Views of Depts/Agencies	HQPT, Electric car pool. More specifics needed,
Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)	Neighbourhood trusts
Approach to employment (p17)	Mixed use employment centre
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Regeneration of 490 ha of brownfield- old Thurleigh Airfield- not clear
Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Delivery organisation to manage eco-town.

Proposed timescale for development?	Not given
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Does not address the eco-towns criteria in detail, connectivity is a major problem.



**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Thamesgate Thamesgate Regeneration Ltd Thurrock DC, Thames Gateway
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No – aware of bid but separate DC/UDC bid for Tilbury centre
Number of homes proposed.	14,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Large parts of the site are Greenfield land in tidal flood zone 3, behind defences and subject to rapid inundation. No sequential test as required by PPS25. Existing defences are 1:1,000 (primary and secondary) and during the 100 year lifespan of any development would degrade through climate change to 1:200 year standard. Significant improvements would be needed as part of any new development Nearby wetland SSSI/SPA likely to be affected by proximity to development Reliant on water resource transfers. This scheme would probably require additional work to Tilbury STW on waste water treatment. site footprint covers many protected species (European designations on Thameside), requires mitigation. Would cause more concern if taken forward along with port developments and possible Thames barrage.

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Bata factory village important example of an industrial village. It is designated a conservation area. Factory villages identified in policy ENV6 of East of England Plan [proposed mods] for protection/enhancement. EH have conducted a study which establishes the importance, and significance, of the settlement, which has international interest.</p> <p>Amount of development would compromise relationship of settlement in the landscape, potentially result in coalescence of urban areas and encroach on setting of Coalhouse Fort [scheduled monument] and river views.</p> <p>A significantly reduced level of development could be accommodated, taking account of historic assets, but should be tied to regeneration of the Bata factory village and re-use of principal buildings.</p> <p>Regeneration of Grays is also important and should not be compromised.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Widespread issues around A13, J30. Timing issues – upgrade scheme not ready before 2015, may affect delivery. No site specific problems.</p>

<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Thames Gateway – Well known scheme offering high numbers of additional growth. Significant issues of green belt/flood risk. UDC not actively in support.</p> <p>Not a council preferred option for development. Not well-located, although 2 major employment areas locally. Location in green belt could affect eco-towns exemplar adversely.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C – on transport</p> <p>D (EA – on timeframe/flood issues)</p> <p>C- NE</p> <p>Overall C/(D)</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage</p>	<p>C/D</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	COLTISHALL Barton Willmore
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Possible support by North Norfolk Council (where the site is located), Not aware of support or objection by the Greater Norwich councils of Broadland / Norwich City / S Norfolk.
Number of homes proposed.	10,000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>expensive new infrastructure needed and uncertainty over ability to issue discharge consents into R Bure because of water quality issues in the Broads . Relationship with Norwich water cycle strategy needs to be made.</p> <p>However, given the levels of growth at Norwich, the cumulative impacts are potentially severe especially due to drainage into the river and its impact on the Broads</p> <p>Extremely sensitive catchment. 30km directly upstream of Broads SAC, environment may not be able to accommodate level of building. Good on GI.</p>

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>The fighter pen (WW2) and 1950s Blast Walls are currently being recommended for scheduling. The setting of these will need to be preserved which could in part be achieved by maintaining the line of the runway and taxiways. We would also hope to see a visual link retained whereby the blast walls can be seen from the line of the runway. The late 1930s layout has some design value and English Heritage is currently funding a characterisation study</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>The Northern Distributor road has no funding and there are environmental issues surrounding the preferred route". A140 does not pass site, some link needed. Role of existing rail likely to be very limited - need to develop a strong and realistic public transport offer.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>GO-E – eco-town scheme relies on NNDR going ahead which is by no means certain. However, NNDR well-promoted by Norfolk County Council and the Councils forming Greater Norwich. Strategic fit with growth of Norwich also needs consideration.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C on transport, potential D on environment</p> <p>C/?D overall</p>
<p>Final assessment</p>	<p>C</p> <p>(EA – C)</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	CAUSEY PARK Gateshead/Derwentside
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No
Number of homes proposed.	Up to 6,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Biodiversity SSSI and BAP habitats on site – inevitable impacts on wildlife/habitats unless protected from use. Bid lacks consideration of conservation and enhancement of biodiversity. Good on sustainable design, construction, green infrastructure on small scale, but this needs larger-scale strategic planning for GI. issue of foul drainage, local sewage works seriously under pressure now. Struggle to meet requirements. Solution for wastewater treatment would be to pump wastewater over a hill to another catchment, which is unsustainable. Very minor flood risk SE corner. .
Heritage views English Heritage)	No indication of how the past would be safeguarded or celebrated (if at all). Opportunity exists, however, for its contribution to local distinctiveness and character to be incorporated, with regionally important mining heritage repaired, restored, interpreted through suitable planning obligations

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Road issues are a showstopper. Significant impact on operation of the Strategic Road Network, particularly the A1 to Tyneside at what is already the most congested link on the region's network. Single road access (A692), no segregated bus lanes, so PT scheme would add to congestion. Scheme dependent on bypass works that are not programmed. No rail option. Lack of employment detail likely to mean out commuting to Tyneside.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Greenbelt/indicative greenbelt, reclamation costs may affect affordable housing offer.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>(C/)D.</p> <p>D on transport connectivity</p> <p>C on environment</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C/D</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Stockton Eco Town

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Elton Park, Stockton, Emolior, with Urban Splash and RSL Stockton-on-Tees North East
Local authority consultation and level of support	Yes- wants DC as part owners. No view from Stockton direct
Number of homes proposed.	7,500
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	40% affordable housing. South of Stockton, next to the A66, making use of existing roads but possible relief road. New metro station and forest. Not zoned in RSS as housing.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Biomass, CHP, Code 6 homes, subs, waste plant, green spaces</p> <p>Not given – bid was not taken forward for cross-Govt Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Some masterplanning, Urban Splash appointed, design coding.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>HA have identified 2 ‘hotspots’ mentions but does not offer solutions. New metropolitan station, LA plan bus improvements.</p> <p>Not given – bid was not taken forward for cross-Govt Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Full range of facilities & CDT Primary care facilities.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>1500 jobs in a mix of uses as part of ‘Build-Out’, 7,500 in total.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Majority agricultural use ‘Few constraints’- although nature reserve in area 60% SVEN investments/ 40% Stockton Council</p>

<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Development Vehicle Local Authority involvement from 3 Rivers RSL</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Half by 2016</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Not freestanding – an urban extension. Impact on North East Growth Point bids? Transport problems are significant.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

<p>Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)</p>	<p>CAMBOIS (Banks Development)</p> <p>Wansbeck.</p>
<p>Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth</p>	<p>Nominal consultation with Wansbeck DC. Other interested bodies (GONE), but others need to be consulted , including County Council and SENNTRI (Regen. Partnership) (GONE).</p>
<p>Number of homes proposed.</p>	<p>5000</p>
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Complex site issues – eco-town, power station, port relocation, energy village. Increasing squeeze on internationally protected coastal habitats. Concerns over port dredging and disposal on river flow patterns. Very good aspects to bid inc transport, green infrastructure on small scale, but this needs larger-scale strategic planning for GI. Internationally designated SPA needs impact to be assessed for all development within a relevant distance not just for immediately adjacent sites. This could potentially delay the process significantly</p> <p>SFRA approach needed to estuary – climate change impacts in future. Need to confer with SENNTRi on SFRA</p>
<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Site contains some poor quality housing, some of which is 'remnant terraces or colliery rows'. No indication of cultural value of these houses or other features which may remain.</p> <p>Positives include coastal location and good renewable energy component.</p> <p>Otherwise no fundamental heritage concerns. Benefits may include regeneration of Blyth Town Centre.</p>

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No showstoppers but likely to need A19 junction schemes in the RFA to be taken forward and further detailed analysis of the impact on the strategic road network is required. Relatively high proportion of bus users for rural location and improvements to PT access being considered. Sustainable transport provision needs to be considered further if the bid progresses (more understanding of road user hierarchy; how transport will contribute to carbon neutrality of development; level of risk if modal shift not achieved). Would need a sound business case for the ABT line and to identify funding. Logistics of opening a branch for the site - how would this operate with Ashington? Would services to Cambois and Ashington alternate?.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Advice needed on sequencing and location as important elements of the bid (ie combined heat and power, jobs) rely on the proposed power station going ahead, but there is little certainty at present about this. The alternatives are very vague, and it is uncertain whether they would have the capacity to deliver the same benefits. Other issues – commitment by other stakeholders? Complicated site ownership, need to understand site location /EIA disparity. . Impact on SPA? Eco-credentials of coal-fired power ? Attractiveness of site for residential use? Given above restraints timing appears unrealistic</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C-</p> <p>C on environment, ?B on transport</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial review stage</p>	<p>C/D</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	WARDLE (Pochin Group Ltd) (Borough of Crewe and Nantwich) Bid subsequently withdrawn
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No
Number of homes proposed.	5, 000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>No protected sites nearby. However, this proposal is substantially greenfield in nature and impacts on local landscape should be considered. That said, there is potential to realise the opportunity that developing a new settlement can provide for opportunities to enhance the natural environment. The EoI is currently weak on green infrastructure.</p> <p>.</p> <p>No mains sewerage in Barbridge , Crewe sewage works would need large scale investment. No major flood risk issues. Potential impacts on the canal system and British Waterways would want to be involved. Due to potential scale and complexity of water management issues (including waste water, water supply and surface water management), a water cycle strategy will be required.</p>

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Note that the site is principally green field therefore HLC and archaeological investigation necessary. Need to consider both any beneficial and negative impacts upon Cheshire's historic market towns and specifically on the viability and vitality of Nantwich itself; though the development could potentially relieve the development pressure on Nantwich</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Located on the Crewe to North Wales Mainline, currently 2 trains per hour. Potential for a railway station and local trains to stop there. A51 bisects the site and is de trunked. Nearest motorway access M6 junction 16.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>All agreed that there was the potential for innovation and much further work to be done on the expression of interest.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial review stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	ECO TOWN CARRINGTON (Trafford MBC)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Yes
Number of homes proposed.	4 – 5, 000 units
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	(Since the meeting in December it has emerged that) – Part of the site may be of SSSI quality for protected species reasons – Black Necked Grebe. This would require appropriate investigation and measures. Overall opportunity for enhancing the local environment not currently recognised by the Eol.
Heritage views English Heritage)	From the map supplied no direct impacts upon the historic environment identified, though the potential for impacts upon industrial archaeology should be factored in

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Very poor transport links. Located adjacent to a freight only rail line but not well connected to the road or rail network.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Land remediation costs and time would be prohibitive and very costly. Part of the site is still operational. Adjacent chemical works would provide significant visual intrusion and noise/environmental pollution.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>D/E.</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial review stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>D/E.</p> <p>(EA – A)</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Derwent Forest (Lakeland Guild Construction Co)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Supported by Allerdale DC
Number of homes proposed.	15, 000 – 20, 000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity (Views of Depts/Agencies, Defra, EA, NE)	No specific issues
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Depts/Agencies – HA, Dft)	Located adjacent to the Carlisle – Barrow rail line and A595 trunk road.

Other comments	Market potential very poor and impact on pressured Lake District housing market would not be significant. Principle of the site not sound. Any development should benefit West Cumbria as a whole.
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	E
Final assessment at initial stage	E



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

AIRTRACK RAIL

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	AIRTRACK RAIL DP9 Planning Consultants, Airtrack Railways Ltd-part of Meyer Bergman Group Bracknell Forest/ Wokingham
Local authority consultation and level of support	No commitment from local authorities, extensive background of lobbying.
Number of homes proposed.	5,900 + 700 on Amen Corner= 6,600
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Case not fully evidenced in terms of need for growth, but clearly a very overheated area. Details of Airtrack at South East RSS New rail station to the South of London. Road proposed in local plan. 500 acres in the Thames Valley between Bracknell and Wokingham. Junction 9 of M4 spur (A329M + SW line). Settlement close to Bracknell and to the SW of Reading. 30% affordable.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>'Triple Zero' development exemplar & Passiv Haus principles. County Park claims - offer of alternative to the Thames Basin Heaths. Allotments Proposed. Proposal for two energy centres, coppiced bio fuel plantations, sustainability strategy undertaken.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Including reference against eco homes. Lifetime Homes Standards & Inclusive Design</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Proposed internal transit system. New Station at Amen Corner and a park and ride located adjacent to A329/ M4 spur. Claim that the benefit of the scheme is that it is on the proposed Airtrack route.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of the general difficulty of creating social involvement. Allotments- many community facilities, but little evidence of details on community involvement. A community health centre.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>80,000m2 of office space and this reverses the isolated office space trend – aimed at international companies.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Green Infrastructure – linking 5900 acres of London Road with 700 acres to the S. Development to include new parkland.</p>

<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Good proposals for governance and options explored in terms of a limited company. Trusts. IPS long term management well rehearsed.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>On site in 2012 – 2028 in 6 phases.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Clear that want to fund (through clawback developer contributions) new rail link as driver of this bid.</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

REDHILL AERODROME

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Clifford W & RC Shrimplin South East Tandridge District Council Reigate & Banstead Borough Council
Local authority consultation and level of support	LAs not supportive. Existing growth point
Number of homes proposed.	5,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	<p>206 ha site lies in Green Belt, east of Redhill. Large part of site developed as an aerodrome in 1930s, so has hardstanding and Aerodrome buildings. Some additional areas used for specialist flying and other plane related uses. Other parts of site contain small holdings/ farms.</p> <p>Housing density 40dph. Mainly agricultural land. Early development and would take a number of years to develop. Structure Plan policies prevent expansion of aerodrome and limit house building.</p>
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	.

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Local energy production and harvesting of rain water mentioned.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Have a design team, but no detail on proposals.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Road access – A23 and M23 (both very busy). Mention improved bus service and possibility of a replacement station at Three Arch Bridge. Little detail on delivery of proposals. Little about transport provision on site.</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Little said.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Office based employment – knowledge based economy.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Part of aerodrome site lies in flood plain. Green belt a major issue in SE developments</p>

<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Envisage a new town trust to manage community assets.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Going to take some time! Large enough to be sustainable and supporting a primary school and community facilities.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>A new community on a village scale. Land assembly. Potential for transport development. Green Belt. 'Fit' with growth point plans</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Dunsfold Park

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Dunsfold Park Dunsfold Park Limited Waverley BC
Local authority consultation and level of support	Not consulted directly, but aware of development as planning submission has been previously submitted.
Number of homes proposed.	2,500
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Is a mixed use scheme of 45,000 sqm including business space. Bid contains a village centre, and energy plant and a waste processing plant.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts/Agencies	Have a CHP plant in bid Waste to be processed locally To have a bio-ethanol plant Aim to reduce net water take Not given – not taken forward for Review
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Master planning underway

<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Will use car deterrants including a car charge. Encourage home working. Electric/biofuel public transport. Use of innovative personal rapid transport system</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Develop a primary school and community facility. Establish a community trust Primary health care facilities to be developed on site.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Not fully clear. Will develop retail space on site and encourage home working. Will provide good public transport links to local towns.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>On brownfield land. Single land owner.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Aim to use a community trust Use the usual pattern in terms of service delivery (police, fire etc)</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>1,560 by 2016 and 1,040 after 2016.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Bid is too small in house numbers. Public transport offer needs further work.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	BORDON-WHITEHILL (Promoter is E Hants District Council.)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Yes, LA led with partners group inc MoD, county, EP, SEEDA
Number of homes proposed.	5,500
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	No capacity to supply onsite water resources – MoD using exempt abstraction. South West Water does not currently have the capacity to supply adequate water resources. Water cycle study needed to assess. Habitats Directive calls for reduced abstraction in area. SFRA needed and assessment of contamination. Wealden Heaths SPA surrounds site. Potential impacts of new residents on protected birds . Mitigation would be needed. Also extra traffic impacts likely as road-based scheme.
Heritage views English Heritage)	A number of archaeological sites of national importance lie within MoD boundaries. These issues need to be reflected in the emerging area action plan

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Would need a stronger case on transport – what is the sustainable offer? A3 has capacity to an extent, but congestion at Guildford. Not clear on level of bus/rail integration.</p> <p>Existing transport link could fail once MoD leaves. Subsidy needed for flexible bus operation. Could a transport provider offer innovative scheme to support LA.</p> <p>(following response to follow-up letter) Dft - approach is conventional and lacking in demand management measures, though basically sound no fundamental difficulty in managing the generated traffic more effectively so content with C in transport terms subject to assurances that measures will be provided.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Consideration needed for employment offer as this will impact on road journeys and environment. Council may relocate offices to town.</p> <p>Defra- eco-town scheme could provide cutting edge approach to water supply (water neutrality).</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B/C</p> <p>C on transport and water issues, also on Wealden Heaths SPA issues , B on other EA issues</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial review stage</p>	<p>B/C</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Sittingbourne

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Sittingbourne Spenhill Developments/ St James Investments Swale Borough
Local authority consultation and level of support	Unclear from bid what consultation has happened.
Number of homes proposed.	2,500
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Not a stand alone town, so has links to nearby amenities. Committed to 30-50% affordable housing. Bid is in an existing town.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts/Agencies	Use on site waste management Use renewable energy Not given – not taken forward for Review
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	No information

<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Has train access already. Good bus links. Would look to develop these existing systems.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Will create a management body to support the community.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Based on existing employment in the town. Would look to build on these opportunities. Unclear how.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>On brown field land.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Would look to establish a management body to help develop the town and support people.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>2,500 by 2016.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Bid fits within the regional plan to reinvigorate Sittingbourne Town centre. Bid is for too few homes. Bid is an urban extension. Transport offer needs work. Forwarded to Thames Gateway for consideration</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

<p>Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)</p>	<p>FORD FORD AIRFIELD (Redrow, Wates)/ FORD ENTERPRISE HUB (Ex councillors consortium).</p> <p>Two separate bids covering the same area.</p>
<p>Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth</p>	<p>No – Arun and Arundel town council have made representations.</p>
<p>Number of homes proposed.</p>	<p>5,500</p>
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>flood risk – covers all 3 flood zones (although majority of development in Ford Airfield bid in zone 1) Need clarification about distribution of housing in second bid. Requirement for sequential test. SUDS (if needed) would need to be implemented outside zones 2/3. The abstraction point is currently 'over-licenced' although should be manageable with commitment to water efficiency and current planned development of resources</p> <p>Surface water management studies are needed and investigations into contamination. These aspects could be managed, but needs ambitious water conservation measures. No major landscape issues – SSSIs nearby but mitigation measures could be developed. Arundel bypass potential to be controversial for landscape/mitigation issues.</p>

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>The bids refer to no archaeological constraints on site but fails to consider the potential impact associated with an Arundel bypass and the potential for serious adverse impact upon the setting of this historic town, and high archaeological potential of the area. The SAM at Tortington Priory could be affected by by pass. Two conservation areas at nearby Yapton and listed buildings</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>A27 Arundel bypass issues. Not prioritised in RFA. Cost of £100m+. Query whether needed for this development. Option for restricting access to A27 and having strong demand management on site. Has potential 'landscape / biodiversity' issues</p> <p>Not aware of major sub-regional issues, but would need more information on local capacity especially into Bognor.</p>
<p>Initial assessment: A)no significant issues at this stage B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B?</p>
<p>Final assessment (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C C – environment Dft downgraded to a C on transport</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	GREENWAY (Fox LLP) Aylesbury DC
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Informal discussion with LDV
Number of homes proposed.	3,000-4,300
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Little road infrastructure – new building would have impacts on area. Limited on site capacity for sewage treatment and nearby STW at full capacity – additional investment likely to be needed e.g. strategic pumping station (s) and off-site rising mains and enhanced capacity at STWs . Similar for water supply i.e. substantial upgrades to the system such as new pumping station and mains as Mursely reservoir at full capacity . Water cycle study needed. More studies needed in general, including site FRA to assess risks posed by new relief road and surface water drainage .</p> <p>Would like to see more detail but good overall integrated approach to development and green infrastructure.</p>
<p>Heritage views</p> <p>English Heritage)</p>	<p>The site is close to 3 conservation areas with potential to impact upon their setting. Of particular concern is the potential to impact upon the historic market town of Winslow, and EH are concerned nationally over the importance of safeguarding the vitality and viability of market towns.</p>

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No particular sub-regional impacts. Relief road through middle of settlement casts doubt on “Eco” status?</p> <p>Faces MKSM – difficult on information given to be sure that car reductions would take place.</p> <p>Reliant on development of EW Rail - the location of the proposed new station to be served by East - West Rail services will be important as it must serve both the new development site and the existing town of Winslow. DfT would not support the provision of two stations in close proximity</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Employment offer needs to be raised to reduce out-commuting impacts.</p>
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B/C</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>B/C</p> <p>EA - C</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (Mar 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	MICHELDEVER STATION MARKET TOWN (MSMT) (Eagle Star) Winchester
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No- Winchester not in support
Number of homes proposed.	12,500
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Water quality/water resources/biodiversity - Potentially significant impacts relate to water quality, as to the feasibility, timing and options available and to the sources of the water supply in terms of potential impacts on the River Itchen SAC and River Test SSSI.</p> <p>Groundwater – Under the provisions of the future Groundwater Daughter Directive, discharges to ground need to be carefully assessed, as all discharges directly to <u>groundwater</u> are banned.</p> <p>The Eco Town will need to pass the tests of the Habitats Regulations. Potentially a show-stopper if left until the project-level stage before given due consideration. Likely to be technical solutions, but only if addressed very early in conceptual stage of plan. Needs water cycle study, SFRA, green infrastructure study.</p> <p>Stone –Curlew breeding grounds within 2km of site – downgrade to significant issue Could be a very well-landscaped site.</p>

Heritage views English Heritage)	Potential archaeological issues. Popham Beacons SAM just to north of site
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	Very significant issues – rail congestion on Waterloo/Winchester line with trains at capacity. Major investment would be needed. Scheme not clear on employment and likely to increase out-commuting. Compounded by major congestion on M3 /Basingstoke area. Risk of increase.
Other comments	Location issues and opposition by LA. Statement opposing the development on sustainability /transport grounds in SE Panel Report.
Initial assessment: A)no significant issues at this stage B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.	C/D D on transport C on environment
Final assessment at initial stage	C/D

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	SHIPTON ECO TOWN Cherwell DC, Oxon
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No. Shipton have queried RSS outcome
Number of homes proposed.	5000+
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>The site lies in a quarry where there are groundwater flooding issues. Annual cycle assessment needed for flood risk etc. Main concern is that quarry needs infilling with inert waste to prevent groundwater flooding and this needs licensing/monitoring arrangements over an extended period. Extensive costs and studies needed, reassurance must be sought from the developers that this is being considered.</p> <p>Serious concerns over wastewater treatment. Only existing sewer links to Oxford, which does not have sufficient capacity to support this development . Would need some local provision – this is not in the bid. Developer confirmed at meeting 10/01/08 looking at on-site STW. However, no investigation into viability of this and water cycle study required to confirm if environmental capacity in receiving watercourse.</p> <p>Developer confirmed at 10/01/08 meeting groundwater pumping, referred to in bid, for potable water supply and grey water use. No alternative water supply proposed in bid, this is unacceptable, especially due to likely</p>

	<p>restrictions on abstraction at low flow periods. Also, site falls in SWOX water resources zone where significant new resource likely to be required to meet cumulative growth, unlikely to be deliverable until 2020s.</p> <p>.Quarry is SSSI on geological grounds, possible that features would be concealed; assessments of development impacts needed. Possible wetland SSSI where train station would go?</p> <p>-</p>
<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>Evidence of a prehistoric landscape beyond the quarry section of the site to the NNW with a scheduled long barrow and two other barrows. To the south east proposals for parkscape/wetlands associated with the river and canal unlikely to affect setting of scheduled ancient monument and conservation area at nearby Hampton Gay</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Positive that have undertaken a degree of work on new station/timetabling etc, but more work needed on this. Half hour frequency of train service would not encourage modal shift. Station at edge of site. Challenge promoters to demonstrate how car use can be drastically reduced. A34 has major congestion issues. Might necessitate restricted access to allow PT alternatives to bed in.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Delays to build out may be likely owing to mitigation requirements.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C/D</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C</p> <p>C on transport, C on EA issues, particularly groundwater flooding/levels, need for filling waste water and water resources.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	WESTON OTMOOR (Parkridge) Cherwell DC, Oxon
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No.
Number of homes proposed.	10,000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Some flood risk/water resource issues but not showstoppers.</p> <p>The existing settlement is connected to a very small sewage treatment works at Weston on the Green. Significant sewage treatment infrastructure will be required. Study is required to determine whether there is sufficient environmental capacity available to carry the load from the expanded infrastructure.</p> <p>Main problem (would require major investment) is lack of local sewerage infrastructure; development would require 100x increase in current capacity. May not be deliverable by 2016, even if finance available. Also, local water courses do not have capacity to receive the treated effluent, so where would it go?</p> <p>Site falls in SWOX water resources zone where significant new resource likely to be required to meet cumulative growth, unlikely to be deliverable until 2020s.</p> <p>Flood zone 3 in parts – not a major issue provided development avoids flood zones (some development and infrastructure currently proposed in flood</p>

	<p>zone 3</p> <p>Adjacent SSSI for grassland, newts and birds, would need protections. Historical landscape (to discuss English Heritage), positive proposal in terms of design concept and sustainable community.</p>
<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>No direct impacts although archaeological potential as evidenced by proximity to site of nearby Roman Alchester SAM. Potential for a cumulative effect on Bicester which is itself undergoing expansion</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Predicated on EW rail which has £200m capital costs. Could developers fund (including ongoing subsidy)? Needs more than 2 trains an hour and would need to be served by a high frequency rail service to be attractive as a 5,000 space Park and Ride site. DfT unlikely to support the proposal to operate an Oxford - Weston Otmoor - Bicester - London Marylebone Chiltern Railways service via new chord line at Bicester as this would duplicate existing Oxford - London Paddington services.</p> <p>A34/M40 jcn overloaded. Assuming no closure of the existing access to the A34, the development could not happen without highly innovative traffic containment measures in line with development control policy.</p> <p>Developer would need to meet cost of bridge over A34 and examples elsewhere suggest this will be very costly.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Opportunity to try an approach with minimal car use to resolve the Oxford access issue.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Final Assessment</p> <p>(Breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (Mar 2008)**

THE SURREY/ LONDON BORDERS ECO TOWN

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Causeway Land Investments LLP Reigate & Banstead Council South East
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No – existing growth point
Number of homes proposed. How many additional to existing plans?	6,000
Does proposal demonstrate the case for additional growth (in local/sub-regional context) and address housing need and affordability?	Not given
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues	40% of homes allocated for social housing, assisted living and special needs. 17 miles from London, 2miles from Banstead and 5miles from Reigate. Surrounded by undeveloped and agricultural land the site is allocated as Metropolitan Green Belt and area of landscape value. 210ha site – 120ha housing, 52ha open space. Site allocated in Local Plan as Metropolitan Green Belt and area of great landscape value
Current status in planning (if relevant)	.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity	Look to address sustainable homes criteria – level 6. Will look at district heating system powered by CHP (partly supported by an on-site energy from waste facility).

Views of Depts/agencies	Not given – not taken forward for review
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Little info – will retain the sense of green and open land.
Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network? Views of Depts/agencies	Reduce car usage through co-location of employment, retail and residential uses. Site is served by Kingswood railway station and bus links along A217. 2 miles from M25. Not given – not taken forward for review
Approach to community involvement (p16)	If selected will involve community in masterplanning. Community and leisure facilities to be provided, but no detail.
Approach to employment (p17)	In the economic corridor between Gatwick and Heathrow airports, which would help attract commercial interest. 600,000sq ft of employment floor space. Will offer a range of commercial premises.
Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues	Will put in place a proper management regime.

Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Phasing proposed to fund initial infrastructure provision: 1,200-1,400 homes and 600,000 sq ft of employment. If planning permission by 2010 then about 3,000 homes could be delivered by end 2016.
Proposed timescale for development?	
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration issues).	Housing and employment guided by sustainable principles. Contribute towards Reigate and Banstead in terms of the growth point.
Other issues/issues not addressed ...	This is in Green Belt and also not in line with existing growth point proposals



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

WESTCOTT

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Rockspring Hanover Property Unit Trust South East
Local authority consultation and level of support	Not identified.
Number of homes proposed.	5-6,000 (on 125ha of site)
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	<p>Former airfield, near Aylesbury (6miles away) and Bicester (10 miles away) and 12miles from M40. 284ha site and operates as a local employment site (considered to be under used). Proposal is an expansion of Westcott Village.</p> <p>Assumption of 40% affordable housing.</p> <p>Expect to provide secondary school, 4 primary and civic hub</p> <p>Allocated as major employment park in Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2011 and strategic rural employment site in LDF Core Strategy 2026.</p> <p>Planning permissions for new and replacement employment and about to be granted planning permission for relocation of offices from Aylesbury.</p>
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>SUDs and holding ponds proposed. Given the concrete on site (eg runways and buildings) there could be an on site aggregate recycling plant. Ecological management of site proposed. Wants to explore relationship between residential and non-residential energy use. Site offers potential for wind generation.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Heritage centre could be proposed – to preserve historic character and sense of place. Lifetime homes standards implemented where possible and an unspecified percentage of wheelchair homes. Initial masterplanning through Inquiry by Design.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Enhance the existing transport. Potential - for park & ride at Aylesbury and Bicester stations; extension of Aylesbury Primary Public Transport Corridor to Westcott. Pedestrian and cycle links within town and to nearby settlements.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Pledges commitment to consultation from the start. Civic Hub developed on existing Westcott Sports & Leisure Club. Envisage setting up a residents forum – possibly in the form of a community trust. Civic hub will include health facilities.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Expand existing employment (currently employs 400+ people) to 2,000 (estimate). Will consider technology for home working. Mixed use employment – retail, leisure and service.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Site owned wholly by promoter. LPA does not regard whole site as brownfield and only permits new employment on 25% of site. Part of site used by Royal Ordnance for testing rocket propulsion and another part has licence for storage of explosives.</p>

Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?	Development managed through estate management company and then once a critical mass in population will set up a Parish Council.
Proposed timescale for development?	2-3,000 homes built before 2016.
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Promoter's intention is to enhance and expand the employment (Venture park) and does not want to prejudice this through promoting an eco-town. Therefore unclear what the purpose of bid is, other than to get through an employment permission?

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	ST AUSTELL (CHINA CLAY) IMERYS (Cornwall County Council)
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Yes
Number of homes proposed.	5, 000
<p>Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Natural England (NE)</p> <p>Environment Agency (EA)</p> <p>Defra</p>	<p>Drainage and groundwater management an area where careful monitoring would be needed. Need to ensure the eco- town does not negatively impact on the new heath and woodland being created.</p> <p>Undertake thorough assessments to identify any designated wildlife sites, protected species & landscapes, and BAP habitats & species that may be affected, Essential that evidence based green infrastructure strategies are developed for all growth points/ecotowns (in partnership with a broad range of representative interests) to identify key GI components, address design and location considerations and take into account access, landscape and biodiversity issues, assets and opportunities</p>

<p>Heritage views English Heritage)</p>	<p>The area has a variety of designations including important industrial archaeology.</p> <p>Whilst the bid is rather vague, at this stage, the commitment to an initial masterplan to consider the areas distinct built and cultural heritage and landscape is welcomed. This should acknowledge emerging national good practice in the preparation of historic landscape characterisation and reflect English Natures 'Joint Character Area' report which suggests the restoration of the redundant china clay workings 'lunar landscape' provides an excellent opportunity to create areas of wildlife, heritage and amenity interest. The impact of significant development will obviously be considerable and perhaps effect these more subtle suggestions. Whether or not an eco town may, or may not, be acceptable cannot, as yet, be determined.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Transport Impact Assessment would need to be undertaken but expected that there would be a modest impact on the trunk road network. Local campaign to upgrade local road linking the A30 with St. Austell. Closest rail station at St. Austell and concern as to how the settlement would be served by public transport.</p> <p>Transport study has been commissioned in conjunction with Restormel Borough Council.</p> <p>Will need to provide more information on likely transport scheme costs/funding</p>

	options.
Other comments	Overall there needs to be a wider benefit to St. Austell. Importance of engaging mineral planning colleagues at Cornwall County Council.
Initial assessment: A)no significant issues at this stage B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.	B – subject to checking further information on the spatial form of the proposal.
Final Assessment (breakdown of any changes)	A/B (EA – A)

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	CURBOROUGH (RPS representing the Curborough Consortium – Redrow Homes, Hallam Land Management, The Banks Group & Gleeson Homes) Lichfield DC West Midlands
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Consulted with LA.
Number of homes proposed.	5,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	No protected species in the area but wet woodlands. Link road to Lichfield would add to environmental pressure in the area. Some landscape issues. Possible river water impacts from Trent-Mersey Canal. Some flooding issues (two watercourses run through the site) but not a showstopper. Large scale SUDS would be required. Issue with water quality. Lichfield SWT would need upgrading.
Heritage views English Heritage)	The submission fails to address the local and wider impacts on the historic environment, particularly the landscape setting and Lichfield's historic core and how these effects could be mitigated e.g. traffic constraint. The completed historic landscape characterisation for the county should inform the capacity of the site to accommodate a development of this scale

<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>Transport assessment reasonably well worked up (is insufficiently ambitious in eco-towns terms and too reliant on earlier proposals) but likely to be 3,000 not 5,000 homes.</p> <p>Some initial technical documents have been seen but not a transport assessment. The technical documents seen so far refer to 3,000 homes not to the 5,000 homes proposed in the eco-towns bid.</p> <p>An existing planning permission for Fradley Park Industrial Estate adjacent to the proposed Curborough site requires an upgrade to Hilliard's Cross Junction as well as localised widening to the A38 once a pre-set level of development is reached. It is unclear at present whether the widening would also be required in respect of the Curborough site. If this proves to be the case it is would be likely to act as a showstopper unless the Regional Planning Body decided to deliver these works through the Regional Funding Allocation.</p> <p>Pressure on the network will mean that the developers will need to commit to funding not only junction improvements but also provide for road improvements on the A38 and a comprehensive public transport strategy. In light of the information attached this may need to be downgraded to a C, with need for assurances on behalf of the developers that this funding commitment can be met by them.</p> <p>Lack of public transport provision/strategy is also a concern.</p> <p>Any new Rail station/line improvement proposals will need a full business case worked up and funding provided. The developers have already indicated that</p>
---	--

	they do not propose to provide a new rail station to service the site.
Other comments	<p>Land at Fradley was previously designated as a new settlement for 3,000 dwellings under the structure plan (the relevant policies have now expired).The LA is currently considering the option of a new settlement at Fradley through their Core Strategy consultation, but are unsure whether this would be additional to the District's requirements emerging through the RSS.</p> <p>This site has been designated as a new settlement under the structure plan but the policy that refers has not been saved . It has some planning history and the LA is open-minded but not sure if this is additional to Lichfield</p>
Initial assessment: A)no significant issues at this stage B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.	B/C (C Transport)
Final assessment (breakdown of any changes)	C (C-DFT)

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	THE THROCKMORTON AIRFIELD SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY QinetiQ/GVA Grimley Wychavon DC West Midlands
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	LA unable to support at this stage.
Number of homes proposed.	5 -7,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	No mention of landscape issues Grassland on site is a BAP priority area'. Several serious issues: foot & mouth burial site (16H); active land fill site (132 H); radioactive contamination from WWII munitions. Sewage treatment capacity.
Heritage views English Heritage)	
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	Transport issues not clearly explained. No mention of public transport strategy. Recently completed A44 Wyre Piddle Bypass could link site to the SRN - however confusion about how road link from site itself to the Bypass would be funded. HA have concerns over impact of site on local traffic in Evesham and Pershore. Single track railway which may need to be upgraded if more regular services required to meet demand from increased

	population.
Other comments	Little merit and close to South Worcester growth point. (GOWM)
Initial assessment: A)no significant issues at this stage B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.	D (EA – C)
Final assessment at initial stage	D/E

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary
(March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	MIDDLE QUINTON (St Modewn & Bird Group; Stratford upon Avon) West Midlands
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	LA is aware.
Number of homes proposed.	At least 6,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Close to Cotswolds AONB so mitigation measures would be necessary re.visual impact Would look for a FRA to make sure there is no flood risk on site – major SUDS likely to be required; also problems with sewage network – probably has insufficient capacity - so study required. In addition, how would the settlement affect near-by towns?
Heritage views (English Heritage)	The surrounding landscape character is particularly sensitive and includes the adjacent Multivallate Iron age Hillfort on Meon Hill, a scheduled monument. The impact on this monuments setting will be significant. Warwickshire’s Historic Landscape Characterisation (to be completed in 2008) must be applied to inform the principle of this proposal. As with the proposed eco town at Lichfield an argument is proposed by the developer consortium that development would benefit the historic character of Stratford (by relieving pressure). However, notwithstanding the inclusion of certain services as part of the

	<p>proposal, the nearest large service centre will remain Stratford with the resultant demands and pressures placed upon it. In addition the impact of traffic and resultant congestion on Stratford, associated with the proposal requires consideration.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies</p> <p>Department of Transport (Dft)</p> <p>Highways Agency (HA)</p>	<p>No issues regarding the strategic network. Concerns over public transport provision to and from site; business case including funding proposals is needed for planned improvements to rail network (currently only used for rolling stock).</p> <p>Lack of information at this stage - specific transport proposals required before full assessment could be made.</p>
<p>Other comments</p>	<p>Isolated location but the council has not yet reached a view.</p>

<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C</p>
<p>Final assessment at initial stage (breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>B/C</p> <p>EA - B</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)
CLIFTON GATE**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Clifton Gate – GVA Grimley, Commercial Estates, Hallam York city council, Y and H
Local authority consultation and level of support	Opposed by council – traffic congestion a major issue.
Number of homes proposed.	5,500
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Comments on emerging RSS and the need for infrastructure improvement in this area, but not clear that Clifton Gate is favoured. Absence of local policies, although the land previously safeguarded for development. 250-345 ha, York city area, to the N of the Ring Road. .Some brownfield, but green Belt review would also be needed
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	

<p>Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Code 5 minimum. Energy strategy, carbon reduction strategy.</p> <p>Not Reviewed</p>
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Based on North Yorks villages style</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Improvements to York outer ring road and bus improvements, mainly focused on a road approach, offering developer contributions through s106.</p> <p>Not Reviewed</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Consultation on future proposals</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Employment and retail areas.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Not clear extent of land ownership or mitigation required.</p>

<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Would set up a delivery body if successful</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Phased to 2106</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Urban extension with problems in terms of road congestion, Green Belt, sustainability of scheme. Other areas put forward in Leeds City Region growth point bid.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	ROSSINGTON (UK Coal) Doncaster BC, Y and H
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Not at this stage. growth points bid covers same area.
Number of homes proposed.	15,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Similar issues to growth point bid. Work needed on sewage infrastructure existing capacity not enough. Water quality issues (possible impacts on River Taw), Sherwood sandstone is a major aquifer; contamination would affect potable supply and would have to be avoided. Multiple studies needed on SUDS, infiltration of water, protection of aquifer.
Heritage views English Heritage)	Extension to a model mining town and located on the southern Magnesium limestone ridge. Archaeological mitigation strategy would need to be undertaken
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	The bid relies on FARRRS which is a relief road that would connect the motorway to the airport. It hasn't currently been approved and there are question marks over whether it is needed. The current road is capable of dealing with current capacity and would only need to be upgraded if further employment opportunities were created near the airport (a move that was not supported in the RSS - which favoured

	<p>business growth in existing city areas). It feels that the developers are relying on this scheme without really considering whether it is needed/will serve their purpose. Such reliance on road building leads to questions over the sustainability /'eco' aspects of bid with the proximity to the motorway already creating high potential for car based commuting. There is the need for a clear P/T strategy and for any road building scheme to be justified through transport assessments.</p> <p>Need to carry out detailed traffic/transport assessment as condition</p>
Other comments	
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	C – on transport and environment issues.
Final assessment (breakdown of any changes)	C



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

The Stainforth & Hatfield Eco Town Initiative

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	The Stainforth & Hatfield Eco Town Initiative Doncaster Council
Local authority consultation and level of support	Not given
Number of homes proposed.	4,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Bid aims to develop a link between towns of Stainforth & Hatfield. This would create regeneration in the existing towns.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts/Agencies	Create new ecological and wildlife habitats, and recreational green space. Would use rainwater harvesting systems. Use renewable energy sources. Re-use of land scarred by mining. Not given – not taken forward for Review
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	Some work seems to have happened but more is required.

<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Bid would provide a link road to M18. Develop the railway station to provide a rail, bus and road interchange. Develop local bus links.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Involve local community in planning the development. Little information beyond this.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Re-develop existing retail space to create more jobs. Little development beyond this.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Bid is based on brownfield land. Single owner.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>No information.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>Unable to state. No information.</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>Not clear how it fits with the regional plan, although bid states the area is identified for regeneration. Bid is for an existing settlement. Too small. There is a lack of detail in several areas. Is the same area as a growth point bid</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Thorp Arch

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	Thorp Arch Leeds Council
Local authority consultation and level of support	No info provided
Number of homes proposed.	7,500
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Bid has a flexible approach to affordable housing but no outline figure given. Consists of 155 hectares of an extension to an existing village.
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Depts/Agencies	Very little information provided. Bid does mention using all practical lower carbon approaches. Not given – not taken forward for review
Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?	No

<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Agencies/Depts</p>	<p>Bid will upgrade access to the A1. Commit to invest in bus services Rail service would require major investment to change the track from a single line to dual line, and nearest station is 5 miles away.</p> <p>Not given – not taken forward for review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Bid would use existing community groups.</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>No information.</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>Land is on the edge of green belt land. Land is owned by multiple parties with no agreement in writing to use land.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>The existing community has an estate management team. Would look to create a new Parish to govern the eco-town, but failing that the existing governance would be maintained.</p>
<p>Proposed timescale for development?</p>	<p>2,000 by 2016, the remaining after (unspecified date)</p>
<p>Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider</p>	<p>No information on regional fit. The bid is not for a free standing town. The transport offer is poor. Very little information generally.</p>

**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	WILLOW GREEN (GMI property) Selby
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No – not aware of bid
Number of homes proposed.	15,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	has positive approach on environment Very few constraints, SFRA carried out, in flood zone 1, Protection zone needed for sandstone aquifer.
Heritage views English Heritage)	The impact on Selby would be significant, particularly as it struggles to regenerate, but no site specific issues.
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	very good motorway access – least stressed part. Have not thought in sufficient detail about public transport. Whitley Bridge has twice daily rail service, no revenue for capacity improvements. Demand? Need to carry out detailed traffic/transport assessment as condition

Other comments	town would be twice size of Selby. Strategic fit?
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C?</p> <p>C on locational issues – other sites in Selby may be better for access</p> <p>(EA – B)</p>
<p>Final Assessment</p> <p>(Breakdown of any changes)</p>	C/B

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	MICKLEFIELD (Peacock and Smith representing a number of developers) Wakefield /Leeds
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	Not given – RSS response/inspectors report on UDP
Number of homes proposed.	Could accommodate up to 7,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	No showstoppers, although lack of detail on site. No assessment of impacts on natural environment in bid. Issue of foul drainage/pumping owing to location. Small water course inadequate for new settlement. Adjacent to gassing landfill site. Flood risk issues as site in depression.
Heritage views English Heritage)	Potential concerns as impact on a Grade II* landscape with key views from a Grade 1 listed building.
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	Proximity to Leeds and on rail line, additional capacity could support trips. Impact on strategic road network – no clear bus routes. Abuts low stressed part of A1, but may need discussion about a junction. Would like to see a detailed bid (including internal travel plans) Need to carry out detailed traffic/transport assessment as condition

Other comments	Good account of Micklefield in UDP report, supports sustainable travel.
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>B on transport</p> <p>B/C on environment</p>
Final Assessment (breakdown of any changes)	<p>C</p> <p>(EA-C)</p>



**Eco Towns Proposals
Assessment Summary (March 2008)**

THE GREENS

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	The Greens, S. Leeds. CIH properties (also submitted Willow Green bid) Leeds City Region (subsequently withdrawn)
Local authority consultation and level of support	Not included in Leeds City Region bid as a growth point, nonetheless could considered in context.
Number of homes proposed.	5,000
Brief summary of development, including – housing offer, affordable homes, location of site, constraints, proposed linkage to other settlements, other spatial issues, context for growth and planning status.	Yes, RSS context, but conclusion in east Leeds was some 'entry level' homes needed. RSS review In Green Belt
ECO-TOWNS CRITERIA (ref Prospectus)	
Approach to environmental issues (p 13). Environmental issues and impacts-environmental	Proposals include Biomass, CHP, Wind energy Microgeneration, Waste – testing needed.

<p>exemplar and opportunity</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	
<p>Approach to Design (p14). Evidence of design work underway?</p>	<p>Urban designers and masterplanners appointed Neighbourhood Hub with sustainable traffic.</p>
<p>Approach to Transport (p15). Issues and impacts on network?</p> <p>Views of Depts/Agencies</p>	<p>Use of existing strong transport links - this is in a congested area of Leeds Improvements needed to A642</p> <p>Not given – not considered suitable for Review</p>
<p>Approach to community involvement (p16) and health (p17)</p>	<p>Cemetery ! Public art, and provision of several lacking facilities</p> <p>Rugby academy</p>
<p>Approach to employment (p17)</p>	<p>Retail development also 40,000 sq' of office space 60,000 workshops</p>
<p>Land issues including use of brownfield, PDL, mitigation, green infrastructure (p18). Land ownership issues</p>	<p>This is an urban infill site - this is in Green Belt and conservation areas.</p>
<p>Consideration of governance, delivery and management of eco-town?</p>	<p>Little detail</p>

Proposed timescale for development?	
Overall vision of proposal, and fit with regional picture (including regeneration) and other issues to consider	Some innovations, but extensions of Leeds suburbs, not freestanding.

**Eco Towns Proposals
Review Assessment Summary (March 2008))**

Name of Eco-towns promoter (details of local authority area/sub-region)	DARRINGFIELD
Does proposal include commitment /agreement by local authority partners to growth	No. May not be aware.
Number of homes proposed.	15,000 to 20,000
Approach to environmental issues Environmental issues and impacts- environmental exemplar and opportunity Views of Agencies Natural England (NE) Environment Agency (EA) Defra	Foul sewage issues; additional infrastructure would be needed. 2 licensed landfill sites, sufficient drainage infrastructure to resolve . Some fluvial flood risk; SUDS and water management would be needed. Overall, information too scant to make a proper assessment
Heritage views English Heritage)	Knottingley is located nearby which is a town with various challenges and located within a specific landscape
Approach to Transport. Issues and impacts on network? Views of Agencies Department of Transport (Dft) Highways Agency (HA)	No showstoppers although there are no public transport plans in bid. Ambiguity around rail freight terminal – a business case needed for conversion to passenger use. A1 has been improved to motorway standard in this area. Need to carry out detailed traffic/transport assessment as condition

Other comments	Very little information is available with this bid
<p>Initial assessment:</p> <p>A)no significant issues at this stage</p> <p>B) significant issues but can probably be addressed through conditions, studies etc</p> <p>C) location where growth is possible but major issues – assurance needed</p> <p>D-high level constraints – reasons why growth in this location is unsustainable.</p>	<p>C</p> <p>More information would be needed if to go forward</p>
<p>Final Assessment</p> <p>(Breakdown of any changes)</p>	<p>C</p>