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This study is an examination of private new settlements in England and Wales, concentrating on the period from 1980 to March 1992. It is set within the context of the significant changes in the relationship between the state, particularly the land use planning system, and the private sector, which took place during this period of Conservative Government, and of major social and economic restructuring.

Attention is drawn to the theoretical and substantive nature of these changes, prior to outlining the history of new settlements, with the focus on the 1960s and 1970s which saw similar, although less intense, private sector activity in promoting new settlements. The main thrust of the research is to firstly describe the geography of new settlement proposals in the 1980s, and then to relate this to the policy formulation and decision making processes of the state, through the planning system. The formulation of national, regional and structure plan policy for new settlements is analysed, together with the decisions taken on individual proposals, within a framework provided by existing theoretical and empirical studies on the nature of the policy and decision making processes. The other significant focus of the research is on the private sector land development process, especially on the residential development process, and on the nature and structure of the development industry.

The research seeks to address a number of key issues, through an approach which, whilst focusing on the main decision agents in the new settlement development process, sees their role, behaviour and power as being structured by wider social relations. The interactions between key "actors" are analysed in illuminating and explaining the wider process of new settlement promoting and relating this to the changing nature of the power relations centred around the land use planning system. This analysis of the new settlement "phenomenon" adds to existing knowledge of the policy formulation process and of the decision making process within land use planning, of the land development process and the behaviour of housebuilders, and of the interactions between the two. It also seeks to contribute to the debate about the changing form and style of land use planning over the past decade.
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PART ONE
SETTING THE CONTEXT
CHAPTER 1

A DECADE OF CHANGE? -
THE RESEARCH PROBLEM
INTRODUCTION

The period from 1980 to 1991 has been one of considerable change both within the planning system, and in relations between the state (local and central) and the private sector. This chapter briefly charts some of these changes, and seeks to set the context for the analysis of the new settlement phenomenon that follows. It begins by looking in particular at changes in the planning system, in relations between the local and central state, and in relations between the local state and the private sector. These changes can be seen as broadly leading to the predominance of private sector interests in the planning system, and thereby forming part of the necessary conditions for the rise of the private sector new settlement in the early 1980s. It then highlights the key research issues or themes in this thesis, and indicates the importance of an analysis of new settlements in addressing these issues.

A SHIFT TOWARDS A DEVELOPER-LED PLANNING SYSTEM?

The years of the Conservative Government under Margaret Thatcher from 1979 to 1991 were characterised by a broad ideological shift. Two strands in particular can be seen as significant in the reshaping of the planning system - neo-liberalism and authoritarianism. As Thornley (1990 - page 2) suggests,

the economic liberal strand has meant that greater power has been given to development interests, while the authoritarian strand has allowed strong central control and the downgrading of local democracy and participation.

Whilst there is little doubt that significant changes have taken place, the extent of the change and its implications have been much debated within the planning profession and by academic commentators (Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989, Griffiths 1986, Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak 1988, Montgomery and Thornley 1988, Jones 1991a, Stranz 1990, Taylor 1991, Thornley 1986, 1988, 1990, 1991, Cloke 1992a, 1992b, Ambrose 1992). Some writers have suggested that the nature of planning has been fundamentally altered, whilst others see a less radical change with more traditional forms of planning continuing alongside new forms. Cloke (1992b), for example, suggests that the Thatcher years saw the rise of 'anti-planning' or the deregulation of planning. Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak (1988) point more to changes in policy and practice, rather than to a fundamental attack on the existence of a land use planning
system per se. Similarly, Hall (1988a - page 361) considers that the Government's "bark was a good deal more significant than its bite."

Griffiths (1986 - page 5) puts the changes into a wider perspective in suggesting that town planning has been deeply affected by the Thatcher government's strategy of 'restructuring for the market' cannot be in doubt. The point to emphasise is that, in the case of town planning at least, it is a process with a long history. The significance of Thatcherism has been to consolidate and legitimate the market supportive role of town planning and not (as is commonly alleged, by planners and others) to initiate it.

Brindley, Rydin and Stoker characterise the period as a decade that marked "a turning point in the history of post-war planning" and which witnessed first the fragmentation and then the remaking of planning, which is emerging from the past decade with its goals and purposes reoriented (1989 - page 2).

They identify a number of different styles of planning, based firstly on the ideological approach to market processes, and secondly on the nature of urban problems experienced by particular areas. Figure 1.1 sets out their typology of planning styles.

Such a typology is of course a simplification of complex social and political processes, of spatially perceived economic problems and of the nuances of ideology. It also says little about how the planning and policy processes are actually worked out in practice. The authors acknowledge these problems, but consider that the approach does assist in focusing on the key characteristics of the redefined or reoriented planning system that emerged during the 1980s.
**FIGURE 1.1**

**A TYPOLOGY OF PLANNING STYLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED NATURE OF URBAN PROBLEMS</th>
<th>ATTITUDE TO MARKET PROCESSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buoyant area: minor problems and buoyant market</td>
<td>MARKET CRITICAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal area: pockets of urban problems and potential market interest</td>
<td>MARKET LED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derelict area: comprehensive urban problems and depressed market</td>
<td>REGULATIVE PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TREND PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POPULAR PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEVERAGE PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PUBLIC INVESTMENT PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PRIVATE MANAGEMENT PLANNING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Market critical styles are characterised by ideology emphasising the redressing of inequalities created by the market, whilst market led styles seek to support market processes whilst correcting inefficiencies.

Source: Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989 - Table 2.1

Thornley points to the main strands of Conservative ideology and identifies a range of changes in both the principles and in the procedures of decision making resulting from the application of these ideological principles. He suggests that one of the primary aims of the reshaped planning system is to aid or facilitate the operation of the market, in that the planning system must keep up with the current trends in that market and foster and nurture them. The modification to the purpose of planning amounts to giving the developer greater freedom (Thornley 1991 - page 143)

In particular he reaches broadly similar conclusions to those of Brindley, Rydin and Stoker in detecting the fragmentation of planning, considering that "the previous universal planning system has been broken up into three different planning regimes", although suggesting that this fragmentation has continued, rather than resulted in, a reoriented planning system, as do Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (Thornley 1991 - page 24). Thornley differentiates these regimes, in much the same way as Brindley, Rydin and Stoker, by
reference to the degree to which the demands of the market are dominant, but adds the extent of democratic accountability in decision making. The three broad regimes are set out in Figure 1.2.

![FIGURE 1.2]

**PLANNING REGIMES UNDER THATCHER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF AREA</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Parks/Conservation Areas</td>
<td>Strong planning control and emphasis on environmental issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDCs/Enterprise Zones</td>
<td>Local democracy bypassed and market criteria dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rest of the country</td>
<td>Market criteria dominant, but decisions taken through the local democratic system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Thornley 1990 page 24

It is clear then that the nature of the planning system has altered, with a change in the relations between the private sector or the market and the local state. In some types of area, at least, it has been reoriented to facilitate the operation of the market. Furthermore, relations between the local and the central state have shifted more fundamentally, through a recasting of the role and functions of local government as a whole (Goodwin 1992, Shaw 1990). Power has swung from the local state to the central state (Ambrose 1992). This shift in private sector/local state and local state/central state relations, centred on the planning system, has been achieved in a variety of ways:

1. **Local planning authorities' discretion in policy making and in decision making has been reduced by greater centralisation of control in the central state.** The Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980 weakened the structure planning process (Ambrose 1992), so that the primary role of the development plan as an instrument for guiding decision making has been played down in favour of a more ad hoc form of decision taking by the central government through the appeal system. It is argued that this has favoured the development industry (Herington 1982), for as Blowers (1987) suggests
the shift from strategic to local planning is favourable to private developers who can bring direct pressure to bear on district councils responsible for development control. At the same time the simplification and greater central control exerted through the Secretary of State favours the big developers who enjoy considerable influence at national level.

So power has shifted to the private sector, and away from

the formally democratic arena of the local planning departments (whose plans must evolve through statutory public consultation procedures) to a more legalistic arena (Ambrose 1992 - page 101).

This remained true until the advent of Section 54a of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991 and the draft PPG on General Policy and Principles published in October 1991 (Department of the Environment 1991). The apparent effect of these legislative and policy shifts is to reassert the primacy of development plans, particularly district wide local plans, as the vehicle for leading development and resolving land use conflicts (Jones 1991b, 1991c). Similarly the balance of power between the public sector planning system and the market may also have shifted once again, although this remains to be demonstrated;

2 Changes to the Use Classes Order which have "weakened the sensitivity of the system" (Ambrose 1992 -page 101), and reduced local planning authorities' scope to control particular types of land use change;

3 Introduction of Enterprise Zones and Simplified Planning Zones, where the role of local planning authorities in controlling the development process has been reduced, and more power given to the centre, whilst enhancing the place of the market (Thornley 1986, Lloyd 1985, 1987, Ambrose 1992);

4 The privatisation of public sector land (South East Economic Development Stategy ND, Montgomery 1986, Kivell and McKay 1988);

5 Introduction of Urban Development Corporations and other agencies - non participatory and centrally appointed and controlled bodies, which have bypassed local planning authorities, particularly in inner city areas (Ambrose 1986, Brownill 1988, Maitland and Newman 1989, Shaw 1990);
6 Abolition of metropolitan authorities, and a consequent weakening of strategic planning in these areas;

7 Agricultural restructuring and the removal of the presumption that agricultural land should be protected from development, as part of wider proposals for farm diversification, linked to growing concerns with the environmental and financial impact of agricultural policy, particularly with the CAP, and of modern technological, intensive farming (Barlow 1988, Cloke 1992b, Flynn, Lowe and Cox 1990, Marsden and Murdoch 1990, Shucksmith 1988, 1989, Shucksmith and Winter 1990);

8 Policy statements, like the White Paper 'Lifting the Burden' (DoE 1985), which encouraged local planning authorities to adopt "a much more sympathetic and accommodating stance towards development interests" (Flynn, Lowe and Cox 1990 - page 24). Significantly, the White Paper re-emphasised and strengthened the presumption in favour of development which had been implicit in planning legislation and practice, in order to improve the efficiency of the system;

9 Housebuilding, particularly in the countryside, has been deregulated, by the introduction of the requirement for local planning authorities to ensure that there is a five year supply of land available for housing development. A number of commentators have considered the mechanics of this process, particularly joint land availability studies, their effects, and the wider implications of the shift to the apparent facilitation of housebuilding (Barlow 1990a, Cuddy and Hollingsworth 1985, DoE 1984a, Hooper 1980, 1985, Hooper, Pinch and Rogers 1988a, 1988b, McKenzie 1983, Rydin 1983a, 1983b, 1984, 1985, 1988, Shucksmith 1988, Shucksmith and Watkins 1988, 1989). In addition, there has been a special presumption in favour of the release of land for housing in the absence of an identified and available housing land supply, at least until recently (March 1992) (DoE 1992). Rydin (1983a, 1988) in particular indicates the extent to which housebuilders have become incorporated in the planning system through the mechanism of 'joint housing land availability studies'. The housebuilders' pressure group, the Housebuilders Federation (HBF), has assumed growing prominence and power, in acting on behalf of the larger production interests.
within the industry, through, inter alia, covert lobbying and overt media campaigns (Rydin 1983a, Walker 1986).

In addition, Maitland and Newman (1989) have identified a number of specific effects which these and other trends during the 1980s have had on the way the planning system is operated and managed. These include new working practices, value systems and organisational cultures and structures, and the 'marketisation' of planning "with an expansion of planning consultancies and more planning undertaken in the private sector". Newman (1991) sees some of these effects as positive, with the likelihood of more democratic, open and participatory forms of decision making.

Through the 1980's then there have been a number of significant shifts in policy, practice and ideology. Flynn, Lowe and Cox (1990), Griffiths (1986) and Healey et al (1988) provide summaries of the detailed changes to the instruments of the planning system over the whole of the post war period, but, in summary, the main changes in the past decade have been:

- control within the planning system has become more centralised;

- local planning authorities have lost some power in policy and decision making to the central state and to the private sector;

- the role of the planning system has swung to that of fostering and facilitating the operation of the market;

- the removal of the presumption against development on agricultural land, and of protection for lower grades of land;

- major housebuilders have become incorporated into the planning system through the debate about availability of land for development, and private sector housebuilding has been facilitated by the requirement for the provision of an available housing land supply;

- the role of planning authorities at county and 'regional' level has been diluted, along with regional and strategic planning.
The broad effect of these has been to cast doubt upon the efficacy of traditional views of planning and implementation as being led by the local state. However the 'ideological project' has not been pursued with equal vigour and efficacy in all areas, nor, indeed, has it been capable of such implementation. The inherent contradictions within the notions of authoritarianism and neo-liberalism, the growing level of environmental awareness and concern, and the need to placate potential opposition in the Conservative heartland in the South East in particular (Barlow 1990a, 1990b, Barlow and Savage 1986, 1987), have meant that the emergence of policy and practice in the last decade has been as much through pragmatism as through single minded pursuit of ideology. So

The Conservative Government is torn between supporting the development industry and safeguarding the interests of its supporters in the rural fringe areas..... The unenviable task of resolving the resulting conflicts has been thrown increasingly on the local authorities (Evans 1989 - page 131)

Cloke (1992b) feels that the central state has been able to juggle capital and class interests with considerable adroitness.

As both Thornley (1991) and Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) suggest, strong planning control or market critical styles of planning have continued in some areas, especially in National Parks, conservation areas, and other designated landscapes. Outside these areas, particularly in the southern half of the country, market led styles of planning have been predominant, and it is here that the competition between interests has been most marked, with the larger housebuilders confronting the planning system and conservation interests, in appeals and in the development planning process. The protection of the countryside for its own sake rather than the protection of agricultural land for production has, to some extent, strengthened rather than weakened planning control. It is planning policies and practices, rather than procedures, which have altered, for as Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak indicate

Despite some current political rhetoric, it is not the existence of a programme for managing land use change that is under fundamental challenge. Rather it is the policies pursued through the system and practices by which it operates which is being questioned. (Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak 1988 - page 10. Emphasis in original)
As policies and practices have changed, so has the role of local planning authorities, especially district councils. Districts have become 'crisis managers' (Evans 1989), as they have been increasingly called upon to deal with the conflicts arising out of the facilitation of the operation of the market, and, as structure planning and strategic planning has assumed less significance, their own development plans have increasingly had to deal with the issues of the accommodation of growth. This policy formulation process itself has become the locus for the expression of conflict between local residents and housebuilders, and between the often differing aims of the local and central state (Walker 1986).

There have been recent changes, not all post Thatcher, which have subtly altered the balance once more. The presumption in favour of housebuilding in the absence of a five year supply has been removed. Structure plans have been reprieved and the development plan system, or at least district wide local plans, have, once again, become the major material consideration (see Section 54a of the Planning and Compensation Act 1991) (Stranz 1990). Indeed this degree of apparent change in the central state's approach to the planning system led Jones (1991c - page 14) to suggest that "somewhere between 1986 and 1988, it is possible to discern a not-so-subtle shift of emphasis from deregulation towards modernisation". This point was emphasised by Sir George Young, then Minister for Housing and Planning, quoted by Nadin (1992 - page 27)

We are, I think, entering a new planning era. After a period of some uncertainty, we see planning emerging in a new light, and with a subtly changed role.

These shifts have served to reinforce the contradictions and paradoxes of the past decade, and to reassert or reorient the role of local planning authorities (but mainly district, rather than, county planning authorities). District councils have, or are likely to assume, more power vis a vis counties and the private sector, and so to have a greater role in directing and shaping growth.
NEGLECTED RESEARCH ISSUES - THE KEY THEMES

There has, then, been a considerable body of work that has emerged over the past ten years or so concerned with an analysis of the relationships between the private sector and the state, and between the local and national state, as worked out through the planning system, and with particular aspects of these relationships, including the land development process. Healey et. al. (1988), Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989), Thornley (1991) and Cloke (1992a) deal in detail with these changing relations in the urban planning system, and with the wider relationships within the state. Ball (1983, 1988), Rydin (1985, 1986), Bramley (1989) and Lambert (1990) have focused on housebuilders and the construction industry in particular, examining how changes in the structure of the industry have influenced relations with the land use planning system and with the state. More spatially directed work on the playing out of conflicting interests during the last decade has focused on Central Berkshire (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986, Short, Witt and Fleming 1987, Barlow 1990a, and Barlow and Savage 1986, 1987). Barlow in particular has extended the analysis to international comparisons with boom regions in France and Sweden (Barlow 1990b, Barlow and King 1991), and to an examination of the effects of different forms of housing provision systems (Barlow 1989a, Duncan 1989).


A number of studies, including Healey (1986a, 1986b), Healey, Davis, Wood and Elson (1982), Healey, McNamara, Doak and Elson (1985) and Davies, Edwards and Rowley (1986a, 1986b) have considered the role and implementation of development plans.

However few studies bring all these themes together by examining particular spatial contexts, particular development plan and decision making processes, and specific forms of urban development. There is a need to focus on the working out of these relationships in particular arenas. In particular it is necessary to consider the interplay of actors in the formulation of development plan policies and the impact of state planning.
on developer behaviour. Few studies have addressed the effects of the planning system on decisions to initiate particular forms of development, or on the process of the implementation of that development.

The key research issues which this study seeks to illuminate are

1. **Relations between the state and the private sector** - clearly relations between particular development interests and the local state have shifted, and the balance of power has swung towards the private sector. Further evidence is however required of the extent to which this has been the case. Moreover, the full implications of the contradictions and conflicting interests inherent in the reoriented planning system remain to be uncovered. Planning has become fragmented, and market dominant forms of planning have characterised certain geographical contexts. Although certain work using case studies of particular areas has suggested how this fragmentation has been played out in practice (see especially Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989, and Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak 1988), further analysis is needed in a wider range of contexts to explore the implications of the shifts.

2. **The effects of the planning system on the private sector development process** - it is not coincidental that the 1980s were marked by a considerable wave of proposals for large scale residential or mixed schemes on greenfield sites, either on the edge of existing settlements or some distance away from them, promoted and comprehensively planned by private sector development interests. Indeed, the broad ideological, policy, state/market relations and legislative shifts that have taken place, coupled with economic restructuring, population shifts and a booming economy in certain localities, provide the conditions for new settlement promotion by the private sector. There had been proposals for new settlements before the 1980s, and indeed, as Chapter 4 shows, not only were some built by the private sector in the 1970s, but the concept of new settlements or new towns has formed a fundamental cornerstone of British planning up to the 1970s. However, the last ten years or so have been unique for the scale and number of proposals put forward by the private sector.

An analysis of new settlement promotion in the 1980s and the early 1990s can help to throw more light on the significance and effects of the wider changes, particularly in the relations between the local and the central state, and between the state itself and the
private sector. In particular, analysis of the interactions between the state and the private sector in the production of new settlements, that is the reciprocal and iterative effects of the promotion of new settlement schemes on state action and on the form and nature of new settlements, can address the key elements of change in the decade.

NEW SETTLEMENTS AS THE KEY FOCUS

New settlements are significant as specific forms of urban development, promoted within specific geographical localities; as development promoted by specific interests or fractions of capital; and in having particular locational or site characteristics, that is, normally, a greenfield, countryside location. In addition, this very specificity has been recognised by the central and local state in detailed forms of policy statements. They have therefore been singled out as distinct development types warranting specific policy advice, in much the same way as out-of-town and regional shopping centres, or development on redundant hospital sites in the green belt. They merit examination, in themselves, as an example of large scale urban development, and for the conjunction of policy, development process and ideological issues that they represent.

So, the struggle over new settlements during the past decade illustrates and brings together a number of critical themes running through discussions of changing state/private sector relations mediated through the planning system. As Cloke (1992b- page 284) suggests

the potential keystone of deregulatory planning in these areas (the 'golden horn') has, however, involved the idea of new settlements, which represent a really interesting example of commodifying housing production to meet particular consumptive and political needs (emphasis in original - words in brackets added)

In a sense, new settlements can be seen as the epitome of the various ideals and issues that characterise the Conservative decade.

First, an analysis of the process of structure plan policy formulation for new settlements and of the decision making process in relation to individual new settlement proposals in a variety of spatial contexts can aid in the examination of the nature of the shift of power from the local state to both the central state and to the private sector development industry. It can also indicate the degree to which the strategic planning process has been weakened and the extent of the rise of 'planning by appeal'.

Second, new settlement promotion has been mainly, although not solely, by large scale housebuilding production interests, and analysis of the outcome of their interactions with the planning system can illuminate the extent of the 'deregulation of housebuilding'. In addition, it can directly address the strength of large scale housebuilding capital, and the degree to which it has become incorporated in the planning process. Indeed, going beyond that, it is possible to consider the extent to which the interests of housebuilders have become linked with those of local planning authorities, in implementing or realising the implementation of development plans.

Third, the essentially countryside nature of new settlements reflects the effects of the freeing of agricultural land for development, and the attempts to resolve the conflict between meeting the need for development and the protection of the environment that has been at the heart of popular debate about planning over the last decade.

Fourth, although, as Cloke (1992b - page 283) rightly suggests, new settlements represent the radical commodification of the countryside, and especially the countryside of the prosperous "rural Britain from Cornwall to Norfolk", it is perhaps inaccurate to suggest that this commodification, and indeed the pressure for new settlements that is its outcome, is limited only to the South. The conditions of population movement and growth, attractive landscapes, large scale housing producers and planning authorities pressured to facilitate the market certainly were greatest in the South East, and it is here that the new settlement waves of the 1980s had their genesis. However, private sector new settlement proposals and new settlement policies in development plans have come forward outside the South. An analysis of the spatial variation in new settlement promotion and in state responses can inform the debate on the geographical specificity of different styles or regimes of planning.

Finally, the localised "battle over new settlements" (Thornley 1990 - page 24), illustrates the juggling of interests, policy and ideology that has taken place over the last decade. For, as Thornley suggests, the fragmentation of the planning system, and the emergence of different styles or regimes of planning, failed to deal successfully with new settlements, as "the effect of development on residents' lifestyles in the shire counties threatened traditional Conservative support " (Thornley 1990 - page 24).

Herington (1989a - page 112) considers that the example of Tillingham Hall and of private new settlements in general
nicely demonstrates the emerging geographical conflicts created by Britain's changing planning process. Wealth-creation goals associated with the changing political economy are ranged against the social and environmental concerns of the State. In this case, the 'status quo' is protected. But should it be? and for how long?

The new settlements 'battle' therefore points to the contradictions inherent in Conservative ideology, and to the pragmatism that essentially characterised the working out of conflicts between the ideological project, environmental protection, facilitation of development and the maintenance of political support.

CONCLUSIONS

New settlements have received comparatively little detailed academic consideration over the last decade. It is possible to divide the literature into four main groups

1 Generalised accounts of the place of new settlements within the changing planning and development processes, such as those provided by, inter alia, Blunden and Curry (1988), Herington (1989a), and Cloke (1992b);

2 The largely polemical debate on the merits or otherwise of private new settlements, and on the appropriate mechanisms for their promotion and development (to which I refer in Chapter 5);

3 Discussions or descriptions of particular proposals;

4 More detailed work on particular aspects of new settlement development, including community provision, social impact and community formation, the development process and planning policy responses.

The amount of detailed work has been fairly limited. First, Martin Elson (1989, 1990, 1991) has examined the provision of community and recreation facilities in large new housing developments, including new settlements, and the growing importance of planning gain packages. Second, the provision of social housing in new settlements has been considered by Welsh (1990). Third, Gill (1990), Owen (1991, 1992a, 1992b) and the New Settlements Research Group (1992) have considered social and community

The only major study of the interaction centred around new settlements between the private sector development process and the development planning process, in a specific spatial context, is that of Fisher (1990), who looked at the structure planning process in Cambridgeshire. Chome (1990) takes a wider view, and attempts to relate private sector new settlement activity to the emerging structure plan policy framework. Practical examples of local plan approaches to new settlement policy and promotion are discussed by David Lock (1990b), Wilcox (1990), Elliott (1992), and Hawkes (1992).

The research funded by the DoE on new settlements, which has considered the pressure for urban development, alternative and sustainable ways of accommodating this pressure, the costs and benefits of new settlements, policy responses and the appropriate policy mechanisms for delivery, has yet to report. Lock and Breheny (1992) briefly outline some of the main findings, which bring together a number of the themes addressed here, but in the context of recommendations for best practice, rather than an account of the interactions that have occurred. Lastly, Nigel Moor (1990, 1991) has provided fairly wide-ranging overviews of new settlement activity in the later years of the study period, with useful summaries of current private sector schemes and of the evolving policy approach and context at national and structure plan level.

There is then a need for a more detailed account of private new settlements as an example of the outworking of the changing central state/local state, and state/market relations, as mediated through the planning system, during the 1980s and early 1990s. The remainder of this thesis seeks to provide that account.
CHAPTER 2

RESEARCH AIMS AND METHODS
INTRODUCTION

This chapter develops in more detail the central research aims of this study, which have been outlined in the previous Chapter. It then goes on to describe and justify the research approaches and methods that have been adopted. Finally, the organisation of this thesis is related to the unfolding of the arguments and issues.

FOCUS AND AIMS OF THE STUDY

The General Focus

As is clear from Chapter One, the general focus of this study is on the changing nature of state/market relations as mediated through the planning system over the last decade or so, and as exemplified in the arena of the 'struggle' over private new settlements. The main proposition is that the effect of the shift in the nature of these relations has been to enhance the role of the private sector both in the planning system and in the process of urban development. However this has not been the case uniformly, and so there exists a variety of different planning styles or regimes, within and between specific areas. Detailed analysis of the interactions between competing interests in the arena of new settlement promotion and development can provide valuable insights into the precise nature of these shifting relations in specific geographical milieux and more generally, and so can illuminate changing power relations.

Detailed Aims

In order to uncover these changing power relations within and around the planning system, it is necessary to highlight key interests and to consider particular arenas where these interests interact. In particular, attention must be focused on

- the policy formulation process at a variety of levels, including the central state (government circulars and PPGs for example), and the local state, both at county (Structure Plan preparation) and district (Local Plan preparation) levels. The policy formulation process, at least in relation to Structure and Local Plans, gives competing interests an opportunity to influence outcomes and to seek to attain favourable policy climates. Moreover it reflects and directly demonstrates changing roles and power within the planning system;
• **the decision making process on specific proposals**, that is the process whereby planning applications and appeals are determined. This process represents, in part at least, the working out or implementation of policy, as well as the weighing of more detailed planning considerations, and similarly illustrates how patterns of influence shift;

• **the land development process, and, more specifically, the new settlement development process.** Just as the planning system has been affected by radical shifts over the past ten years, so has the private sector development process, in part as a response to these shifts (Healey 1991a, 1991b, Healey and Barrett 1990). The process of new settlement promotion itself is an illustration of the changing nature of the development process, and of the relative influence of the market in relation to the regulatory devices employed by the state;

• **the interactions between these processes**, highlighting the precise roles, power and influence of key actors or decision agents in these processes. In addition, more specific forms of interaction, including conflict, negotiation and bargaining, as well as the exertion or attempted exertion of influence, have a significant role.

These particular 'arenas' form the main loci for the research. The key research aims are concerned with the analysis of these 'arenas'.

**Key Research Aims**

This study addresses three key research aims:

**Key Research Aim 1**

To determine the conditions leading to, and necessary for, new settlement production - involving an analysis of the particular configuration of social relations, including conflicts and contradictions, between the various levels or forms of the state (as manifest in the planning system), and between the state and the private sector (as manifest in the variety of agencies in the development industry).
The specific areas of analysis which are explored to meet this aim are

A  **analysis of the structure of the development industry**, and in particular the housebuilding sector (which is dominant in new settlement promotion), and the impact of external and internal influences on its strategies and development aspirations (undertaken in Chapters 11 and 12);

B  **analysis of the response of the state through the planning system** - an examination of the national and local state framework, of the policy response to pressure for new settlements, of the implementation of policy and of decision making. This involves a consideration also of the contradictions and conflicts inherent in the state's response at different levels, and between, and within, the planning system, and the conflicting ideologies and wider national government policies (Chapters 6 to 10);

C  **analysis of the effect of the actions of other institutions, actors and decision agents on the climate for new settlement production** (mainly in Chapters 10 and 11).

**Key Research Aim 2**

To examine the roles, relative power and influence, interrelationships, and impact of key agencies or actors in the new settlement development process, taking the analysis further in particular case studies to throw more light on these relationships, in specific geographical areas.

The specific areas of analysis are

A  **analysis of central state policy development and decision making**, and the impact of this on policy and decision responses at a more local level (Chapters 6, 7 and 8);
B analysis of local state policy development and decision making, the effects of central state ideology, policy and decisions and the response of local planning authorities to private sector new settlement promotion (through general and more specific case studies) (in Chapters 6, 9 and 10);

C analysis of developer behaviour in promoting and producing new settlements, and of the way in which this affects, and is affected by, the actions of other interests (Chapters 11 and 12);

D analysis of other actors in the process, and their impact on the promotion, and the form and content of new settlement schemes (in the context of most Chapters).

Key Research Aim 3

To determine the extent to which the balance of power within the planning system has shifted to the private sector during the last decade.

A This involves a synthesis and drawing together of the previous analysis, set against a view of the predominance of particular interests at the beginning of the study period (in the concluding Chapter).

THEORETICAL APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Theoretical approach

Since this study is concerned with uncovering relations and interactions between diverse institutions and groups, and moreover with relations that are in part conflictual, the theoretical perspective which is adopted is one based on an examination of the political economy of new settlement production. This involves the analysis of institutions and agencies in terms of their relative power and of the conflict between them. So the analysis is concerned with the different goals, ideologies and relative power of the institutions and actors involved in the new settlement development process as a whole and in the interactions centred around the planning system, and of the constraints that they
impose on the actions of others (Healey and Barrett 1990, Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak 1988).

This analysis will, however, at various points as it unfolds be set within a wider framework that relates power and conflict in the processes of policy formulation, decision making and development in relation to new settlements to the wider processes which structure relations in and around the planning system, and which structure the social formation. The adoption of this approach makes it possible to add to existing middle range theory to link largely descriptive knowledge about substantive issues to higher order theory about structuring processes (Healey 1986c).

Particular attention is directed to those actors that are considered, from a synthesis of current understanding, to be of key importance in the processes under study. The role of other actors is explored in the context of the key interactions centred around the main actors. Figure 2.1 outlines the key or main actors and other, more secondary agencies. Each 'set' of actors is grouped into those which either form part of, or are likely to be allied to, the state or 'capital'.

**FIGURE 2.1**

**KEY AGENCIES IN THE NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CAPITAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAIN ACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central state</td>
<td>Promoters/developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Planning Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Planning Authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECONDARY ACTORS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate agencies</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Pressure Groups</td>
<td>Financial Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pressure Groups</td>
<td>Design Professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Councils</td>
<td>National Pressure Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Consultants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These groupings suggest simple alliances and direct or subservient relations, but the actual situation, in terms of the type of relations, is, of course, more complex than is suggested in the diagram. There are not necessarily simple alliances between different interests along the lines indicated, and alliances that are formed may shift over time (Evans 1989, Short, Fleming, Witt 1986). However, the key interactions forming the focus of study are those between the central and local state and the developers, influenced by, and within the context of, interactions with and between the 'secondary' actors. Some of these 'secondary' actors may be more important than others in particular cases. However the importance of these interactions and of these 'secondary' actors remains to be demonstrated.

It will be evident from the discussion so far that the central state could be seen as synonymous with central government, and the local state as synonymous with local planning authorities. However, neither the central nor the local state is monolithic, as political and other interests may diverge, and differ between different groups of actors within the central or local state. Indeed this will emerge from the later analysis in a number of instances.

Although it was earlier argued that much of the 1980s can be characterised as demonstrating a degree of conflict between the central state and the local state, and between the latter and the market or developers, it may also possible to explain some of the interaction as involving corporatism or a process of interest mediation and policy negotiation between the state and interest organisations, particularly those representing the development industry. The implementation of policy objectives, both at a central and local level, may require the collaboration of particular interest groups, and of course these may also be given an opportunity to participate in the policy making process itself. Laffin (1986) puts forward the idea of a policy community, a relatively small group, which, in land use planning, may include central government civil servants (the DoE and its regional offices), local government officers and politicians, and representatives from interest groups. Such a policy community "will be the source of policy ideas and will determine what constitutes legitimate knowledge in this policy area" (Evans 1993 - page 13). The idea is a particularly useful one in the context of this study, both purely in terms of policy generation for new settlements and in relation to the slightly broader notion of the formulation of design and implementation concepts.

The general theoretical starting point is therefore based on the notion of competing interests in the development and policy formulation processes, overlaid with the idea of the
potential incorporation of particular interests in these processes. The emphasis is on an analysis of the processes

**Research Methods**

**Overall approach**

The overall scope of the research, and in particular the gathering of data and evidence on private new settlements, has been limited in three main areas.

1. **in geographical terms**, the study deals only with England and Wales, partly because differences in the planning system in the rest of the UK make direct comparisons rather more difficult, and partly simply to maintain a coherent and manageable focus. Work on themes relevant to the study in areas outside the UK has, of course, been referred to where appropriate, particularly in relation to studies of the private sector development process in North America, which has some parallels in relation to large scale residential development with the UK;

2. **temporally to the period between 1980 and early 1992**, although analysis of the private sector new settlement development process prior to this period is used as a means of providing ideas and evidence to inform subsequent analysis of that process during the study period;

3. **to a consideration of those forms of urban development which accord with the definition of new settlements outlined in Chapter 3**. Again, the literature dealing with the residential development process as whole has been used to provide evidence, and to aid in explanation of the more specific process of new settlement development.

The study as a whole combines a number of different but complementary research strategies. In general terms a 'hierarchical' approach has been adopted to the collection of data and other evidence with which to analyse inter agent activity. A wide ranging analysis of the research issues preceded more detailed, and focused, study through a series of case studies in specific geographical and policy contexts. As the research process is iterative, the initial ideas and explanations that were derived from the general review were refined and then tested in the specific case studies of particular contexts.
In more detail, the first, broad element of the methodology has been the collection of data and information on new settlement schemes throughout England and Wales, complemented by an analysis of the strategic planning context, of the policy formulation process (particularly in relation to Structure Plan review and the preparation of local plans), and of the development process of individual new settlement schemes. Principal sources of information for this phase were documentary information supplemented by interviews and questionnaires where appropriate.

**Case studies**

Case studies of specific geographical areas and specific contexts formed the second element, and second phase, of the research methodology. The choice of this research method followed directly from the nature of the study, since case studies are particularly useful for considering the questions of 'how' or 'why' which are central to this study (Yin 1984). Moreover, the essence of a case study approach is that it is capable of generalisation to theoretical propositions and therefore can be used to advance broader theory, rather than being representative of a wider population, as in other forms of more statistically based research. In addition of course, they can provide substantive evidence on the key processes and issues in particular contexts, for, as Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989 - page 26) indicate, case studies allow in-depth analysis "of the interaction between agents that constitutes planning practice", and they are the most appropriate method of studying processes. The studies have been selected following a replication, rather than a sampling, logic, and so are not representative of the wider 'population' of new settlement proposals.

The studies focus on particular counties since it is evident that many of the interactions between the state and the market have taken place in the forum of the development planning process, especially in Structure Plan production and review, or in the context of decisions made in the light of current or emerging policies. Since Structure Plans are (generally) prepared for single counties this particular framework provides a 'real life' context for examining the key research issues. So by analysing the processes of new settlement promotion and production, and of policy formulation and implementation, within specific counties, it is possible to uncover the key interactions and relationships between actors, and, from these, to generalise to wider theory concerning the central themes of the study.
The material from these studies has been integrated into the more general analysis, rather than treating each in isolation, thereby ensuring greater coherence and continuity in the text. This approach also enables the general analysis to be more detailed and specific than would otherwise be the case. In this way, then the research methodology is not a 'true' case study approach, relying only on evidence from the studies, since the analysis also uses evidence from the wider ranging review.

The counties chosen for case study are

Cambridgeshire;
Leicestershire;
Hereford and Worcester.

As I have indicated these areas were not chosen as being representative of the wider 'population' of contexts where struggles centred around new settlements have taken place, but on the basis of the contribution they might make to understanding the key interactions and processes, and to wider theory about these issues. Each of the areas chosen can be seen as embodying a different balance of interests. The detailed justification for the choice of each county is

1 Cambridgeshire - a county on the fringe of the South East where, according to Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989), a market-critical style of planning ('regulative planning') is still in evidence, and where private sector pressure for new settlements has been greatest. It was also the first county to propose a new settlement in a review of its structure plan, later modified by the Secretary of State. There has then been a whole range of interactions between the state (both national and local, and including county and districts) and the market (a diversity of private sector development interests), in a variety of arenas (including structure plan preparation, local plan preparation, individual planning applications, negotiations over planning gain packages, local inquiries and ministerial decisions). The range, diversity and longevity of the processes in the county suggest that it is a particularly interesting and fertile area for study.
Leicestershire - in the East Midlands, where development pressures were less intense than the South East or East Anglia. There were a significant number of new settlement schemes although the development plan framework made no provision for them. It did not address this pressure until towards the end of the study period. In contrast to Cambridgeshire where the new settlement schemes came forward through the policy process, the schemes in Leicestershire can be characterised as a challenge to that process. Here also the range of interactions is wide and varied, and particularly interesting are several schemes that have seemingly led rather than followed the development plan process. It may be characterised as market-led, rather than plan-led as in Cambridgeshire.

Hereford and Worcester - The form of interaction and conflict between the national and local state in Hereford and Worcester is as interesting and worth examination, as the state/capital interactions. Here there was indeed a 'struggle' around the formulation of policy for new settlements. The interests of the central state (the Secretary of State) and of the private sector (a number of housebuilders who had put forward new settlement schemes) conflicted with those of the local state (the county council), although there was also conflict within the local state (between the county and districts, and between officers and members). The outcome of the conflict was the insertion in the structure plan of a policy proposing consideration of a new settlement. In bald terms the planning process here can be seen as being central state-led.

The object then has been to choose a variety of spatial contexts, where planning objectives, issues, processes and outcomes have been different, and where the balance of power appears to be different as well.

Research Strategies

Two research strategies have been used to address the main research issues and seek to understand and explain the interactions and relationships between actors in the development process, both in the wide ranging review and in the more specific case studies. These can be categorised as descriptive and analytical or explanatory as follows:-
1 Descriptive

Evidence has been gathered to address such questions as

Where is new settlement promotion taking place?
What types of new settlements are being promoted?
What is the scale of new settlement promotion in particular areas?
Which agencies are responsible for new settlement promotion?
Where have policies to deal with new settlements been formulated?
What are the type and content of the policy framework?
What decisions have been made on new settlement proposals?
What are the reasons for the decisions and by who were they made?

The research strategies and sources of evidence that have been used to examine these issues are

A **documentary** - study of a wide and disparate range of available sources of information, including journals and the specialised planning and construction press; national and local press; local planning authority policy documents, committee and other reports; regional and national policy guidance; a wide range of promotional literature for individual new settlement schemes;

B **surveys of planning authorities** - looking at existing and prospective policy frameworks and stances, and at the substantive issues involved in individual counties or districts, and of developers/promoters, looking at what firms or other agencies are involved in new settlement promotion and production, where they are involved and in what precise way;

C **interviews** - with representatives of local planning authorities, developers/promoters and agents;

D **case studies** of new settlement activity in particular geographical locations.
2 Analytical or Explanatory

here the research questions include

Why are new settlements being proposed in specific geographical locations?
Why have particular schemes been formulated?
How have particular schemes been formulated?
How have specific policy responses been formulated?
Why have specific policy responses been formulated?
What factors underlie the policy responses formulated?
What agencies have held the balance of power and influence between particular interests?
How has this balance been resolved?

The research strategies and sources of information used to examine these issues are broadly similar to those noted above, but they are rather more specific and include:

A questionnaire surveys of planning authorities and developers/promoters;
B interviews - a considerable number of semi-structured interviews with planning authorities, developers/promoters and agents;
C case studies in particular contexts and geographical areas, including more detailed and focused forms of A and B.

Research Contribution

This study is essentially an examination of the interactions of key agencies or actors in the process of new settlement promotion and production and in the planning process. It can make a contribution to the body of existing empirical and theoretical knowledge about

A the policy formulation and implementation process at national and county (Structure Plan) level;
B the changing nature of planning over the past 10 - 12 years, including the changing relationship between the public and private sectors, and between the central and local state, and changing styles or modes of planning in response to the evolving form of centre/local and state/market relations;

C the residential development process, and changes in that process, and in the housebuilding sector and in the role of other agents in the development industry, as a response to the wider ideological and practical shifts of the last decade or so;

and more generally

D mediating middle range theory that bridges empirical studies and higher level theory on social processes (Barrett and Healey 1985, Healey 1986c).

ARRANGEMENT OF THESIS

The third Chapter of this Part of the thesis outlines the precise nature of new settlements, and begins the conceptualisation of their development process by reviewing approaches to the categorisation of new settlements.

Part Two develops the analysis of the interplay of interests in the new settlement development process by drawing out critical relationships from a review of the development processes of new settlements in the twentieth century, and in particular in the post-war period upto the late 1970s. It then focuses on the study period and describes, and analyses, the new settlement schemes of this period, outlining their scale, spatial distribution, their promoters and the major characteristics of the schemes. It also examines the contention centred around new settlements through an analysis of the new settlement debate - the arguments for and against privately developed new settlements.

Part Three deals with the formulation of policy for new settlements, and undertakes a detailed examination of the way in which policy for new settlements has been formulated and how this has shifted over the study period. Policy formulation at national, regional, structure plan and local plan level is addressed, by means of case studies and by relating it to the significant theoretical issues.
Part Four considers the development process and the way in which the private sector has interacted with the state in the planning system, both in policy formulation and in implementation. It begins by considering the private sector development process, reviewing the literature on the residential development process in particular, and highlights those models that are appropriate to an analysis of new settlement development. This Part then looks at the structure of the UK housebuilding industry, and at the private new settlement developers, as actors in the development process. It then goes on to address the specificity of the new settlement development process, before considering the reasons for private sector involvement in new settlement promotion.

Part Five draws the thesis to a conclusion by reviewing the critical interactions between the private sector and the state in the new settlement development process, considering the points at which the private development process intersects with the policy formulation process and with the wider planning process. Finally it draws out the main conclusions and lessons of the study, firstly for the theoretical debate and for academic research, and, secondly, for planning practice in the form, content, etc. of policy for new settlements, and for the process by which such policy is formulated.
CHAPTER 3

CONCEPTUALISING APPROACHES TO NEW SETTLEMENTS - SOME CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS
INTRODUCTION

The previous Chapters have justified this study's focus on private new settlements as a particular form of urban development to illustrate the competition of interests centred around urban development in the 'Thatcher years'.

However, before embarking on this analysis, it is necessary to establish the nature of this particular form of urban development, first, by setting out the definition of new settlements used in this thesis, and, second, by understanding the precise characteristics of private new settlements, through a review of existing work on classifications and typologies of new settlement types. This will also begin to draw out approaches to conceptualising the processes of new settlement promotion and development, thereby highlighting critical issues, relations and actors that can inform the later, more detailed analysis.

TOWARDS A DEFINITION OF NEW SETTLEMENTS

Discussion of Some Terms

A wide range of different terms have been used in the literature to describe new urban settlements. As Golany points out, writing mainly in the context of new settlements in the USA,

In recent decades the terms new town, new community, new town in-town, regional growth centre, satellite town and others have been used interchangeably (Golany 1976 - page 22).

In the specifically British context, the terms used have been rather different, and include

- new towns;
- new country towns;
- new market towns;
- new villages
- new communities;
- new townships.
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Each of these has slightly different connotations regarding their size, urban form and the nature of their social relations. The term new settlement is preferred in this study as a valueless or neutral term devoid of the embodied associations or ideals which housebuilding capital has sought to exploit through the label or name attached to a particular new settlement. Other terms are used only where they have been used by a scheme's promoter or by a Local Planning Authority.

Cloke (1992b) argues that new settlements can be seen as part of a wider process of the commodification of housing production and of the countryside. In this, the terms used to describe new urban forms assume considerable symbolic importance, and, as Golany suggests, this is not limited to the UK context.

Some planners, designers, developers and others have used the words to suit their own purposes. Because the term new town connotes innovation, private developers have exploited it for commercial purposes (Golany 1976 - page 22).

In the UK, promoters of new settlements have tended to use those terms, especially 'new villages' or 'new country towns', which carry the appropriate imagery. One example from many will suffice to indicate the content of this imagery. The Church Commissioners, in promoting a new village in the Greater York area, see "the essential characteristics of a new village environment" as including

- a cohesive built form based on traditional focal buildings

- a sense of place and community

- contact with the countryside (Church Commissioners 1991).

Chome points to this relationship between the terms used to describe new urban settlements and the creation of image, for

Some new settlement developers have generally uncritically used the terms without defining them, often for very good reasons, as 'town' has particular urban connotations that may be undesirable, whilst 'village' is altogether more acceptable and evokes the right kind of image, particularly for the house buyer (Chome 1990 - page 10).
Indeed, as Merrett (1984) suggests, 'new village' is used to "conjure up disarming visions of rural tranquillity". A distinction can therefore be drawn between the label given to new urban settlements in the USA and in the UK. Developers in the UK have eschewed the term 'new town', largely because the image that this term creates is not, as it may be in the USA, one of innovation, but one associated with the negative aspects of the state new towns programme. 'New village' or 'new country town' are much more appropriate labels for those who seek to create and market a lifestyle and a total environment, and to fill a specific niche in the housing market (Ball 1983, Crouch 1985, Williams 1989, Cloke 1992b).

New settlement defined

The definition of a new urban settlement used in this thesis was first set out in Amos (1988), although it has subsequently been expanded. A new settlement is either

a free-standing urban development that contains a significant element of residential development, although it may also contain elements of retail, commercial or industrial development as well, with some provision of services (including social, leisure, health, educational or welfare facilities) and normally some local employment, on a site in the countryside. The site may be a greenfield site, a site with a small number of existing buildings or one that has been developed in some other way (a quarry or a commercial forestry, for example). The development is planned and designed in a comprehensive manner either by a single developer or by a consortium of developers;

or

a substantial expansion of an existing settlement, which adds more than 50% to the existing dwelling stock, and which is carried out in a comprehensive manner according to a master plan. Again the expansion may be largely residential or more mixed with other forms of urban development, and providing some additional social, leisure, health, education or welfare facilities, and some degree of local employment.

The second of these, radical expansions of existing settlements, is rather more problematic than the first, as the precise extent of the additional residential and other development that transforms an existing settlement into a new settlement is open to question (Goss 1992). The figure of an addition of at least 50% of the existing housing stock is used here, although an earlier definition suggested 70%, and this threshold finds some
support elsewhere (Amos 1988, Lock and Breheny 1992). The distinguishing notion is that the expansion transforms the existing settlement in a short period and in a way that is tantamount to the creation of a new settlement. The most important factors are that, firstly, the expansion is planned, co-ordinated, and implemented in a coherent manner, not necessarily by the same development agency, but by agencies working to a single agreed plan, and secondly, that the development involves more than the provision of dwellings. It must also involve "new community, educational and health services" (Goss 1992 - page 5), and possibly the provision of local employment.

Corden (1977 - pages 15 & 16) provides a similar definition of new towns or planned communities in the USA:

any relatively autonomous community of limited population size planned under the direction of a single entrepreneur or development agency as a total unit which contains housing, community services, and amenities, as well as employment adequate to support a socially and economically diverse population.

She goes on to indicate that a new town can be distinguished from other forms of settlement by "the extent of its planning, and the length of time involved in the development process, its economic base, and the range of its facilities and services" (Corden 1977 - page 16). Her definition does not, however, contain any reference to the precise urban form that a planned community may take, so that it is not clear, for example, whether "relatively autonomous" applies to the physical location or form, or to the political status of the settlement. The definition also raises the question of population diversity ("socially and economically diverse population"), which may be a possible aim of the development agency rather than a criterion differentiating the settlement from other forms of urban development. On the whole it is perhaps more appropriate as a definition of a new town developed by a public rather than a private development agency where there is a specific policy objective to create some degree of social balance.

The definition put forward by the author attempts to avoid such policy related issues, and to cover most forms of new settlement, irrespective of the nature of the development agency. These issues are considered in more detail in the development of new urban settlement typologies below.
From these two definitions of new settlements, it is possible to isolate the main characteristics of new settlements, and in particular those features that mark them out as distinct forms of urban development:

- free-standing;
- on a site in the countryside;
- residential development but with an economic base, and a range of facilities and services;
- planned and designed in a comprehensive manner;
- promoted by the private sector;
- a lengthy development process.

Some of these characteristics also describe the development process and the development agencies involved, which begins to move the analysis into a consideration of processes rather than just form.

Exclusion from the definition - specialised new settlements

Some forms of new urban development, which might otherwise meet the definition adopted here, are excluded from the analysis, because of their very specialised nature (leisure-related new settlements or those for the elderly), because of the peculiar form of economic relations that govern their development (company towns), or because of their urban form (urban villages).

New settlements specifically designed for the elderly may be subdivided into retirement villages or continuing care villages (Williams 1989). The former provide a "link between conventional housing and retirement living through the provision of a range of on-site leisure facilities" (Williams 1989 - page 18). Continuing care villages, an American concept beginning to emerge in this country, provide care and a range of communal and commercial facilities, usually with medical facilities like a nursing home, for between 300 and 350 elderly people (Martin 1990). Although they provide residential development, entry is restricted (by age), the range of services is specialised, and they are promoted by specialist forms of capital.

Leisure related new settlements include holiday villages and golf villages. The Henley Centre (ND - page 27) outlines the main characteristics of holiday villages as "high quality (rented) accommodation in lodges or villas, usually in landscaped woodland or water settings, together with extensive indoor and outdoor leisure facilities". Golf vil-
lages can be distinguished from other new settlements that include a golf course, as the golfing facilities are a major element of the scheme rather than being subsidiary to the main development. Like continuing care villages, golf villages have their origins in the USA, although they are also found in Spain and elsewhere, and "typically these comprise "golf lodges", set in woodland located between fairways and used on a time share basis" (Walton 1991 - page 21). The residential element of leisure related new settlements is essentially for let, on a short term basis, rather than for owner occupation.

The Company Town is promoted by a single company to house the workers in its employment, and is more characteristic of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, although Darley (1978a, ND) charts a number developed in the 1930's. Later examples include the villages built by the Forestry Commission in the Scottish Highlands and elsewhere in the period between 1945 and 1980 (Wonders 1990). This type of new settlement is not characteristic of current new settlement promotion in the UK, although there are recent examples in North America, described by Gill (1990) and Dauncey (1991).

The urban village, or Structured Planned Urban Development, shares many of the characteristics of the new settlement, including mixed land use, a balance of housing and employment, long term development, provision of facilities and services, promotion by the private sector, comprehensive planning through a master plan and design codes, and a size range of 1,200 to 2,000 dwellings (3,000 to 5,000 population) (Aldous 1992). It is largely a concept designed for the improvement of urban areas, for, of the situations where Aldous (1992) suggests urban villages might be appropriate (brown land, suburban and small urban sites), most are essentially urban rather than rural in nature. Stevenson (1992) argues that the concept is not applicable to greenfield sites, in part, because of its urban form, design and density, although Aldous considers that it might be applied here as well. Proposals of this type are excluded from the analysis, except where they relate to greenfield sites, or to edge-of-town locations (such as redundant hospitals or depots) where the major elements of the definition are met.
CONCEPTUALISING NEW SETTLEMENTS

Reference was made earlier to the comparatively little attention given to new settlements by commentators seeking to analyse changing relations in and around the planning system over the past decade. Consequently there have been few attempts at conceptualising the nature of new settlements or at producing taxonomies of new settlements or of their development process. It is important here, however, to review, in more detail, those attempts that have been made, to point to those features that are of significance in the planning and development processes, and in the way in which these processes interact. It can also aid in identifying those interests that are central to these processes.

The main features of new settlement form and development process can be drawn out from the two definitions of new settlements outlined above:

- size/scale;
- urban form (i.e. free-standing or radical expansion);
- nature of site (i.e. in the countryside);
- character or urban design;
- self containment;
- mix and scale of residential development;
- population diversity (social and economic);
- socially, demographically and economically balanced population;
- nature of economic base, including the provision of local employment;
- provision of services and facilities;
- comprehensive planning;
- comprehensive design (a master plan);
- the form of the development agency;
- co-ordination by the development agency (i.e. promoted by the private sector);
- length of development process.

Some or all of these can be used as criteria to distinguish different forms of new settlements. Most of the classifications that have been developed use only some of these criteria. The following sections discuss those new settlement taxonomies using a single factor, or a limited number of factors, before turning to a consideration of more wide ranging typologies.
Size

The size of new settlements has largely been defined by the proposed number of dwellings or the resident population. Here and in the remainder of the thesis, both population and dwelling numbers have been used. A notional dwelling occupancy of 2.5 persons has been applied, converting population to dwelling numbers, or vice versa, to allow comparisons of both parameters to be made.

In his study of the provision of recreation and community facilities in new private housing, including new settlements, Elson (1989, 1990) defines large urban developments as having more than 750 dwellings. He then goes on to distinguish a number of broad bands of urban development by the type and range of community and recreational facilities that might be expected to be provided. The size bands are

under 1,000 dwellings (up to 2,750 population);

1,000 to 2,500 dwellings (2,750 - 6,750 population);

over 5,000 dwellings (13,750 population).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID LOCK'S TAXONOMY OF NEW SETTLEMENT SIZE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SIZE IN DWELLINGS</th>
<th>OTHER FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(population in brackets)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMLET</td>
<td>UPTO 50 (125)</td>
<td>No significant employment or community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLAGE</td>
<td>50 - 1,500</td>
<td>Primary school over 750 d/hs, no significant employ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(125 - 3,750)</td>
<td>ment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRY TOWN</td>
<td>1,500 - 6,000</td>
<td>Significant employment and several schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,750 - 15,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lock 1989a, 1989b, David Lock Associates 1990a
Lock (1989b, 1989c, 1990a) considers this lower size limit of 750 dwellings to be the smallest size for a viable new settlement, with an adequate range of facilities. He has put together a definition of three new settlement types, based largely on size (although referring to other features as well), as indicated in Table 3.1.

The second major classification of new settlement size was produced by Ravetz (1991) as part of a wider framework for defining "for practical purposes, the main characteristics of any individual scheme" (see Table 3.2). There is no real agreement with Lock on the relationship between population and number of dwellings and the description of settlement types.

**TABLE 3.2**

**RAVETZ'S TAXONOMY OF NEW SETTLEMENT SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SIZE IN DWELLINGS</th>
<th>SIZE IN POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER</td>
<td>10 - 100</td>
<td>4 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMLET</td>
<td>100 - 1,000</td>
<td>40 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VILLAGE</td>
<td>1,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>400 - 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOWN</td>
<td>10,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>4,000 - 40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>40,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ravetz 1991

In discussing CDL's new village proposals, Merrett (1984 - page 14) contends that settlements "with a population equal to or in excess of 15,000 persons" are small towns rather than villages.

Lastly, and predating both Lock and Ravetz, a more 'official' definition of new settlement size and type came from the Department of the Environment in the Discussion Paper "Housing in Rural Areas: Village Housing and New Villages" issued in July 1988 (DoE 1988a). The only concrete definition was that of the "new village scale" of 200 to 1,000 dwellings (500 - 2,500 population). However it is possible, by inference, to arrive at two other benchmarks from the Discussion Paper:

- Village/Small Town - less than 5,000 population (2,000 dwellings);
Larger than Village Scale - 4,000 population upwards (1,600 dwellings)

This 'new village scale' has assumed considerable potency as a 'target' in policy formulation, being incorporated into the semantics of the new settlement debate, although it was not actually stated in formal guidance from the central state (DoE 1988b, 1989a). The 'semi-official' line of the Discussion Paper was contradicted by the Inspector holding the inquiry into the 'called-in' applications in the A45 corridor in Cambridgeshire. He expressed the view that the new settlements of 3,000 dwellings (7,500 population) were new small towns (Departments of the Environment and Transport (DoE/DTp) 1992a).

### TABLE 3.3

**NEW SETTLEMENT SIZE DEFINITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New cluster</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>DWELLINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New hamlet</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravetz new hamlet</td>
<td>100 - 1,000</td>
<td>40 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock new village</td>
<td>125 - 3,750</td>
<td>50 - 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoE new village</td>
<td>450 - 2,500</td>
<td>200 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravetz new village</td>
<td>1,000 - 10,000</td>
<td>400 - 4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elson large urban development | 1,875 | 750 |
DoE small new town | 2,500 - 5,000 | 1,000 - 2,000 |

DoE large new town | 5,000+ | 2,000+ |
Cambridgeshire A45 NS Inspector small new town | 7,500 | 3,000 |
Lock country town | 3,750 - 15,000 | 1,500 - 6,000 |
CDL new country town | 13,000 - 15,000 | 5,000 - 6,000 |
Ravetz new town | 10,000 - 100,000 | 4,000 - 40,000 |
Ravetz new city | 100,000+ | 40,000+ |


Table 3.3 brings the range of new settlement size definitions together, indicating that there is only a broad measure of agreement in two areas, first, on the general size range
of new villages, and, second, on the general lower limit for a town, and that, in particular, Ravetz's size definitions are markedly divergent. This general lack of agreement is understandable given the wide range of size definitions for existing settlements in the geographical literature as a whole. Brief exploration of this literature is useful for indicating where new settlements might sit in the existing urban size hierarchy.

**Size of existing settlements**

Clark (1982) points to the many definitions of types of settlement in use world-wide and suggests that size of settlement can be seen as a continuum that enables distinctions to be drawn between settlement types distant on the continuum (such as village and city), but that differentiating those settlement types close to each other is much more difficult, with there being little agreement about the dividing lines and about terminology. In the UK, the meaning of the concepts of hamlet, village, town and city vary regionally (Merrett 1984). Small towns and villages or small settlements with less than 10,000 population (about 4,000) dwellings are considered to be urban places, but rural settlements, although this figure has little significance for the land use structure of such settlements (Best and Rogers 1973). Everson and FitzGerald's (1969) classification of settlements by population size (as indicated in Table 3.4) is rather dated, particularly on the minimum and maximum for a town and the minimum for a city.

**TABLE 3.4**

CLASSIFICATION OF SETTLEMENTS ACCORDING TO POPULATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Size</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>10 - 150</td>
<td>4 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>150 - 1,000</td>
<td>60 - 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1,000 - 25,000</td>
<td>400 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>25,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>1,000 - 200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5 sets out the maximum sizes of rural settlement types derived from a number of other studies.
### TABLE 3.5

MAXIMUM RURAL SETTLEMENT SIZE DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>DWELLINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everson/FitzGerald</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everson/FitzGerald</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss (1978)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorburn (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best/Rogers (1973)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small town/Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Country Town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cloke 1979 - Table 2.1, and Cloke 1983 with additions by the author

There is limited agreement on the size thresholds for settlement types, which reinforces the notion that population cannot be used in isolation to distinguish rural and urban settlements, or particular types of settlement.

Size or scale is important in a number of ways. First, as I have already suggested, the terms 'village' or 'town' create particular images, the use of which is important in both marketing the development to potential consumers and for 'selling' the concept to planning authorities and existing residents. Second, the various settlement terms have connotations regarding the role, function and place of new urban settlements in the existing settlement hierarchy. Third, they also have implications for the scale of potential impacts, and particular terms can be used to downplay the perception of these impacts. Lastly, size has been politically important, in that the new village scale as defined by the DoE has become adopted as the appropriate new settlement size in many contexts.
Character - Urban Form and Design

This study uses urban form as a composite term to describe the degree to which a new settlement is physically separate from existing settlements, and its physical characteristics or built form.

Rowland (1990) takes this notion and extends it into an analysis of the philosophy inherent in the urban design of new settlements. He distinguishes three types of new settlement based on the design approach, as indicated in Figure 3.1

FIGURE 3.1

URBAN DESIGN APPROACHES IN NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back to the future</td>
<td>Retro style, using traditional layout, local building methods, and with mixed use &quot;trying to create an idealised society&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The standard product</td>
<td>Volume builders' design approach - &quot;large estates held together by a landscape structure&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Modern Settlement Planning</td>
<td>Influenced by the Garden Suburb and Milton Keynes, with a recognisable structure, and an element of formality, based on strict orientation of streets and boulevards as an organising principle, &quot;offset by more romantic suburban idylls within the development framework&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Rowland 1990

This is a useful way of ordering thinking on design approaches, and on overall urban form, and, although not all current new settlement proposals fall neatly into these categories, the basic principles can be recognised. To some extent Rowland links design approach to the nature of the promoter or development agency, making this explicit in relation to "the standard product" (being promoted by volume housebuilders), and to the "Post Modern Settlement Planning" form, whose promoters are not seen as house-
builders, but are described as being "more concerned with innovative design statements" (Rowland 1990 - page 64).

A different approach is that of Ravetz (1991), who is more concerned with overall urban form than with urban design per se, although the design approach is implicit in some of his categories. He suggests five different types of form:

- diffused ("as in 'non place'"),
- agricultural/smallholding,
- garden ("as in 'garden city'"),
- courtyard,
- high density.

This approach has limitations in confusing urban form/urban design with the predominant land use in some cases (particularly in the 'agricultural/smallholding' type). In addition, there are no criteria to enable distinction to be made between the types (i.e. what is 'high density'? and the categories are not mutually exclusive ('courtyard' could also be 'high density'). It is then essentially descriptive rather than analytical, lacking this focus that is inherent in Rowland's schema.

**Location**

Ravetz (1991) considers new settlement location in terms of travel time to existing metropolitan areas, as indicated in Table 3.6. This is, of course, entirely subjective in that travel time will vary depending upon the mode of transport, and the geographical area in which the travel takes place (road travel, for example, being easier and quicker in some areas). So, although the locational categories may have some validity in themselves, the variable used by Ravetz is open to question, and the values ascribed to it are, at best, general and of little, wider validity or application.
TABLE 3.6
TYPES OF NEW SETTLEMENT DEFINED BY LOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>within built area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>upto half hour travel to city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ex-urban</td>
<td>upto 1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural remote</td>
<td>upto 2 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ravetz 1991

Function

Here function describes the economic base or functions of a settlement and the role it may play in planning policy terms. The economic function of a new settlement includes the range of services and facilities that it provides, the nature of its economic base or activities, and the degree to which it provides employment for its residents; that is, the degree of self containment, which is related to the extent to which its population relies on out commuting to employment.

Size and function are combined by the Department of the Environment in the draft PPG on Housing (DoE 1989a). Here two types of new settlement are distinguished partly by size and by the range of social and community facilities and services provided (and thus by their function in the settlement hierarchy), but also in relation to the policy functions which they might perform:

- **new villages** - in the broad range of 200 - 1,000 dwellings with the possible purposes of "relieving pressure for development in existing villages", and "extending the variety of housing types available in the area". A full range of social, educational and community facilities would not always be necessary (DoE 1989a - paragraph 21);

and

- **larger new settlements** - here no size range is given but such settlements could play a part "in meeting the demand for new housing, particularly where existing communities already face problems of congestion and over-loading of local serv-
ices". Adequate community facilities and a range of house types, including social housing, would need to be provided (DoE 1989a - paragraph 22).

It is difficult to see that there is a real distinction between relieving pressure for development and meeting housing demand where there are problems of congestion or overloading, since one of the outcomes of development pressure is likely to be pressure on local services, whilst the provision of new housing in new villages will make a contribution to meeting such demand in the wider area. These planning policy purposes are not mutually exclusive. It is also evident that 'larger new settlements' may differ not only in size, but also in function, location, urban form and a number of other parameters.

There are also other policy functions which a new settlement might perform, and by which different types of new urban settlement might be differentiated. Lock (1989c, 1989d) points to five functions:

- accommodating planned growth;
- dormitory settlement to serve major employment centres;
- self contained communities - major housing growth accompanied by necessary facilities, employment and "quality of life";
- to stimulate economic development in an area;
- retaining development in declining rural areas.

This approach also tends to confuse policy function with service and employment provision functions, whilst the categories are not mutually exclusive in that any one particular new settlement could fall into more than one category (particularly in relation to the last two functions). It does however move away from using size as the sole differentiating factor and incorporates a number of criteria, some more explicitly than others, including degree of self containment, economic base, degree of social balance of the population, and service provision. This classification by potential function does need to be seen in the context of the earlier taxonomy by Lock outlined in Table 3.1 (Lock 1989b, 1989c).

Some of Lock's policy functions are to be found in Ravetz's (1991) attempt to distinguish new settlements by economic function. Here he identifies 6 basic categories (some with a number of subdivisions) as in Figure 3.2, based on particular forms of economic base and economic function (in relation to growth centres and satellite/metro new settlements). He also fails to specify the criteria for differentiating between the various
types. It is clear, however, that many current new settlement proposals in the UK are likely to have a fairly diverse economic base, which would make it extremely difficult to classify them according to the functional types put forward here.

**FIGURE 3.2**

**NEW SETTLEMENTS DEFINED BY THEIR ECONOMIC FUNCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dormitory</th>
<th>Satellite/metro</th>
<th>Growth centre</th>
<th>Telecom/network</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resource</td>
<td>high technology</td>
<td>manufacturing</td>
<td>civil/military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Special   | leisure         | education     | treatment       | retirement |

Source: Ravetz (1991)

*Approaches combing scale, location, function and urban form*

A rather different approach is to extend the range of criteria to include scale or size, location and urban form, as well as function (and to confine function to the primary service functions of the settlement), as shown in Table 3.7. In effect this takes the descriptive labels currently in use and seeks to define their main characteristics.

This type of approach is useful in accommodating a number of parameters, but some of the size distinctions are fairly arbitrary. It also lacks reference to the nature of the development agency, the planning policy purpose and the policy context, but this is not crucial to the purpose of the classification, which links the current nomenclature to function and size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialised new settlements</td>
<td>Primary function is provision either of leisure related facilities and accommodation or of secure environments for the elderly with health care. Smaller in scale than primarily residential new settlements, generally between 300 and 600 units. Not always free-standing. Some other facilities may be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundant hospital sites</td>
<td>Provision of housing and services on sites formerly substantially developed. May not always be free-standing from other settlements, and normally will reuse some buildings and other features. Scale varies and is not a determining factor. They can also be distinguished by being the subject of specific policy guidance from Central Government (on hospital sites in the green belt).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships</td>
<td>Physically contiguous with existing settlements - scale may vary up to 10,000 dwellings (25,000 population) - akin to neighbourhood centres in State New Towns (may in some cases be the completion by the private sector of new town begun by State). Contain social, community, health, education and recreation facilities. May also be some employment, apart from services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale rural villages</td>
<td>Free-standing, countryside site. Less than 1,000 dwellings (2,500 population), with limited services and local employment. Distinguished from new market towns by being a lower order service centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New market towns</td>
<td>An intermediate category between villages and new country towns, so between 1,000 and 5,000 dwellings (2,500 - 12,500 population), although normally above about 3,000 dwellings (8,000 population). Range of services will relate to size of settlement, more than village but less than country town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New country towns</td>
<td>Distinguished from new market towns and from large mixed developments by the emphasis on the provision of housing and local services. May also have reasonable range of employment, but not on the scale provided in large mixed development. Scale 5,000 - 6,000 dwellings (12,500 - 15,000 population).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large mixed developments</td>
<td>Wide range of housing and employment, often linked to business park, an office park, high tech industry or a regional scale retail park. The emphasis on housing as an element in the scheme is less than in new country towns, as the employment linked development is normally equally important in terms of scale and the return to the developers. Scale of housing development may be less than in new country town (2,000 - 3,000 dwellings or 5,000 - 7,500 population).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Amos 1991
Conclusions - basic concepts

The approaches to the conceptualisation of new settlements discussed so far are largely descriptive. Their main utility lies in outlining the nature and form of new settlements, rather than in illuminating the development or planning processes, but they do point to both the variety of different types of new settlements and to the underlying common features.

Typologies

From a consideration of conceptualisations of new settlements based on a single parameter or on a limited number of parameters, I now turn to discuss four typologies which incorporate a wider range of parameters, and which also introduce the notion of the agency responsible for the development of new settlements and of the mode(s) by which new settlements are developed. These focus attention more on the processes than on descriptions of the form or content of new settlements.

Golany

Golany (1976) distinguishes new urban settlements by four elements

- economic base and self containment;
- land use pattern;
- provision of services;
- commuting behaviour.

He suggests that the most important of these is the economic base, for the other three elements will derive from, and be affected by, the degree of economic self containment. Golany sees this as "a dominant factor dictating the nature, setting, function and relation of a settlement to its region" (Golany 1976 - page 23), and he uses it to subdivide new settlements into 2 groups. These groups (which are set out in detail in Figure 3.3) are

1 Settlements with economic self containment - these are not based on commuting and are comparatively self sustaining in all respects, with a wide range of land use and a degree of social balance. "Usually these settlements have been carefully, innovatively and comprehensively planned and developed, to serve
purposes and achieve goals other than merely providing housing” (Golany 1976 - page 23)

2 **Settlements without economic self containment** - these are economically or physically related to existing settlements, with the provision of housing areas predominant.

![Figure 3.3](image)

**CLASSIFICATION OF NEW SETTLEMENTS BY GOLANY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW URBAN SETTLEMENTS</th>
<th>SETTLEMENTS WITH ECONOMIC SELF-CONTAINMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>new town</td>
<td>new town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new community</td>
<td>new city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new city</td>
<td>company town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>natural resources town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single product town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>energy town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project construction town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>military town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resort town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retirement town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional growth centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>free-standing community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accelerated growth centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>horizontal city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vertical city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new town in-city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTLEMENTS WITHOUT ECONOMIC SELF-CONTAINMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satellite town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metro town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planned development unit (PUD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new town intown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size plays some part in differentiating these various types of new settlement, with new communities having a population of between 25,000 and 100,000 (10,000 - 40,000 dwellings), and new cities more than 250,000 population (100,000 dwellings).
form, the degree of separation from existing settlements, planning aims and objectives, location and development agency are all important additional differentiating factors.

However, as Golany acknowledges, the types are not mutually exclusive, and so the typology tends to confuse policy purpose, physical form and degree of self containment within each of the categories. For example, a regional growth centre may be a new town or new city and is distinguished only by the policy purpose or aim of the development agency. Similarly the types described as 'horizontal city', 'vertical city' and 'new town in-city' are all physical forms of new settlement which are only differentiated from the other types within the same category by this form.

Much more useful in practical terms and to the central research aims of this study is Golany's summary of the characteristics of new urban settlements, in which each of the 16 types is considered in relation to 14 determining characteristics (Golany 1976 - Figure 2.15). This is set out in Table 3.8.

These determining characteristics go beyond merely physical characteristics of urban form to include notions of

- the degree of public (or state) involvement in land ownership, planning control and development;
- economic base and service provision;
- population size;
- social and economic balance;
- whether, and how, the urban area is defined (i.e. by green belts etc.);
- the relationship to the countryside/green areas.

The policy functions of the settlement types are implicit in the characteristics, rather than being defined separately.
TABLE 3.8

SUMMARY OF NEW SETTLEMENT CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public or unified land ownership</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confined green belt</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine town and country</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersecting green open space</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined and compact area</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited population size</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced community</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood units</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound economic base</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximate places of work and residence</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local provision of infrastructure</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support industrial decentralisation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public as main enterpriser</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong planning control</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Golany 1979

KEY TO SYMBOLS: X = Not applicable, P = Applicable in Part, Y = Applicable

KEY TO SETTLEMENT TYPES

1 New Town
2 New Community
3 New City
4 Company town
5 Development town
6 Regional growth centre
7 Free-standing community
8 Accelerated growth centre
9 Horizontal city
10 Vertical city
11 Satellite town
12 Metro town
13 Land subdivision
14 PUD
15 New town in-town
16 New town in-city

Golany's typology is useful in highlighting a wide range of characteristics which may be used to differentiate new settlement types. It does make some reference to the type of development agency or promoter, to the role of the state (in promotion, land ownership and planning control), and by inference to the concept of comprehensive planning and design. So, for example, the state is the enterpriser for new towns, development towns,
new town-in-city, and regional growth centres, and public or unified land ownership is important in the first three of these. For most of the other types, the private sector is dominant in promotion and in the development process, although some degree of planning control (either by the state or by the private sector promoter/developer) is exercised in a significant number of cases.

The typology is largely a static view which lacks reference to the policy context, and to the development process, and moreover, to the dynamic and changing nature of these processes.

Ravetz

Particular elements of Ravetz's typology have been referred to earlier. The typology is designed to be comprehensive and inclusive, "listing the main attributes of the variety of new settlement schemes" (Ravetz 1991 - page 1). It is set out in detail in Table 3.9.

Of these attributes, he identifies six as differentiating or distinguishing types of new settlements

- process;
- location;
- form;
- economy;
- equity and management;
- size

Most of these have been used by other writers, as the key elements in differentiating new settlements, and, indeed, there is a degree of similarity with Golany's typology. However, process and equity and management have not received much attention elsewhere, although perhaps some elements of each are implicit in Golany. Ravetz only gives criteria which could be used to place individual new urban settlements into each of these attribute categories for size, location and process, and of these, the criteria for location and size are particularly subjective. Moreover, they do not find support elsewhere in the literature.
### TABLE 3.9
**RAVETZ’S TYPOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTRIBUTE</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>new expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conversion including urban sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including redundant hospitals etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>urban within built up area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suburban up to half hour travel to city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ex-urban up to 1 hour travel to city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remote rural up to 2 hours travel to city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td>diffused as in “non place”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as in “garden city”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agricultural/smallholding garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>dormitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>satellite/metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>growth centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>telecom/network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>civil/military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>retirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity and manage-</td>
<td>commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ment</td>
<td>local authority/government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 - 100 population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,0000 - 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000 - 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ravetz 1991

As I have already commented in detail earlier on location, size, form and economy, I will concentrate here on the criteria relating to process, and equity and management.
Ravetz's description of the four types of process (new, expanded, infill and conversion) make it clear that he is concerned not with the process by which new settlements are promoted and developed, nor with the interactions which may take place with the policy and decision making processes, but with the physical process or form of the new settlement in relation to existing built urban form. The types of process are not mutually exclusive, in that an expansion or conversion may be 'new'. New settlements on redundant hospital sites are likely to involve more 'new build' than conversion of existing buildings, although they would be conversions in the sense of converting a developed site from one predominant use to another.

The use of the terms equity and management suggest, firstly, the source of capital and, secondly, the agency responsible for managing the development of the settlement and particular elements of the settlement once it is developed. The terms do not convey any sense of the agency or agencies responsible for promoting the settlement, for carrying out the development or for major decisions about the settlement at various stages in the development process, nor does it deal with the mechanisms of development. However it remains a useful concept which can throw some light on the nature of the new settlement. The types identified (commercial, local authority/government, social housing, trust, combined) are fairly simplistic labels which may cover a range of different forms of social relations. So, for example, 'commercial' may cover a range of different forms of private sector promoter or developer, and it will be suggested later that the form of private sector promoter will have an effect on the overall form, type and size of new settlement. In addition, the 'social housing' type is rather odd in this context, referring, as it does, to a type of development or residential form rather than an agency (as do all the other categories).

The attributes suggested by Ravetz are important factors in distinguishing new settlements, and so, to this extent, the typology is useful, although not comprehensive. Its use is, however, mainly as a descriptive static 'snapshot' view of new settlement schemes, which says little about process or about the dynamic nature of the development process. It is unable to shed light on the wider interactions with the policy process (which, as I will demonstrate later, may be particularly important in shaping the form of a new settlement).
Stephen Potter

Potter (1986) carried out a pioneering survey of privately developed new towns in Britain, and developed a two-fold classification of these schemes, distinguishing them by their urban form, and by their mode of development. Each of these parameters contain a number of separate, but interrelated ideas, as indicated in Figure 3.4.

FIGURE 3.4
POTTER'S TYPOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>URBAN FORM</th>
<th>MODE OF DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive planning by single strategic authority</td>
<td>Wholly private sector initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self containment (economic/social) and degree of physical separation</td>
<td>private sector initiative and state planning framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public sector initiative and planning framework, private sector implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from Potter 1986

The Urban Form dimension covers two key concepts

- comprehensive planning by a single authority or agency
- self containment in terms of the provision of social, educational and other facilities and employment.

Although this part of the taxonomy was not explicitly presented as a continuum, but more in the form of ideal or polar types, it is possible to develop this as a continuum, and
to illustrate the application of these concepts (as in Figure 3.5), using examples of the private sector new settlements of New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath in comparison with normal housing developments.

FIGURE 3.5

URBAN FORM

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING
strong control & planning standards
single ownership

NO SELF CONTAINMENT
basic facilities
little employment

SELF CONTAINMENT
with high level of facilities and employment

weak control
multi ownership

LACK OF COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

1 = Martlesham Heath and New Ash Green, 2 = normal housing development

This highlights the essential difference in the development process between the two forms of urban development, and the ways in which this influences the resultant urban form (with, for the private new settlements, strong control by the promoter and by local planning authorities, land ownership by a single agency and the provision of a range of facilities and local employment).

The Mode of Development dimension of the classification refers to the source of the initiative for development (whether public or private sector), the agency responsible for planning the settlement and exercising design and standard controls, the form of the planning policy framework, and the extent to which the scheme meets wider goals. Here
there are three ideal types, which move not on a continuum from public to private sector domination of the development process, but from a positive to a negative planning framework

- **State planning and initiative** (including purchasing land, planning the form and layout of the settlement, and servicing areas for private sector development) and private sector implementation, with a positive planning stance - examples given by Potter include South Woodham Ferrers, Bowthorpe, Mosborough and Magor and Undy (new settlements or major extensions promoted and developed by the local state - mostly County Councils);

- **private sector initiative** with a negative planning response (planning authority provides a planning framework after private sector promotion of the new settlement);

- **"Town developed with the initiative coming wholly from the private sector"** (Potter 1986 - page 305) - the examples which he gives include New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath (promoted and/or developed by the private sector). Here, by implication at least, the planning response was negative, both in terms of the stance taken and the lack of provision of a policy framework.

Potter's taxonomy is more oriented towards the development process as a whole than the other two typologies dealt with earlier. It captures more of the dynamics of the policy and development process, and the way in which they may interact, but it is also concerned with the traditional notions of urban form (including the degree of physical separation from existing settlements) and self containment, in terms of the economic base and service provision. It is particularly useful in considering the processes involved in new settlement development rather than the forms of new settlements. The only significant criticism which can be made concerns the internal logic of the typology, in that the notion of comprehensive planning by a single authority of agency is contained in both Urban Form and Mode of Development. The Mode of Development dimension is able to accommodate most of the new settlements of the 1960's and 1970's, except Bar Hill, promoted by the local state (Cambridgeshire County Council) within a strong policy framework, and developed by the private sector, after the County had assembled the land.
I have refined Potter's typology to produce a typology with three components which is illustrated in Figure 3.6. It first appeared in Amos (1988), but more detail has been added to the components or dimensions of the typology. These dimensions are:

- Planning Response
- Mode of Development
- Urban Form

**FIGURE 3.6**

**AUTHOR'S TYPOLOGY OF NEW SETTLEMENTS**

---

**PLANNING RESPONSE**

- Planning led (strategic allocation)
- Developer led (challenge to policy)

**MODE OF DEVELOPMENT**

- wholly private sector initiative
- wholly public sector initiative

**Urban Form**

- self containment
- role/function
- degree of physical separation
- scale

Source: Amos 1988 page 3
Planning Response - this relates to the form of the planning policy framework and to the nature of the planning stance adopted on a new settlement proposal. It is a continuum which ranges from a positive policy context provided by regional guidance and/or structure plans, and possibly by local plans, to the lack of such a framework and "developer led provision through planning applications and appeals" (Amos 1988 - page 3). It is also capable of accommodating different forms of policy response. Planning Response has been separated out from Potter's Mode of Development dimension, as the form of the planning response (i.e. planning policy framework, and the response to individual proposals) is one of the main determining (and distinguishing) factors in the new settlement development process, and one of the key issues which needs to be analysed and explained. It therefore needs to be dealt with separately.

Mode of Development - this is also a continuum which covers the range of, and potential combinations in, the inputs into the development process. It is more limited than Potter's Mode of Development dimension, as the latter also dealt with the nature of the planning framework. Here the dimension contains the basic idea that one agency is responsible for overall planning (urban design and planning the layout and development programme rather than planning in the sense of intervention or control) and development, although the single agency may be a group of firms, include local authority representation, or may be the local state itself. The essential notion is of co-ordination in development. The continuum provides for differentiation by the type of development agency, public, private or varying degrees of partnership between the two, which undertakes the functions normally associated with development, including

- site finding and acquisition; provision of development finance; overall planning, including preparation of a master plan; provision of infrastructure, services and facilities; construction of dwellings and community, industrial and commercial buildings; co-ordination of development; design control; management and maintenance; and marketing and sales (Amos 1991a - page 2)

To these activities, it is perhaps necessary to add tenant selection in order to cover those new settlements where the private or public sector select or exercise some degree of control over the occupiers of particular forms of housing or commercial development. Thus

Public sector involvement may extend from solely intervening through the development control function (as at New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath) to initiat-
ing the concept but leaving the financing and implementation to the private sector (as at Bar Hill), to carrying out most, or all of the development functions, except construction (as in the County Council new towns of South Woodham Ferrers, Bowthorpe, Magor and Undy, and Killingworth). A variety of intermediate positions can be envisaged (as at Cramlington). Similarly for the private sector, involvement in different stages and functions of the development process has varied in these settlements, and in the privately promoted new settlements (Amos 1991a - page 2).

**Urban form** - this is concerned with the physical characteristics of the settlement, including size, the degree of self-containment in economic and other terms, the extent to which the settlement is free-standing or physically discrete from other settlements, and the role or function of the settlement as a service centre in the settlement hierarchy. It therefore adds size and role or function to Potter's Urban Form dimension, and of course, excludes comprehensive development by a single agency which Potter includes here.

This typology, like Potter's, is designed to deal with the dynamic realities of the development process, but puts more emphasis on the form and content of the planning policy framework. It also seeks to point to the potential interactions of these processes. The Urban Form dimension does not set out criteria for distinguishing settlements in relation to each of the components, but merely suggests that these factors are important and need to be taken into account. This dimension is, perhaps, the least important of the three for analysis of the interactions of the development and planning processes and of the outcomes.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The discussion in this Chapter has sought to analyse approaches to conceptualising new settlements, in order

1. to describe and highlight the nature and the essential characteristics of new settlements;

2. to indicate the variety of forms of new settlement schemes;

3. to point to potential problems of definition, particularly in terms of size, role or function, and location;
4 to attempt to uncover some of the processes at work in new settlement production;

5 to point to some of the key actors or agencies involved in new settlement production and in the process of intervention by the state in their promotion and production;

6 to indicate some of the potential stages in new settlement development at which interaction may take place.

Whereas the earlier, single parameter approaches are useful for more descriptive purposes (that is for describing the nature of new settlements, as in 1, 2, and 3), the typologies have a greater utility in addressing the analytical aims concerned with processes, as in 4, 5, and 6. Since the conceptualisations were developed for a variety of purposes, their usefulness to the objectives of this study varies, particularly according to the degree to which they actually address the key dynamic elements of the processes. The most useful are those that isolate the nature of the development agency as a key parameter, and link this with the planning response, in terms of both the planning policy framework and the process of decision making relation to individual proposals.

The typologies fall into two groups. Those produced by Golany and Ravetz are essentially descriptive, concerned with identifying the key features of particular predetermined types of new settlement, albeit, in the case of Golany, with an emphasis on a wide range of parameters, including those crucial to the development process, like development agency, form of planning control, and type of land ownership. These typologies are essentially static views or 'snapshots', which do not address the dynamic nature of the development process, of the planning system, or of the interactions between these processes.

However, the second group, those of Potter and the author, are centred around processes (although they also address issues of form and economic base), and so are dynamic in nature, enabling particular schemes to be analysed in relation to the topology dimensions. The author's typology goes further than Potter's in separating out the state's planning policy framework and responses to proposals from the notion of overall planning (including the preparation of a master plan, overall design, the programming of construction and service provision, and developer control of the scheme). These typologies suggest that analysis of the 'mode of development' and of the 'planning response'
will have considerable power in explaining the nature of the outcomes of state/capital interaction in particular instances, and indeed the remainder of the thesis is devoted to this analysis. So, the author's typology provides a framework for the study, and Figure 3.7 indicates where the particular dimensions of the typology are considered in the thesis.

**FIGURE 3.7**

**FRAMEWORK OF THESIS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPOLOGY DIMENSION</th>
<th>CHAPTERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Response</td>
<td>4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of Development</td>
<td>6, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Form</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the analysis of the approaches using a single parameter or a limited number of parameters has highlighted a number of key substantive issues. First, the descriptive labels applied to individual new settlement schemes are important for a number of reasons, especially for the image which these labels create. Second, and arising out of this, size or scale is a significant issue in itself, and one which derives in part from the label used. Settlements carrying labels which have 'urban' images, particularly those which suggest an urban scale, are likely to be more problematic than those with a 'rural' image and a 'village' scale. The potency of the 'new village' scale has already been referred to. Third, Rowland (1990) has pointed to the potential relationship between the urban form and design of a new settlement and the nature of its promoter, and to the possible role of design agents in shaping this form. So, in terms of physical outcomes, the form of new settlement 'on the ground' may derive as much, or more, from the urban designer as from the promoter. This points to a consideration of the role of these actors in the new settlement development process. Fourth, and underscoring the value of the more dynamic typologies, process is more important than form, as it is only by understanding the processes leading to particular outcomes that form can be explained.
The next part of this Thesis goes onto look in more detail at the new settlement development process, particularly in relation to those new settlements developed in the post-war period up to the late 1970s. It seeks to draw out the major influences on the development process and indeed to refine the concept for detailed exploration later. It also considers the characteristics of current new settlements.
PART TWO

PERSPECTIVES ON PRIVATE NEW SETTLEMENTS
CHAPTER 4

CONCEPTUALISING THE NEW SETTLEMENTS DEVELOPMENT PROCESS -

LESSONS FROM PRE-1980 NEW SETTLEMENTS
INTRODUCTION

The recent re-emergence of the concept of new settlements developed and promoted by the private sector has taken place with only fleeting references to the considerable history of the foundation of new communities in Britain. Moreover, the scale of the state new towns programme has directed attention away from this legacy, ensuring that promotion and development by the state are perceived as the norm rather than, when viewed against the historical background, as atypical. It is perhaps worth restating, as David Lock (1989d) has done, that the history of new settlement development in the UK has been dominated by the private, rather than the public, sector, and the state new towns programme of the period from the mid 1940's to the 1970's is very much an anomaly. For, as Lock (ND - page 89) indicates

During the 1980's, there has been a resurgence in Britain of proposals for new communities. We should not be surprised that these are promoted primarily by private investors and developers, nor should we be surprised at the modesty of their scale or the overwhelming folksiness of their concepts. The truth of the matter is that the state-sponsored new towns programme which ran in Britain from 1946 to its sad and ragged end in the 1990's was, from the perspective of history, an anomaly. The many beautiful and successful British villages and small new towns made in Britain over the last few hundred years were generally the creation of wealthy landowners (some philanthropic, some decidedly selfish) or the experiments of sects seeking to demonstrate a Utopia.

There is then, a considerable history of private new settlement development in the UK (Cherry 1970, 1988, Darley 1978a, Edwards 1981, Hall 1974, 1988a, 1990, Sharp 1946), a critical examination of which can aid in the explanation of the current form of new settlement promotion and development. This Chapter reviews this historical legacy, looking in particular at the new settlement development process, at the precise roles of the private sector and the state (whether New Town Development Corporation, Central Government or LPAs) in all the stages of the creation of new communities, and at the responses of the planning system. In this it draws on the ideas which form part of the 'dynamic' typologies outlined in Chapter 3. A secondary aim is to consider the urban form, and economic and social base of these earlier new settlements.

The review is essentially chronological, beginning briefly with the settlements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, including the Garden City movement, but
focusing on the period after 1947 (which marked the introduction of a comprehensive town planning system, and so fundamentally altered state/capital relations), and in particular on the 1960's and 1970's. It finishes at the end of the 1970's as the regulatory regime of the next decade represents something of a break with the past, as I have shown earlier. The method of analysis adopted is to examine the major new settlement schemes of this period, including the state's new towns programme (reviewing the private sector's place in this programme), and to seek to draw some conclusions on the critical interactions and on the determinants of form. The results of this analysis are summarised in the conclusions to this Chapter.

NEW SETTLEMENTS OF THE LATE NINETEENTH AND EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURIES

*Industrial new settlements*

These early private new settlements, especially New Earswick, Bournville and Port Sunlight, have been influential in the evolution of approaches to the layout and design of residential areas and of whole settlements. Some of their promoters' ideas about the nature of social relations which they sought to create have also permeated later thinking on new settlement development. In particular the notions of social mix and balance, the creation of a community based on co-operation, the return of some development value to residents and the involvement of residents in the management of the settlement all continue to be crucial issues in new settlement promotion and management.

It is not appropriate to consider these settlements in detail, but a number of general conclusions, which are relevant to the central themes of this study, can be drawn from their development process and urban form

1. *Comprehensive planning and strong control over changes in the built environment* - all three bore the stamp of their founders, and of the architects and "town planners" they employed, who exercised strong overall control in the absence of state intervention. This control was, in part, based upon an overall master plan, a concept that, with the shift away from rational-comprehensive land use planning, has only recently resurfaced in many of the current new settlement schemes, after having been used extensively in the state new towns.
Community development - at New Earswick and Bournville control passed, some years after their development began, from their founders to Trusts. Bournville was developed under the leasehold system, with the Trust retaining the freehold and utilising some of its income to maintain the open spaces and landscaping. Similarly the freehold of the land at New Earswick is still held by the JRHT, thereby enabling a pioneering approach to the provision of new housing, although the "self governing community' that its founder hoped for did not come to pass" (Darley ND - page 22). The village is run by the New Earswick Management Committee, with representatives from the residents and the JRHT, and a Village Council. However, as Best (1990 - page 2) points out, "if Joseph Rowntree hoped for a true housing co-operative in which residents owned and controlled all their own affairs, he would be disappointed".

Development costs - all three were built at low density, in reaction to the monotony of the prevalent by-law housing. However the costs of this higher quality environment were such that rents had to be pitched at a level which excluded many ordinary working men, or the development had to be subsidised by the promoter (Gaskell 1981). There were, then, problems with the economic viability of some of these early settlements.

Self containment - each of these settlements were located close to the industrial factories of their founders, and so to sources of employment, although the housing at Bournville and New Earswick was not built exclusively for their workers. Self containment in employment was not an expressed objective of most of the promoters (Best 1990, Darley ND). They did, however, seek to provide a range of facilities with the emphasis on educational and 'appropriate' recreational activities, seeing this as a necessary part of attaining their broader social aims (Day 1981, JRHT ND, Darley ND, Edwards 1981).

Village and community - these early settlements were predicated on the notion of the village as the place where a positive social mix could be created with the benefits of neighbourliness, co-operation and a harmonious community life. These notions, and more lastingly, the accompanying imagery, have proved to be particularly resilient and continue to be potent, being packaged and commodified as part of many current proposals.
These settlements provided an arena for formulating and testing ideas about urban design and layout, and for the creation of different forms of social organisation, later developed more fully in Howard's ideas for the Garden City.

**Howard and the Garden City**

Ebenezer Howard occupies a central place in the historiography of new settlements. His advocacy and practical demonstration of planned decentralisation, together with its later adoption by individuals prominent within the emerging planning profession (such as Unwin and Osborn) and by vociferous lobbying groups (like the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA)), led firstly to the creation of practical examples at Letchworth (1903) and Welwyn Garden City (1920), and secondly to the adoption by the state of the planned new settlement and its embodiment in the programme for the New and Expanded Towns beginning in 1946.

Howard's ideas are set out in "Tomorrow - The Peaceful Path to Real Reform" (1898), later republished in 1902 as "Garden Cities of Tomorrow" (Howard 1898, 1902). They draw upon the earlier examples of Bournville and Port Sunlight, and upon Utopian writers such as James Silk Buckingham, as well as earlier social reformers (Beevers 1987, Hall 1974). In this sense, he offered little that was new or novel, but encapsulated these eclectic sources, and "it was probably this very eclecticism in Howard's thesis that was its strength" (Gaskell 1981), appealing, as it did, to a wide range of interests (Hebbert 1989). His argument, put simply, was that both town and country offered a mixture of advantages and disadvantages - the town with a poor social and natural environment, but with opportunities for employment and access to services, whilst the countryside offered an attractive natural environment, but with no social or economic advantages and opportunities. The planned Garden City could combine the advantages of both town and country but with none of their disadvantages, by the planned decentralisation of population and employment. Howard advocated Garden Cities of about 30,000 population, set in about 6,000 acres, and grouped into a polycentric 'Social City', with a population of up to 250,000, surrounded by open countryside. Howard's ideas thus contained two distinct elements - the decentralisation of population and the channelling of these forces to form self contained communities (Fishman 1989).

The development mechanism for the Garden City would be private enterprise, financed with loans, and by purchasing cheap land in the countryside, the increase in land values
could be used to fund social infrastructure and repay the initial loan (Miller 1992). These ideas were put into practice at Letchworth and Welwyn Garden City. Letchworth was founded by the First Garden City Ltd (FGCL), and although undercapitalised and beset by financial difficulties, it was ultimately successful, partly because, as Hebbert (1989 - page 312) indicates "businessmen took over the boards and promoted them on regular commercial lines".

Parker and Unwin's plan was based on neighbourhood units, with a school, shops, social and recreation facilities, separated from the industrial areas in an early form of zoning. The need to encourage private and speculative development "proved to be more influential than the desire to achieve high aesthetic standards for the town as a whole" (Gaskell 1981 - page 180), and as a result the standards which FGCL set were diluted.

Howard's concept, although Utopian, was founded in practical financial sense, and, as Miller (1984 - page 13) says, the Garden City concept and its concrete expression at Letchworth

freshed the practicality of a new, co-ordinated, approach to the laying out and development of land, with many aspects readily applicable to the control and articulation of the further growth of existing towns. Town planning in an identifiable form had arrived but the concepts and techniques required fine tuning and the creation of an appropriate institutional structure.

Day emphasises the extent of Letchworth's influence (1981 - page 181)

Letchworth's place in the history of modern town planning is of paramount importance whether one agrees with the principles on which it was designed or not. It was notable step for a group of private individuals to instigate and eventually implement the planning and development of a complete new town. The project was the model for Welwyn and the later government sponsored post-1945 new towns. Its standards influenced later government legislation on housing standards and decentralisation of population.

Howard's ideas for the development of new settlements by private finance, and for the return of some of the surplus value generated by the development to the residents in the form of social, recreational and other infrastructure and facilities, have continued to be influential (Melman 1986). The concepts of planned decentralisation, the separation of
residential from industrial areas (zoning), the limitation of the outward spread of urban areas by green belts, and the creation of new, free-standing settlements with low density housing areas and with social, educational and other facilities and employment, all became central tenets in later planning practice. However Glass (1968 - page 72) has noted the inherent anti-urbanism of these concepts.

In current town planning - as shown, for instance, by the emphasis on decentralisation, low density developments, new towns and neighbourhood units - the thought of the utopias and their relatives, such as model communities and university settlements, is still very much alive. Indeed the mixture is as before: only the container - the language - is different. And as there has been no new genesis of ideas, this is hardly surprising. Twentieth century Britain has not only inherited but also re-experienced this distaste for towns.

**Summary - mode of development of early new settlements**

From this brief review, it is possible to draw out a number of conclusions on the mode of development of these new settlements.

1. **Strong control, planning and co-ordination by a single development agency** is evident. The precise nature of this agency has varied - a fraction of industrial capital (as in the industrialists' new settlements), a Trust (later in the development and management of some of these settlements), a specially formed development company (as in the early development of Letchworth or Welwyn Garden City), or a protected Corporation (Letchworth). The state's role in the development of these settlements was minimal.

2. The **high development costs** of these settlements, partly due to the higher than normal standards of environment and design, required subsidy, either through the acquisition of low cost land or directly by the developer, or resulted in high rents and the exclusion of some groups.

3. The **use of cheap agricultural land** and the **return of some of the surplus value to the residents** via the social facilities was a central part of the philosophy upon which Howard's schemes were founded. Notions of some degree of residents' participation also underlay some of the other settlements.
Particular agents or actors were influential, either as individuals, or as designers or 'consultants' in the preparation of master plans and detailed layouts.

A degree of pragmatism must be noted for, although Howard in particular sought wider community involvement in the development agency, his settlements were developed with private investment capital, under market conditions, with the residents having no interest in the company for its profits. A shift in development priorities and philosophy led to a dilution of design aims.

THE STATE NEW TOWNS

The aim here is to discuss the varying roles of the state and the private sector in the development of the state new towns, for, even here, these roles were by no means unchanging, or indeed clearly and unambiguously differentiated at the outset, as Hebbert (1989) has shown.


Even under present conditions some of these firms, with or without help from the State in facilitating the acquisition of sites, could build simply as a business enterprise, and as a paying one, new towns that would replace and render obsolete portions of our existing cities (quoted in Town and Country Planning 1939)

The later history of Letchworth demonstrates some of the problems inherent in the creation of valuable assets owned by the 'private' sector in the form of new settlements, as "With rapidly rising land values in the late 1950's, FGCL, as a public company, became increasingly vulnerable to a take-over from outside, when commercial exploitation might well have taken precedence over Howard's original ideas" (LGCC ND). A private Bill was promoted in Parliament in the early 1960s to establish LGCC as a public body to take over Letchworth, and manage it on behalf of the community. Egerton-Smith (1989) outlines Letchworth's progress under the LGCC, and points to the lessons which may be drawn from its development. The LGCC now provides a model for the future, owning most of the land within the garden city as well as some of the surrounding countryside, maintained as an agricultural belt, acting as landlord, managing the garden city's assets and using financial surpluses for the benefit of residents and for the provision of community facilities (LGCC ND, Melman 1986, Egerton-Smith 1989). Egerton-Smith estimates that the Corporation returns about £800,000 per year to the community.
Ideas for new communities to solve housing problems, and for state support for a new towns programme, gained ground during the 1920's and 1930's, both unofficially, as in Purdom's 1920 proposal for 23 satellite towns around London, and officially, in a number of government reports in the 1930's (Hardy 1991). The Abercrombie Plan for Greater London and a number of other regional plans, produced at the end of, or just after, the Second World War, proposed the decentralisation of population from the large cities to new, self contained settlements, and in the case of London, a green belt to prevent further outward urban expansion (Merlin 1973).

The "campaign" culminated, in 1945, in the establishment by the newly elected Labour Government of the Reith Committee on New Towns to determine the most effective mechanism for putting this concept of planned decentralisation into effect. In evidence to the Reith Committee a number of leading housebuilders and financial institutions argued that they would be able to plan, finance and develop the new towns, once central government had chosen the site and assembled the land (Hebbert 1989). The Committee recommended that a variety of agencies should be involved in new town development and the first draft of the New Towns Bill included provision for new town development by limited liability companies. It was later redrafted and the New Towns Act 1946 placed control in the hands of the state (Cullingworth 1979). Sites were to be found and designated by central government, the town was to be constructed and managed by a specially created Development Corporation, as suggested by the Reith Committee, and funded by central government, and responsible to Parliament. Later the Commission for New Towns was established to take over the assets of the new towns as they were completed. This mechanism was designed to return the surplus value created by enhanced property values resulting from new town development to the 'community'. Only when a new town was near completion would control over it be passed onto the local authority. Despite this lack of democratic control, Hall (1974 - page 106) feels

Almost certainly, Reith's formula as the right one. In building the new towns, freedom for managerial enterprise and energy has to be given priority over the principle of democratic accountability: if the new towns had had to account for every step to a local authority, they could never have developed with the speed they did
The details of the programme of new town designation and development which followed are well known: two distinct phases are discernible, from 1946 to 1950, and from 1961 to 1970² (Aldridge 1979a, 1979b, Evans 1972, Hall 1974, Osborn and Whittick 1977).

Private sector and state roles in new towns

The Mode of Development dimension of the author's typology provides a framework for looking in more detail at the role of the Development Corporation and of the private sector in the new town development process, and in the major activities which comprise this process -

1 Site finding and land assembly - activities carried out by central government (or possibly site finding by consultants), with land being acquired by agreement or by compulsory purchase (Schaffer 1972). Early purchase of land enabled the Development Corporation to reap the benefit of the increase in the value of the land resulting from the new town designation and development. Moreover as land was purchased at agricultural value "the building of a new town on agricultural land could be profitable", and "the first generation of UK new towns, such as Harlow, yielded a surplus to the British taxpayer within 12 years of commencement" (Lock 1989b - page 15);

2 Master planning - responsibility lay solely with the Development Corporation (or more precisely, its own internal architects and planners or external consultants)³;

3 Financing development - finance came from government subsidies and long term loans at moderate rates of interest;

4 Provision of infrastructure - the Development Corporations serviced land and provided the necessary infrastructure;

5 Construction - this varied depending on the type of development

²Details of the new towns are set out in Schaffer (1970) and in annual surveys in the November edition of the Town and Country Planning Association journal Town and Country Planning.

³Interestingly, with the winding up of many new towns, a number of architects/planning departments have been sold or formed themselves into consultancy companies. Some of these, especially Business Environments (formerly planners/architects with Warrington New Town Development Corporation), are active in the private new settlement field. Personnel from other new towns, like Milton Keynes, have joined prominent private sector companies, so there is a wealth of expertise from the state new towns available in the private sector.
(i) dwellings - the proportion of housing built by (or for) the Development Corporation, local authorities and the private sector varied, over time and in each new town. In general the proportion built by the Development Corporation and by local authorities declined over time and that constructed for sale by the private sector grew;

(ii) industry - the Development Corporations leased serviced land to firms to construct premises or built factories for letting or sale;

(iii) offices - construction by the Development Corporation for rent or by firms for their own occupation or for rent;

6 Control of design - overall control of design, both initially through the Master plan, and then through more detailed layouts and briefs, and later, over individual buildings, rested with the Development Corporation.

So, in general, the state, through the Development Corporation, had wide ranging responsibility in the planning and development processes, as Merlin (writing in 1973) indicates

The Development Corporation possesses wide powers; in general, the planning and administration of the new towns; in detail, the acquisition of land, by purchase or appropriation, the construction of dwellings, shops, offices, factories and public buildings, with the possibility, however, of delegating some of these tasks to local councils, companies or individuals. It is responsible for the designated area of the new towns but can also function beyond this area in its planning capacity, as happened in the case of Livingston and its surrounding area. In the matter of housing, the corporation makes (or controls the making of) the general and detailed plans, invites estimates for groups of several hundred dwellings and supervises the work carried out by private contractors (Merlin 1973 - page 27)

In consequence, the role of the private sector, through the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's, was largely passive, "to buy the opportunities packaged and presented by the Development Corporations. The private sector had to wait for opportunities to be presented in the market place, and to compete accordingly " (Lock 1989b - page 15). During the 1960's there was increasing pressure for private sector involvement in the state new
towns, particularly in providing housing for owner occupation (Bland 1968, Dunham 1968).

The distribution of roles between the state and the private sector has changed, with a gradual increase in private sector involvement, particularly in the construction of owner occupied housing from about the mid 1960's, and more widespread private investment from the mid 1970's (Potter 1985, Hebbert 1989, Lock 1988a, 1989a). This has culminated, in recent years, in the private sector being responsible for completing the new or expanded towns of Harlow (Essex) and Peterborough (Cambridgeshire), by the construction of townships according to the master plan prepared by the Development Corporation (Brown 1991). Lock points to several reasons for this increasing involvement, including economic recession and high interest rates leading to the borrowing of capital from non-government sources and the instigation of joint ventures with the private sector; a reduction in public expenditure; the policy shift towards channelling of resources into the inner cities; and mounting criticisms about the design failures of some housing and other schemes in the new towns (Lock 1989a, 1989b).

The public sector's (central state) role has now been reduced to the provision of infrastructure, to the servicing of publicly owned land for sale, and to land assembly. The disposal of new towns' assets, which begun in the early 1980's under the government's privatisation measures, has changed the ownership profile considerably (Brown 1985, Hebbert 1989). As Potter (1985) suggests, the ideology of the new towns has been redirected to the achievement of different goals, and they now represent a "free enterprise approach to state intervention".

So although the traditional view of new towns being state promoted, with the state responsible for all stages of the development process, remains broadly accurate, it is an oversimplification and one that needs refinement. The private sector has become more involved in many of the functions that the Development Corporations formerly carried out in the 1950's and 1960's. As Turok (1989 - page 72) suggests, idealistic views of the new towns concept have clouded judgements for

It has frequently been stated that the programme was interventionist and comprehensive ... a detailed analysis of the powers and resources of the new towns corporations shows these claims to be misleading. New towns were usually acting with rather than intervening against prevailing economic trends. This was the case particularly with the decentralisation of population and industry from
urban areas. Their powers to act positively were confined to the acquisition of land and the co-ordination of residential, industrial and commercial property development .... Their scope to plan comprehensively was constrained by an inability to initiate and control key types of social and economic development, and by their circumscribed funding arrangements.

Financially the early new towns were successful in making a reasonably quick return on the capital invested, but as their size grew, especially with the designations in the late 1960's, the difficulties in attaining financial viability, also demonstrated by Letchworth and Welwyn Garden City, became evident.

PRIVATE NEW SETTLEMENTS IN THE 1950'S AND 1960'S

The institution of a 'comprehensive' planning system in 1947 adds a new dimension to the analysis of the new settlements of this period, since the planning policy framework and response must be examined alongside the private sector development process. Struggles centred on the planning system begin to emerge during this period. So, for example, schemes for settlements of 25,000 population, on Isle of Grain in Kent, promoted by Richard Costain Ltd in 1955, and from the Metropolitan Estate and Property Corporation at Pentrych near Cardiff in 1964, were refused planning permission. The former was also dismissed on appeal (Adams 1957, Archer 1971a, 1973).

During this period, coupled with growing private sector involvement in the state new towns, there were calls for private enterprise new towns (Sherman 1969), and for new villages in which the private sector could play an enhanced role (Bilsby 1968). The mechanism for providing the latter could be varied

Some should be the result of private ownership seizing the opportunity, possibly some by the Land Commission - if it can overcome the problem of sale to the highest bidder; some by co-operation between the various forms of local authority and development companies; but all having the common denominator that they must be complete enterprises with all levels of society provided for, all forms of home ownership provided, and the whole range of shopping, commercial and industrial and social elements built in parallel as the village grows. Private enterprise would welcome involvement in worthwhile overall development (Bilsby 1966 - page 106/107)
This variety in development agencies or mechanisms will become evident from the analysis which follows. Although the private sector was enthusiastic about undertaking new town or new village development from the 1940s onwards, few schemes came forward, and even fewer were built, due to the problems of ensuring financial viability and to conflict with the planning system, both at central and local state level.

**New Ash Green**

New Ash Green was developer-led, and, in the absence of a positive policy framework, emerged from conflict with the local state. SPAN’s planning application for the settlement was granted on appeal by the Minister in 1964, after refusal by Kent County Council on the grounds that the area had a housing surplus, and the village would serve the needs of London, rather than of the local area (Archer 1971a, Bray 1981a). The Minister saw merit in the provision of additional housing to meet London’s needs within commuting distance and went against the recommendation of the Inspector, who supported the housing provision argument, but considered that the scheme would have strained local resources (Bray 1981a).

The village (with about 2,300 dwellings and a target population of about 6,000) was located on the edge of the green belt in Kent to the south east of London, and, according to Bray (1981a), embodied a number of principles which had characterised earlier new settlements, including high quality architecture and landscaping, neighbourhood units, social mix, self containment, and a high degree of residents’ participation in the management of the settlement, particularly of the open space and recreation facilities (Darley 1978a).

New Ash Green typifies some of the difficulties of private sector new settlement development, since after development had begun in 1967, the company experienced local opposition, lack of co-operation by the local authorities, and the economic recession of the late 1960s, and, by the end of 1969, had run into debt (Bray 1981a, Potter 1986). Building Societies were reluctant to fund the unconventional house construction methods and the promised rented housing to be provided by the Greater London Council (GLC) did not materialise. In 1970 SPAN suspended construction and the following year sold the land to Bovis, who completed the housing development along more conventional lines in the mid-1980s (Elson 1989). The visual quality of the village was diminished as a result, although SPAN’s commitment to communal, high quality open space was retained (Darley 1978a, Edwards 1981).
The village remains largely middle class in character (Potter 1986) and lacks local employment, although in social terms it has a high degree of voluntary or communal activity and social interaction (Rural Viewpoint 1990). It is well provided with social and public facilities (Pryce 1988), and one of its strengths lies in the tiered management structure, with the Village Association, managing the major community assets, and a residents' society for each neighbourhood (Pryce 1988). Both SPAN and Bovis imposed restrictive covenants to control changes to the dwellings and to ensure high standards of maintenance, and this control is now being exercised by the Village Associations (Elson 1989, 1991, Pryce 1988). In design terms, Edwards (1981) considers it to be one of the best pieces of suburbia. However its strengths and weaknesses, particularly in social terms, are summarised by Rural Viewpoint (1990 - page 9).

New Ash Green would seem a success in creating a new settlement with a sense of community but not in meeting housing need nor, therefore, in encouraging the mix of social classes that characterise traditional villages.

SPAN undertook all aspects of the development process, from the search for a site (they had looked at other sites including Bar Hill - see below), land assembly, design and master planning, obtaining planning permission, co-ordinating construction through to marketing and sales. In their marketing of New Ash Green, SPAN used the imagery of the village to 'sell' the development, with their sales literature emphasising the communal aspects, its countryside setting and the intangible components of 'villageness' which they hoped to create. The term 'new village' was however avoided. although the settlement's architect, Eric Lyons, specifically disavowed the Garden City approach to design. "It is not going to be a Garden City, but a lush, green urbanism - the Verdant Village" (quoted in Bray 1981a).

Bray (1981a pages 35 - 36) points to the factors which led to the parietal lack of success, and indeed which had an effect on other new villages of this period.

The failure may have been caused in part by bad luck in the form of delays, broken promises, and a shrinking national market, but much more complex issues.

---

4 The planned industrial area was opposed by residents and so was not granted planning permission.

has a greater effect. SPAN had faced fierce local opposition from the start, and were curiously naive in their assumption that all would be well once their plans were made public and their reputation accepted. Even more important was the problem of attitudes in the British planning system, and amongst the people and government which gave this system its authority: neither were ready for the scale of experiment proposed by SPAN.

Bar Hill

Unlike New Ash Green, Bar Hill in Cambridgeshire was essentially local state led, and it emerged through, rather than in conflict with, the planning system, and within a positive planning policy framework. The County Council proposed a ring of new villages with the objectives of relieving development pressure, providing services economically, acting as a focus for the surrounding area and conserving the character of existing settlements as a response to the pressure for housing resulting from economic growth in and around Cambridgeshire (Cambridgeshire County Council 1985, Darley 1978a, Moss 1978, Fisher 1990).

Of these, only Bar Hill was developed, being granted planning permission in 1964, with a target of around 1,250 dwellings and 4,000 population. The County Council took an active role in promotion, particularly land assembly, but rather than purchasing land outright, sought an agreement with the landowner to sell to the nominated developer at full residential value (Cambridgeshire County Council 1985). This partially explains the early development problems also characteristic of New Ash Green, as the high cost of land purchase and of on- and off-site services, and the need to price dwellings competitively in order to maintain sales and cash flows "put a substantial squeeze on their margins of profit" (Cambridgeshire County Council 1985 - paragraph 3.2). The initial developer sold the site in 1969 to the Nun Corporation, a subsidiary of Ideal Homes, which itself later went into liquidation in 1974, and the site then passed to number of volume housebuilders, who carried on the development. With the initial disposal of land the standards of design and layout were, to some extent, lowered. In 1976 the County Council intervened more actively, preparing a local plan for the village to bring the development under control and to attempt to reimpose the original design standards (Cambridgeshire County Council 1985).

The provision of facilities lagged behind the construction of the dwellings, although the village does now have an industrial estate, and a reasonable range of facilities. Like
New Ash Green it is predominantly for owner occupation, with less than 10% of the housing falling into the 'social housing' category (Potter 1986). A village trust was responsible for the maintenance of the open spaces and landscaping, and services and infrastructure were provided by the developers.

Cambridgeshire County Council (1985 - paragraph 7.1) conclude that Bar Hill's development demonstrates both successes and failures, again pointing to the problems inherent in the new settlement development process.

On one hand, the development has proved ultimately successful in that it has provided homes for people in the Cambridge area, provided sites for industry, offices and warehousing and has provided a location for a superstore serving a much wider area than Bar Hill itself. On the other hand, Bar Hill in its final form has not achieved the design standards set by the original plan, does not contain all the facilities originally envisaged, and also those that have been provided have proved more costly to the public purse than was at first though.

Rather more prosaically, Franks (1989) in a series of explorations of English villages, and of the notions of 'villageness', commented positively on the development of an active community organisation, thus pointing to the need to assess success and failure in terms of residents' perceptions of the form and quality of social life, as well as the tangible land use and policy aspirations.

If you can measure the health of a community in terms of the busyness of its residents' association, then Bar Hill must be considered to be in the pink. Every month there is a newsletter vibrant with local activity, and the longer-standing residents say that one of the best benefits of life in Bar Hill is that there is always plenty to do, and never a shortage of people prepared to organise the doing.

Continuing the long-standing strategy of the dispersal of growth and of restraint in and to the south of Cambridge (Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989, Fisher 1990), Parry Lewis, in study of the Cambridge sub-region in 1974, proposed a new settlement of 90,000 population (about 36,000 dwellings) as a growth point to the east of the city, although this was not developed. The strategy continues to form the cornerstone of planning in the county, and new settlements were to play a part in this in the 1980's, a theme to which I shall return later.
East Goscote

East Goscote in Leicestershire was begun in 1965, and it apparently faced few of the economic problems of the other new settlements of this period. It differs from Bar Hill in being led by the private sector, but, unlike New Ash Green, had the support of the local and central state. East Goscote emerged through negotiation and agreement, rather than from confrontation or through a favourable planning policy context.

Coming forward from the promoter, Jelson Ltd, it was treated as a departure from the Leicestershire County Development Plan, and 'called-in' for determination by the Minister at an inquiry in November 1962. The proposal was supported by Leicestershire County Council, as planning authority, as the only feasible means of redeveloping the largely derelict Ordnance Depot, despite its location on 'white land'. Although the Inspector recommended in favour, the Minister refused the scheme on the grounds that insufficient detail of the layout, the uses and the design had been provided. However he suggested that the developer co-operate with the County Council to prepare an informal town map (MoHLG 1963). Discussion took place and a more detailed application was approved by the County Council in June 1964, although without any formal agreements regarding the provision of community facilities.

The original target was about 900 dwellings, and although 500 had been completed by 1967, it lacked the social or other facilities for many years (Rural Viewpoint 1990). It now has a population of about 3,000 with some degree of local employment in a small industrial estate, and a range of facilities (Owen 1992a, 1992b).

The development process of the village is unusual in that it was developed by a single firm which constructed the housing, industrial buildings, shops, and many of the community facilities (New Settlements Research Group 1992). Local authority involvement was limited to the provision of a small number of dwellings for rent, and for elderly persons; to initial participation in negotiations over layout and design; and to the exercise of some degree of control through negotiation on, and determination of, planning applications for phases of the development.

Cramlington and Killingworth

The other two major new settlements of the period depart from the 'model' which has emerged from the preceding discussion of a limited role for the state in the development
process. Both were partnerships between the private sector and the local state, albeit with differing roles for the market.

Cramlington in Northumberland was proposed for designation as a comprehensive development area in 1959, and confirmed by the Minister for Housing and Local Government in 1963, with a target of 16,000 dwellings. The strategic aim was to create a new growth point in an area which had suffered from declining employment and from environmental dereliction (Northumberland County Council 1974). Here Northumberland County Council and Seaton Valley Urban District Council (UDC) underwrote the investment, provided the infrastructure and the schools and developed most of the industrial estates (Ross 1968, 1969). The County Council as LPA prepared the master plan, whilst Seaton Valley UDC, as housing authority, provided housing for rent. The private sector owned about half of the new town area and provided the majority of the housing, which was for owner occupation, as well as the main social facilities and the commercial development in the town centre.

Currently, a private sector consortium (consisting of European Land and British Coal Pension Fund) proposed to develop the final phase of the new town as a golf village (which includes 400 dwellings and office and commercial space, as well as golf-related facilities) (Planning 1991a). This has parallels in the growing private sector role in the central state new towns as I suggested earlier.

Killingworth was also promoted by Northumberland County Council, this time in association with Longbetton UDC, although the role of private enterprise was more limited, as according to Ross (1968 - page 160) "70 per cent of the housing development is intended for the rehousing of population from Tyneside as part of an agreement under the Town Development Act". The County Council acquired the land and entered into an agreement with the District Council to carry out all aspects of the development except housing (Northumberland County Council 1974). As in Cramlington, the County Council undertook the development of the industrial estates, but it also acted as the development authority for the housing authority. Private sector housing was limited, although, again as in Cramlington, the town centre was largely developed by private developers.

Summary

Two distinct types of new settlements emerged during this period, 'pure' private sector new villages and local state/market partnerships, although the precise roles and influ-
ence of each sector in each of the settlements is rather different. In the private sector
new villages of Bar Hill, and to a lesser extent in East Goscote, the local state played a
positive role, either initiating the concept or providing co-operation and services. The
planning policy contexts, and the degree of conflict with the state in the planning system,
also show marked variations. Of course, in the local state-led partnership new set-
tlements, the state's role was also positive, but much more wide ranging. The extent of
the partnership varied, and indeed it is questionable whether these do represent a
'partnership' rather than local state dominance.

PRIVATE NEW SETTLEMENTS IN THE 1970s

Writing in 1971, Archer (1971a - page 1) suggested that “in recent years there has been
a quickening of interest in the possible development of new towns in England by private
terprise”, and that the prospects were rather brighter "as the present Secretary of
State, Peter Walker, stated in 1969 that ...'the development of new towns in the future
will be carried out by private enterprise". This proved to be a fairly accurate prediction
as rather more 'privately promoted' new settlements gained approval than hitherto,
although analysis of the development process indicates that forms of partnership
between the state and the private sector were more common. So, even outside the
state sponsored new towns, the public sector still had a major role in some of the new
foundations of the 1970s.

Martlesham Heath

Promoted by the Bradford Property Trust Ltd in 1963, to the east of Ipswich in Suffolk,
on a former airfield, Martlesham Heath is an example of a new settlement emerging
through negotiation within a favourable planning policy framework, albeit one which the
proposal had helped to shape. It was initially refused planning permission in 1965
(Aldous 1983), but with the reduction of the target population from 10,000 to 3,500,
and the development of a regional planning strategy of accommodating growth in the Ipswich
area, in which Martlesham Heath had a role, planning consent was granted in 1973 by
the LPA (Bowyer 1991). Despite the favourable policy context and the granting of
permission, further negotiation, over a period of several years, on the provision of roads
and drainage, was required before development began in 1975 (Bradford Property Trust
PLC 1982). The overall lead-in time was therefore considerable.
In the early years of its development, Martlesham Heath faced some of the problems noted at New Ash Green and Bar Hill, for the first phase began during a slump in the housing market, and it was not until 1978 that house sales took off (Parker 1979).

The settlement demonstrates strong overall control in its design and layout, with development of the village being carried out in accordance with an overall master plan prepared by Clifford Culpin and Partners, with the aim of achieving "controlled chaos" (Aldous 1983), as part of a conscious attempt to depart from the traditional approach to the design of housing areas. This desire to foster a degree of variety and diversification in house design and types owed much to the ideas of the developer’s agents, Bidwells (Parker 1979). The layout is based on a series of 14 hamlets, grouped around a village green, with considerable diversity of design between and within each hamlet, derived from the use of different local architects and different construction companies, mostly local, for each hamlet (Public and Local Services Efficiency Campaign 1990).

Rather like New Ash Green and Bar Hill, Martlesham Heath lacks 'social housing', with only about 10% of the 1,300 dwellings for rent or sheltered accommodation for the elderly (Potter 1986). The village has considerable local employment, being sited adjacent to a pre-existing, 70 acre industrial estate (Bradford Property Trust PLC ND), and reasonable social facilities (Potter 1986). The village is managed by a resident controlled Neighbourhood Association, although Bradford Property Trust PLC has retained the industrial buildings and village centre within their development portfolio (Bradford Property Trust PLC ND, 1983). Gillian Darley's verdict on Martlesham Heath is that in design and amenities it aspires to standards well in advance of the usual, but that it is a village for the relatively affluent - it is "a tasteful, prosperous, one off enclave but a place of distinctive and original character" (Darley 1979).
South Woodham Ferrers

South Woodham Ferrers in Essex was developed by the County Council using Comprehensive Development Area powers and so it is a local state-led new settlement, which

... serves as an example of a project in which a public agency assumes a leading role in developing land; that is, assumes the role of the private developer and continues with the project in concert with private, rather than public agencies (Bray 1981b - page 1)

Potter (1986 - page 307) describes the nature of the mode of development more specifically

To all extents and purposes, South Woodham Ferrers is a local authority new town, with Essex County Council purchasing all the development land, servicing it and selling the sites for private housing, industry and commercial development. As in the state new towns, the development is intended to be self financing, with the rise in land values planned to cover servicing costs and loan interest charges

In the early 1980s, Essex County Council purchased the land at prevailing market rates, and like Cramlington, responsibility for the development of the new country town was divided between the County Council and the local Rural District Council, as Bray (1981b - page 7) indicates

The County initiated the scheme, obtained the land and the financing, and made plans for the provision of the major site services and amenities. The District Council, in addition to its normal maintenance duties, took responsibility for the completion of the design for the foul sewer system ... From the beginning both parties decided to develop South Woodham Ferrers in-house, without setting up a separate development corporation, and without contracting the project to private consultants.

South Woodham Ferrers is rather larger than most of the new settlements discussed so far, with a target of about 4,500 dwellings, a proposed population of 17,500 and a site area of about 1,300 acres (Potter 1986, PULSE 1990). In fact it is more accurately described as a new country town (Moor 1990). It was not however built on a green field
site, but, like Basildon, a first generation new town, was developed on an area of plot-
lands, to control and provided coherence to the growth of the existing unplanned sett-
lement, as well as rationalising the economic provision of services, and to meet the
increasing need for housing land (Bray 1981b, Essex County Council ND, Guild 1980).

The plan for the town was approved in 1974, and construction started towards the end of
that year. However the state of the housing and property market had an impact on the
speed with which development got underway and on the form of the scheme, as
commencement coincided with a downturn in the market and private developers were
reluctant to purchase land. To stimulate development, Essex County Council retained
ownership of the land and granted builders licences, with the County obtaining 10 - 15%
of the selling price of each house (Bray 1981b). Design standards also slipped at this
time from the standards proposed in the pioneering Essex Design Guide (Essex County
Council 1973), for, as Guild (1980 - page 26) indicates, "builders tried to revert to the
'traditional estate layout' with houses set back from the road, and large front gardens.
The property market then improved sufficiently to jack up the standards." Since then,
tight design control has been exercised by the County Council, through a design guide
and detailed design briefs for each site (Guild 1980).

As befits a town of this size, a range of social, commercial and recreational facilities
have been provided, but housing is largely for owner occupation with about ten per cent
low cost, sheltered and rented social housing (Essex County Council ND, Guild 1980,
PULSE 1990).

The settlement has been the outcome of a partnership between different parts of the
local state with the County Council playing the major role in initiation, land assembly, co-
ordination, design control and financing and construction of industrial buildings. So, as
Moor (1990 - page 3) indicates, "public land ownership enable the County Council to
control the development, which is widely regarded as a good example of joint public and
private co-operation". The private sector's role has been limited to the construction of
dwellings and commercial buildings. The County Council also continues to market the
settlement and the dwellings, as "affordable prestige", stressing the availability of large
family houses and the proximity to London in its advertisements. It has been argued

---

6 Bray (1981b) provides further details of the management structure adopted by the County
Council, of the tensions with the District Councils after reorganisation and of the problems faced in
the successful development of the town.

7 See, for example, the advertisement in What House? (Many 1991) by the Home Buyers Centre
of the County Council located at South Woodham Ferrers, which emphasises the friendliness and
that South Woodham Ferrers provides a role model for meeting housing needs whilst preserving the quality of life (PULSE 1990), although Bray (1981b - page 30) feels that it is likely to remain unique in Essex, due to economic recession, shortage of suitable sites, and declining demand, and

first because the County's political will has been so weakened since re-organisation, and second because the District Councils have yet to show an inclination to use their new powers on projects of such a scale.

**Other Public/Private Sector Partnerships**

The 1970s were characterised by a number of other forms of partnership between the local state and the market, including Bowthorpe (Norfolk), Magor and Undy (Gwent) and Singleton (Kent), resulting from active implementation by local authorities of strategies for accommodating growth pressures. Although, perhaps in urban form, these developments do not conform precisely to the definition of new settlements used in this study, they do provide further valuable insights on the development process in particular.

**Bowthorpe, Norwich, Norfolk**

Bowthorpe, begun in 1975, is more of a suburban extension or township than a new settlement, and, unlike many of the other settlements discussed here, it contains a far greater proportion of rented housing, with only about 33% of the 1,800 dwellings for sale (Potter 1986). In addition to the housing, the township contains substantial employment and shopping areas. The City Council acted as developer, purchasing the land, preparing the master plan, co-ordinating the project, and servicing and disposing of the land, and, as in South Woodham Ferrers, some of the private housing was constructed under licence with deferred payments, when the market was less than buoyant (Lloyd 1979).

**Singleton, Ashford, Kent**

warm welcome in the country town, the luxury, comfort and convenience of the larger, more up-market dwellings and the proximity to London. Elsewhere in the same edition, the New Homes Guide indicates that development is still continuing with three housebuilders constructing mainly detached 4/5 bedroom houses, although with some larger terraced housing, all in the price range above £120,000.
Singleton, promoted by Kent County Council, in the late 1970s, is similar in urban form to Bowthorpe, and was developed to accommodate new housing development arising from Ashford's role as a major growth centre in the county. The County Council purchased the land, provided services, controlled design and carried out much of the landscaping (Surveyor 1979). As part of the process of controlling the development, but also to stimulate housebuilding (as at South Woodham Ferrers and Bowthorpe), the County Council retained the ownership of the land whilst the dwellings were under construction, selling the freehold at the same time as the housebuilding sold the dwelling, thereby reducing the builder's development costs and making the development more viable (Surveyor 1979).

Magor and Undy, Gwent

An expansion of two villages about 5 miles from Newport, begun in 1975, the scheme aimed to provide for growing housing demand in a rural area in a comprehensive manner, by increasing the population of the villages from about 1,000 to 5,000 (Gwent County Council 1975). Here again the local authority, Gwent County Council, has played a leading role in purchasing the land, preparing a master plan, servicing sites, formulating design briefs, and leasing the serviced sites to housebuilders, as well as providing new community facilities such as schools and open space, and a new bypass (Gwent County Council 1975, Potter 1986).

Lower Earley, Berkshire

Lower Earley, on the edge of Reading, spans the 1970s and 1980s in its development, and, in some ways, exemplifies the private new settlements of the period between 1950 and the 1970s, and of the 1980s. In its scale and development agency (a consortium), it mirrors the CDL new country town of the 1980s, but in the lack of congruence in the phasing of dwellings and facilities and in its social composition, it is more akin to the earlier private new settlements. The growing involvement of local authorities through the use of planning instruments such as development briefs and planning agreements can be discerned in its development process, reflecting the increasing sophistication of planning authorities in the 1980s. The varying roles of the central and local state in the planning process are also demonstrated.

Planning applications, submitted by a consortium of volume housebuilders and the landowners, for 6,000 dwellings on a site of 1,000 acres, in a regionally designated area
of growth between the M4 and the southern boundary of Reading, were originally approved in 1972 and 1974 following the release of the site on appeal in 1969 (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986, Elson 1989).

Wokingham District Council (the LPA) produced a development brief in 1977 covering design, housing mix, and the provision of facilities and open space, and negotiated a planning agreement, over a period of several years, which sought the provision of a substantial planning gain package (detailed by Elson 1989). However, in common with other new settlements of the 1960s and 1970s, the development lacked facilities in its early stages, with no major community provision being made until 1987, when the development was approximately 80 per cent complete. As Elson (1990 - page 11) points out significant attempts to recoup the position, by making planning agreements with developers to provide community and sports provision in conjunction with major retail additions, as well as by local authority funded facilities, have occurred.

The housebuilders sought changes to the brief, increasing the overall density by the introduction of smaller dwellings and Short, Fleming and Witt (1986 - page 77) comment that "the brief, lacking any legislative purchase, was more a statement of hope than an effective blueprint".

Again, like many of the earlier new settlements, Lower Earley lacks social balance, an impression borne out by Elson's (1989, 1990) survey of the development, for, as Short, Fleming and Witt (1986 - page 78) state

Given the size and price of dwellings in Lower Earley, the social composition (is) skewed towards higher income groups. Surveys of residents have shown that just over 50 per cent of the levels (sic) of households come in the high income professional and managerial occupational categories and less than 5 per cent are in the unskilled manual category. Lower Earley is a residential area catering for the middle and upper income groups.

Lower Earley typifies the problems of large scale residential development in the 1960s and 1970s, including the lack of social balance, the fluctuating housing market, changing developer aspirations, and the difficulties of ensuring the provision of facilities in step with the development of the housing, given the absence of appropriate mechanisms for obtaining adherence to design and development briefs. This last problem may be
related partly to the legislative framework, but also to the relative inexperience of LPAs in dealing with proposals of the complexity of new settlements or other large scale housing developments.

**Smaller Scale New Settlements**

Finally, two much smaller scale new settlements reflect very different development processes. The redevelopment of Harriston in Cumbria was local state-led and implemented, being initiated by Wigston RDC in 1971, and completed by its successor Allerdale District Council in 1979 (Darley 1980, Horberry 1980a, 1980b). The LPA used consultants to prepare a feasibility study and master plans for the rehabilitation and rebuilding of the isolated and deteriorating village of about 110 dwellings, purchased the land and the dwellings and carried out the redevelopment with finance from central government. The private sector had a role only as contractor.

Conversely, Delamere at Cuddington in Cheshire was developed by the housebuilder Whelmar, and emerged from some degree of conflict with the planning system. Granted permission on appeal in 1964, development did not start until 1974. In common with many other private sector settlements, it is a middle and upper housing market settlement with few community facilities, but with some degree of cohesion provided by the residents' management trust.

**Idealistic Schemes**

All of the schemes discussed so far were promoted either by the state, or various forms of capital. However, during the 1970s there were a number of examples of what may be described as innovative or utopian schemes, some of which progressed far enough to come into conflict with the planning system. Most emerged out the 'alternative lifestyle movement' and were linked with ideas of rural resurgence, rural resettlement, communitarianism and self sufficiency. Typical was Warren's (1980 - page 184) call for "... a number of new villages: co-operative, self-supporting units of about 300 households based on a fair share of land and resources and therefore sustainable into the future". Girardet (1976) also argued for "agriculturally based villages rather than industrial new towns", with co-operative agriculture as the main economic base.

8 The village was in a variety of ownerships, with 47 dwellings owner occupied, 18 privately owned and rented, 27 owned by the Harris family (who had owned the mines whose workers the village had originally been built to house), and the remainder empty (Horberry 1980a).
Gillian Darley (1978b) describes several of these proposals, including a craft garden village on a disused army camp in Shropshire, refused planning permission by the County Council. The Dartington proposal for a cluster of new hamlets, based on principles of low energy use, low cost housing and residents' participation was similarly refused consent (Hancock 1976a, 1976b). Similar in nature was Smigielski's (1978) co-operative village scheme at Stanford Hall in Nottinghamshire. A more radical proposal from Page (1984 - page 36) sought to combine the old and the new in "an update of the village structure used in many new towns to provide a sense of community and place, using technology to provide much greater self-sufficiency and community autonomy".

At this time, the TCPA were campaigning for a 'third garden city, to "serve as a test bed for new ways of living in the 1980s. The object would be to explore a new quality of life in both town and country" (Thomas 1979). The project was eventually developed as a new neighbourhood at Lightmoor in Telford, again reflecting some of the practical problems inherent in the promotion of new settlements, including land acquisition and conflict with the local state (Bond 1985a, Gibson 1985, Wood 1989).

**Academic Views**

Finally, in the 1970s, a number of more academic commentators, concerned with rural planning, recognised the potential of new villages. Woodruffe (1976 - page 62), encapsulated some of the planning arguments for new villages

> there may well be more attention paid to the possibility of new villages; though currently not in favour as a means of accommodating population growth in rural areas, new villages may eventually be recognised as a creative and feasible alternative to the continual expansion of existing settlements. They may also be seen as socially desirable.

Paul Cloke (1983), when writing in 1981, reviewed current rural settlement strategies and alternative approaches, in particular to the key village policy, and saw new villages or rural resettlement as being a partial and location specific approach, but

> nevertheless it is possible to envisage the majority of new developments in pressured areas being centralised into new purpose-built and well-serviced settlements, thereby conserving environmentally sensitive villages whilst continuing...
to provide adequate levels of services and facilities in the area (Cloke 1983 - page 179)

and drawing on Moss's (1978) cautionary note on Bar Hill, he concludes

Clearly, not all new villages serve to enhance the opportunities available to local residents, and care should be taken to select a suitable context for any new village scheme. With this caveat, there would appear to be considerable scope in the concept of new or refurbished settlements as focal points for future patterns of rural settlement planning (Cloke 1983 - page 180).

However whilst recognising the positive planning arguments for new settlements, this approach overlooked the conservatism inherent in the reaction of LPAs and the Planning Inspectorate. The Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) highlighted the problem that new villages, particularly the more experimental, might face, when giving evidence to the Countryside Review Committee in 1977 (quoted in Moor 1985)

planning authorities have difficulties in permitting the development of new communities which are different or experimental without undermining normal policy. It is our view that these difficulties should be faced by making specific exceptions to policy where proposals or experiments in rural living are put forward.

CONCLUSIONS

It is now possible to draw together some conclusions on the roles of the state and the private sector, and on the interrelationship between the development process and planning policy context, from this analysis using the Mode of Development and the Planning Response dimensions of the typology. The focus in on the new settlements of the period between the early 1950s and the late 1970s.

Mode of Development

As I suggested in Chapter 3, the Mode of Development can be seen as a continuum with a range of possible combinations of private and public sector inputs (Amos 1988). This has been the case in practice with the local state having some role, even in what might appear to be purely market promoted or led schemes. This involvement has been in a variety of forms
solely intervening through the development control function (as at New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath);

- some role in negotiating layout and design, and intervention through the development control function (as at East Goscote);

- initiation of the concept, including site finding and assembly but leaving the financing and implementation to the private sector (as at Bar Hill);

- carrying out most, or all of the development functions, except the bulk of the construction of dwellings and commercial facilities (as in the County Council new towns of South Woodham Ferrers, Magor and Undy, and Killingworth).

The degree of support or co-operation given by the local state has also varied

- opposition and little co-operation (as at New Ash Green);

- support and some intervention in the design process (at East Goscote and Martlesham Heath);

- the preparation of local plans, design briefs or agreements (at Bar Hill and Lower Earley).

The local state is not monolithic, and there may be conflict between different "arms", but there appears to have been a reasonable degree of co-operation. In general County Councils have taken the lead (except at Bowthorpe), with Districts being responsible mainly for the provision of housing and services.

Conversely, the market has been involved in different stages and functions of the development process in each of these settlements. There is, then, no one single model, and only New Ash Green, Martlesham Heath and East Goscote, of the major examples analysed, demonstrate the characteristics of a 'traditional' private new settlement, with the private sector being responsible for promoting and implementing development.

Figure 4.1 summarises the roles of public and private sector agencies in ten of the major settlements analysed, identifying the agency responsible for the main functions of the
development process, or where more than one agency was involved, suggesting the relative balance of responsibility.

**FIGURE 4.1**

**ROLES IN THE NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

| Site | Planning Finding | Land Planning | Finance Planning | Services Planning | Master Plan Control | Design Coordination | Constr- |ution |
|------|------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|
| BH   | Pu               | Pu           | Pu/Pr            | Pr                | Pr/Pu              | Pr/Pu               | Pr       |
| EG   | Pr               | Pr/Pu        | Pr               | Pr                | Pr/Pu              | Pr/Pu               | Pr       |
| NAG  | Pr               | Pr           | Pr               | Pr                | Pr/Pu              | Pr/Pu               | Pr       |
| MH   | Pr               | Pr/Pu        | Pr               | Pr                | Pr/Pu              | Pr/Pu               | Pr       |
| LE   | Pr               | Pu/Pr        | Pr               | Pr/Pu             | Pr/Pu              | Pr/Pu               | Pr       |
| C    | Pu               | Pu           | Pu/Pr            | Pu                | Pu                 | Pu/Pr               | Pu=Pr    |
| K    | Pu               | Pu           | Pu               | Pu                | Pu                 | Pu                  | Pu/Pr    |
| SWF  | Pu               | Pu           | Pu               | Pu                | Pu                 | Pu/Pr               | Pr       |
| MU   | Pu               | Pu           | Pu               | Pu                | Pu                 | Pu                  | Pr       |
| B    | Pu               | Pu           | Pu               | Pu                | Pu                 | Pu                  | Pu/Pr    |

Key - BH = Bar Hill, EG = East Goscote, NAG = New Ash Green, MH = Martlesham Heath, LE = Lower Earley, C = Cramlington, K = Killingworth, SWF = South Woodham Ferrers, MU = Magor and Undy, B = Bowthorpe
Pu = Public sector, Pr = Private sector. Where two agencies are shown thus Pr/Pu, the first took the leading role. Pu=Pr means that the responsibility was roughly equal.

Essentially the figure indicates that the new settlements of this period fall into two categories:

- **market-led** - the first five settlements, where the private sector carried out most of the functions in the development process, although Bar Hill differs from the rest in relation to the local state initiation of the concept;

- **state-led** (usually the local state, or more particularly, the County Council) - the second five settlements where the public sector dominated, although in some instances in a partnership with the private sector.
Within each of these categories, there is variety in relation to the precise functions and the balance of responsibility for these functions between the market and the state.

As the roles of the state and capital have varied, so has the nature of the development agency. East Goscote, New Ash Green (initially), Martlesham Heath and Lower Earley were all promoted by a single private sector development agency, although in the case of the last two, this was not, at Martlesham Heath, a housebuilder, and at Lower Earley, we can begin to see the emergence of the 'single' agency, the consortium, which is in fact a group of developers acting together.

This is illustrated in Figure 4.2, which places a number of these settlements on the Mode of Development continuum ranging from wholly private to wholly public involvement in the development process.

**FIGURE 4.2**

**MODE OF DEVELOPMENT CONTINUUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOUTH WOODHAM</th>
<th>KILLINGWORTH</th>
<th>CRAMLINGTON</th>
<th>BAR HILL</th>
<th>NEW ASH GREEN</th>
<th>MARTLESHAM EAST HEATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE SECTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Amos 1991b

In some of the local state-led new settlements, the role of the state has extended into those areas normally the function of the market, including providing financial support to the development of private sector housing, by indirect subsidy, and into marketing the settlement or individual dwellings.

Analysis of the development process does indicate that new settlement development is problematic in financial terms, as most of the schemes discussed, at one stage or another, ran into difficulties, mainly due to the fluctuating nature of the housing market, linked of course to wider economic recession. In addition, wider financial viability has had an impact on urban form, particularly on density, design and layout, first, as changes in developer have almost invariably resulted in a departure from the original design concept and a lowering of standards, and second, as housebuilders seek to vary
consents by constructing those house types which are more appropriate to prevailing market conditions. The other major impact on financial viability has been the high cost of providing services, costs which were often well in excess of initial estimates, again resulting in eroded returns.

Other common features of the development process have been

1. the provision of facilities has lagged behind the construction of housing, in part due to the lack of binding agreements with developers resulting from weak powers or simply failure to use them (Bar Hill, East Goscote, Lower Earley);
2. the lead-in time from the granting of consent to development has often been considerable, stemming from the need for prolonged negotiations over the provision of, or contributions to services and facilities (Martlesham Heath), or over design and layout (East Goscote);
3. the growing importance of negotiation and bargaining during the period, particularly over design or density control, and the provision of services and facilities;
4. the use of a variety of instruments by LPAs to exercise control over the development in those cases where the local state has not taken the lead in the development process. These range from involvement in the preparation of the initial master plan (East Goscote), to varying forms of planning agreement (Lower Earley) and design guides/briefs (which may be linked to formal agreements), and, in the case of Bar Hill, a local plan. However even in the local state-led new settlements, changing market conditions have forced some degree of compromise on design aspirations and standards, pointing to the potential weakness of local state control, except where it is actually the major constructor as well as instigator.

**Planning Response**

Most of the 'private new settlements', including the local authority-led new towns, were formulated within a context provided by formal or informal planning policy guidance. Only New Ash Green and East Goscote emerged contrary to prevailing policy, the former being granted on appeal by the Minister, and the latter being a departure from the provisions of the Development Plan (which had support from the County Council, and from the Minister). Lower Earley, although not counter to regional policy, did encounter
initial conflict with the local planning authority, being granted on appeal. The form of the policy framework within which these schemes emerged is somewhat different from that within which the new settlements of the 1980s and 1990s have been considered. In part this can be related to the inherently different nature of the development plan system, before and after 1968 (Cross and Bristow 1983). It appears that most, especially the County Council initiated schemes, accorded with general planning policy intentions rather than with specific policy instruments, and so are analogous to the designation of state new towns in this respect. The promotion of Martlesham Heath had an impact on the resultant form of the regional policy. However, only Bar Hill emerged directly from a development plan policy framework. Figure 4.3 illustrates the planning policy framework in the form of a continuum.

**FIGURE 4.3**

**PLANNING RESPONSE CONTINUUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW EAST</th>
<th>ASH GOSCOTE HILL</th>
<th>LOWER EARLEY</th>
<th>MARTLESHAM HEATH</th>
<th>BAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO POLICY FRAMEWORK (speculative)</td>
<td>PLAN LED POSITIVE FRAMEWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

Figure 4.4 combines the planning policy framework with the local state response and places the main 'private sector' schemes of the 1960s and 1970s on a continuum with these two dimensions.
It indicates that the schemes enjoyed very different relationships with the planning system, firstly in relation to the LPA's stance (or decision) on initial planning proposals, and secondly in relation to the existing planning policy framework. The different positions of, for example, East Goscote and New Ash Green reflect the degree of support which East Goscote received, although both were promoted counter to the current development plan policy framework. Similarly with Lower Earley and Martlesham Heath, both of which accorded, to some extent, with the regional planning policy framework. Their positions reflect the initial opposition of the local state to the proposal at Lower Earley.

The settlements were also developed, or permitted, in order to fulfil a range of specific planning functions, from the accommodation of regionally generated growth (as at Martlesham Heath, South Woodham Ferrers, Singleton, Lower Earley and New Ash Green), the relief of pressure on existing settlements (Bar Hill), the provision of economic opportunity and the removal of dereliction (Killingworth and Cramlington), the restoration of degraded land (East Goscote), and the rationalisation of existing development and of service costs and provision (South Woodham Ferrers).

There is, in general, an absence of the degree of 'struggle' and controversy which surrounded the new settlements of the 1980s due, in part, to the relatively closed nature of
the planning system before the mid-1970s, which did not provide the same opportunities for participation or contestation.

Synthesis and Conclusions

Darley (1978a, 1979) suggests that the private sector’s record in the development of new villages in the period from the late 1940s to the beginning of the 1980s is a depressing one. This is perhaps rather a harsh verdict, but the preceding analysis has indicated a number of factors which have led to their problematic development:

1. The fluctuating or cyclical nature of the economy and the housing market, which depressed sales for critical periods, reduced returns to developers, and led to slower than expected housing development; social and commercial facilities not being provided in step with housing; the lowering of initial design standards and intentions; and the withdrawal of some developers and the bankruptcy of others;

2. The opposition of many LPAs to the idea of new villages, demonstrated by the initial refusal of New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath, and by the private sector’s poor record overall of obtaining planning permission;

3. The degree of commitment and involvement of LPAs varied. Many LPAs were unwilling to co-operate fully in the new settlements which did get underway. At New Ash Green, opposition to the scheme continued despite its granting on appeal, whilst those new settlements that have been developed most closely in line with original intentions have been those with a high degree of LPA commitment (most noticeably, of course, those in which the local state has taken the lead as ‘developer’);

4. High land values and infrastructure costs acted as a deterrent - in order for a new settlement to succeed developers need to purchase low value land in an appropriate location and failure to do so, as at Bar Hill, has had severe consequences, whilst part of the success of New Ash Green and Martlesham Heath resulted from the acquisition of cheap land and the use of the increase in land values to partly fund community facilities;
Planning policy context - in general the new settlements that have been developed most successfully have accorded with an emerging policy framework, or more normally, with an LPA's general intentions. Usually this policy framework has been a strategic regional or sub-regional one, rather than a detailed or scheme/site specific policy;

Lack of effective mechanisms to link the phased provision of housing to that of social and community facilities, which has led to the considerable lag in the development of the necessary community provision. In some cases, this perhaps reflects the relative unsophistication of the LPA (or of the planning system)\(^9\), as well as weak or ill-defined legal powers. It is only in the last ten years or so that planning agreements have been widely and effectively used;

Long time scale of development, and inherent inflexibility of initial development briefs - housebuilders' aspirations in terms of the type, size and cost of dwellings to be constructed have changed over time, not unsurprisingly, in response to changing consumer tastes, preferences and demands. Such changes have also resulted from the fluctuating economic fortunes of individual developers and particular schemes. To some extent these were not foreseen, accommodated or controlled, and led to significant alterations in original design intentions and standards.

Unproblematic new settlement production is certainly related to, and partly dependent on, a buoyant economy, and of the settlements of the 1960s and 1970s, only East Goscote seems to have been unaffected by a wider economic recession. Landownership and the cost of land acquisition is also an important factor in determining the degree to which new settlement development is financially viable, as cheap land allowed the provision of social and other facilities to be subsidised. Landownership facilitated the development of the local state-led new settlements, by giving the County Councils greater control over the private sector constructors.

---

\(^9\) See, for example, East Goscote where Leicestershire County Council "sought to impose only two conditions on the initial application, covering the submission of further details and the removal of all buildings and rubble from the site prior to the commencement of the development of the village" (New Settlements Research Group 1992 - page 11). Following the call-in of the application, its refusal by the Minister and a re-submission (supported by the County), "seven conditions were imposed on the layout permission granted in June 1964 ... for a scheme covering 140 acres and with over 900 houses, the matters covered by condition are relatively limited" (ibid). This is by no means atypical, and there was, of course, no planning agreement either.
Drawing this analysis together, it is now possible to consider the relative roles of the actors in the development process, and the effect of the planning system on this process of new settlement development.

Previous views of the new settlement initiatives of the post-war period (including the state new towns) have tended to categorise them too easily as private or public, based on a somewhat superficial view of all of the functions associated with the development process. No one particular model emerges from this analysis, but instead a variety of different forms of state and market involvement. Certainly the post-war process of new settlement creation has not been dominated by the private sector, at least until the end of the 1970s. Rather this period has been characterised by a growing private sector role in state new towns, local state-led development with a limited but varied role for the market (including forms of public/private sector partnerships), and a number of market-led settlements.

Overall the role and power of the market in the new settlement development process has grown, although this has taken place with only an indirect or weak relationship with the formal development planning process. Central state decisions on planning applications have been important, for example, in upholding appeals (New Ash Green and Lower Earley), and in encouraging negotiation (East Goscote). However, the local state has been more important in decision making (Bar Hill, East Goscote, Martlesham Heath and the County Council-led new settlements). The local state role in policy formulation has been less clear, as policy, per se, or at least, formal policy expressed in development plans, has been relatively unimportant. Pro-active policy has been developed predominantly in circumstances of considerable growth pressure (Lower Earley, Bar Hill, Martlesham Heath, South Woodham Ferrers), or where a growth point is required (Cramlington, Killingworth). On the whole, though, this pro-active policy has tended to be outside the formal development plan process.

Central/local state interactions have been important, in, for example, affecting the mechanisms for new settlement production, such as shaping the form of negotiation at East Goscote. Once a new settlement is underway or completed, other actors have a significant role in management and maintenance, although, as the conflict at New Ash Green over the industrial development demonstrated, this interaction may not always be positive.
Turning now to the impact of private sector pressure for new settlements, only in the case of Martlesham Heath did the new settlement proposal have a positive effect on the resulting shape of regional or sub-regional policy. In general, pressure for new settlements seems to have been largely expressed directly as planning applications, rather than through any other forum.

As I will show later the 1980s display a distinct change in the relationship between the state and the private sector.
CHAPTER 5

PRIVATE NEW SETTLEMENTS IN THE 1980s AND 1990s
- THE NEW SETTLEMENT DEBATE
INTRODUCTION

At the end of the 1970s some commentators suggested that the prospects for private sector new villages were rather poor (Darley 1979), with, for example, Bray (1981a - page 37) feeling that "for the next few years, New Ash Green will remain a unique example of a new, comprehensive community". However this pessimism appears to have been misplaced, for within a relatively short period (from about 1983 onwards), private new settlement proposals abounded. This suggests that conditions for the production of new settlements by the private sector had changed. The extent of that change, and the intensity of the struggle which was engendered, may, perhaps, be reflected in the comparatively few proposals which actually succeeded in obtaining planning permission. One of the aims of this work is, of course, to shed light on the degree to which the 1980s mark a fundamental shift in the power relations and a major contention is that the form of the shift in these relations provided part of the conditions necessary for new settlement production.

In Chapter One I put forward some of the possible reasons for the change in production conditions, including the shift in relations between the state and the market, with the growing 'deregulation' of planning. As Paul Cloke (1992b - page 283) indicates, the outcomes of this shift were manifest in specific geographical contexts, as "inevitably, however, the unevenness of capitalist development has led to particular pressures on particular rural localities". Part of that pressure from housebuilding fractions of capital was in the form of new settlements, but there was a wider struggle. Conflicts over urban development grew, first and most fiercely, in the South East. This conflict also took place nationally, over the shift implicit in the new policy documents from the central state, which set out the basis for the reordered policy approach to development in the countryside, including draft circulars on housing land and green belts (Johnston 1983, Hall 1983a, Grove-White 1984, Herington 1984a). Taken together these circulars "implied a weakening of Green Belt controls and a greater deference to market trends in the allocation of housing land" (Grove-White 1984 - page 30), although the content of each was modified as a result of the intense conflict.

So the early years of the 1980s were marked by shifting power relations centred around the land use planning system, and shifting policy. A central issue during this period, and later, was the role which new settlements might play in the reoriented policy approach to accommodating development. The debate was, and has been, polarised, with lobby
groups like the TCPA proclaiming their merits, and others such as the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) opposing most schemes. However even the CPRE has not been consistently and uncritically hostile

In areas of substantial growth, CPRE recognised a possible role for new settlements as the most environmentally and socially attractive way of providing new housing development (Burton 1990 - page 7)

This Chapter outlines the origins and beginnings of this resurgence of private new settlements in the 1980s, and then considers the substantive policy issues in the continuing debate on new settlements. A critical examination of these issues can aid in the analysis of the wider changes in power relations which are the object of this study.

THE BEGINNINGS - EARLY 1980s

As I have suggested, renewed interest from the private sector in promoting and developing new settlements dates from the early 1980s. For, in mid 1983, a number of the larger housebuilders forming the Volume Housebuilders Study Group (VHBSG)1 announced, firstly, the formation of New Villages Ltd. (Architects Journal 1983, Planning 1983a, 1983b) and, secondly, a specific programme reported by Linton (1983a).

A consortium of housing contractors is planning to build a series of 12 small new towns or large villages on green field sites within easy reach of London. They have already identified "target" locations, which are being kept secret, although some of them are known to be in the green belt

The consortium soon dropped the name New Villages Ltd., becoming instead (perhaps more accurately) Consortium Developments Ltd. (CDL), and starting operations on 1st August 1983. Their proposals were for self contained 'new villages' of 7,000 to 8,000 dwellings (15,000 to 20,000 population) on sites of about 1,000 acres, within a 30 mile radius of London, with the object of meeting the alleged shortfall in the amount of land available to provide for the required new housing in the South East2. Rather propheti-

---

1The Volume House Builders Study Group is made up of the largest housebuilders - that is those building over 2,000 dwellings per year, meets on an informal basis, and lobbies Central Government ministers (Rydin 1983, 1986, Vision 1988). Initially, all of its members formed CDL.

2The use of the term 'new village' for a new settlement of the scale proposed (which could more accurately be described as a town according to the evidence on the debate about new settlement scale in Chapter 3) can be seen as an attempt to create a specific image. Indeed, the description
cally, Linton (1983b) suggested that "the developers expect an uphill struggle to get planning authorities to agree, particularly to the green belt sites", and quoted one of the consortium's members "Obviously there are going to be objections and it's not going to be an easy ride, but having taken those difficulties into account, we are going to proceed".

This publicising of the new village project came hard on the heels of the draft circular on housing land which, by indicating that "new settlements might in some cases be the answer to the problems faced by builders in getting adequate supplies" (Planning 1983b), had paved the way. Its tone and emphasis certainly appeared supportive to the housebuilders' case, in solely focusing on the potential difficulties builders might have in obtaining developable housing land. Given the heated nature of the debate over the circular (and about its companion on green belts), the announcement could be seen as a direct challenge to the planning system, and more particularly to the local state's role and power in that system, by a large and influential group of volume housebuilders seemingly confident about the eventual outcome.

The project had, of course, been under preparation for some time. CDL's own chronology (CDL 1988) indicates that in 1982 the VHBSG had commissioned consultants Conran Roche to assess the viability of the plan for new country towns and to pinpoint the most suitable locations in the South East of England; this work went on into 1983. This is corroborated by Conran Roche and indeed some of the results of this work appeared in a series of articles, written by planners from Conran Roche, setting out the case for private new settlements in the South East3 (CDL 1988, Keene 1989). Indeed the origins were even earlier for Fred Lloyd Roche (partner in Conran Roche), writing in 1986, said "the CDL programme has its origins about five years ago, when I discussed the concept of a new country town with Tom Baron of the Volume Housebuilders Study Group"4 (Lloyd Roche 1986 - page 312).

3In particular, articles by Lee Shostak and David Lock (Shostak and Lock 1984, 1985).
4Tom Baron was, at that time, Chairman and Managing Director of Christian Salveson, one of the members of the VHBSG and of CDL. He had been secretary of the VHBSG, as well as a special housing advisor to Michael Heseltine, when he was first Secretary of State for the Environment, and as such closely involved in the drafting of circular 22/80 Development Control - Policy and
Although CDL’s project represents the largest, concerted ‘programme’ for the construction of private new settlements in the UK, it later crumbled in the face of the lack of concrete support from Ministers who had appeared supportive of its aims (with the dismissal, on appeal or ‘call-in’, of their four major proposals), mounting local antagonism, and opposition from many LPAs (Shostak 1991, Grigsby 1992).

At about the same time as CDL’s ‘programme’ was launched, but in a rather different geographical and planning context, proposals were also being formulated for a rather different kind of new settlement. A group of professionals, including planners, architects, surveyors and lawyers, who later formed the Pentref Trust and its subsidiary the Pentref Development Company, discussed ideas for a small (500 dwelling) new village at Tircoed to the north of Swansea (Planning 1984a, Grove 1985a, 1986). It was to be based on markedly different principles to those which underlay CDL’s proposals (although their rhetoric was similar), having at its centre Howard’s concept of residents’ participation. A trust was to be established and endowed with the surplus from the development (Grove 1985a). Bill (1991) dates the beginning of the project as 1981 with the formation of Pentref Trust. Unlike any of CDL’s proposals, it has actually obtained planning permission and is in the course of development. The company has plans to find and develop other sites, along similar lines.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS

So fittingly two very different new settlement “programmes" began at around the same time. In many ways they represent the ends of the spectrum of new settlement production - large scale new country towns, promoted by the volume housebuilders, and small scale new villages, promoted along more idealistic lines. Between these two extremes fall many of the proposals which emerged during the 1980s, for since 1983, other development interests have followed the lead set by CDL, and refined it, as CDL’s own concept was refined during its nine or so years, and the volume of private sector proposals has grown steadily. Figure 5.1 indicates the important events and dates in this growth concentrating in particular on the most significant proposals and on those that are of relevance to the case studies. It covers the initial announcements of proposals, the submission of planning applications, the making of decisions on applications, the

Practice (DoE 1980, Architects Journal 1983). His views on the planning system and its relationship with the housebuilding industry are set out in Baron 1980
lodging of appeals, the hearing of appeals at public inquiries, the issuing of decisions on appeals and other events which are of significance. The chronology needs to be seen in the context of other policy developments outlined in later Chapters. It does however provide a useful picture of the relative changes in the intensity of activity centred around new settlements.

FIGURE 5.1

CHRONOLOGY OF NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formation of Pentref Development Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conran Roche commissioned by VHBSG to assess viability of new country towns plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Formation of CDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Preparation of study on Tillingham Hall (Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Tircoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>LPA support in principle for Tircoed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Tillingham Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Tillingham Hall refused PP and appeal submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Brenthall Park (Harlow, Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Great Lea (Berkshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Chafford Hundred (Essex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Great Lea refused PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Eversley (Hampshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Tillingham Hall inquiry begins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement of Foxley Wood (CDL in Hampshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Tillingham Hall inquiry ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Chafford Hundred granted PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement of Wymeswold (Leicestershire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Wymeswold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Announcement of Leybourne (Kent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Shenley (Hertfordshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Tillingham Hall appeal dismissed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Belham Hill (Cambridgeshire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Submission of O/L PA for Denny (Cambridgeshire)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June
Submission of O/L PA for Crow Green (Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Scotland Park (Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Swansley Wood (Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Foxley Wood

July
Submission of O/L PA for Bourn Airfield (Cambridgeshire)

August
Foxley Wood refused PP and appeal submitted
Tircoed granted O/L PP

September
Announcement of Waterfenton (Cambridgeshire)

October
Announcement of Wilburton (CDL in Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Eversley (Hampshire)
Shenley inquiry

December
Announcement of Stone Bassett (Oxfordshire)
Submission of further PA for Wymeswold
Brenthall Park appeal upheld
Eversley refused PP

1988 January
Nightingales Park inquiry opens
Nightingales Park inquiry ends
Submission of O/L PA for Stone Bassett (CDL)
Eversley appeal submitted

April
Submission of appeal for non determination of Stone Bassett PA
Work begins on Chafford Hundred
Submission of O/L PA for Upper Donnington (Berkshire)

May
Wymeswold PA called-in by SoS
Submission of O/L PA for Waterfenton and Westmere (Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Wellfield Park (Stevenage)
Announcement of Garendon (Leicestershire)

June
Foxley Wood inquiry begins
Upper Donnington refused PP
Stone Bassett refused PP

July
Submission of O/L PA for Six Hills (Leicestershire)
Foxley Wood inquiry ends

August
Submission of O/L PA for Kettleby Magna (Leicestershire)

October
Great Lea inquiry
Submission of further O/L PA for Wymeswold

November
Announcement of Thorpe Arch (near Leeds)
Announcement of Acaster Malbis (now St Andrews - North Yorkshire)
Announcement of Forest of Galtres (North Yorkshire)
Stone Bassett inquiry begins
Submission of O/L PA for Denny (Cambridgeshire)
Wymeswold PA called in by SoS

December 1989
Submission of O/L PA for Highfields (Cambridgeshire)

January
Eversley inquiry opens
Stone Bassett inquiry ends
Announcement of Bittesby (Leicestershire)

February
Eversley inquiry ends
Submission of further O/L PA for Waterfenton (Cambridgeshire)
Announcement of Mere Green (Hereford & Worcester)
Announcement of Shernock Court (Hereford & Worcester)
Tircoed first phase granted detailed PP

March
Wymeswold inquiry begins
Submission of further PA for Swansley Wood
Submission of O/L PA for Garendon (Leicestershire)
Submission of O/L PA for Northwick Village Project (Essex)

April
Submission of O/L PA for Great Common Farm (Cambridgeshire)
Submission of O/L PA for Nine Mile Hill (Cambridgeshire)
Wymeswold inquiry ends

May
Cambridgeshire PAs called-in by SoS

July
SoS minded to dismiss Eversley and Nightingales Park appeals, and minded to allow Foxley Wood appeal
Stone Bassett appeal dismissed
Submission of O/L PA for Stretton Magna (Leicestershire)
Submission of O/L PA for Aston Prior (Shropshire)

September
Submission of O/L PA for Hare Park (Cambridgeshire)
Announcement of Bowbrook (Hereford & Worcester)

October
SoS minded to dismiss Foxley Wood, Eversley and Nightingales Park
Upper Donnington inquiry
Cambridgeshire A10 inquiry begins
Work started at Tircoed

December
Cambridgeshire A10 inquiry ends
Foxley Wood appeal dismissed

1990 January Cambridgeshire A45 inquiry begins
Submission of O/L PA for Allington (Cambridgeshire)
Announcement of Micheldever Station (Hampshire)

February Great Lea appeal dismissed
March Submission of further O/L PA for Allington
Number of new settlement proposals announced in North Yorkshire

April Number of new settlement proposals announced in North Yorkshire
Wymeswold refused PP by SoS

May Northwick Village Project called-in

July Submission of O/L PA for St Andrews

August Upper Donnington appeal dismissed
Cambridgeshire A45 inquiry ends
Submission of further O/L PA for Stretton Magna

November Announcement of Kennett (Cambridgeshire)
Announcement of modified Micheldever Station
SoS issues article 14(1) direction on St Andrews
Northwick Village Project call-in inquiry begins

December Northwick Village Project call-in inquiry ends

1991 January Submission of O/L PA for Ashford Great Park (Kent)
Aston Prior appeal dismissed

February CDL 'mothballed'
Medburn (Northumberland) approved

March Stretton Magna PA withdrawn
White Court West (Braintree) granted PP

August Northwick Village Project refused PP by SoS

November Approval by SoS of Emmersons Green
Contracts exchanged on first phase of Shenley

December Dismissal/refusal of Cambridgeshire A10 NS (Denny, Waterton and Westmere)

1992 January White Court West (initial phase) granted detailed PP
March Dismissal of Cambridgeshire A45 NS (Allington, Belham Hill, Bourn Airfield, Great Common Farm, Hare Park, Scotland Park, Swansley Wood)
Sources: for CDL activities upto 1988 Resume of Activities in CDL 1988, for others various, including newspapers, planning press and application/appeal documents

Notes: NS = new settlement, PA = planning application, O/L = outline, SoS = Secretary of State.

It is clear that, for example, the number of proposals and of planning applications has increased over this period, particularly from 1987. Government intervention has similarly become more marked, unsurprisingly, with the 'call-in' of applications, and the issuing of decision on appeals and 'call-ins'. This is part of the 'struggle' over new settlements which was accompanied by the debate I referred to above on the place of new settlements in the planning of the 'outer city' (Herington 1984b).

THE NEW SETTLEMENTS DEBATE - ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST

As I suggest the debate on new settlements can be seen as part of the wider debate on urban development and of the struggle over the role and power of land use planning, especially at the level of the local state, and of the power of the market in relation to the local state. Analysis of this debate, and, in particular, of the arguments put forward for and against private new settlements can illustrate the precise nature of this wider struggle, in highlighting the key themes and key areas of contention. Also, following Rydin and Myerson (1989), an interpretative analysis can illuminate the perceptions of participants in the process, and provide a way of tackling ideological effects. It can also highlight those issues which appeared to be of greatest importance to particular participants in the debate, and by focusing on the arguments of the promoters it is possible to isolate some of the substantive reasons for the growing pressure for private new settlements.

At the public launch of CDL’s 'programme' of new villages, Tom Baron outlined some of the arguments which the new settlement promoters used to justify their proposals.

The expansion of existing towns and the development of new communities in the South East has been severely restricted by lack of public sector investment and restrictive planning policy. We believe that the private housebuilding sector can provide the solution to this problem without relying on Government or local authority funding (Planning 1983b - page 10).
Baron went on to add that the substantial resources of the firms making up the consortium would allow it to consider developments on a scale never previously thought possible in the private sector (Planning 1983b). Similar arguments have been advanced by other promoters, but these lie at the heart of the debate, and reflect Conservative ideology, as well as suggesting the power of the housebuilders ("substantial resources"). The substitution of private capital for state funding and an implicit attack on the ("restrictive") planning policies of the local state, accord with the Government's ideological project.

Since then, the debate on the relative advantages and disadvantages of new settlements has continued, carried out at first in the pages of the planning journals and the national press, and later in the forum of public inquiries and Examinations in Public (EiP). This debate has been both emotive and unfocused at times, but over the years from 1983 it has moved from generalities to become more related to specific issues, proposals and sites as they have emerged. It has also become more concerned with particular planning policies, whilst at the same time a more general discussion, partly polemical, has continued, both on new settlements per se and on the general level of new development, particularly in the South East of England.

Particular events and proposals have served to highlight it for relatively short periods, such as the public disagreement between the previous and the (then) current Secretaries of State for the Environment in the first few months of 1988, but it has continued nevertheless. It is from this continuing debate that the cases for and against the concept of privately developed new settlements are drawn.

**The case for new settlements**

A considerable number of arguments, some of which are interrelated, have been put forward (Amos 1988, 1989b, 1990c), although, as David Lock (1988b - page 10) notes, "the case for planned new country towns is the traditional case for new towns, but motivated and resourced by the private sector". In part this traditional case is that new settlements "offer a coherent approach to the planning and management of urban growth and restraint areas" (Herington 1989b - page 226).

The most comprehensive summary comes from Alasdair S. Jones (1990), who compares new settlements (in this case new villages, but the general principles and arguments remain the same) to the alternative and more usual form of urban expansion
through the incremental growth of existing settlements. Figure 5.2 sets out his main points.

**FIGURE 5.2**
THE CASE FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS SUMMARISED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW VILLAGES</th>
<th>INCREMENTAL GROWTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Away from green belts/sensitive environments</td>
<td>Threaten green belt or sensitive environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divert demand from cherished environments</td>
<td>Existing settlements become uncomfortably oversized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not alter character of existing settlements</td>
<td>Alters scale, form and appearance of existing settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better related to landscape</td>
<td>Poor relationship with landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better prospects of low cost rural housing</td>
<td>Less chance of low cost rural housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flexible land supply</td>
<td>Supply unlikely to match demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower land prices funds own infrastructure -</td>
<td>Higher land prices - minimal private sector contribution to adequate services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>better infrastructure, facilities and services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher design standards, sense of unity and</td>
<td>Spread of suburbanisation, lacks identity, may weaken existing community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to long term</td>
<td>Short term view</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A.S. Jones 1990

Many of these have been echoed by other writers and new settlement promoters, and they are set out in rather more detail as follows:-
1 Meeting an identified (or alleged) shortfall of housing land or houses, particularly in the south east of England, or playing a part in meeting the demand for housing - Much of CDL's case for new settlements in the South East of England is based on the alleged shortfall they identified between the amount of housing land being allocated through the structure plan process and the number of dwellings required to meet needs (brought about by migration, population growth and the increase in the number of households). The precise statistical discussion is developed fully by a number of writers (Bennett 1984, Shostak & Lock 1984, 1985, 1987, Dyer 1985, Johnston 1985, CDL 1988, Lock 1988b, Hall 1989a, 1989c, 1991a, Perera 1989a, 1989b). A consequence of this alleged shortage of land for housing development is alleged to be higher land prices, higher costs of development and higher housing prices (Bond 1985b), which finds some degree of support in the studies by Cheshire and Sheppard (1989) and Evans (1987) of the effects of the planning system on house prices. So the development of new settlements on cheaper rural land can reduce development costs and house prices (Dyer 1985). This argument about the shortfall of housing land being allocated by County Planning Authorities, and the effects of this supply restriction, explicitly on the consumers of housing and implicitly on the housebuilders (and their profit margins), has been at the heart of the housebuilders' attempts to 'free up' the planning system (Evans 1987, Humber 1987, 1990, Humber and Jones 1984, HBF 1989).

2 Reducing pressure for piecemeal development in existing settlements, thus avoiding overdevelopment, and the adverse environmental and other effects stemming from this - increasing the supply of housing land available, through the development of a new settlement, would enable LPAs to resist development elsewhere (Bennett 1984, Shostak & Lock 1984, 1987, McLaughlin & Woolley 1985, Lloyd Roche 1985, Hall 1989b, Miles 1989, Dean 1990, Smallman 1990). In particular it would avoid the problems associated with 'town cramming', as the continued infill of existing settlements has become known (Lock 1990a, Smallman 1990, Hall 1991a). Savage, a critic of CDL's initial proposals, does agree that, as part of a comprehensively planned development strategy, new settlements should make it easier for LPAs to resist development pressure elsewhere (Savage 1984). This view is shared by some LPAs, for, as Miles (1989 - page 16) noted in a discussion of new village proposals in the North East, Castle Morpeth Borough Council's chief planning officer said "pressure for the release of land elsewhere in the borough would be eased or more readily counteracted". However new settlements have been viewed by some (such as the CPRE) as being associated with areas of growth, and therefore exacerbating, rather than reducing development pressure (Burton 1990).
3 Assisting in the conservation and protection of valued built and natural environments - This is one facet of the argument in 2, but related to the protection of existing settlements, townscapes, landscapes and habitats of considerable conservation, historical or architectural value (Gibbons 1990). For as David Hall (1989b - page 112) notes "New towns have always been a conservation measure as much as a measure for providing balanced development in a good environment." Lock (1989b - page 3) develops this theme, relating it to the pace of new development, for "the creation of new settlements to accommodate urban growth enables the character and extent of existing settlements to remain stable, or at the very least, enables a more acceptable rate of change."

4 Providing cost effective investment in infrastructure and other facilities, by developer funding or contributions - most of the community facilities and infrastructure required in a new settlement can be funded by the developer using the increase in the land value (HBF 1989, Lock 1989d, 1990a, Northfield 1989), and so minimise the costs falling on the public sector, in Grove's (1985b - page iv) terms "a kind of do-it-yourself comp and bett". Bennett (1984 - page 7) made it clear that

"CDL would expect to meet all on- and off-site costs of physical infrastructure associated with the development of the settlement which would include a major distributor, foul and surface water drainage, and depending on location, water, gas and electricity mains."

In addition, serviced sites for schools and clinics would be provided, and, if necessary, contributions made to the construction of new buildings (CDL 1988). In practice, the precise package being offered has varied, depending on the economics of each individual scheme, and on the wider economy, so that in times of recession and depressed housing markets, the private sector is likely to offer (and be able to fund) less comprehensive packages (Peart 1989, Elson 1990).

The planning gain argument is the second of the private sector's core arguments, and with the reduction in the power and financial ability of the local state to provide infrastructure and services following privatisation and central government attacks on local spending (Le Grand and Robinson 1984, Bell and Cloke 1989), the packages of infrastructure and facilities offered by the market have assumed greater importance, particularly in new settlement proposals (Healey, Ennis and Purdue 1992, Elson 1989, 1990,
1991, Meikle, Pattinson, Wheeler and Zetter 1991). Such an argument can also be assumed to appeal to a central state whose policies include shifting responsibilities into the market place and reducing the state's role in the provision of services (Bell and Cloke 1989).

5 Contributions to wider improvements in infrastructure and social and other facilities - New settlement development is likely to result in improvements in infrastructure, particularly in the construction or improvement of off-site roads in order to accommodate the development, and in the availability of additional social, recreational and other facilities provided in the new settlement which would benefit the existing population (Hall 1985, Elson 1989, 1990). In addition, A.S. Jones (1990) points to the problem of growing thresholds for services which undermine the argument that limited expansion of certain existing villages can maintain and support shops, schools and surgeries. He suggests (1990 - page 9) that

it may be the case, that by the establishment of such services as part of a new community package, new settlements are able to provide rural service centres capable of the provision of such facilities that may be under threat in adjoining areas.

6 A more economical use of land and other resources than the more traditional ways of accommodating urban growth, like peripheral expansion of, or infill within, existing settlements - Archer (1971b) suggested that the developers of new settlements can obtain economies of scale and avoid the diseconomies which may be associated with more scattered development in suburban locations. In part this is related to the more cost effective provision of new infrastructure and services possible in new settlements, and to the effective overall use of land which can be achieved by comprehensive planning on a greenfield site. Merrett (1984) attempts an assessment of the density and consequent land take of CDL's early proposals, showing that more land may be required than originally thought the case and so that the use of land may not be as efficient as predicted. Lord Northfield, the chairman of CDL, stated the case for CDL's largest scale schemes in more forthright terms, indicating that they have advantages over smaller schemes and over infill or peripheral development

....we have to work the free market system as best we can and secure a return of a significant part of the betterment into infrastructure and community facilities.
This would not be possible on significantly smaller schemes (Northfield 1989 - page 14).

Lock (1989b, 1989d, 1990a) sets out in detail the economic considerations governing the scale of, and mix of facilities in, the private sector new settlement, and sheds light on the impact of financial viability on the development process, and on the end-product. This work has been followed up in an as yet unpublished research project for the Department of the Environment, which seeks to compare new settlements with other forms of urban growth, and to suggest which is more appropriate to achieve sustainable development and a range of other benefits (Lock and Breheny 1992).

7 Minimise the impact of urban growth on agricultural land and on the countryside - With the slow rate of agricultural land conversion to urban uses, the loss of some rural land is "not an unbearable cost in return for a better housed population" (Fyson 1984). Furthermore new settlements offer a better alternative to, and one which would have less impact on the countryside than, the continued urban sprawl characteristic of the peripheral expansion of existing settlements, again because of the ability to plan and arrange land uses effectively and comprehensively on a greenfield site (Bond 198b, Hall 1989b, Young 1989, Smallman 1990). In this sense, the new settlement debate has become embroiled with a parallel debate on the impact and effectiveness of green belt policy (Elson 1979, 1986, Herington 1984a, 1990, 1991). Fyson (1986 - page 3) neatly sums up this aspect of the case, when commenting on the Tillingham Hall proposal

In terms of conservation of the countryside, a sensible strategy to take advantage of the motorways within the region and the maintenance of the integrity of an albeit smaller London green belt, Tillingham is an infinitely better option than the present situation, characterised as it is by piecemeal accretionary development at green belt edges and a serious shortage of houses where people want to live.

Darley (1989), Green (1989), Green and Holliday (1991), Green, Holliday and Arden-Clarke (1989), Holliday (1990, 1991), and Grove (1990a, 1990b) all extend the argument to include many of the other problems of development in the countryside, and the consequences of existing policy. In particular, Gillian Darley (1989) looks back to the new village antecedents
No-one can imagine that creating a handful of new villages will solve the problem of development in the countryside but just such a few might, as their predecessors once did, set an influential example.

8 New settlements provide opportunities for the balanced and phased development of housing and employment - "Additional employment will result from the development of a new settlement which would be planned so that the increase in jobs would be broadly in balance with the increase in population" (Bennett 1984 - page 7), something which is possible only in planned new settlements. This has echoes of the partial objectives of the state new towns and of Howard's ideas, but the extent to which such a balance can be achieved in practice has been questioned (Herington 1988).

New settlements could also increase the range and types of jobs available, not just to the residents of the settlement, but to people in adjoining towns and villages (Bennett 1984). Hall (1991a - page 4) suggests additional economic benefits from a programme of new settlements, as this helps to stimulate national and local economies by providing a good environment for firms and their work forces, by stimulating greater productivity of firms in new towns than similar firms elsewhere, and by yielding a better return on assets.

9 Ensure a continuity in the supply of land for development to housebuilders and other developers, thereby facilitating competitive house prices, provision of a wide range of facilities and the production of a high quality environment - the continuity of supply of developable land for a developer in a new settlement would reduce overheads, and other costs, and increase productivity through providing stable employment for the management, workforce, and sales staff (Bennett 1984, Shostak and Lock 1984). In this way it would have considerable advantages for the developer over smaller scale development in or on the edge of existing settlements, as it would ensure a greater degree of certainty in the supply of land over a longer period of time. This is one of the major advantages for the private sector, since continuity in the supply of developable land helps to guarantee continuity of returns, and to strengthen the position of the developer vis a vis other actors in the development process (Ball 1983, Smyth 1982, 1984). It can be seen as part of the struggle between the housebuilders and landowners in particular (Goodchild and Munton 1985).
New settlements represent an opportunity to achieve a high standard of, and diversity and variety in, design, layout, landscaping and open space, and to improve the overall quality of life, by a balanced provision of facilities. First, there is an incentive for the developer to provide a high standard of development and recreational, social and other facilities, as these enhance the marketability of the development, since, as Northedge (1988 - page 27) suggests, "the public will reject towns which have deficient facilities".

Second, as Archer (1971b) argues, high standards and a wide range of facilities in new settlements give their developers a competitive edge over other forms of new housing development, for "without this additional investment, the site in a new settlement is not as attractive as sites in existing urban areas" (Bennett 1984 - page 7).

Third, there may be a genuine desire to achieve quality in the development and Lloyd Roche (1986 - page 313) outlines the reason for CDL's emphasis on this:

In advocating the new country town concept for CDL it has been necessary to focus on the quality of development envisaged. We have all seen the poor quality of much contemporary housing development in the UK, but it is important to understand that a major factor in this is the disproportionately high cost of land. CDL, by working on a relatively large scale, can negotiate a keen price that allows investment in a quality product: high quality landscaping, sensitive selection of street furniture, sensitive design of public spaces, variety in both form and tenure of housing provision and a wide range of supporting facilities. This is a cornerstone of the proposal.

Last, the wider benefits of a planned environment are summarised by Hall (1991a - page 4):

a proper balance of land uses thus shortening journeys to work, providing easy access to a range of public and other services, and providing a mix of housing tenure....

Irrespective of the imperatives there might be in terms of marketability and a desire to achieve quality, high standards of design and facilities enhance land values (Archer 1971a, Bennett 1984, Shostak and Lock 1984, Northfield 1989). This enhanced value accrues to the developer rather than the landowner, since the cost of the gain package
is set against the land value and deducted from the price paid for the land (Bennett 1984). So the argument highlights the struggle between the housebuilders in particular and landowners, over the supply and cost of land. It may be interpreted as an indirect attack on local state planning policy, charged, by the housebuilders, with increasing the cost of land (Humber 1984, Blincoe and Dobson 1985). The appeal is to improve the standards of development, not by changes in layout, design or construction methods for example, but by reducing the cost of land to the developer, with the inference that low cost sites should be released, even if counter to planning policy. The responsibility for the problem of poor quality urban development, and for obstructing the solution is placed with the local state.

11 New settlements can assist in channelling decentralising population into planned locations, thereby lowering densities in the inner city and allowing urban regeneration to take place more easily and cost effectively - With continuing counter urbanisation and drift of population and business from the larger cities, Herington (1988 - page 309) argues that new settlements could play a role, as part of a modified form of planned decentralisation, for

   even if the potential for absorbing migration from the cities is limited, private new settlements of whatever size might achieve a valuable role in managing a greater volume of decentralised population growth and in meeting the housing needs of those living outside the city.

New settlements are also seen as part of the policy package for achieving the regeneration of the inner city (Woodrow 1986, Hall 1988a, 1989b, Pattison 1987, Planning 1989a, 1991a). Indeed the TCPA asserted that

   it will not be possible to create the kind of towns, cities and villages we want without some new development being in the form of new garden cities, new villages or country towns (quoted in Planning 1989a)
12 Provide opportunities for new patterns of social mix by ensuring the balanced provision of a range of house types, sizes, tenures and prices, particularly the provision of low cost housing of various types. Unlike peripheral or infill development, where new housing usually follows the established tenure, style, price and size patterns, new settlements are an opportunity to "mix shared ownership housing, privately rented housing on assured tenancies and housing for sale, in a broad range of house prices" (Bennett 1984 - page 7), thereby producing socially balanced school catchments, and more socially mixed communities. Once again this argument has echoes of Howard and the idea of social balance.

The potential contribution of new settlements to the provision of affordable housing is emphasised by Lock (1990c) and by Shostak and Lock (1985 - page 19) in that "a programme of new country towns could offer a steady stream of homes which first-time purchasers, for example, could afford". As social housing became a more significant issue through the 1980s, so it developed into one of the central elements of CDL's case, "we are adamantly committed to the creation of a balanced community. New Country Towns like Foxley Wood are not just executive ghettos by another name" (Bennett 1987 - page 35).

13 New settlements can increase choice - New settlements will increase the housing supply, with greater choice of locations for the housebuilders and for the consumer, and more variety in the type, price and tenure of houses, as well as a greater choice of lifestyle (Shostak & Lock 1984). They may also provide for unmet demand in particular sectors of the housing market, as in the demand for housing at the upper end of the market in the North East (Miles 1989), or provide wider access to housing in pressured rural areas where house prices have risen to levels which exclude many locals (Grove 1990a).

14 New settlements should stabilise land prices - land and house prices in areas where settlements are developed should stabilise, by increasing the number of houses available in the local housing market (Bennett 1984, Rookwood 1988). The precise effect on house prices is open to doubt, for, as Rusbridger (1988 - page 2) points out "Mr. Bennett anticipates that prices wouldn't drop, but argues that they wouldn't rise so fast. He acknowledges that there would have to be expansion on a massive scale - perhaps 300,000 houses in the South-east by the end of the century - to make much difference".
15 Offer the chance of defusing local political opposition to new development - Shostak and Lock (1985, 1987) argue that the piecemeal allocation of land for housing and other forms of development frequently meets with considerable local opposition, which the adoption of a new settlement option by LPAs could defuse. This argument is echoed by Hall (1989b - page 113) who notes:

A further advantage of a policy for new settlements is that it would contain local and political opposition. The not in my back yard (NIMBY) syndrome is perfectly understandable. Nobody wants new development on their doorstep, especially if it spoils the view and generally disrupts the local environment whilst construction takes place. While it is probably also true that the fewer people near to a green-field site for a new settlement would not welcome it either, the opposition would obviously be less.

Binney (1989a, 1989b - Page 25) sees the case for small scale new villages, of between 100 and 400 dwellings, being strengthened as existing residents are less likely to object since "a sensitively designed and sited new village - no larger than their own and no nearer than any existing village - would be far less of an intrusion". These arguments have proved to be overoptimistic and possibly naive in view of the contention which has accompanied most new settlement proposals.

16 New Settlements can enhance the environment irrespective of their size - The potential of new settlements in this respect is described by Scott (1991 -page 16) as:

...a chance to achieve a responsible balance between development and the environment in which landscape, ecology and long term management are major features of any master plan

Herington (1988 - page 309) makes the point that a number of new settlements have been proposed in "areas of poor farmland, or in non-agricultural areas of already degraded landscapes" such as disused airfields, former military depots or quarries, and so they could make a positive contribution to the upgrading of rural landscapes. Higson and Wilson (1991 - page 18) agree and suggest, prosaically that new settlements may provide "a way of life in closer association with managed natural environments than is the norm in most existing towns", by enriching...
the landscape in which they are situated, restoring some of its pre-modern agriculture, pre-drainage environmental richness and valuing woodland and wetland as part of man's essential wilderness

More generally, according to Dean (1990 - page 6)

there are parts of the country where the development of a new settlement can bring about enhancement of the environment by carefully implemented landscape schemes, planting of woodlands, provision of wildlife habitats etc. on land which may well have been degraded by modern farming techniques.

17 New settlements can provide a better standard of environment - This extends beyond the creation of a high quality environment within a new settlement to a more general and widespread improvement of living and working environments. For, in drawing a parallel between the current case for new settlements and that for garden cities, Hall (1989b) argues that

In the last analysis the case for new settlements rests on creating a better environment for everyone. The garden city idea was not just about making the best of town and country available to those who lived in the garden cities; it was and is about making the best of town and country available to those living and working in the big cities and smaller towns as well.

18 New settlements offer the opportunity to create social and economic patterns, based on the principles of sustainable development - this was, at first, as much, or more, an argument for small scale, co-operative, communitarian new villages (Warren 1980, Holliday 1985, 1990, Grove 1985b, 1990a, 1990b), rather than for the new settlements of the private sector housebuilder, although in the past couple of years or so, issues of sustainability have become more common in the new settlement debate as a whole. Lloyd Roche (1986 - page 313) suggests that new towns tend to attract creative and adventurous people, and so "new forms of urban and social structure have emerged". Osborne (1991 - page 30) sees new settlements in more rounded social and land use terms as well

New settlements must be designed to embrace a life style and should be much more concerned with the whole concept of communities and not singular uses in zoned locations.
In rural areas, Grove sees small scale new villages addressing the particular social and economic problems of the countryside, and in particular as meeting some of the pressures for development, traditionally blocked by restrictive policies on development in the open countryside which

.. give everything to the wealthy minority and neglect the rest ... it does not even achieve its stated objectives: the character of fine villages is radically altered and a most beautiful feature of the countryside is marred .... a more imaginative but risky policy would allow that the pressures deserve to be acknowledged and (at least to some modest degree) met. The way to achieve this with a minimum of damage to the countryside or to the established villages is to sponsor new free-standing villages (Grove 1990b - page 197).

Porritt (1987), Green and Holliday (1991), Green, Holliday and Arden-Clarke (1989), Grove (1990a) and Holliday (1990) argue against current countryside policy as well, and for an easing of restrictions to facilitate changes in farming patterns, more varied forms of economic development, new life style opportunities, and to improve the quality of life. This type of role for new settlements has become particularly apposite as greater emphasis has been placed on the environmental, social and economic sustainability of development in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Pearce, Markandya and Barbier 1989, Button and Pearce 1989). In particular new villages may offer advantages in low energy consumption or the use of renewable sources of energy (Gibbons 1990), although Owens (1991) considers that new settlements are not inherently energy efficient. She suggests that this is a complex issue dependant upon the degree of self containment, in terms of homes and jobs, and on the relationship with other urban areas, as well as individual and collective lifestyles.

Hall (1991b), Holliday (1991) and Lock (1991a, 1991b) all address the qualities required for sustainable new settlements. Lock, as part of a discussion of appropriate urban forms for sustainability, indicates some of the qualities which new settlements can (and should) have to make them sustainable,

servicing by public transport; energising by environmentally responsible methods; inbuilt waste management and recycling; urban design that will give us variety, mix, permeability and legibility; environment friendly codes on building materials;
layout energy efficiency (aspect, orientation); green space that is variably useful to human activity, ecology and food production (Lock 1991a - page 8)

The link between sustainability, emerging forms of urban development, new settlements and patterns of movement, particularly by public transport, is considered by Green and Holliday (1991), who see new settlements as an answer to all forms of congestion, Mogridge (1991) and Dixon (1991). The House Builders Federation (HBF) in particular draw attention to the potential benefits of new settlements in reducing pollution

on the right scale and given the right balance of employment, shopping, education and public transport, they can be designed to reduce car use, to promote other forms of public transport and to reduce pollution (HBF 1990)

Steeley, like Lock, sees the potential contribution of new settlements to the sustainability of urban development in much wider terms, echoing implicitly and explicitly Howard's idea of the Garden City and the Social City,

New communities are incremental additions to existing, evolving urban systems. They have contributions to make to attempts to increase the sustainability of urban systems and minimise non-renewable resource usage, but their major contribution may have nothing to do with their own internal layout and operations; instead, it may be the contribution they could make by virtue of their location and activities to the urban system of which they form part (Steeley 1991 - page 77)

This part of the case of new settlements is summed up by the HBF in suggesting that

They may therefore provide the greatest opportunity for genuinely "green" and environmentally friendly development that planners and the housebuilding industry can jointly realise (HBF 1990)

The case for new settlements has returned with considerable force to the ideas expressed by Ebenezeer Howard a century ago, broadening them to address current concerns about the effect of continued growth on the environment as a whole.
Summary

The merits of new settlements have been argued by a variety of sources, including the development industry itself, consultants acting for the industry, academics, pressure and interests groups, and local authority planners. It is possible to group the arguments into four categories:

**aesthetic** - to do with the improvement of the environment, the quality of life, design, etc.;

**social idealism** - concerned with social balance, social justice, improving opportunity and choice, aiding disadvantaged groups, etc.;

**market objectives** - here the arguments may appeal to other groups, and may meet their objectives, but the basis of the argument is that it facilitates or improves the operation of the market, and primarily, the operations of the housebuilders;

**strategic** - concerned with the wider role of new settlements in urban development and in the achievement of broad planning aims.

Figure 5.3 indicates the categories into which the arguments fall.

It is unsurprising that most of the market objective case has come from the developers involved in new settlement promotion, from their consultants, or from the HBF, although this has been tempered by the use of many of the other arguments, which are likely to appeal to other interests. The range and diversity of arguments used is such that, at least, on a non site specific basis, elements of the case are likely to be supported by most interests. From an initial focus on the alleged shortfall of housing land the private sector case has broadened and shifted, coming to embrace current concerns until new settlements become part of the sustainability debate. It can be argued that a conscious attempt has been made to use arguments, and indeed terms, like new village, as "an ideological device to mask what many groups have greeted as a... strategy for major urban expansion with rural England" (Merrett 1984 - page 141).
# FIGURE 5.3

**ARGUMENTS FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>Reduce pressure on existing settlements; conserve valued environments; high standard of design, and improved quality of life; improve rural land; better standard of environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Idealism</td>
<td>wider improvements in infrastructure and facilities; more economical use of land; provide balanced housing and employment; new patterns of social mix through balanced housing provision, especially low cost housing; increased choice; better standard of environment; create sustainable social and economic patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Objectives</td>
<td>Meet housing demand and/or shortfall in housing land; cost effective investment in infrastructure and facilities; continuity in land supply, enabling high quality environment, competitive house prices and provision of facilities high standard of design etc, and improved quality of life; increase choice; stabilise land prices; defuse local political opposition; create sustainable social and economic patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Reduce pressure on existing settlements; conserve valued environments; more economical use of land; minimise impact of urban growth on countryside; assist in decentralisation and inner city regeneration; stabilise land prices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

Cloke (1992b - page 284) suggests that the most persuasive arguments are those concerned with the ability of the promoters to fund infrastructure, low cost housing and community and environmental benefits, so "it is little wonder, in an age of increasing
legitimacy for planning gain, that the new settlement idea received considerable professional and public support".

Developer funding of facilities, particularly where the requirements for such facilities have been formally incorporated into planning policy, becomes, in fact, landowner funding, given that the cost of the planning gain package is paid for by the reduced price of land. In this way, planning gain can be seen as a form of tax on land development, paid not by the developer but by the landowner. The market objectives case, in particular, highlights the advantages of new settlements for the housebuilders, in providing low cost land, continuity of the supply of developable land, continuity of housing production, locational choice and locations in marketable localities, and suggest why, during a period when local planning authorities were reducing the amount of land being allocated (Simmie 1986), new settlements proved attractive.

The case against private new settlements

In the period immediately after CDL's launch, the general case against privately produced promoted new settlements was put with some force, but since then opposition has tended to focus on particular schemes on particular sites. So, for example, the early months of 1988 saw a particularly fierce debate in the national press, in which the (then) current and former Secretaries of State for the Environment became embroiled, occasioned by the imminent public inquiry on CDL's second scheme at Foxley Wood, and by the submission of an application for their third scheme at Stone Bassett in Oxfordshire.

The debate has also turned to issues of the most appropriate development mechanisms and of the scale of individual new settlements and of the new settlement "programme" ended, particularly in the south east. The more general arguments can be summarised as

1 New settlements will have an adverse impact on open countryside, natural habitats and agricultural land - This argument is at the heart of opposition to new settlements and to increased urban development (Moss 1978, McLaughlin & Woolley 1985). New settlements are seen as part of the growing urbanisation of the countryside, especially in the South East of England, for, as Heseltine (1988a - page B9) wrote, in relation to CDL's Stone Bassett scheme
....they are infectious. If one planning application succeeds, the consortium moves on. So the problem of protecting my constituents from the urbanisation of rural Oxfordshire is not just a local matter. The whole of the south of England, as my parliamentary colleagues will testify, is increasingly concerned.

Perhaps the most emotive evocation of this argument comes from Lovibond (1988 - page 15)

England is closing in. Country towns that once reflected the characteristics of the landscape that surround them have been blurred into anonymity by vast, identical housing estates, and even the least, remotest village has its dispiriting crop of bungalows and executive villas. There is scarcely a hilltop where the prospect is not of raw, new building and hardly a place in all England where at night the sky is not stained with the ochrous glow of the advancing city.

2 New settlements will have an adverse impact on Green Belts - this was one of the main arguments against CDL's first new country town (Tillingham Hall, Essex), pro­pounded particularly by the CPRE and the LPAs in Essex opposed to the development, in that a major incursion into green belt land for a new settlement would lead to further breaches elsewhere (Bond 1985b, Dumsday 1985, Dyer 1985, Johnston 1985, Woolley and Rosborough 1985, McLaughlin & Woolley 1985, 1986, Herington 1989b). Moreover, since one of the purposes of the green belt is to encourage regeneration of the inner city by preventing development of greenfield sites, new settlements would run counter to this if in, or on the edge of, the green belt (Woolley 1986). The argument is less important now, as most later proposals have deliberately avoided the green belt, in order to reduce potential policy objections.

3 Private new settlements will lack social balance - There are a number of strands to this argument. Unlike the public sector new towns, "private sector new towns, notwithstanding any ambitions for social mix, will essentially be free standing private housing developments", with some fairly bleak social consequences (Wray 1985a). Although new settlements may provide a range of dwelling types and tenures, both affordable and owner occupied housing is likely to be more expensive than in existing settlements. For these reasons, "the settlements would probably attract mainly younger, economically active and relatively prosperous sections of the community" (Savage 1984 - page 6) and do little to meet the housing needs of the new single person or single parent households being formed, which, according to Grigson (quoted in Johnston 1985), would form a
significant proportion of all new households. On the whole then they would cater mainly for owner occupiers (Archer 1971a), would lead to social polarisation (Woodrow 1986), and would not contribute significantly to the most urgent housing needs (Lally 1985), a point made forcibly by Bate (1990) who argued that they would have no impact on homelessness, poor quality housing, mobility, tenure and the cost of house purchase or renting.

A slightly different point made by A. Jones (1990) is that many of the social benefits claimed for new villages, especially the quality of social life and interaction, may prove to be illusory, and this is echoed by Owen (1991) in a more theoretical approach.

4 Private new settlements will lack economic balance, being little more than commuter settlements - Given increased mobility and social changes in rural areas and villages, private new settlements are, at best, only likely to function as commuter or dormitory settlements, especially where there are good communication links, by motorway or railway, to London or other major urban areas (Archer 1971a, Darley 1978, Savage 1984). Graham Moss (1978) pointed to this as one of the adverse effects of Bar Hill, coupled with its impact on existing rural employment. Although some employment may be attracted, there may be a mismatch between the type of employment and local skills available, especially if high tech industry is promoted in a new settlement. A more far reaching point is that private new settlements "will certainly not be able to function as economic growth points" (Wray 1985b), because of the low level of industrial development which is likely to take place.

5 Some infrastructure and servicing costs will still fall on local authorities and other service providers, and may have an effect on planned expenditure in existing areas - In particular the revenue costs of new facilities would still have to be met by local authorities and other service providers, for example, in landscape maintenance, often to the detriment of spending programmes already formulated for investment in facilities or services elsewhere (Savage 1984, Lally 1985). In addition off-site capital costs, as, for example, in increasing secondary school capacity to accommodate the pupils from a new settlement, may also fall on the local authority. In relation to overall levels of service provision, Bate (1990) feels that concentration of provision in existing settlements would be a more effective option than concentration in new settlements. These arguments help to explain the growing comprehensiveness of the planning gain packages being offered or being sought by LPAs, in the face of centrally imposed spending restrictions. Such packages have increasingly addressed revenue costs
arising from continuing maintenance or the capital costs of school and other provision off-site.

6 Few mechanisms to ensure that the wider community benefits from the acquisition of cheap land by the developer - The central principle upon which the private sector new settlement is based is that the profit or surplus from the acquisition and development of cheap land can be used to create a high quality environment, and to fund infrastructure and facilities. However there is, according to Savage (1984 - page 4) "no obvious mechanism by which this community benefit will be delivered." Wray is also sceptical, contending, first, that developers may not be able to purchase land at existing use value, in which case the windfall profits will be made by the landowner, and second, that if land is purchased at agricultural value, then the developers will "enjoy the happy bonus of speculative land profits, in addition to their normal developers profit" (Wray 1985b - page xiii).

Hall also doubts that the appropriate level of facilities can in fact be provided by the private sector, whilst "keeping house prices within the range that people can afford", and indeed goes further to suggest "on its own the track record of the private sector is such that it simply cannot deliver what is required" (Hall 1985 - page 4). Hall and a number of other commentators argue for development agencies, which combine the private and public sector functions, for a partnership approach and for strategic planning (Hall 1985, 1988b, 1989a, 1989b, 1991b, 1991c, 1992, Woodrow 1986, Wray 1986a, Barker 1988, P. Hall 1989, Lock 1988a, 1988b, 1989a, 1989c), for development trusts (Falk 1990a, 1990b), or for strong executive agencies such as Development Corporations and Regional Development Agencies (P. Hall 1988b, Self 1990).

The points raised by Hall (1985) and Wray (1985b) inject a note of realism into the debate on land acquisition and developer funding of facilities, and one which casts some doubt on the rhetoric of the development industry. The link between the development plan process and land purchase is crucial, as the allocation of land for a new settlement, if site specific, is likely to raise the value of the land to normal residential value, and, unless detailed packages of infrastructure and facilities are specified in planning policy documents at the same time, the developer is unlikely to be able to force the inclusion of these in the land price. Developer funding calls into question claimed benefits of high quality development or may result in low standards of facility provision. In this way the relationship between the development process and the development planning process because critical, and through this the power of the various interests (local state,
housebuilders, landowners, etc.) shifts, within the broad context of wider local state/market relations.

7 Choice of location is likely to be governed more by financial than planning considerations - Following on from 6, the need to acquire cheap land means that land with little or no prospect of achieving planning permission must be chosen as it will have the least hope value, and hence lowest land value. If this occurred, "locations will be selected for financial rather than planning reasons", and "the more unselective and the more secretive the land acquisition process, the less CDL can be said to be working with, rather than against, the planning system" (Savage 1984 - page 4).

8 Lack of a regional or strategic planning framework within which to set proposals - Hall's (1983b - page 291) initial response to the CDL's proposals was that they "cannot be evaluated in the context of an up-to-date regional strategy which integrates housing demand, employment, shopping, transport, countryside protection and the rest." His position has been restated in later contributions to the debate, in which he argues for new settlements to be set within a clear strategic framework (Hall 1985, 1988a, 1988b, 1989a, 1989b, 1989c, 1991b, 1991c, 1992). Other supporters of new settlements, like Fyson, have also pointed to the lack of adequate strategic planning (Fyson 1991). More trenchant criticism of CDL's case came from Savage (1984 - page 4)

the fact is that the CDL proposals for the south east lack context. They are a package solution to a perceived regional housing demand. They are presented without references to particular places or parts of counties and without community or local government support. CDL is promoting communities of pre-determined size and character looking for somewhere to happen.

A similar point was made by Bate (1990) that the proposals were a solution in search of a problem. Following the Secretary of State's dismissal of CDL's appeal on Tillingham Hall, Herington argues that the proposal "neatly exposed the lack of any strong regional planning framework for decision making" (Herington 1989b - page 112). Wray sees the private new settlement (and especially CDL's proposals) as a "temporary palliative" which "removes the pressure for resolving the wider issues of growth and development in the south east, which requires effective strategic planning and increased public investment, missing since the abandonment of new towns" (Wray 1985a - page 4). Wray goes on to argue for a Land Agency for the South East to ease problems of land supply, recoup betterment, provide infrastructure and plan for growth within a regional planning
framework, and with a flexible physical development strategy which might include a mix of new towns and new villages, developed in a private/public sector partnership (Wray 1986a, 1986b).

Moreover, unlike the new towns there would be no mechanism for encouraging the movement of employment to a private new settlement, other than through the normal operation of the market (Archer 1971a), and so the settlement would be unable to play a wider regional role (Johnston 1985, Smith 1985). Private new settlements are therefore seen as an inadequate response to the problems of the south east (Smith 1985).

In the wider context of addressing regional imbalances and the problems caused by "overheating" in the South East, typified by the pressure for private new settlements, has come a call for firmer urban and regional planning policy (Heseltine 1988a, 1988b), which would include the consideration of the option of new settlements, of varying size (Barker 1988, Gossop 1988, 1989, Hall 1988a, 1988b, 1989c, 1992, Lock 1988a, Steley 1988, Woodrow 1988a, 1989b, P. Hall 1989). These can be seen as critiques of central state policy and ideology (the deregulation of planning through the weakening of strategic and regional planning and the reduction in state intervention in the operation of the market) as much as an attack on new settlements per se.

9 New settlements could lead to pressure for the release of more, rather than less, land for housing and other forms of development - Herington (1988 - page 309) doubts that new settlements would take pressure off existing towns and villages, for this

would require in the long term a more dirigeiste kind of restriction on new-build than currently found in most local plans outside green belt areas - precisely those areas which are likely to be favoured for new settlements.

A. Jones (1990) points to the long lead time in developments, which means that current housing options are the result of a strategy initially implemented perhaps a decade ago, so that new settlement development and incremental or peripheral development of existing settlements would take place at the same time. Even with new villages, land supply is likely to be increased, whilst the history of new town development suggests that pressure on nearby settlements may be enhanced. Bate (1990) develops this argument to link new settlements with growth strategies, for reasons developed by Burton (Senior Planner for the CPRE) (1990 - page 7)
equally tenuous are the claims that new settlements will relieve the pressure for incremental development ... the reality is that a new settlement is likely to have only a marginal effect on such pressures because the small builders operating ... will continue to demand work, and the planning system will be unable to prevent continuing small-scale development

Reynolds (also then from the CPRE) comments that

.... in building a new settlement one is usually making a commitment on growth and further pressures that must be anticipated at the outset ...... a new settlement acts as a magnet of itself and existing development pressures would be unlikely to disappear. Thus a new settlement can have the effect of double counting, and result in more development than is strictly necessary (Reynolds 1991 - page 2).

In relation to the land required for new settlements, Merrett (1984) argued that new settlements would be likely to need more land than first proposed in an examination of the amount of land required by CDL's 'new villages'. He concluded that "the land take requirement in CDL's only public statement on their new town proposal is grotesquely inadequate", with a requirement some 62% greater than they suggested.

10 Free-standing new settlements could lead to the under utilisation of existing spare capacity in infrastructure in urban areas - Provision of services and infrastructure in urban areas has been planned to take account of likely future demands arising from additional growth. The spare capacity which exists, in schools for example, may be under-utilised, if new development takes place in new settlements rather than in existing urban areas (Savage 1984).

11 Private investment and other resources could be diverted away from the regeneration of the inner city - The argument is put most strongly by Wilson (1983) "If the whole of inner London is not to become a poverty-stricken inner-city ghetto for the poor, the construction industry has to play its part in the creation of attractive, modern communities in London, in the repair and rehabilitation of older housing, and in the creation of more socially-mixed communities". In similar vein, Lally (1985 - page 4) feels that "at a time when both public and private investment are severely constrained it is scandalous to suggest diverting much needed resources to enable greenfield development when our inner cities are literally rolling away." Likewise, North (1988) argues
that "the health of the cities and large towns of Britain now depends on there being middle-income people left at the centre of them... half the land used by private house-builders has been used for housing or commerce before: the pressure to find such sites needs to be maintained". Thomas (1985 - page 4) however supports a new garden city programme with private/public sector partnerships, provided that "it demands no new public subsidies", and he argues

all possible government aid for urban development needs now to be concentrated in the inner areas of our great cities and towns. It is here where the most desperate need exists to create far better conditions for family life and for industrial and commercial enterprise.

12 New settlements planned for private profit are unlikely to be best located to meet wider needs - the objection here is to the private sector taking the lead in the development of new settlements, an argument which is linked with those concerning the lack of a strategic regional framework and of mechanisms for returning the betterment created by new settlement development to the "community", and the need for public/private sector partnerships (Woodrow 1986). Put at its most simplest, by Harris (1989 - page 27)

doubts have also been expressed about whether the private sector, where the profit motive is always uppermost, is the most suitable agent for building an entire town, with all the necessary community facilities.

As Dumsday (1985) suggested, the opposition to Tillingham Hall was based, in part, on the underlying philosophical objection that, unlike the state new towns, the private sector new settlements were being promoted for profit rather than as part of public policy or through altruism.

13 Housebuilders and other developers are likely to take a short-term rather than long term view with regard to the development of the new settlement - developers would seek to develop a new settlement quickly and would not have a long term stake in its management leading to possible lower standards of design and maintenance (Archer 1971a, Northedge 1988), or, in the words of Shostak and Lock (1984 - page 13) "it can be assumed that the private developers .... have their priority in profit from house building rather than town building".
14 New settlements, particularly those located within easy commuting distance of London, are likely to lead to increased road traffic - Wilson (1983) suggests that "the result will be increased road traffic into London when we already have far too much. The price for this is high traffic density with wasted human resources in traffic jams, pollution, excessive noise, energy loss, and a higher road accident toll". North widens this out to include much of the South East where "the sheer amount of extraneous rushing about which it (new development) would generate would be a profound disbenefit for the wider environs" (North 1988).

15 New settlements would not solve the housing problems of the south east - the scale of the problem is such that the few private sector proposals put forward would make little contribution to the overall level of need. Furthermore part of the problem is the high price of land and of houses. New settlements will not have much impact on house prices, as "the houses can not sell at prices greatly different to those nearby that are not in new towns" (Northedge 1988 - page 28), a point endorsed by Cresswell (1988), whilst Carrow (1988) sees new settlements as fuelling pressure for land and house price rises. Conversely, opposition from existing local residents to CDL’s Tillingham Hall proposal arose partly from the perceived adverse impact that the development of a new settlement would have on the price of existing houses in the area, as residents feared a sharp drop in property values (Woolley and Rosborough 1985). Eversley, speaking at the inquiry on Tillingham Hall, said (quoted in Wray 1986b - page 80) "Tillingham Hall will not solve the housing problems of the South East ...... the project would not stop the rise of land and house prices. The developers would make sure of that." Reynolds (1991) and Bate (1990) argue that, rather than there being an under-supply of housing land in the south east, as suggested by proponents of new settlements, there is an oversupply based on the requirements set out in structure plans, and that new settlements would have little effect on house prices. Burton (1990 - page 7) supports the land supply contention, and develops the argument on house prices as

the simple fact is that the planning system is not responsible for high house prices. The economic events of the last two years show clearly that economic factors, not the planning system, operate as the key influence on house prices ..... providing more homes in a new settlement would have no effect on house prices.

In addition, private new settlements, without the mechanisms available in the state new towns, are unlikely to be able to play a role in a positive policy of urban decentralisation,
for "without specific state intervention to move people from the cities - which is not now available - how many people will wish to take the opportunity to move from crowded conditions to private new settlements, often located at considerable distances from the conurbation?" (Herington 1988 - page 309). Peter Hall (1989) also acknowledges that new communities could not cater for all the demand for housing in the south east, but in advocating that much of the growth should go to the existing large growth towns, balances this with a programme of planned private new communities.

**Summary**

A range of arguments have been put forward against new settlements, and although wide ranging, these do not form a coherent case. Within this range are arguments

against new settlement per se;
against private sector new settlements;
against CDL new settlements (and against new country towns in particular);
against new settlements in particular circumstances.

As I have suggested, some of the arguments are as much against styles of planning and against government policy as against the concept of new settlements. Here in particular we can place the calls for a stronger planning system, and for greater state involvement in new settlements through partnerships or through the local state taking the lead. These calls have come from the proponents or supporters of new settlements as well as from their opponents.

Figure 5.4 groups the case against new settlements into the four categories (aesthetic, social idealism, market objectives and strategic) used in Figure 5.3.

The main arguments against new settlements promoted and developed by capital are largely centred around concern that market imperatives rather than planning policies would dictate the form, location and timing of schemes. So the fears are that the choice of location would be governed by financial considerations and not best placed to meet wider needs, that the market would take the short term view of new settlement development which normally characterises private sector urban development, and that the much vaunted community benefits, one of the main arguments for new settlements, would not be achieved.
## FIGURE 5.4

### THE CASE AGAINST NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>adverse impact on countryside etc; adverse impact on green belt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Idealism</td>
<td>lack of social balance;        lack of economic balance;       costs of infrastructure and services will fall on state, to detriment of spending plans; lack of mechanisms to ensure that wider community benefits ensue; unlikely to be best located to meet wider needs; would not solve housing problems of South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Objectives</td>
<td>lack of mechanisms to ensure that wider community benefits ensue; choice of location governed by financial considerations; unlikely to be best located to meet wider needs; developers will take short term view of development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>adverse impact on green belt; choice of location governed by financial considerations; lack of regional planning context; exacerbate rather than reduce pressure for land release; underutilisation of existing spare service capacity; divert resources from inner city; unlikely to best located to meet wider needs; lead to increased road traffic; would not solve housing problems of South East</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

These concerns point to particular perceptions of the planning system and of its power vis a vis the private sector, especially in circumstances where that balance was shifting in any case, and these perceptions are of a relatively powerless local state.

Aside from the strategic objections, opponents of private sector new settlements have based their case on social idealism although, of course, adopting an opposite stance to their proponents, in arguing that the very nature of privately developed new settlements would result in lack of economic and social balance.
CONCLUSIONS

This Chapter has outlined the main arguments which have been advanced by the proponents and opponents of private sector new settlements over the past decade or so. Many of these arguments have subsequently been reiterated by LPAs and by other objectors in relation to particular schemes, and they have, in the course of such localised debates, been refined and become much more specific. However it is clear that the general tenure of the public debate has shifted over time, to emphasise issues which were (or are) of current concern, so that, for example, arguments about land availability have given way to a concern with the appropriate form and locus of policy for new settlements, and the role of new settlements in the sustainability of urban development. In this sense the arguments have become more 'global', placing new settlements firmly in the context of an assessment of the appropriate forms of urban development for the future.

There has, as I have suggested, been a parallel debate on the appropriateness of new settlements developed by private capital rather than by the state, or by partnerships between both sectors. The market objectives arguments emphasise the advantages of new settlements for the housebuilders in particular, with the potential of land acquisition at low cost, landowner funding of infrastructure and facilities, and a continuing supply of developable land.

The form of the case made by the housebuilders, particularly CDL, can be interpreted as part of a strategy to create a generally favourable climate of opinion, as may the use of particular value-laden terms and concepts, both in the rhetoric of the general arguments for new settlements and in the descriptions of those settlements. CDL had high expectations of success, bolstered by lobbying the central state, and by apparently supportive Ministerial pronouncements, as well as by their perceptions of their own power and of the relative weakness of the planning system.

The analysis does indicate the central role of private sector consultants in the 'strategy' as propagandists setting out the case for privately promoted new settlements in general terms, through articles in the planning press and conference papers, in addition, of course, to the formulation of a case at a more specific level in relation to individual schemes. Much of the case for new settlements has therefore come from these consultants, as well as from lobby groups, like the TCPA, with whose central aims, the con-
cept accords. Cloke (1992b - page 284) sums up the sophisticated approach of the private new settlements proponents

Sophisticated lobbying in local and national political arenas was enhanced by the increasing trend of "poaching" experienced local authority planners to work for the private sector and it included the specific strategy of persuading the planning profession of the aesthetic and strategic merits of developing new settlements as opposed to the norm of expanding existing ones.

The next Chapter looks in detail at the new settlements which emerged.
CHAPTER 6

ANALYSIS OF THE NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS IN THE 1980s AND 1990s
INTRODUCTION

As the chronology (Figure 5.1) in Chapter 5 indicates, since the announcement of the CDL ‘programme’ of new settlements in mid-1983, there has been a wave of proposals from the private sector continuing throughout the decade and into the 1990s. The proposals have varied in location, scale, urban form, promoter and in a range of other characteristics. Moreover, the proposals have come forward in many different forms, from planning applications (which may or may not have been the subject of an appeal), through proposals as part of a structure plan review or local plan preparation process, to informal schemes. Both the central state and the local state have responded to these proposals in a variety of ways.

The Chapter analyses the private new settlement proposals of this period, and the response of the state through the planning system. The general aims are twofold

1 to describe, and to answer questions about, the nature of new settlement proposals - where, when, and what?

and

2 to use the data to address some of the key research issues and in particular

a) the changing nature of state/market relations during the 1980s and 1990s;

b) the changing balance of power relations, between the central and local state, centred around the planning system;

c) the responsiveness of the planning system to the pressure from the private sector, especially in policy formulation and decision making, and the relative role and power of the actors in these processes;

d) the response of the development industry to the changing nature of power relations;

e) the changing nature of the development process, particularly of the new settlement development process, and the relative role and power of the market and the state in this.
The material in this Chapter can be seen as the second stage in the analysis of the key relations, to be explored in more depth through the case studies and analysis of the policy formulation process, with the discussion in Chapters 4 and 5 providing the initial stage through the examination of the interactions in pre-1980 new settlements and of the struggle manifest through the ongoing debate on the relative merits of private sector new settlements.

The Chapter begins with a brief discussion of the data sources used to gather this material (a more detailed discussion of the problems inherent in the use of this information can be found in the Appendix). It then goes on to deal with the growth in the number of schemes over time, with the pattern of decisions made on those schemes submitted as formal planning applications, with the spatial pattern of schemes and decisions, and with the type and nature of the promoters of these schemes. It concludes by relating the results of the analysis to the research issues and questions.

DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS

Few studies provide a reasonably comprehensive review of current new settlements proposals, and the earliest, by Potter (1986) includes a number of schemes which are not encompassed by the new settlement definition adopted in this study. Later, Harris (1989) used data provided by the CPRE to both list and map a number of then current schemes, and Moor (19990) has outlined a number of the more recent proposals. Rather more comprehensive directories have been published by the author (Amos 1989b, 1990c, 1991c). The recent David Lock Associates/University of Reading research project for the DoE is also founded upon a wide ranging empirical survey, and, although it is yet to be published, some initial findings have been reported (Lock and Breheny 1992).

The data presented in this Chapter has been drawn from a number of sources

a) the author's survey (which is a combination of surveys of developers and local planning authorities);

b) surveys by Harris (1989); Potter (1986); and the undated CPRE survey;

c) information in developers' promotional and other literature;
d) information appearing in the planning, architectural and building press over the past 10 years.

The data is fairly comprehensive, in that most schemes have been identified, although two potential problems should be noted. First, there are likely to be proposals which have not appeared in any of the information sources surveyed, particularly schemes which have not been made public\(^1\). The information which follows should therefore be regarded as a "best guess" of the number and timing of the new settlement proposals which have emerged during the period under study. Second, some types of information have been more difficult to gather or have been unavailable, so that, for example, the dates for the conception of first publication of schemes are, in some cases, estimates. Other data which are most commonly lacking relate to the target population and site area of proposals, and in some cases, the number of dwellings proposed. Where there are deficiencies I have indicated these in the text or in the relevant tables. In addition, there is almost a complete lack of potentially commercially sensitive data, including land prices, length or form of option agreements, and similar information.

In the analysis which follows I shall be using data relating to planning applications and appeals, as well as to the overall number of new settlement schemes. The use of this type of information is becoming increasingly common, in what are known as "development control studies". There are a number of conceptual problems with the use of development control data which have been raised in these studies, and these are discussed in Appendix One. From this discussion it should be noted that all of the potential pitfalls have been taken into account in the analysis which follows.

All of the data in this Chapter are complete up to the end of March 1992, and references to years are to the calendar year, except for 1992 where the data refers to the first quarter only. The notes for each table describe, where appropriate, the limitations of the data in that table.

\(^1\)That this was the case became evident from interviews carried out by the author with consultants and developers, who often indicated that they were involved in new settlement proposals in particular areas but were unwilling or unable to give further details. The number of unpublicised proposals is difficult to estimate.
NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS - NUMBER AND CHANGE OVER TIME

This section indicates how the number of new settlement proposals has changed over time, from the early indication of the emergence of a 'programme' of new settlements in mid 1983 up to the end of March 1992.

TABLE 6.1

THE NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: upto the end of March 1992. Includes all proposals whether the subject of an application or not. Where more than one proposal has been put forward on the same site this is included.

Source: Author's survey

Table 6.1 sets out the number of new settlement proposals that have been publicised or first made public in each year since 1984. I stated earlier that CDL's 'programme' of 'new villages' was first announced in August 1983, although it had been in preparation for some time before that. The announcement did not refer to specific sites, and it was not until 1985 that some of these became known, although informed guesses had been made. The data in the Table includes all new settlement schemes, whether

- the subject of planning applications;
- schemes floated by the private sector at EiPs or Local Plan Inquires (LPIs);

2 Sites or locations suggested as possible 'targets' or CDL included Hook in Hampshire, and up to 15 locations in Essex, Kent, Surrey, West Sussex and Hertfordshire (Planning 1983a, 1983b)
other publicised schemes.

The Table does not include those schemes put forward by local planning authorities, either through the development plan process (mainly in local plans), or through other mechanisms, since the focus is on schemes promoted by the private sector (schemes coming forward through local plan allocations or policies will, however, be considered later when the analysis moves to the policy formulation process - see Part Three). In addition, a number of schemes have been omitted where it has not been possible to trace the data of first publication or announcement. For this reason the total number of schemes in Table 6.1 does not equate with the number of proposals set out in other Tables. The number of missing schemes is small and so the data gives a valid overall impression.

Most striking is the steady growth in the number of proposals up to the peak in 1989 and 1990, and then the dramatic drop in the number of new schemes being announced. Rather unexpectedly this decline does not coincide with the downturn in the housing market experienced from the end of 1988 onwards, nor does it mirror the decline in development activity shown in, for example, the drop in the number of all types of planning applications being submitted. There is a need for a degree of caution in interpreting the table, since, as was apparent from the discussion of the beginnings of the COL 'programme', work on new settlement schemes (such as site finding, negotiation over acquisition, preparing a scheme, undertaking financial and other appraisals etc.) is likely to begin some considerable time before they become public. This lead-in time may be of the order of 12 to 18 months in some cases, and so the peak in terms of the initiation/preparation of schemes may have been in 1988/1989 rather than 1989/1990.

If this were the case the peak would roughly coincide with the change in the buoyancy of the housing market.

---

3 The precise dating of the beginning of the downturn in the housing market will depend upon the indicators used. Fleming and Nellis (1990) indicate that the peak of house price inflation occurred in the third quarter of 1988 in the South, and in the fourth quarter of 1988 in the Midlands, but not until the second or third quarter of 1989 in the North of England and Scotland. Using construction data, "between the last quarter of 1988 and the last quarter of 1989, new private sector housing starts fell by nearly 40 per cent" (Fleming and Nellis 1990 - page 49). Finally using the index of the submission of applications for major residential development, this peaked in the last quarter of 1988, and declined markedly after the second quarter of 1989 (DoE 1991). So the downturn dates from around the last quarter of 1988 to the second or third quarter of 1989.
There are several explanations for this pattern of the emergence of proposals shown by the Table

- it will be related to the opportunities for promoting schemes, so that particular structure plan review processes in certain counties, especially where new settlement policies have been formulated or contemplated, not only generate a private sector response in the form of new settlement proposals (especially where a positive new settlement policy framework appears likely to emerge), but also give promoters a forum in which to publicise their schemes. This will become more apparent later in this Chapter when I present data on the geographical distribution of proposals and in Chapter 9, which discusses policy formulation through the structure plan review process at more length;

- the continued growth in the number of proposals coming forward after the latter half of 1988 demonstrates the development industry's long term view of new settlement promotion, and that this is not necessarily related to the state of the housing market at the time a scheme is being contemplated. As I have already suggested, developers are likely to begin to promote a scheme well before they consider it will gain approval;

- the growing momentum of proposals being formulated through the second half of the 1980s will have been sustained by the favourable policy 'climate' in particular counties (such as Cambridgeshire for example), where positive new settlement policies were formulated or appeared likely to be formulated;

- the reasonably positive policy stance on new settlements taken by Central Government through the late 1980s will have encouraged some promoters, as it appears to have encouraged CDL at the beginning of the 1980's, as will the general shift in central state ideology and in the general policy climate to a facilitation of the operation of the market;

- schemes arising from particular structure plan review processes form a significant proportion of the proposals coming forward in certain years, as will become apparent from the analysis of the spatial distribution of proposals. So that, for example, the 20 or so proposals in Cambridgeshire, which became public at about the same time, will account for a major share of the proposals for 1987 and 1988. The same is true for other regions and counties.
Planning Applications for New Settlements

The number of planning applications submitted for new settlements each year, as set out in Table 6.2, shows the same general pattern as the number of proposals emerging, with a steady increase since 1984. However, it peaks some 2 years earlier than the number of schemes coming forward as a whole, in 1988 rather than 1990, and then drops off, although not so dramatically. This tends to confirm the point made earlier that the pattern of scheme announcements may not give a wholly accurate picture of the timing of schemes, and that the peak of activity is more likely to have been in 1988/1989. It is also clear from a comparison of Table 6.1 and 6.2 that a relatively small proportion, some 43%, of new settlement schemes, have been the subject of formal applications.

TABLE 6.2

NEW SETTLEMENT APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED EACH YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: upto end March 1992. Includes all proposals submitted as formal applications. Double counting of outline and detailed permissions has been eliminated, but where more than one outline application has been submitted, this has been recorded.

Source: Author's survey

The growth in the number of applications for new settlements parallels that in the number of planning applications submitted in England and Wales as whole (as shown in Table 6.3) which also peaked in 1988/89, and declined markedly from then (DoE 1991a).
TABLE 6.3

THE NUMBER OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER (THOUSANDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987/88</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988/89</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989/90</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990/91</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DoE 1991a

It is perhaps more relevant to consider the pattern in the number of planning applications submitted for major residential development (defined as being for more than 10 dwellings). This grew during the period from 1982/3 to 1987/8 (Roger Tym and Partners 1989). Applications for residential development (new dwellings) reached a high point in the last quarter of 1988, and although remaining fairly constant until the April to June quarter in 1989, have declined steadily since then (DoE 1991), again a trend similar to that for both new settlement proposals and applications as a whole.

I can point to several, interlinked, explanations for this pattern of new settlement applications:

- The decline in the volume of applications being submitted is perhaps not unexpected, as the downturn in the housing market and the economy which took place towards the end of 1989 or the beginning of 1990, is more likely to have affected the number of planning applications being submitted than it is the number of schemes promoted through development plan procedures in general;

- the submission of an application, possibly followed by an appeal, is likely to be significantly more costly than merely promoting a new settlement through an EiP, LPI or other means. The decline in returns to the housebuilders in particular

---

4 David Lock indicates that the cost of the new settlement inquiries in Cambridgeshire (new settlement applications "called-in" and appeals in the A10 and A45 corridors) was of the order of Pounds 13 million - One million pounds by each of the 11 promoters and two million pounds by the local planning authorities (Lock 1992). Although these were exceptionally long inquiries, the A10 inquiry lasting from 31st October 1989 to 2nd February 1990 (see Note 6 and relevant dates in chronology in Chapter 5), this does give some idea of the costs associated with promoting new settlements through the whole of the planning system. The figure of about one million pounds per
during 1989 and 1990 would have put pressure on them to avoid or delay incurring these costs;

- depending on the nature of the agreement which promoters reach with site owners, the obtaining of planning permission could trigger the making of initial payments for the land. The state of the housing market after the end of 1989 was such that few housebuilders would have wished to have obtained a consent at that time. For, since development conditions were unfavourable, they would not wish to have to make fairly large payments for land, or to have to start development, thereby incurring the large "up-front" costs which follow from site clearance, the provision of roads and infrastructure, and other costs, without the prospect of obtaining returns at an early date;

- as with the number of schemes coming forward overall, the submission of planning applications for new settlements is linked to the stage and nature of the policy formulation process, and to an assessment of the likely outcome. Policy formulation processes in particular counties will have been more likely than others to generate applications, especially where the expectation is that a favourable policy climate will be produced;

- to some extent applications are only submitted where there is considered to be a reasonable chance of success, or as a more tactical move to seek to influence policy formulation processes and outcomes. The circumstances where applications might have been successful declined after 1988 and 1989 (Later Chapters deal with the policy framework and with decisions on specific new settlement proposals).

Just as there is likely to be a lag between initiation and publication or announcement of a scheme, so there may be a considerable time lag between a new settlement scheme being publicised, and an application being submitted. Indeed, a scheme may only be floated in order to try to influence the production of a favourable policy climate, and may be unsuccessful in achieving this (and so an application may not be submitted). In addition, extended negotiation with a local planning authority may indicate that a scheme has no chance of obtaining permission, either at all or in the form in which it is initially

scheme has received general corroboration from a number of promoters of schemes in Cambridgeshire.
promoted. It therefore follows that only a proposition of publicised schemes will become the subject of an application.

The data in Table 6.4 show the number of applications submitted in any one year as a proportion of the total number of schemes publicised in that year. The decline in the proportion of applications in the years between 1989 and 1991 is apparent, although the small number of schemes coming forward in 1991 mean that the percentage for the year is anomalous.

**TABLE 6.4**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS AS PROPORTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES PUBLICISED PER YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Upto end March 1992

Source: Author’s survey

Table 6.5 presents a more accurate picture. It indicates, in relation to the number of new settlement proposals in each year, the proportion that eventually became the subject of an application. So, for example, 69% of the schemes publicised in 1986 eventually were submitted as applications, although not necessarily in that year. As suggested above, there may have been a lag of a year or more in many cases. The data serves to reinforce the view from an analysis of Table 6.4 that developers are submitting fewer applications for new settlements. It is apparent that whereas in the early years, from 1984 to 1988, at least two thirds of the schemes eventually were submitted as applications, since that date the proportion has dropped dramatically, and developers have brought forward schemes in other forms, for the reasons indicated above. The
only exception is 1991, which can be regarded as atypical because few new proposals emerged, and so, it would be unwise to suggest that the trend in the submission of new settlement applications has reversed.

**TABLE 6.5**

**PROPORTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES SUBMITTED AS PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>OVERALL NUMBER OF SCHEMES</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Upto end March 1992

Source: Author's survey

So the period from 1988 to 1989 marks a significant change in the nature of new settlement promotion, with the private sector bringing forward fewer schemes and promoting fewer as formal applications. Other means of promotion have become even more important than they were earlier in the period.

**Decisions on New Settlement Schemes**

Having outlined the pattern of the submission of formal applications it is now possible to analyse the decisions which have been made. The applications may be

a) withdrawn
b) not determined;
c) determined by the local planning authority;
d) "called-in" by the Secretary of State for determination;

and then

e) the subject of an appeal to the Secretary of State, following non determination or refusal by the local planning authority, and determined by him.

The analysis seeks to shed light on the role and relative power of the central and local states in decision making. Table 6.6 indicates the overall number of decisions made each year. There is some double counting as proposals which were the subject of an application and then of an appeal will appear as a decision twice, although not normally in the same year. Notwithstanding this, a couple of points can be made. First, only about two thirds of the submitted applications had been determined (up to March 1992). Second, there is an evident time lag between the number of applications and the number of decisions, with the peak in the latter occurring in 1989, although with a relatively constant number of decisions in succeeding years.

**TABLE 6.6**

DECRESIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS BY YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Upto end March 1992. Includes all decisions (whether on appeals or applications) where these have made. Non determined applications and appeals are ignored.

Source: Author's survey
The time lag is due, in part, to the particularly complex nature of new settlement applications and to the high proportion which have either gone to appeal or have been "called-in". Such applications take a considerable time to process and determine and similarly appeal inquiries are likely to be lengthy, with a considerable lapse of time between the inquiry and the issuing of the Secretary of State's decision. Again, however, some of the decisions relate to particular geographical locations, so that, for example, all of the decisions in 1992 (to the end of March) result from the "call-in", by the Secretary of State, of the proposals on the A45 in Cambridgeshire.

Table 6.7 indicates the nature of those decisions which have been made. The key point to emerge is that the success rate is low, with only 12 (22%) having been approved, and conversely, the refusal rate is correspondingly high - 42 decisions or 78%, with a peak in 1989 (which also saw the highest number of decisions).

5 There is some limited data on the length of new settlement inquiries (whether appeals or "call-ins"). These obviously tend to be longer than most inquiries, and the following indicates the total period of time for inquiries on major new settlement schemes. It should be noted that the inquiry may not have been in session for the whole of the time period, as there are normally a number of rest days and other days on which site inspections are undertaken, nor for the whole of each day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INQUIRY</th>
<th>INQUIRY DATES</th>
<th>LENGTH (WEEKS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tillingham Hall</td>
<td>18/3/86 - 15/5/86</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxley Wood</td>
<td>1/6/88 - 14/7/88</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Bassett</td>
<td>29/11/88 - 22/12/88</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/89 - 19/1/89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymeswold</td>
<td>7/3/89 - 18/4/89</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversley Green</td>
<td>10/1/89 - 27/2/89</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire A10</td>
<td>31/10/89 - 2/2/90</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Prior</td>
<td>4/4/90 - 11/9/90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of the elapse of time between the inquiry and the announcement of the Secretary of State's decision, the average time period is 11 months. The following data indicate the range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INQUIRY</th>
<th>LENGTH OF TIME BETWEEN INQUIRY AND DECISION (MONTHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tillingham Hall</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxley Wood</td>
<td>12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Bassett</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wymeswold</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eversley Green</td>
<td>12 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire A10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston Prior</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = to first interim decision, # = to final decision.
TABLE 6.7

NATURE OF DECISIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENT APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS BY YEAR OF DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>APPROVED/ UPHELD</th>
<th>REFUSED/ DISMISSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of decisions

Note: Upto end March 1992. Includes all decisions (whether on appeals or applications) where these have made. Non determined applications and appeals are ignored.

Source: Author's survey

The overall approval rate (the number of approvals as a proportion of the total number of schemes publicised), is, of course, much lower at only 6.6%. In addition the approval rate has declined since 1988, so as more decisions emerged, more schemes have been refused.

Table 6.7 deals with all decisions, whether on applications or appeals, but rather more revealing is the desegregated pattern of decisions on each of these. Table 6.8 indicates the decisions made on planning applications, whether by the Secretary of State or by the Local Planning Authority. Again the main point is that the approval rate for applications is slightly better than that for all decisions at 27.5% (of applications determined), and 13.75% of applications submitted (whether determined or not).
### TABLE 6.8

**NATURE OF DECISIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENT APPLICATIONS BY YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of PAs submitted (80) 13.75 36.25

Note: Upto end March 1992. Decisions on planning applications (i) by LPAs, and (ii) by Secretary of State on "call-in" applications. % of PAs submitted expresses the number of applications approved and refused as percentages of the total number of applications submitted, so that 50% remain undetermined to date.

Source: Author's survey

Both the approval and refusal rate have remained reasonably constant throughout the period under study, with the approval rate increasing slightly from 1988 to 1991, then dropping dramatically. So contrary to the pattern for all decisions, it would appear that the chances of the approval of applications have increased slightly since the change in housing market conditions, although the small number of decisions make it difficult to draw particularly valid conclusions.

Have the decision makers adopted a more restrictive stance towards new settlement applications than other forms of development, and how does the trend in new settlement decisions compare with decisions on other forms of development? Table 6.9 indicates the approval rate for all types of planning applications in England over the period 1981/82 to 1991/90, and Table 6.10 gives the approval rate for major residential applications, and for all major applications in England for 1989 and 1990.
From a comparison of the data in Tables 6.8, 6.9 and 6.10, it is apparent, first, that the approval rate for new settlement applications is considerably below that for major applications and for major residential applications. Second, whilst approval rates for new settlement applications increased from 1987 onwards (except for the first quarter of 1992), this runs counter to the national trend of all applications, but mirrors the trend for both all major applications and for major residential applications.

The data presented so far does not distinguish between decisions on applications taken by the Secretary of State and those taken by LPAs, so is there a significant difference in the type of decision being taken on applications by the central and local states? Table
6.11 sets out the relevant data. The figures for the Secretary of State relate to "called-in" applications (whether direct or as a result of a referral as a departure). The decision on whether to "call-in" an application is at the discretion of the Secretary of State. This normally takes place when applications raise significant issues which affect a wide area, or where the proposal is particularly controversial. The decision to "call-in" an application will depend on the varying interpretations of these circumstances by different DoE regional offices, or by different local planning authorities. In fact, the Secretary of State made a decision on about 35% of those applications which have been determined, a proportion which is higher than for other forms of development.

Three main points can be made from this data. First, the overall approval rate, and the approval rate for both decision makers, has fluctuated throughout the period. Second, the rate is still significantly below that for major residential applications, and for other major development. Third, at first view it appears that LPAs (with an approval rate of 33%) are more likely to grant an application for a new settlement than the Secretary of State (an approval rate of only 14%).

**TABLE 6.11**

**COMPARISON OF LPA AND SECRETARY OF STATE DECISIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENTS APPLICATIONS BY YEAR AND OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APP</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: APP = approved, REF = refused, % approved = approvals as a percentage of the applications determined by either the LPAs or the Secretary of State, TOTAL = the total number of decisions per year.*

Source: Author's survey
It would appear then that the local state is significantly more permissive than the central state. However this conclusion needs to be treated with caution, for, as I suggested earlier, the interpretation of development control data is fraught with difficulties. Since the applications which the central state determines are, by definition, particularly complex or controversial (because they have been 'called-in'), they are more likely to run counter to adopted policies or to have a significant impact than the applications determined by the local state. They may also be 'poorer quality' applications, although this can not be determined except by a more detailed assessment of each case, including the form and content of the application, and the policy context. However, taking the evidence of the Table at its face value, it is apparent that, despite the shift in relations between the market and the state, the relaxation of planning control did not extend to new settlements. It should be noted that the Secretary of State was not called on to determine an application until 1988, and it is only since 1990 that the central state has had to make an appreciable number of decisions.

New Settlement Appeals

If, as it appears, the central state has been less permissive than LPAs in dealing with new settlement applications, what has been the outcome when these have gone to appeal (either as a result of non determination or following a refusal of planning permission)? It would be expected that the restrictive stance displayed on applications would also apply in relation to appeals. The number of appeals lodged will also say something about the reaction of the development industry, since it has been suggested that one of the outcomes of the outworking of conservative ideology was a greater emphasis on policy making by appeal (Ambrose 1992, Cloke 1992b). Developers may be more likely to pursue proposals to appeal in a climate which appears to favour their interests. Unfortunately, there are comparatively few instances of determined appeals (13), and so some of the conclusions can only be tentative. Table 6.12 indicates the number of appeals determined each year and the success rate.
### TABLE 6.12

**DECISIONS OF NEW SETTLEMENT APPEALS BY YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>UPHELD</th>
<th>DISMISSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Author's survey

The appeal decisions only started to filter through in 1989 (after 2 in 1987), not surprising given the timing of refusals outlined above, and the considerable lapse of time between the submission of an appeal and the issuing of a decision. However, as expected, the Secretary of State has been even more restrictive on appeal than in relation to applications, and supportive of local state decisions, overturning only one. The same caveats apply here as in relation to applications i.e. possibly poorer quality proposals or potentially counter to adopted policy.

Just under 50% of refused new settlement applications went to appeal, a rate higher than for other forms of development, which may indicate the confidence of the private sector in obtaining a favourable outcome, or the significance of the gains to be made if successful. The Table indicates the timing of decisions but not of the submission of appeals. This information is not available accurately for all appeals, but Table 6.13 gives the broad picture.
### TABLE 6.13

**YEAR OF SUBMISSION OF APPEALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto end March 1992. Includes appeals for which decisions have been issued, whether resulting from refusals or from non determination.

Source: Author's survey

The number of appeals peak in 1988, just before the downturn in the housing market, and have declined since, with none lodged in 1990 and 1991. The decline in the number of appeals parallels the increase in the refusal rate of schemes, indicating perhaps that the private sector has become less willing to finance costly appeals, and that the decreasing chances of success on appeal acted as a deterrent. It may also be related to the emerging policy framework for new settlements, which gives greater guidance on the likelihood of successful applications and/or appeals, and to potential changes in government policy on new settlements.

**Comparison between the local state and central state**

In order to shed more light on the relative roles and permissiveness of the central and local states, Table 6.14 compares the Secretary of State's overall decision ratio with that of LPAs. First, the overall success rate of new settlement proposals has remained at a low level, and has declined from the most successful period overall from 1986 to 1988. Second the finding that LPAs are more permissive than the Secretary of State is confirmed, with the central state overall approval rate of 11% compared to the appeal "approval rate" of 7%, and to the local state's approval rate of 35%.
TABLE 6.14

COMPARISON OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE BY YEAR AND OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>OVERALL APP %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>App</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Upto end of March 1992. The SoS column includes both appeal and call-in applications. APP = approved, REF = refused, APP % = the percentage approved. Total = the total number of applications and appeals in each year, Overall app % = the overall percentage of approvals in a year.

Source: Author's survey

The analysis of the pattern of decision making on new settlement proposals indicates that

- the success rate of new settlement proposals is low, and significantly lower than for other types of major development, and it has declined slightly over the period (since 1988);

- the local state is more permissive than the central state in approving applications (with the approval rate improving slightly over the period);

- the central state is even less permissive on appeals than on applications;
• the private sector has made significant (although unsuccessful) use of the appeal mechanism.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE NEW SETTLEMENTS

The analysis so far has been aspatial, and in order to provide greater explanation it is necessary to determine if there are any significant patterns or differences in the geographical distribution of the promotion of new settlement schemes or in decisions. So has the private sector been more active in some regions than others, and have LPAs or the Secretary of State been more or less permissive in particular areas? These issues can be considered on a regional basis, which will give a general pattern, or on a county basis, which can later be related to the policy formulation process through structure plan review in particular.

The Regional Distribution of New Settlement Proposals

The spatial distribution of new settlement proposals has changed markedly but few authors have analysed this. It is possible to construct an impressionistic outline before presenting more detailed evidence.

In the mid 1980s most proposals emerged in the southern half of the country, especially the South East and East Anglia (Potter 1986, Pattison 1987). However by 1988 Herington pointed to

A recent change is their emergence in the Midlands. Four proposals have submitted in locations near Loughborough, Leicestershire, and Lincolnshire, Northamptonshire and Staffordshire have also seen planning applications for new settlements (Herington 1988 - page 308).

In 1989, a number of commentators noted that although the distribution was biased to the South of England, there was a detectable growth in the number of schemes in the West and East Midlands, and in North Yorkshire (Amos 1989b, Harris 1989). The situation had changed a little by mid-1990, for there were significant concentrations of proposals in South Wales and North Yorkshire, as well as in the Borders region of
wider with most counties having at least one proposal (Amos 1990c). A year later this broader scattering of proposals had become more marked

Such new settlement proposals... are more evenly spread around the country. A couple of years ago they were, in the main, a phenomenon of the southern half of the country, but there are now a number of proposals for new settlements around York, arising out of the Greater York Study, and others for Northumberland, Tyneside and Scotland (Amos 1991d - page 303).

The general impression is that over the study period, the regional distribution of new settlements has widened. Table 6.15 provides some quantitative data to add to these qualitative accounts, and indicates the current regional distribution of new settlement schemes. It includes only private sector applications and publicised schemes, and not those put forward or floated by planning authorities through the development plan or other mechanisms. There is an element of double counting where more than one proposal has been put forward on the same site, but this is justified as the focus is on the overall distribution of proposals.

**TABLE 6.15**

**DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS BY REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire/Humberside</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Based on standard regions. Includes all schemes, whether applications or informal proposals, but not LPA proposals. Upto end of March 1992.

Source: Author's survey
The data confirm the impression from the earlier discussion that the private sector has concentrated on the southern half of the country, with just under half of the schemes in the South East (32%) and in East Anglia (17%). It is also evident that private sector activity declines across the country from the South and Midlands to the North and West. Early findings from the DoE New Settlements research project confirm the concentration of proposals on the fringes of the South East (Lock and Breheny 1992).

Table 6.15 gives a static picture, but more revealing is the change in the regional distribution over time shown in Table 6.16. As suggested, developers concentrated on the southern half of the country (the South East and East Anglia) up until 1988, when the pattern became more spatially diversified and more proposals have come forward in most regions. In fact although the number of schemes in the South East have increased, as a proportion of the total publicised each year they have declined since the peak in 1985. The other regions demonstrate a greater fluctuation with no clear trend, and no significant concentrations of proposals in particular years.

**TABLE 6.16**

**NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS IN EACH REGION PER YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To end of March 1992. Includes all private sector proposals, but not those included by LPAs in development plans.

Source: Author's survey
However, the northward spread of proposals in the later 1980s, particularly after 1988, is demonstrated by the peak years for each region. So the peak year for East Anglia was in 1987, in Wales and the North West in 1988, in the East and West Midlands and in the North in 1989, and in Yorkshire and Humberside in 1990.

Finally Table 6.17 shows the number of schemes becoming public in each region in each year of the period as a proportion of the total number of publicised schemes in each region. The peak years for all regions have been since 1988, not surprisingly given the high points in the number of schemes coming forward overall in 1989 and 1990. The highest proportion of proposals coming forward in the South West, Wales and the North West doing so in 1988 (although there was another peak in the North West in 1990), in the East and West Midlands and the North in 1989 (again the North had another peak in 1990), in the South East, East Anglia, Yorkshire and Humberside (and the North West and the North for the second time) in 1990. Apart from the South East with the proportion of its proposals coming forward each year increasing, there is no particular pattern in the other regions.

TABLE 6.17

PERCENTAGE OF EACH REGION'S NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS PER YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To end of March 1992. Includes all private sector proposals, but not those included by LPAs in development plans etc. SE = South East, EA = East Anglia, EM = East Midlands, WM = West Midlands, Y/H = Yorkshire and Humberside, SW = South West, W = Wales, N = North, NW = North West.

Source: Author's survey

This data does reinforce the previous point that a significant number of most regions' schemes tend to come forward in one, or perhaps two, years, at least outside the South
East. So each region (except the South East and South West) have one year when the proportion of schemes was 40% or more, and, in all except the South East, East Anglia, and the South West, 70% or more have been promoted in two years. This temporal concentration of private sector activity is related to other wider events, including particular structure plan review programmes, EiPs, and local plan preparation, as well as to demand and housing market buoyancy in the region.

So initially the private sector concentrated on new settlement promotion in the South East, explained in part by CDL's reasons for targeting this region as the one where the scale of housing need and market demand, and the buoyant land prices, were such that new settlements could be justified, and could be commercially viable (Shostak and Lock 1984, 1985, CDL 1988). Later in the 1980's attention switched to other regions, and the pattern of spatial distribution has become more diverse.

The Distribution of New Settlements by Counties

The regional distribution of new settlements gives a broad picture of private sector activity. However it is necessary to consider more specific geographical milieux, particularly the distribution of schemes by county, as this can be tied to specific events which may have a policy focus. Table 6.18 indicates the current pattern, which is uneven but confirms the southern bias. Most counties have at least one proposal, and only the Isle of Wight and Cleveland in England, and Dyfed, Powys, Gwynedd, and Mid Glamorgan in Wales are without new settlement proposals of any kind.

The interrelationship between the concentration of large numbers of schemes in particular counties and the development plan preparation or review processes in those counties is apparent. Except for Essex, in the seven counties with the highest number of schemes, positive new settlement policies were proposed in structure plan reviews (or in Northamptonshire, in a local plan, and in North Yorkshire, in a precursor to a structure plan review, the Greater York study), which generated many of the schemes put forward. This does not wholly explain the volume of schemes emerging in these areas, for in some of the other counties with a lower volume of proposals, there have been similar circumstances at some stage in their structure plan review process.
### TABLE 6.18

**DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS BY COUNTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex (inc. East and West)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Glamorgan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Upto the end of March 1992. Includes all private sector proposals.
Source: Author's survey

This spatial distribution can also be explained by the development pressures and opportunities in those areas, for, although of the ten counties with more than 5 schemes, four
are in the South East, the remainder are (or were) buoyant counties, or the most buoyant counties within their regions - East Anglia (Cambridgeshire and Suffolk), the West Midlands (Warwickshire), East Midlands (Northamptonshire and Leicestershire), and North Yorkshire (Green 1986, Stewart 1990).

**The Spatial Distribution of New Settlement Decisions**

Having outlined the general spatial distribution of proposals, it is now necessary to establish if there are spatial differences in the type of decisions on these. Table 6.19 sets out the relevant data.

**TABLE 6.19**

**DISTRIBUTION OF DECISIONS BY REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>REF</th>
<th>APP %</th>
<th>O/A %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire/Humberside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: To the end of March 1992. The table includes all decisions whether on applications or appeals. APP = approved, REF = refused, APP % = the number of approvals as a percentage of the total number of decisions in the region, O/A % = the number of approvals in a region as a percentage of the total number of approvals.

Source: Author's survey

From this a number of points can be made. First, half of the new settlement schemes that have been approved are in the South East, although these represent only 20% of the decisions in the region (just below the approval rate for all schemes). Second, no schemes have been approved in the West Midlands or East Anglia. Third, the largest number of decisions are in the South East and East Anglia, not unsurprising because
these regions have the largest number of schemes overall. Fourth, and more importantly, the highest approval rates are largely in those regions outside the southern half of the country, so that Yorkshire and Humberside, Wales, the North, the North West and the East Midlands all have approval rates of 50% or more. However, the number of decisions in most of these regions is small (3 or less) and so not a great deal can be made of this.

This is a static picture and it is important to establish how the decision making pattern has changed over the period. Table 6.20 gives the number of decisions made in each region per year, confirming the steady growth in decisions illustrated earlier. It does also help to explain the general pattern of decisions, for some of the concentrations in particular years are accounted for by linked inquiries in particular regions, so that for example, the 12 decisions in East Anglia, in 1991 and the first quarter of 1992, arise from the "call-ins" and appeals in relation to new settlement schemes on the A10 and A45 in Cambridgeshire. There are other similar concentrations in other regions, although less 'dramatic' than in East Anglia.

TABLE 6.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To the end of March 1992. Includes all decisions whether on applications or on appeals. Regional abbreviations are as in Table 6.17. They are arranged in descending order of the volume of proposals overall. Source: Author's survey

Looking at planning applications, the general picture is indicated in Table 6.21, and is very similar to that for decisions as a whole. The only significant difference is that the
approval rate for applications in the South East is higher than that for all decisions. However, the number of cases is too small to enable any other valid conclusions to be drawn.

TABLE 6.21

DISTRIBUTION OF DECISIONS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>APP</th>
<th>REF</th>
<th>APP %</th>
<th>O/A %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire/Humberside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: To the end of March 1992. The table includes all decisions on planning applications taken by LPAs or by the Secretary of State on "called-in" applications. APP % = the number of approvals as a percentage of the number of decisions in each region, O/A % = the number of approvals in each region as a percentage of the total number of approvals.

Source: Author's survey.

More pertinent is the regional split of decision making shown in Table 6.22. Outside the South East and East Anglia, the local state has been the main decision maker, with only one appeal and two 'call-ins' in the other seven regions. So, it would appear that the private sector has been most confident about lodging appeals (either for refusal or for non-determination) in the South, although, of course, there has been a greater chance of appealing against refusal in the South East in particular, because of the greater number of decisions, and especially refusals.
**TABLE 6.22**

**DECISIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES BY REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>LPAs</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APPEALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto end of March 1992. All appeals and applications. A = approved, R = refused, U = upheld, D = dismissed, - indicates no decisions in that year.

Source: Author's survey

However, only in the South East and East Anglia have there been sufficient decisions to draw comparisons between the performance of the central and local state. First, in the South East, the overall approval rate for both the LPAs and the Secretary of State has been remarkably similar, but the central state has been far less likely to uphold an appeal with only one successful out of 11 lodged. The large number of dismissals indicates that on the whole the Secretary of State has backed the decision of the local state, overturning this only once. Second, in East Anglia, all the decisions have been taken by the central state, but these relate to one specific area - the Cambridge urban fringe and to one structure plan review process.
NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTERS

So far the analysis has concentrated on the main areas of private sector pressure for new settlements, and indicated something of the decision making process. However little has been said about the promoters of new settlements, and whether the type of promoter has an influence on the nature of the scheme promoted. Six main categories of new settlement promoters have been identified, as follows

*Single housebuilding or construction companies* - simply a firm engaged largely or solely in housebuilding, other forms of construction or in civil engineering (although they may form part of a larger group engaged in a range of activities, or may themselves engage in such activities, especially property development). This category also includes single property development companies;

*Partnerships between two housebuilding or construction companies* - a partnership or joint venture between two such companies, where each is identified as joint applicants or promoters;

*Consortia* - where three or more housebuilding or construction companies are the joint promoters (the best known example, to which I have referred before, is CDL, but there are others which tend to come together for particular schemes, rather than having a continuing existence, as CDL did);

*Landowners* - schemes where the owners of the new settlement site are the sole promoters (although as noted below they may later involve one or more housebuilding, construction or other firms). This category does not include other entities or companies, such as housebuilders or property development companies, which own the site. These are placed in the appropriate categories;

*"Mixed" partnerships or consortia* - a partnership, or a group of more than two companies or entities, which do not fall into the two partnership or consortia categories outlined above. The most common of this type of promoter are partnerships between a landowner and a housebuilding firm, and between a property development company and other bodies. Perhaps the best known of the mixed consortia is that formed by the Co-operative Wholesale Society (CWS), Whatco (a joint venture company formed between CWS and Alfred McAlpine), and the Professional Golfers
Association (PGA), which is involved in promoting new settlements associated with championship golf courses;

**Others** - this category includes those not falling into any of the other categories. It includes such diverse bodies as the Open Cast Executive, Insurance Companies and Pension Funds, and a group of professional planners, architects and solicitors responsible for forming the Pentref Development Company promoting Tircoed.

Before looking in more detail at the role of these different forms of promoter, a number of methodological and definition problems need to be briefly considered:

1. There is a lack of information on the type of promoter for certain schemes, so that schemes for which this information is unavailable have been omitted from the analysis, thus explaining any discrepancies between the data presented below and that in the earlier tables;

2. Arrangements for the promotion of a new settlement may alter during the course of its promotion, so that, for example, a single company may decide to take on a partner, or a landowner may form a partnership with a development company. I have normally taken the promoter as being responsible for the initial conceptualisation of a scheme, and so have discounted later changes (although these may be of importance in analysing the development process as a whole);

3. It is not always possible to discover precisely which companies or entities are involved in promotion, as certain relationships between companies may not be made public;

4. There is a difference between the arrangements for promoting a new settlement and for constructing it if the promotion is successful, and, again, it is not always possible to uncover this. Almost invariably, even where a settlement is being promoted by just one housebuilder, or by landowners and non housebuilding construction or other companies, one or more housebuilders will become involved in construction at some stage. The analysis which follows is concerned solely with promoters rather than with arrangements for developing the new settlement.
The categorisation which has been adopted here is open to the criticism that is more appropriate and accurate to concentrate on the nature of the interests involved, rather than to be concerned with fairly superficial functional labels (McNamara 1983, Healey, McNamara, Elson and Doak 1988) 6. However it does have some utility in pointing to the variety of forms adopted for promoting new settlements.

Table 6.23 indicates the number of new settlements being promoted by each of the types of promoter identified earlier.

TABLE 6.23

NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTERS</th>
<th>NEW SETTLEMENTS (number)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single housebuilding or construction companies</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships (housebuilders etc.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortia (housebuilders etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mixed&quot; partnerships or consortia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. The categories of promoter are as defined earlier in the text - see pages 179 & 180. There are a number of schemes where the promoter is unknown or where it is not possible to identify the nature or type of promoter.

Source: Author's survey

As expected, the fraction of capital responsible for promoting most new settlements has been the single housebuilding, construction or development company, and partnerships, or consortia, of these companies. More surprisingly has been the prominent role of landowners. This general pattern has not remained static over time, and Table 6.24

6 A simple illustration is that the functional category of housebuilder may hide a variety of interests and relations, so, for example, a housebuilding company may be the owner of the site which is being promoted, or, almost invariably, will have some other form of interest in the land. The Chapters on the Development Process explore these and related issues in more depth.
indicates something of the way in which this has altered. The dates chosen are those for which comparative data is readily available.

**TABLE 6.24**

**CHANGE IN NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTERS OVER TIME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4/92</th>
<th>5/90</th>
<th>11/89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single housebuilding or construction companies</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housebuilders partnerships</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housebuilder consortia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. The categories of promoter are as defined earlier in the text. There are a number of schemes where the promoter is unknown or where it is not possible to identify the nature or type of promoter.

Source: Author's survey

Although housebuilders and construction companies have always played a major role, they have tended to operate more in isolation over the period and less in partnerships or consortia. Landowners have similarly been responsible for promoting more schemes. One explanation for the changes in the type of promoters relates to the decline in the average size of new settlements being promoted. Consortia are more likely to promote the larger and more costly new settlements, which require the participation of several firms to spread the financing, promotion and construction costs. Conversely, single housebuilding firms and landowners will be more able to promote (and even develop) smaller new settlements, where the costs will be lower. Landowners may also have become more aware of the returns to be made and so sought a more active role in the development process, in much the same way that they have become more involved in other aspects of the planning process, including greater participation in the local plan process, particularly in those areas with high development potential (Adams 1987, Adams and May 1990a, 1990b, Adams and Kent 1991). So although the housebuilding/construction fraction of capital has been responsible for the promotion of a major proportion of schemes, there is significant variety in the types of promoter.
How successful has each form of promoter been in gaining approval for those schemes that have been the subject of formal applications (and appeals)? Table 6.25 indicates the decisions made on both applications and appeals.

### TABLE 6.25

**SUCCESS RATE OF PROMOTERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTER</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single housebuilder, construction or property development firm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership of two housebuilder, construction or property development firms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium of housebuilders etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed consortium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1993. The Table includes all schemes which have been determined, whether appeals or applications, and counts both where more than one decision has been made on the same proposal or site.

Source: Author's survey

The most successful have been the mixed consortia and the 'other' promoters, although with few decisions. The approval rate for the other forms of promoter is about the same, but with housebuilders' consortia performing marginally better. A more accurate picture can be obtained by looking at the overall success rate, and so Table 6.26 expresses each promoters' approvals first as a proportion of the total number of approvals, and then as a proportion of the total number of decisions.

As will be apparent from the earlier data on decisions, none of the promoters have been particularly successful, although the single housebuilders and the housebuilding consortia have both gained more than a quarter of the total number of approvals, and so would appear to be the most successful promoters.
### TABLE 6.26

OVERALL SUCCESS RATE OF PROMOTERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROMOTER</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>TOTAL %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single housebuilder, construction or property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development firm</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership of two housebuilder, construction or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property development firms</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium of housebuilders etc.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed consortium</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Approved % = approvals as a proportion of the total number of approvals, Total % = approvals as a proportion of the total number of decisions.

Source: Author’s survey

### THE SIZE OF NEW SETTLEMENTS

I suggested earlier that there may be a relationship between the nature of a new settlement promoter and the size of the settlement promoted. There may also be a relationship between the size of a proposal and the outcome in terms of the decision on an application and/or appeal. An examination of the size characteristics of new settlement proposals will add to explanation of the private sector development process, and possibly of the pattern of decision making.

A number of different parameters can be used to describe, compare and analyse the size of a new settlement scheme:

- the number of dwellings proposed (usually clearly stated for most proposals);
- the target population of the settlement - this is closely related to the number of dwellings (but has been less often clearly stated in proposals than the number of dwellings);
• the overall site area - this has little utility as a comparative tool because of the wide variety of potential land uses and the amount of land which might be devoted to them;

• Net residential or other density measures - one of the various forms of density measures is more useful than overall site area as a comparative measure, but it has no relationship to the size of schemes per se.

The most useful measure is the number of dwellings proposed, but there are some methodological problems in using this parameter. First, some publicised proposals have not included a proposed dwelling target, and these have been omitted from the analysis. Second, in some cases the target has been stated as a range and the proposal has been excluded if the size range is too wide to fall within those used in the tables. Last, the number of dwellings proposed may be altered during the course of the "life" of the scheme, for example, as the result of negotiation with the planning authority, or as calculations of the overall financial viability of the scheme change. Where the number of proposed dwellings has changed, I have taken the earliest figure given.

Table 6.27 indicates the size distribution of the 145 schemes for which such information is available. The most significant feature is the generally small size of proposals with about two thirds less than 2,000 dwellings, c60% under 1,500 and 36.4% less than 1,000. The largest number of proposals (23.4%) have been in the 1,000 to 1,499 dwelling range, and there are few at either end of the size scale - only 2.1% over 6,000 dwellings, and 4.1% under 200 dwellings. So few private sector promoters have followed CDL's lead in proposing settlements of more than 4,000 dwellings, and their 'programme' constitutes a significant proportion of the larger schemes.

In part, the size of schemes is related to, and dictated by, emerging policies for new settlements in certain areas. Perhaps the most significant example, to which I shall return later, is the new settlement policy in the Cambridgeshire structure plan which proposed two settlements - one on the A10 to the north of Cambridge of 1,500 dwellings, and the other on the A45 of 3,000 dwellings. Since there were 8 competing schemes on the A45 these alone constitute half of the proposals in the 3,000 to 3,499 dwelling category. There are, of course, a number of other, similar examples. The other major 'policy' which had a wide ranging influence is the DoE's new village size of between 200 and 1,000 dwellings.
TABLE 6.27

THE SIZE RANGE OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES - DWELLINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHEMES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 - 499</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 1,499</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 - 1,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 2,499</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 - 2,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 3,499</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500 - 3,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 6,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000 - 7,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,000 - 8,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. The number of dwellings proposed in a number of schemes is unknown. A few others have been proposed as a range rather than a specific figure.

Source: Author's survey.

Table 6.27 gives an essentially static picture, but how have the private sector responded over time? There have been significant changes in the size range of new settlement proposals, for, writing in November 1989, I indicated that most proposals fall within the range of 1,000 - 6,000 dwellings .... with the greatest numbers in the smaller size ranges, of 1,000 - 2,000 and 3,000 - 4,000 dwellings (Amos 1989b - page 314)
A year later the situation had changed

now about two thirds are below 2,000 dwellings in size, and about 90% are of
less than 4,000 dwellings (Amos 1990c - page 318).

Table 6.28 compares the current size distribution with that at the end of 1989.

**TABLE 6.28**

**NEW SETTLEMENT SIZE - COMPARISON BETWEEN 1992 AND 1989**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>MARCH 1992</th>
<th>NOVEMBER 1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Includes all private sector proposals submitted or publicised by the date indicated, where the total number of dwellings proposed is known. % = percentage of total schemes in each size range.

Source: Author's survey.

It is clear that the emphasis has switched to smaller new settlements. The proportion of schemes in every size category except less than 1,000 dwellings has decreased, so in March 1992 about 69% of new settlements are less than 2,000 dwellings, whilst in November 1989 the proportion was 49%.

This is confirmed by Table 6.29, which indicates the number of schemes coming forward in each year of the study period in the size ranges used in Table 6.28, and by the data in Table 6.30, which gives the proportion of new settlements in each size range coming forward each year. 1988 represents an apparent break, with the proportion of schemes over 3,000 dwellings dropping from 47% to 20% and of schemes of less than 2,000 dwellings increasing from 40% to 82%. In the years since 1988 the proportion of
proposals of less than 2,000 dwellings has always formed at least 73% of the total number of schemes. So the private sector response over the period has been towards smaller schemes, most markedly to new settlements with less than 1,000 dwellings, although settlements in the 2,000 - 3,000 and 3,000 - 4,000 dwellings categories and a few larger proposals have continued to come forward.

**TABLE 6.29**

**CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROPOSALS PER YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Schemes for which no size range is known are omitted.
Source: Author's survey

**TABLE 6.30**

**CHANGES IN THE SIZE OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF SCHEMES BY SIZE PER YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Schemes for which no size range is known are omitted.
Source: Author's survey
So far, the picture has been a national one, but are there any distinct *regional* differences in the size of new settlements promoted by the market? Table 6.31 indicates the current number of proposals in each size category in each region which have been put forward over the whole period.

**TABLE 6.31**

REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS BY SIZE RANGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size Range</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Regional abbreviations are as stated in Table 6.17.

Source: Author's survey

Several points can be made. First, large new settlements, above 4,000 dwellings, tend to be concentrated in the South East, with only 2 out of the 13 proposals of that size in other regions. Second, proposals of more than 3,000 dwellings are concentrated largely in the South East, East Anglia, and the Midlands, so that there is a northward decline in the size of proposals, just as there is in the number of schemes. Third, the number of proposals in each category increase with size in East Anglia, whilst the trend elsewhere is for a decrease in size. This may be explained by the emerging policies in the Cambridgeshire Structure Plan which called for a new settlement of around 3,000 dwellings.

This distribution is confirmed by Table 6.32 which expresses the number of proposals in each size category in a region as a percentage of the total number of proposals in the region. In all regions except East Anglia proposals of less than 2,000 dwellings constitute at least 50%, and in most cases, much more, of the total number of schemes in the
region. Only in the South East (23%) do schemes of more than 4,000 dwellings form more than 14% of the total number of proposals in a region. In East Anglia, medium size new settlement proposals (between 2,000 and 4,000 dwellings) predominate, being 70% of the total. The only other significant concentration in this size range is in Yorkshire and Humberside with 30%.

**TABLE 6.32**

**REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF NEW SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS - PERCENTAGE OF EACH REGION'S PROPOSALS BY SIZE RANGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Regional abbreviations are as stated in Table 6.17.

Source: Author's survey

So far the analysis has concentrated on the size distribution within particular regions. Table 6.33 extends the analysis to compare regional with national patterns, and indicates the number of schemes in each of the size categories for each region as a percentage of the total number of schemes in that category.

From this Table it is apparent that the private sector has targeted the South East for the larger schemes, so that of the schemes of between 4,000 and 5,000 dwellings, 100% have been in the South East, as have most of the proposals between 5,000 and 6,000 and over 6,000. There is a wider distribution of smaller schemes, but with a significant concentration of proposals between 2,000 and 4,000 dwellings in East Anglia (for the reasons stated above). The small number of schemes in the North, North Wales and South West mean that their proportionate share in each size category and overall will be low in any case.
TABLE 6.33

PERCENTAGE OF NEW SETTLEMENTS IN EACH SIZE RANGE BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Regional abbreviations are as stated in Table 6.17. The Table indicates the proportion of each region's share to each size category.

Source: Author's survey

Decisions

I indicated earlier the general pattern of decision making, and suggested that the local state was generally more permissive than the central state. Is the size of a proposal influential in decision making on applications and appeals, and is there a relationship between the size of proposals and the nature of the decision?

Overall, the approval rate declines with the increasing size of the proposal, as indicated in Table 6.34. So larger new settlements are less likely to be granted permission, either initially or on appeal. This bias towards smaller settlements is marked for 58% of the proposals granted permission have been in the 1,000 dwellings or less category.
### TABLE 6.34

**DECISIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENTS PROPOSALS BY SIZE CATEGORIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>APPROVE</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dwellings</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>APPROVE</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dwellings</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Includes all decisions, both on applications and appeals and so does involve some double counting.

Source: Author's survey

Is there a difference in the response of the local and central states to the size of proposals? Table 6.35 sets out the approval rates of LPAs and the Secretary of State on applications.

Approval rates for small new settlements (either less than 1,000 or less than 2,000 dwellings) are high for both the Secretary of State and for LPAs. The major difference is in relation to schemes over 2,000 dwellings, as none have been approved by the Secretary of State, whilst the LPAs' approval rate is 28%. So on the whole LPAs are more likely to approve larger new settlements than the Secretary of State.
TABLE 6.35

DECISIONS ON NEW SETTLEMENT PLANNING APPLICATIONS BY SIZE CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Ref</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Includes all decisions on planning applications.

Source: Author's survey

As noted earlier the private sector has pursued a significant number of proposals to appeal, but been remarkably unsuccessful, with only one upheld. As can be seen from Table 6.36, this was in the 3,000 to 4,000 dwelling range. The number of instances of appeals are too few to draw any other valid conclusions.

TABLE 6.36

NEW SETTLEMENT APPEAL DECISIONS BY SIZE CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
<th>REFUSED</th>
<th>APP %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992

Source: Author's survey
Are there any spatial variations in decision making according to the size of the schemes? There are too few decisions to make many valid conclusions, but Table 6.37 sets out the distribution of decisions by size range in each region.

In general it can be concluded that small new settlements are more likely to be approved outside the South East, and larger new settlements are more likely to be approved in the South East than elsewhere, although this may be due to the preponderance of large schemes in the South East. Most significantly perhaps, no new settlement proposals of more than 1,000 dwellings have been approved outside the South East over the study period.

**TABLE 6.37**

**DISTRIBUTION OF DECISIONS BY SIZE RANGE AND REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE RANGE</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>WM</th>
<th>Y/H</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
<td>A R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Regional abbreviations are as given earlier. A = number of approvals, R = number of refusals.

Source: Author's survey

**Promoters**

Earlier I suggested that there was a relationship between the type of promoter and the size of settlement which they promoted. Table 6.38 indicates the number of settlements promoted by the types of promoter identified earlier in each size category, and Table 6.39 expresses this as a percentage. The 'other' category has been omitted because of
the very small number of settlements which have come forward from this form of promoter.

TABLE 6.38

SIZE OF NEW SETTLEMENTS PROPOSED BY PROMOTERS - NUMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE CATEGORY</th>
<th>S H</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. SH = single housebuilder/construction firm; HP = partnership between housebuilders/construction firms; C = consortium of housebuilders/construction firms; LO = landowner; M = mixed consortium. For full definition see text.

Source: Author’s survey

TABLE 6.39

SIZE OF NEW SETTLEMENTS PROPOSED BY PROMOTERS - PERCENTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE CATEGORY</th>
<th>S H</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Abbreviations as above, for full definition see text.

Source: Author’s survey
This tends to confirm the point that consortia are generally responsible for the larger schemes (51% of consortia schemes are more than 3,000 dwellings), although 42% of the proposals from the consortia have been for settlements of 2,000 dwellings or less. The partnerships have promoted larger schemes than single housebuilders or construction companies. Landowners and mixed consortia have tended to promote smaller schemes, with 83% of the landowners' and 81% of the mixed consortia schemes less than 2,000 dwellings.

Table 6.40 indicates the proportion of each size category coming forward from each form of promoter. Again this confirms that the majority of the larger schemes have been promoted by consortia. It also shows that single housebuilders have not preferred one particular size range although they have been responsible for promoting nearly two thirds of the schemes in the 2,000 - 3,000 and 4,000 - 5,000 size categories. So on the whole there is a broad relationship between the form of promoter and the size of settlement promoted although this is only one of a number of factors which will determine the size of schemes.

### TABLE 6.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE CATEGORY</th>
<th>S H</th>
<th>HP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>LO</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 6,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Upto the end of March 1992. Abbreviations as above, for full definition see text.

Source: Author's survey
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This Chapter has set out to answer a number of basic questions about the geography, scale, and nature of the new settlement proposals which have emerged during the study period, about the response of the planning system to these schemes, about the changing nature of the development process, and about the interaction between the private sector and the planning system.

Looking first at the geography of new settlement promotion, this has changed over the period, in part in relation, inter alia, to changing market conditions, with a widening spatial distribution of schemes, both on a regional and county basis. The South East, East Anglia, the West Midlands, the East Midlands and Yorkshire and Humberside still predominate, having the highest overall numbers of schemes and the highest proportions of schemes. There has however been a change since 1988 with a wider spread of schemes.

The size of schemes being promoted has similarly changed with a trend towards smaller new settlements, demonstrated by the increase in the proportion of schemes of less than 2,000 dwellings. Overall about a third of the proposals now fall into the DoE's "new village" size category (less than 1,000 dwellings), and about two thirds of the total number of schemes are less than 2,000 dwellings.

Turning now to the response of the planning system, and in particular to the different responses of the central and local state, the Secretary of State has had a significant role to play in the determination of applications for new settlements, 'calling-in' a number of contentious proposals and deciding appeals, against either non-determination or refusal. Overall, the central state has been more involved in decision making on new settlements than on other forms of development.

In terms of the nature of decision made, the Secretary of State has been less permissive than LPAs on both planning applications and appeals, and has been more restrictive on appeals than on applications. On appeal, the local state's decision has been supported in all but one case (7% of the appeal decision taken by the Secretary of State). Conversely, the local state has shown a greater degree of permissiveness, with the LPA approval rate increasing over the period in relation to the overall approval rate, although this is due, in part, to more refusals by the Secretary of State on "called-in" applications and on appeals.
There are, of course, spatial and, particularly, regional variations in decision making by the local and central states. Outside the South East, East Anglia, and the West Midlands, both LPAs and the Secretary of State are more permissive, although there is limited data on which to base this conclusion. In the South East (the region with the greatest private sector activity) the LPAs' and Secretary of State's overall approval rate is similar, and about half of the schemes approved have been in this region, although the approval rate in the South East is only 20%. In terms of the size of new settlement proposals, LPAs are more likely than the Secretary of State to approve applications for larger schemes, as the central state has not permitted an application for a scheme of more than 2,000 dwellings.

It is also possible to consider the wider effects of the planning system as a whole, and to compare the approach to new settlements with that to other forms of development. The success rate on new settlement applications (measured as a proportion of those schemes on which a decision has been made) is 22%, which is significantly lower than for other types of development, as is to be expected. For applications alone (as a proportion of submitted applications) the success rate is lower at 13.75%. So conversely the proportion of new settlement proposals which have been refused is significantly higher than for other forms of development. The overall success rate (measured as a proportion of schemes coming forward) is only 6.6%. The approval rate has decreased slightly in the period from 1988 to 1991, although the most successful period in relation to the number of schemes being approved was from 1986 to 1989. For planning applications, the success rate has increased in line with the trend towards the approvals of more major schemes.

The central state has had a major role in decision making over the study period, although not the key role. Contrary to expectations however, the central state has been more restrictive than the local state, both in permitting fewer schemes (as applications or on appeal) and in permitting smaller schemes. Where LPAs have themselves refused proposals, the central state has been supportive of these decisions. The stance of the central state provides a counterbalance to the rhetoric of policy statements, and to the whole ideological thrust of the 1980's.

The nature of the new settlement development process has changed over the period. Changes in the wider economy and in the housing market appear to have had an effect on the promotion of schemes by the private sector. Both the number of schemes and
the proportion of planning applications grew steadily until 1988/89, and then declined dramatically. This pattern of private sector new settlement activity matches that for planning applications as a whole in England, and more relevant that for major residential applications. Dating the beginning of the downturn in housing market conditions from around the end of 1988 and the beginning of 1989, it is apparent that economic recession has affected both the promotion of new settlement schemes as a whole and their promotion as planning applications. Moreover appeal submissions by the private sector also peak in 1988.

So it can be argued that the private sector has responded to a downturn in economic conditions by the promotion of fewer schemes, by promotion in those areas which continue to be buoyant, and by promotion of smaller schemes which, given the relationship between success rate and size, appear to be more likely to be successful. A downturn in economic activity may not result in a halt of new settlement promotion but it has brought about changes in the mode, scale and locale of promotion. In part these changes may also result from other factors, such as the restrictiveness of planning policy in the South.

The nature of new settlement promoters also changed over the period, with a relative decline in the number of schemes being promoted by consortia or partnerships since 1989, and more proposals being put forward by landowners and single housebuilding/development companies. This change was accompanied by a change in the nature of schemes, and particularly in their size, for a greater number of smaller proposals emerged as the period progressed. On the whole, single housebuilders and landowners tend to promote smaller schemes than partnerships or consortia. Just over half of the schemes from the housebuilding consortia were for more than 3,000 dwellings, whilst conversely 83% of schemes promoted by landowners were for less than 2,000 dwellings. Landowners and single housebuilding/construction firms each promoted 40% of the schemes of less than 1,000 dwellings. The reasons for the changing size of schemes and hence in the change in type of promoter lie elsewhere.

In terms of success, the mixed consortia and the 'others' category proved most successful, albeit with a small number of decisions. Approval rates for the other forms of promoter showed little significant difference at around 18% to 20% of promoted schemes which had been determined.
There has also been a change in the geographical areas targeted by the private sector, as I suggested above, and in the size of schemes promoted in those areas. Larger new settlements (of more than 4,000 dwellings) are concentrated in the South East. In all regions apart from East Anglia small new settlements form at least 50% of the regional total. So there is a general northwards decline in the size of schemes.

On promotion, and picking up the conclusion above, the evidence points to the importance of arenas other than planning applications for promoting new settlements, given the decline in the number of applications being submitted. It suggests that the process is a complex one which includes, in some cases, the attempt to create a favourable policy framework or climate, rather than merely confronting the planning system through the submission of a planning application. There are then a range of tactics used by promoters and it is noticeable that significant use has been made of the appeal route, although this had been almost wholly unsuccessful, at least in terms of obtaining a favourable outcome.

So there is some evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between the type or form of promoter and the nature of the settlement being promoted, but it is less clear that the form of promotion is dependant upon the nature of the promoter. To establish this, it is necessary to analyse the interactions with the policy formulation process, in particular, in more detail.

It is apparent, for example, from the concentration of schemes in most regions, except the South East and East Anglia, in certain counties and in one or two particular years, that the opportunity to influence the policy framework or the potential for a favourable policy response, has encouraged the promotion of schemes by the private sector (although the state of the local and national economy will also have an effect as well). The form that the promotion takes (i.e. as a planning application, as a proposal pursued through the local plan or structure plan process, as an appeal etc.) varies and is dependant upon other factors as well.

So private sector pressure for new settlements is related, in part at least, to an emerging policy climate, both nationally, and more importantly locally, and to one which either appears favourable or gives an opportunity for participation in the policy formulation process.
Landowners have played a significant role in the promotion of new settlement schemes, although in terms of decisions on schemes submitted as applications, they have not been more successful than other forms of promoter. The importance of their role lies more in bargaining over the release of land and over the price of land. Equally important is the 'struggle' between landowners and developers over the funding of infrastructure and community facilities, for it appears that planning gain' is borne more by the landowner than by the developer.

Lastly, and briefly, the previous discussion has pointed to some of the main elements of the interaction between the planning system and the private sector. The private sector, has reacted to the state's response to new settlement pressure (and to wider economic changes), by a switch in the scale and location of schemes being promoted. Similarly there is evidence of a change within the development industry itself as the form of new settlement promoter has altered in response to these changing conditions. The process has been one of varied interaction, but more evidence is required to explore the precise nature of the changing power relations.

So the overall picture is one of an uneven pattern of action, reaction and response. The general ideological climate, and specific changes of emphasis and policy within the planning system, have not resulted in a widespread freeing of the planning system, at least as demonstrated by the response to new settlement proposals (applications and appeals). The central state has adopted a more restrictive stance than the local state on those schemes which have come before it for decision, despite its rhetoric and the signals given to the private sector by the apparent policy and ideological shifts.

The next Part of the Thesis moves on to examine the policy context for new settlements in more detail, and to explore the policy formulation process at all levels from national to local. It will therefore advance the analysis of the private sector/planning system interactions, and shed more light on the changing nature of the power relations.
PART THREE

THE ANALYSIS OF POLICY FORMULATION
CHAPTER 7

POLICY FORMULATION FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS - NATIONAL GUIDANCE
INTRODUCTION

This Part of the thesis is concerned with the formulation of policy for new settlements, and examines this process in relation to central government policy; regional advice and guidance; the preparation and review of structure plans; and the local planning process. A Chapter is devoted to each of these and the aims in these Chapters are

1. to describe the form and content of the evolving policy framework for private new settlements;

2. to explore the interactions between the key actors in the arenas provided by the various forms of policy and policy making;

3. to analyse and explore the influence of the central state on policy formulation at lower levels in the land use planning system, and thus to consider the role and extent of the power of the central state vis a vis the other actors in the process;

4. to consider the extent to which evolving policy has had an impact on the private sector new settlement development process.

I have already outlined the way in which Government ideology and policy in relation to the land use planning system has shifted during the years since 1979. I have also suggested that this context is of considerable significance for the production of housing by the private sector, and hence for private new settlements. It is important to establish how the central state's policy on private new settlements has evolved over the past decade as part of the assessment of the extent to which planning policy has become liberalised. I indicated in the previous Chapter that an apparent relaxation of planning control did not extend to decisions to permit new settlements in significant numbers, since the central state has been more restrictive than the local state in determining applications for new settlements. Moreover, the central state has been particularly restrictive in determining appeals, overturning a local state decision only once. Is there anything in the central state's specific policy approach which might explain this apparent paradox, as a more general liberalisation could be expected to be manifested in a permissive stance on new settlements? This Chapter traces the development of policy for new settlements at a national level, whilst later Chapters relate this policy framework to strategic policy for new settlements and to the Structure Plan and Local Plan Policy formulation processes.
The specific objective of this Chapter is to follow up the empirical evidence on the central state's decision making on new settlement applications and appeals in Chapter 6, by focusing on government policy statements as part of an assessment of the precise role and influence of the central state in policy formulation. The discussion in this Chapter will also add to previous analysis of the continuing and wide ranging debate on new settlements which characterised the 1980s.

THE NATURE OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Government policy may be expressed in a variety of forms, including

- Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs)\(^1\);
- Circulars\(^2\);
- White Papers;
- Ministerial Statements;
- Strategic or Regional Guidance;
- Draft PPGs and Circulars;
- Appeal decisions;
- "Call in" of applications, and subsequent Ministerial decisions;
- Modifications of, and decisions on, Structure Plans;
- Call in of Local Plans, and subsequent Ministerial decisions.

Chapter 6 dealt with policy as expressed through appeal decisions and decisions on 'called-in' applications in general terms. In this Chapter, I will concentrate on policy as expressed in PPGs and draft PPGs, Circulars, and Ministerial Statements, referring only briefly, where necessary to the other forms of policy. However it should be stressed that these other forms, particularly decisions on appeals and the modification of Structure Plans, are particularly important for a number of reasons.

First, they too reflect changing Government policy, possible in advance of a more formal statement in a PPG. In this way they may be seen as representing 'ad hoc' policy for-

---

\(^{1}\) Planning Policy Guidance Notes, introduced in 1987, are designed to convey current Government policy on a variety of topics, and will eventually replace Development Control Policy Notes (DCPNs).

\(^{2}\) With the advent of PPGs, Circulars are not more oriented towards advice on procedural and legal, rather than policy matters. As more PPGs are produced, extant Circulars are being cancelled, where their guidance is superseded, or subsumed in a new PPG.
mulation, which can have a significant impact on private sector activity, and so, for example, the major appeal decisions have been quoted or referred to in the cases prepared by promoters for later new settlement appeals or 'call-in' inquiries.

Second, although formal central government policy may be expressed in PPGs, circulars and Ministerial Statements, its implementation is a more complex process. It relies on LPAs giving effect to it in their decision making on proposals, and in policy and plan preparation. LPAs are required to have regard to central state policy statements, but the only effective means for the central state itself to implement these statements is through decisions on appeals, on 'called-in' applications, and on structure or local plans. Appeals and 'call-ins' remain as sanctions which the central state can utilise to 'enforce' its policy, although the former only come into play when used by a developer aggrieved at an LPA decision to refuse a proposal (or to impose unacceptable conditions upon it). The central state can do little when applications are approved by CPAs contrary to national policy, except to call-in an application when it becomes apparent that such a decision will be taken. The central state has rarely intervened in the preparation of local plans, at least formally, but modification of structure plans is a second significant arena where national policy can be implemented (although of course, this, in turn, requires districts to give effect to structure plan policies in their decisions).

Third, although the central state's direct involvement in the implementation of its land use planning policy is limited, the promulgation of policy through circulars and PPGs not only creates the general ethos of the planning system, but also shapes the response of the private sector.

E Volving Government Policy ON Private New Settlements

A formal policy statement from Central Government on private new settlements first appeared in July 1984 in Circular 15/84 (DoE 1984a), at a time when, as I indicated earlier, few proposals from the private sector had yet emerged. In fact the only indication of private sector interest of any scale had been the announcement of CDL's 'programme' in mid-1983. The policy advice had however been canvassed in a couple of drafts of the Circular issued in July 1983 and February 1984, with the first of these drafts appearing shortly before CDL's announcement. Following this, there was a lull in the issuing of guidance until 1988, since when there has been a welter of policy state-
ments in various forms. Figure 7.1 sets out the chronology of policy statements from Central Government on private new settlements, giving the source and date of issue.

FIGURE 7.1

CHRONOLOGY OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT POLICY STATEMENTS ON NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Circular 15/84 - Land for Housing</td>
<td>1983 (July) &amp; 1984 (February)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular 15/84 - Land for Housing</td>
<td>1984 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 2 - Green Belts</td>
<td>1988 (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 3 - Land for Housing</td>
<td>1988 (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 9 - Regional Guidance for The South East</td>
<td>1988 (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by Minister of Housing and Planning</td>
<td>1988 (February)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing in Rural Areas : Village Housing and New Villages (DoE Discussion Paper)</td>
<td>1988 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing in Rural Areas</td>
<td>1988 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by Minister for Water and Planning</td>
<td>1988 (September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PPG 3 - Housing</td>
<td>1989 (October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by Secretary of State for the Environment - Planning and Local Choice</td>
<td>1989 (October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PPG 15 - Structure Plans and Regional Planning Guidance</td>
<td>1989 (November)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 15 - Regional Planning Guidance, Structure Plans and the Content of Development Plans</td>
<td>1990 (May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by the Minister of Housing and Planning</td>
<td>1990 (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Paper &quot;This Common Inheritance&quot;</td>
<td>1990 (September)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by Minister of Housing and Planning</td>
<td>1991 (January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPG 1 - Land for Housing</td>
<td>1991 (August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 3 - Housing (Revised)</td>
<td>1992 (March)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

I shall now consider each of the more significant of these statements in more detail, and show how the Government's policy has developed, pointing to significant changes of emphasis and substance.
Draft Circular 15/84 - Land for Housing

As the title suggests, the main emphasis of the draft circular was on policy for the provision of an adequate and continuing supply of land for housing. It required the identification of at least 5 years supply of land, plus the identification of the general location of a further 2 years supply, but with a 2 year supply on which development can start immediately. The circular went through two drafts. The first draft, issued in July 1983, proposed some rather far reaching changes to the relationship between planning policy and plans and the private sector housebuilder. It relaxed the degree of control to be exercised by Local Planning Authorities, and to some extent, it reduced the status of the development plan in determining the location of new housing, since, for example, the existence of an adequate land supply would not, in itself, be a sufficient reason for refusing planning permission for other sites not already allocated for housing development. It also introduced the concept of the need for housing allocations to meet market demand rather than housing needs, thereby adding marketability criteria to assessments of housing land supply. It was therefore a concrete expression of the central state’s ideological ‘project’ to reorient the planning system to facilitate the operation of the market.

In this vein, it was, not surprisingly, fairly positive in relation to new settlements

In some areas it may exceptionally prove the best solution to plan for new settlements rather than to expand existing communities (Johnston 1984a)

As I indicated earlier the issue of the draft circular roughly coincided with the announcement by CDL of their ‘new village’ programme, and, in fact, the draft was seen, by some, as “giving a green light to new villages in open countryside” (Planning 1984b). However this interpretation may not have been wholly warranted, as the report of a meeting between the Secretary of State for the Environment (Patrick Jenkin) and the CPRE indicates

.... the draft Land For Housing circular’s view that in some circumstances completely new settlements would be a valid way of meeting land supply requirements was taken in some quarters to imply that they would be allowed to go ahead as departures on appeal. But Jenkin was very emphatic..... that new
development should take place within the structure and local plan network (Johnston 1984b - page 9)

This first advice on new settlements is tentative, lacking definition of key concepts, including the areas where, and the 'exceptional' circumstances in which, they might be appropriate. The problem to which new settlements might prove the solution is essentially one, not of land supply per se, but of conserving or relieving pressure on existing communities. It also downplays the role of the development plan system, despite the Secretary of State's own view of the interpretation of the guidance.

Following adverse reaction to the first draft (also containing advice on Green Belt policy which provoked even more criticism), it was withdrawn in December 1983, and a second draft issued in February 1984. This appeared to place renewed emphasis on the development plan system, particularly for the production of new settlements, on the reuse of urban land and on protection for agricultural land.

Circular 15/84 - Land for Housing

The length of time between the publication of the first draft and of the final version indicates the intensity of the debate and the highly political nature of the land availability issue itself. When finally issued, in June 1984, Circular 15/84 reaffirmed the Government's policy on the provision of an adequate and continuing supply of land for housing (DoE 1984a). In the context of an indication of appropriate forms and locations for development, the circular indicated, as the second draft had done, that

In a few cases it may be practicable to consider making provision in structure plans for new settlements. Any such proposals for structure plan alterations, and any specific proposals of this kind by private developers, must be subject to normal planning procedures (DoE 1984a - paragraph 6)

It is clear that the process of structure plan preparation and review is considered to be the appropriate forum for the assessment of the need for new settlements, picking up on the Secretary of State's privately stated view, and indeed the change in emphasis from the first draft is clearly evident, with the onus being placed on structure plans. However, the second sentence is less clear with the undefined phrase 'normal planning procedures' tending to introduce a degree of ambiguity into the guidance, adding confusion on whether applications and appeals were to be regarded as normal planning
procedures, alongside the process of structure plan review. The statement also gives no guidance on the form or scale of a new settlement and so lacks a precise definition, as well as other criteria which might govern location and scale.

**PPG 3 - Land for Housing**

Among the first of the new series of PPGs, PPG 3 updated the guidance on housing land contained in Circular 15/84 (DoE 1988b). However, it post-dated the first of the major inquiries into private new settlements, that on Tillingham Hall in Essex\(^3\), and was also issued after the Secretary of State\(^4\) had made his decision on the appeal.

**Tillingham Hall**

This decision is important, not only as the first on CDL's series of new country towns, but also because the form of the Secretary of State's rejection of Tillingham Hall provided further guidance on new settlements, and possible hope for new settlement promoters elsewhere. It had a bearing on later policy guidance and on the private sector's response. In paragraph 8 of his decision letter, the Secretary of State considered that well conceived schemes of this kind, in appropriate locations, may have a part to play in meeting the demand for new housing, especially where the development meets most or all of the local infrastructure costs and the need for community facilities. Indeed, the possibility of new settlements contributing to the provision of new housing was referred to in Circular 15/84, and some local authorities are currently considering making provision in structure plans for schemes of this kind (DoE/DTp 1987)

\(^3\) The site was located in the Essex Green Belt.

\(^4\) The Secretary of State for the Environment was now Nicholas Ridley, who had replaced Patrick Jenkin. Secretaries of State for the Environment during the study period have been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Heseltine</td>
<td>1979 - 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom King</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Jenkin</td>
<td>1983 - 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Baker</td>
<td>1985 - 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Ridley</td>
<td>1986 - 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Patten</td>
<td>1989 - 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Heseltine</td>
<td>1990 - 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Howard</td>
<td>4/92 to date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Williams 1992 Table 7.3 updated by author
Although the scheme had merits, as noted in the comment in paragraph 8 quoted above, it was rejected on grounds of intrusion into the Green Belt, and lack of special justification, including lack of need for the provision of additional housing land.

The appeal decision did little to clarify the earlier reference to normal planning procedures, for the Secretary of State indicated, rather ambiguously, that

"... whilst it would normally be appropriate to consider a release of housing land of this magnitude in the context of the Structure Plan process, there is no reason why the present proposals may not properly be considered by way of an appeal under Section 36 and 37 of the 1971 Act (DoE/DTP 1987 - paragraph 4)"

Discussion of PPG 3 - Land for Housing

The PPG emerged at a time when pressure for new settlements was growing, as I have shown in Chapter 5, and it reproduced much of the substantive content of the Secretary of State's decision on Tillingham Hall. Paragraph 11, in a section entitled 'The location of housing: general considerations', stated

"In a few cases it may be practicable to consider making provision for new housing in the form of new settlements. These might range in scale from moderate sized townships to small villages. Well-conceived schemes of this kind may have a part to play in meeting the demand for new housing, especially where the development provides for meeting all or most of the costs of local infrastructure needed to service the site and to meet the needs for community facilities generated by the new development. Any specific proposals by developers must be subject to normal planning procedures and must be considered within the framework of existing planning policies (DoE 1988b - paragraph 11)"

The guidance in Circular 15/84 had been combined with the relevant part of the Secretary of State's decision letter on Tillingham Hall, with little new added. Significantly, the explicit reference to structure plans, found in the earlier circular had been omitted, although it could be argued that the phrases 'making provision' and 'framework of existing planning policies', at least tacitly, refer to this type of strategic context. This view is strengthened by the advice in a later section of the PPG on the role of development
plans, showing 'how future requirements for new housing can best be met' (DoE 1988b - paragraph 12).

The use of 'may' and 'in a few cases' indicates that large numbers of new settlements are not seen as appropriate, and that, of course, the policy is flexible and not prescriptive. The concept of large scale development meeting the cost of the infrastructure it requires is endorsed, although the wording in PPG 3 is tighter than the corresponding sentence in the Tillingham Hall decision. With the addition of the phrases 'needed to service the site' and 'generated by the new development', the backing for planning authorities seeking contributions to wider infrastructure problems is circumscribed.

The potential role of many new settlements has shifted from protecting existing communities to one of meeting housing demand, although this may not reflect neglect of other potential roles, but arise more from the topic matter of the PPG. It does serve to reaffirm the Government's ideological stance in reorienting the planning system to a market facilitating approach, through meeting housing demand rather than housing need.

For the first time, a series of criteria which can be used to test the appropriateness of new settlements are introduced. They should

1. be well-conceived: Although this is not developed further, it is apparent that since it stems from the Tillingham Hall decision letter, it refers to the overall design approach and to the degree to which the scheme as a whole has been thought through and presented in a coherent form;

2. provide for meeting, rather than meet, as in the Tillingham Hall decision, all or most of the local infrastructure costs (here the emphasis is on local costs, needed to service the site, rather than on any wider infrastructure or other costs which might arise form the development);

3. provide for meeting the need for community facilities;

4. be subject to normal planning procedures (although, as before, this is not clarified); and

5. be considered within the framework of existing planning policies.
Also newly introduced is the vague reference to scale, which may have covered in general terms the size range of proposals coming forward at the time, but which gives no concrete guidance.

On the whole the PPG can be seen as tentatively positive, taking forward the earlier guidance in an incremental manner, but adding a note of confusion by seemingly reducing the emphasis on the structure plan process as the appropriate policy mechanism for reaching decisions on the need for new settlements, without giving any unambiguous advice on alternative mechanisms.

**Statement by Minister of Housing and Planning**

Ministerial statements may be made in a variety of situations, and, as PPG 1 (DoE 1992a) suggests, they need to be taken as carrying weight and conveying government policy. In this sense they are equally important as more formal policy expressions through PPGs and Circulars. Shortly after the issue of PPG 3, the (then) Minister for Housing and Planning made a speech during a Commons debate in February 1988:

> Perhaps we should be looking again at the idea of planning new settlements a little more carefully. There comes a time when the expansion of existing villages must end if they are not to turn into towns and have their nature changed ..... We should provide the proper services and do things carefully with quality development.....That may be a better way forward (Minister for Housing and Planning 1988).

It seemed rather more positive than the advice in that Planning Policy Guidance, indicating a specific role for new settlements in maintaining the character of existing settlements, and clearly pointing to the need for the provision of services, and for a high quality of development. The extent to which the enthusiasm of Minister for Housing and Planning for new settlements was shared by his colleagues is not altogether clear. Certainly the former Secretary of State for the Environment, Michael Heseltine, had come out against new settlements, and indeed in arguing for greater government intervention in the market, and against development in the South East, had seemingly shifted away from espousal of the government's pro-market ideology (Carvel 1988, Wintour 1988, Travis 1988a, 1988b, Taylor 1991). Heseltine's stance is significant since he later became Secretary of State again in 1990, and the shift in the government's policy stance...
on new settlements which took place around then, and to which I shall refer later, may well have come from him.

**Housing in Rural Areas: Village Housing and New Villages**

In July 1988, the Department of the Environment published a Discussion Paper, dealing with the planning aspects of housing development in villages and considering the possibilities of new villages (DoE 1988a). That document is referred to here as the Discussion Paper to avoid repeating its lengthy title. The letter accompanying the Paper made it clear that it was concerned with new villages in particular locations

in areas well away from the conurbations, and well outside the Green belts (DoE 1988c)

It was released simultaneously with "Housing in Rural Areas", which specifically addressed proposals for encouraging the provision of low cost housing in rural areas (DoE 1988d). This form of presentation of draft policy guidance in a discussion paper is unusual, for, although circulars and PPGs are normally issued in draft for comment, this paper canvassed views before the preparation of such draft guidance. It was, evidently, the processor to a new PPG.

As the title suggests, the paper was directly concerned with housing in rural areas. The need to make provision for the demand for new housing was placed firmly in the context of rural restructuring - changes in the rural economy, particularly in agriculture, and in the structure, location and movement of population. The tenure of the paper's view of new settlements was explicitly stated early on, in paragraph 3

......needs have to be catered for in land use planning, and well designed new housing both in existing villages and perhaps in small-scale new villages can make a useful contribution without conflicting with other important policy objectives for the conservation of the countryside (DoE 1988a - paragraph 3)

The paper went on to look at the size and distribution of villages and small towns, at the nature of the population turnaround and its composition, and at the level of rural service provision. Changes in the rural economy, and in economic activity and employment in rural areas were also charted. The focus then turns to a discussion of rural settlement
policies, and to a critique of the 'key settlement' approach, including the effects of restraint on non key settlements.

Discussion moves onto new villages in the section entitled 'Future Developments', after some consideration of the population thresholds required to support particular services. The paper reiterates the guidance contained in Circular 15/84 and in PPG 3, and outlines the essence of the decision on Tillingham Hall, before pointing to the precedents for new villages, including New Ash Green and Bar Hill, as well as many estate villages and other planned settlements.

In paragraph 33, the Paper makes a significant observation

There have been very few proposals for new settlements of what could be called a 'new village' scale - say around 200 to 1000 or so houses - apart from the occasional proposal to utilise an existing developed site such as a redundant hospital or disused airfield (DoE 1988a - paragraph 33)

For the first time in a Government policy statement, a definition of the scale of a new settlement, in this case a new village, appeared. Although the document did not represent formal policy, or even informal policy, as noted above, this definition of scale has assumed considerable significance with the size range coming to be used in policy formulation and in the preparation and arguing of cases on appeal and call-in. I have already placed this definition in the context of a more wide ranging discussion of the scale of particular forms of new settlement (see Chapter 3), and it is evident from that analysis that the range arrived at in the Discussion Paper, without any concrete evidence, apart from a brief analysis of service thresholds, is not universally accepted as the appropriate size range.

The reason for the scarcity of 'new village scale' proposals is traced to tight planning control in rural areas. From the evidence in Chapter 6, it is apparent that such control would have acted as a deterrent to the submission of proposals, for, of the proposals for new settlements emerging prior to 1988, only 20% had been for less than 1,000 dwellings.

However, 'well located, well planned and well designed' new villages may provide an alternative to sporadic development in the countryside. An additional role, and perhaps a more important one for 'well conceived new villages' is to
......help relieve development pressures on other areas, including Green Belts and AONB's\(^5\), where firm restraint on development must be maintained (DoE 1988a - paragraph 40)

Other general locational guidance follows

......provision (for housing development) should be steered well away from the conurbations and other large urban areas. In the South East it should be well beyond the outer boundary of the metropolitan Green Belt (DoE 1988a - paragraph 40)

Encouragement is given to consideration of new settlements in those areas of the South East where severe restraint on housing in rural areas is not being exercised, and where more ample provision is being made for new housing, for here it may well be both practicable and desirable to meet part of that provision in new and existing villages. That would be in accord with the Secretary of State's regional strategic guidance for the South East (DoE 1988a - paragraph 40)

The paper concludes by offering some views on the appropriate policy mechanisms for addressing new settlements, and on the possible content of such policy. Whilst acknowledging the widely varying circumstances across the country, "in reviewing county structure plans and in preparing or reviewing local plans"

Local planning authorities may wish to consider developing criteria for the planning of new or expanded settlements, including provision for essential services and other requirements including factors relating to layout, design and infrastructure (DoE 1988a - paragraph 41)

It is possible to summarise the general content of the paper by extracting from it a number of points which could serve as policy guidance or as criteria which proposals should meet (the references in brackets are to the paragraph where the 'criterion' or quotation appear)

\(^5\) AONBs is the acronym for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
1. not infringe Green Belt policy (paragraph 35);
2. not infringe conservation policies (paragraph 35);
3. 'new village projects can be expected to provide their own infrastructure', including roads, drainage, water, etc. (paragraph 36);
4. be 'well located' (paragraph 35);
5. be 'well planned' (paragraph 35);
6. be 'well designed' (paragraph 35);
7. not result in an increase in traffic on 'narrow country lanes' (paragraph 36);
8. location selected bearing in mind the capacity of existing roads and the cost of improvements (paragraph 36);
9. 'offer a reasonable choice of housing types, costs and tenure which will help to meet local housing needs as well as those likely to have a wider market' (paragraph 37);
10. achieve high standards of design, layout and landscaping, creating schemes 'that are well suited to the needs of modern living while at the same time achieving an attractive environment' (paragraph 38);
11. location well away from conurbations and other large urban areas (paragraph 40).

So, on the whole, the Paper lends general encouragement to small scale new settlements, between 200 and 1,000 houses or 500 to 2,500 population, described as the 'new village scale', although there had been comparatively few proposals of this scale by the private sector at the time the Paper was prepared and issued. There are a number of possible explanations for the endorsement of this scale of new settlement.

Although, as I have already pointed out, this size range is not derived from any rigorous analysis, this may, perhaps, be appropriate, given the status of the document, which seeks reaction and views, rather than being a draft of a policy statement. The intention may have been to gauge reaction to its adoption. Alternatively it can be argued that the Discussion Paper indicated this size range as appropriate because it was dealing with rural areas and rural housing, and explicitly addressing new villages rather than other forms of new settlement. This interpretation gains weight from the form of later policy statements, as will be demonstrated.

Given the considerable controversy generated by the then more common larger new settlement schemes of more than 3,000 dwellings (Tillingham Hall, Foxley Wood and Stone Basset, amongst others, and the Cambridgeshire proposals), the setting out of a lower size range can be seen as an attempt to influence the private sector to put forward
schemes in this range, and to influence LPAs to adopt this size limit in emerging policy proposals. It can be viewed as a compromise designed to defuse or reduce local political opposition.

The Discussion Paper restores the emphasis on the development plan as the appropriate policy formulation mechanism for private new settlements which PPG 3 had, perhaps ambiguously, removed. The issue should be addressed by both structure plan and local plans, but here there is an element of confusion about which is most appropriate, and what form policies should take in these plans. Policies should evidently be detailed, with criteria on services, layout or design, but the crucial question of possible location is not dealt with, beyond the general locational guidance to which I have referred. So, the Paper does not offer guidance on whether structure or local plans should develop policies indicating general or specific locations for new settlements.

Previous references to the potential roles of new settlements had been to the part they might play in safeguarding existing communities or settlements. The idea of relieving pressure from designated areas, such as Green Belts or AONBs, as a whole, is introduced for the first time, as is the concept of the new village as an alternative to sporadic development.

As I have already indicated, the Paper introduces a wider range of "performance criteria" for new settlements than earlier formal guidance. There is, for example, the first reference to the issue of highway and traffic impact of a new settlement, and to the concept of a new settlement providing a choice of housing types, the latter presumably arising out of the statement on "Housing in Rural Areas".

The need for a new settlement to meet most or all of its infrastructure costs had already been clearly stated in PPG 3. The Discussion Paper elaborates on this, making a link between infrastructure costs and the price of land, with the implication that the costs of services and facilities can be met by landowners, rather than developers such development can be carried out in ways that put no additional demand on public expenditure. The cost of providing roads, drainage and other facilities can be taken into account by developers in the overall cost of development and in the price that they are prepared to pay for the land: it need not mean higher house prices (DoE 1988a - paragraph 3)
So, overall, the Discussion Paper exhibits a degree of growing sophistication in policy formulation for new settlements, and offers the most detailed analysis of the new settlement issue in a Government policy or "quasi-policy" document so far. Its general tone is more positive than previous policy statements, although this may, in part, be due to the nature of the document itself, rather than to a substantive change in policy emphasis.

**Statement by Minister for Water and Planning**

In a speech to the RTPI's Town and Country Planning Summer School in September 1988, the then Minister for Water and Planning, Michael Howard, referred briefly to the Discussion Paper, and to new villages

> The concept of new villages, as set out in our recent discussion paper, could hardly be described as an innovation in planning thinking. It is more a reminder of a mechanism with a thoroughly respectable planning pedigree. I look forward to seeing your comments, and to seeing ideas for their use - for there is nothing to stop any planning authority now from allowing such proposals where they would be acceptable in land-use planning terms, or to stop them including proposals in their development plans, as Cambridgeshire have done (Howard 1989)

Significantly, Howard makes reference to two mechanisms for producing new settlements - the development plan route which had been dropped from PPG 3, but restored in the Discussion Paper, and, by implication, the alternative route of a response to a planning application. Whilst in one sense giving additional strength to the development plan as the appropriate mechanism, the statement in another sense weakens it by introducing the idea that it is acceptable for planning authorities to respond to ad-hoc pressure from the private sector.

**Draft PPG 3 - Housing**

A little over a year after the Discussion Paper, and just under two years after the original PPG 3 had been released, a new draft PPG on housing land was issued (DoE 1989a). It continued the general theme of previous policy on housing land in that a balance was to be struck between the need for development and the conservation of the countryside and of the environment, whilst acknowledging that provision would need to be made for some housing outside existing urban areas. Aside from the advice on new settlements, the most significant alteration in the draft was the abandonment of the special pre-
sumption in favour of housing development introduced in the original PPG. In this the beginnings of a tilt in the balance back towards a strengthened planning system can be seen).

New settlements were addressed specifically in a section on "Housing in Rural Areas". The advice to planning authorities on how and in what form the issue should be tackled was firmer than before

Planning authorities, in formulating their policies for the location of new housing in structure and local plans, should consider whether new settlements have a possible role in their areas, and if so where and on what scale (DoE 1989a - paragraph 20)

The draft then differentiates between two different scales of new settlement - 'new villages' and 'larger new settlements'. The size range suggested in the Discussion Paper of 200 - 1,000 houses is used to define new villages, which if carefully sited, could help to relieve pressure for development in existing villages, and could extend the variety of housing types available in the area (DoE 1989a - paragraph 21).

Significantly perhaps, following the deliberations in the Discussion Paper on population thresholds for services in rural settlements, the issue of infrastructure is considered, but given modern standards of mobility, not every village needs to be able to sustain a full range of social, education and community services (DoE 1989a - paragraph 21).

On larger new settlements, the guidance from the earlier PPG resurfaces, but is extended with a consideration of the potential role of such new settlements.

Well-conceived schemes of this kind may have a valuable part to play in meeting the demand for new housing, particularly where existing communities already face problems of congestion and over-loading of local services. It will be essential that proposals for such settlements include a wide variety of house types, including an element of social housing provision, and adequate community facilities (DoE 1989a - paragraph 22)
The extent to which infrastructure and community services are to be provided and the role of the developer in this is rather different than in relation to the 'new village' scale new settlement.

Developers will be expected to contribute towards the cost of such facilities and to meet all or most of the costs of providing new infrastructure, road improvements, and similar requirements generated by the new development (DoE 1989a - paragraph 22).

A radical departure from previous guidance, and one which was barely hinted at in the Discussion Paper, is the detailed advice on the form of policy on new settlements for structure plans, where it will be helpful for them to identify the district for which the settlement is intended, and the broad location. General statements that a proportion of housing provision may take the form of new settlements could produce a proliferation of unsatisfactory schemes, and create uncertainty as to how much provision should be made for other forms of housing development in a particular district (DoE 1989a - paragraph 23).

The Discussion Paper's point about land values taking account of the cost of infrastructure provision is included and elaborated upon, by indicating that where possible locations are identified, plan policies should be explicit about the provision which developers will be expected to make to costs of infrastructure and community facilities and about social housing provision, so that land values take account of these costs (DoE 1989a - paragraph 23).

Figure 7.2 indicates in summary form the basic content as a series of criteria which can be applied to the two scales of new settlement considered in the draft PPG.
**FIGURE 7.2**

**CRITERIA FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS IN DRAFT PPG 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW VILLAGES</th>
<th>LARGER NEW SETTLEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be in size range of 200 - 1,000 dwellings</td>
<td>include wide variety of house types, including social housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be carefully sited</td>
<td>include adequate community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be in right location to fit landscape</td>
<td>meet costs of infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extend the variety of housing types</td>
<td>contribute to cost of community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be of a size compatible with costs of providing infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not necessarily provide full range of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMON CRITERIA**

- be beyond outer boundaries of Green Belts
- not in National Parks or AONBs
- create a more distinctive sense of community
- public consultation essential
- achieve high standard of layout, landscaping and design

Source: Author - drawn from draft PPG 3

The advice in this draft is firmer than before, particularly in relation to the role of development plans in considering new settlements, for it indicates that Local Planning Authorities *should* have regard to the place of new settlements in formulating policies for the location of new housing, in both structure and local plans. Moreover, the guidance on structure plans goes beyond that offered in Circular 15/84 or in the original PPG 3, making it clear that the location of new settlements, and their scale, should be defined both in terms of the appropriate District and the broad location of the new settlement.

The development plan route for the production of new settlements is therefore endorsed, but there is still a note of ambiguity in that the precise role of structure plans and local plans, and the relationship between them, is not clarified. So that whilst the draft PPG suggests that structure plans should identify broad locations, how this is to be taken further in local plans is not discussed, nor is the form of policy to be formulated in local
plans. There is now no mention of other mechanisms for producing new settlements, for the reference to "normal planning procedures" in PPG 3 or "allowing such proposals" in Michael Howard's speech, have been dropped.

The need for any policies formulated to be explicit about requirements for infrastructure and community services, which was previously stated in the Discussion Paper, is given more weight. However, it is clear that these requirements are likely to be different for different types or scales of new settlements.

Arising partly, perhaps, out of the Discussion Paper, the draft PPG differentiates between two scales of new settlement, which may be appropriate in different areas, and which may fulfil different roles. New villages may be appropriate "in some rural areas", whilst there may be a case for larger new settlements "in some areas". The roles envisaged for the two types of new settlements are, at first glance, rather different, with new villages relieving pressure on existing villages, and extending the range of housing types available, and larger new settlements meeting the demand for housing, especially in circumstances where there is overloading of services or congestion. However, when considered carefully, there is little to distinguish the two, since one of the manifestations of development pressure will be the increasing load placed upon existing infrastructure and services. In addition, extending the range of housing types is a way of meeting housing demand, and so the distinction made on potential roles is, in many ways, an artificial and unreal one.

The distinction between new villages and larger new settlements is carried over into the discussion on infrastructure, where the need for its provision is dependant upon the scale of the new settlement, so that in new villages, a full range of services may not be necessary. A distinction is also made between community facilities, including social, educational and other services, and other infrastructure. Developers should contribute to the former, but meet most or all of the costs of the latter. The highlighting of the traffic and highway implications of new settlements in the Discussion Paper finds expression in the draft PPG through the addition of road improvements to the list of infrastructure which developers should fund.

Social housing provision in new settlements also assumes greater importance than hitherto, in line with the wider debate about this, particularly in rural areas (Constable 1989, Constable, Lawes & Bacon 1987, Welsh 1990). Such provision becomes one of the essential criteria to be met by new settlement schemes.
It is possible therefore to trace the relative influence of the original PPG 3, and of the Discussion Paper in the formulation of the new draft guidance. Elements of the original survive, but the general tenure of the draft is more akin to that of the Discussion Paper. The draft, therefore, is the most positive policy guidance so far, firmly placing the onus on Local Planning Authorities, through development plans, to decide on the role and place of new settlements.

**Statement by Secretary of State for the Environment - Planning and Local Choice**

This policy statement, from Chris Patten, was issued at the same time as the draft PPG and as the interim decision on three new settlement proposals in North East Hampshire, including another of the new country towns proposed by CDL, Foxley Wood. One of its roles was thus to draw together and explain these decisions and policy changes, by setting these in the context of the requirement to meet housing demand whilst striking a balance with its effect on the local environment. Local choice can determine how and where housing provision is met, provided that this is within the framework established by national and regional policy. Such local choice also extends to new settlements, for local planning authorities should decide whether new settlements have a role to play, and

Some authorities have already decided that there is a role for new settlements in their area: for instance, new settlement policies were incorporated in the revised Cambridgeshire structure plan, approved earlier this year. In other areas, it may be reasonable to conclude that new settlements have no useful part to play in meeting housing demand. Those who have assessed the options fully at the local level are generally best placed to decide (Secretary of State for the Environment 1989a - page 6)

Again the potential of new settlements is endorsed by the Secretary of State

I would however hope that planning authorities will give this possibility serious consideration (Secretary of State for the Environment 1989a - page 6)
New settlements can help relieve pressure for peripheral development and for development within existing settlements, which has become known as "town cramming", provided that they are in the right place, and

so long as people can have real confidence that a decision in favour of a new settlement will relieve development pressures elsewhere (Secretary of State for the Environment 1989a - page 7)

The implication of this is that new settlement policies should be backed by restraint policies elsewhere. This policy Statement serves to reinforce the rather positive tone of the draft PPG, whilst introducing the nebulous concept of local choice. Again, in this statement, the beginnings of a shift back to a central role for the planning system, through the development plan, can be detected.

**Draft PPG 15 - Structure Plans and Regional Planning Guidance and PPG 15 - Regional Planning Guidance, Structure Plans and The Content of Development Plans**

Surprisingly, coming as it did shortly after the release of the draft PPG 3, the draft Guidance on Structure Plans and Regional Planning Guidance makes no specific reference to new settlements (DoE 1989b). It does indicate the weight to be attached to structure plans in determining planning applications

where there are clear policies in the development plan which are relevant to the proposal under consideration, they will carry considerable weight, and the Secretary of State and his inspectors will be guided by them in dealing with planning appeals (DoE 1989b - paragraph 26)

There is, however, some guidance which could apply to new settlement proposals. Policies in regional guidance, structure plans and local plans are to form the framework for consideration of development proposals, and

local planning authorities and communities affected by development proposals should not be compelled to re-examine or re-argue such major planning issues, which have already been considered and suitably dealt with in an up-to-date structure plan, because a developer chooses to submit a proposal for substantial development which is plainly inconsistent with the relevant policies in the plan and
seeks to have them re-examined in the planning appeal process (DoE 1989b - paragraph 27)

Where applicants pursue proposals to appeal and inquiry they may be liable for costs where a proposal is clearly inconsistent with policies in approved and up-to-date structure plans, and this applies, inter alia, to large housing development 'where they are in conflict with policies in the structure plan' (DoE 1989b - paragraph 28). The draft guidance firms up the role of development plans, and structure plans in particular. However new settlements do not appear in the list of topics on which structure plan policies should be formulated.

Six months after the draft PPG was published the formal PPG emerged (DoE 1989c). Much of the content of the draft was reiterated, but there was one significant change. New settlements were added to the list of key structure plan topics on which policies should be developed - "where appropriate the role envisaged for new settlements" (DoE 1989c - paragraph 18). The detailed guidance contained in draft PPG 3 on the form and content of structure plan policies for new settlements was not reproduced explicitly.

**Statement by Minister of Housing and Planning**

This was a keynote speech by Sir George Young to the conference "Tomorrow’s New Communities" organised by the TCPA and the JRF in January 1991, which developed his views expressed a couple of years earlier (Young 1989, 1991). Much of the address reiterated Government policy as set out in the draft PPG 3, with further emphasis on local choice through the planning system. The clear message emerged that it was for local planning authorities and communities to decide the appropriate form and location of new development, and that new settlements remained an option which would not be thrust upon them

new settlements are one option. They are a proposition which deserves consideration, not just a knee-jerk reaction from the NIMBY faction. We see no reason to thrust new settlements on communities. But if the option is rejected, we are entitled to expect such communities to make reasonable and adequate provision for new development in their areas in other ways (Milne 1991 - page 2)

Young indicated that the development plan process was the appropriate mechanism, although regional guidance could also have something useful to say about new settle-
ments at a strategic scale, including their broad location. It might also be necessary to go beyond the formal development plan to prepare detailed planning briefs for particular sites, once planning policies were in place. It would be important for the requirements for infrastructure, community facilities and affordable housing, to be set out clearly in planning policies, in order to avoid the danger that

if sites or even areas of search are identified in plans, speculative land values at normal residential values will be generated, and the opportunity to create balanced communities which low land prices can offer will be lost (Milne 1991 - page 2)

The notion that new settlements could improve the landscape by reusing disused land, such as depots, airfields or hospitals, was introduced.

However Young went further than before in suggesting that local plans, rather than structure plans, might provide better opportunities for considering new settlements, since the adoption of policies in structure plans could generate a number of alternative schemes which were difficult to handle. The local plan preparation process, and particularly that used by Kettering Borough Council 6 enabled a drawing together of the planning process and the private sector development process, and provided for public consultation and debate. The Minister also introduced the idea of the sustainability of new settlements.

Taking the speech as evidence of Government policy, it is possible to detect a shift, but one which is, to some extent, confused. The emphasis appears to be on the local plan preparation process, rather than on structure plan review, as the main instrument for making decisions about the need for new settlements. The confusion arises partly from the reference to the potential for regional guidance to offer pointers to the location of new settlements, so all three levels of planning policy - regional guidance, structure plans and local plans - are relevant, but the most relevant or appropriate appears to be local plans. That new settlements represent an option to be considered is not challenged.

6 Following an enabling policy in the Northamptonshire Structure Plan Alteration, Kettering Borough Council proposed a new village policy in their local plan, and held a 'beauty contest' by inviting schemes for consideration. The DoE have apparently been particularly interested in this process as potential model. See the Chapters on structure and local plan approaches for further discussion of this (and of types of new settlement policies).
Draft NPPG 1 - Land for Housing

Although this thesis is not concerned with new settlements in Scotland, consideration of the draft of one of a new series of National Planning Policy Guidelines on Land for Housing in Scotland is useful in highlighting possible changes to Government policy as a whole (Scottish Office, Environment Department 1991)\(^7\).

Much of the early content of the NPPG reflects that in PPG 3 and the draft PPG 3 for England and Wales. New settlements are considered under the topic heading of "Housing outside urban areas", for which one of the principles is that they should "be considered as an alternative means of accommodating some of the demands for new housing" (Scottish Office, Environment Department 1991 - paragraph 23). The circumstances in which new settlements might be appropriate are where the capacity of existing settlements to accommodate additional development is restricted

where there are limits to significant growth within cities and large towns or constraints to the expansion of existing towns and villages. These might take the form of infrastructure constraints such as roads capacity or sewerage or the less tangible limit to the capacity of villages to absorb large scale additions without undermining their architectural character and environmental quality (Scottish Office, Environment Department 1991 - paragraph 34)

Again planning authorities are directed to consider whether new settlements have a role and "if so where and on what scale". The distinction between new villages and larger new settlements, which is made in the draft PPG 3, is also made here but less clearly, and the 'new village scale' size range does not appear. The same comments on the identification of districts and broad locations in new settlement policies in structure plans, on infrastructure provision and on a variety of housing, including low cost housing, also appear. A departure from English guidance is the mention of small new settlements associated with recreation and tourism, especially golf related development. Picking up on the sustainability theme, the NPPG specifically refers to the potential of new settlements in terms of energy efficiency

\(^7\) The NPPGs are being prepared on the same basis as the PPGs in England and Wales (see Note 1), and contain policy guidance within, where necessary, a locational framework.
New settlements also provide an opportunity to achieve energy conservation in various ways: by locating the new settlement in close proximity to the main centres of housing demand and employment and planning positively for public transport links; by ensuring the layout of the settlement is designed to minimise energy and that it also caters positively for public transport, and within the buildings themselves. Positive provision should be made for public transport as well as cycling and walking as part of a transportation package. New settlements should therefore:-

- achieve improved standards of layout, landscaping and design;
- give high priority to energy conservation (Scottish Office, Environment Department 1991 - paragraph 38)

The Scottish NPPG is of interest in more clearly specifying the constraints to the further development of existing settlements, dropping the ‘new village scale’ size range, and espousing the cause of sustainability particularly in relation to energy conservation and encouragement of public transport.

**PPG 3 - Housing (Revised)**

The new PPG 3 was issued in March 1992, nearly 2½ years after the release of the draft, and 4 years after the original PPG 3 (DoE 1992b). It came at a time when the ‘boom’ in private sector activity had passed, and fewer schemes were being floated, as I have shown in Chapter 6. The considerable lapse of time since the draft reflects a degree of conflict within the DoE and between Ministers over the role of new settlements, and over the general tone of the policy statement. There had been three Secretaries of State for the Environment since the draft was released, and there was speculation that this, and the fact that Heseltine was now Secretary of State, was responsible for both the delay and the change in direction and emphasis from the draft. For some time prior to the release of the PPG, there had also been some speculation that the Government was becoming less positive about new settlements, based on decisions by the Secretary of State on the Nottinghamshire and Warwickshire Structure Plans in which enabling policies were deleted (Planning 1991c, 1991d, Rattenbury 1991).

The PPG marks a significant shift in the Government's land use planning policy, with a number of major changes to existing policy. These are highlighted at the beginning of the PPG
- to put increased emphasis on re-using urban land, particularly derelict or under-used land, as a means of relieving pressure on the countryside;
- to stress the importance of local choice, through the local plan and unitary development plan process, in deciding how to meet the needs for new housing development;
- to withdraw the special presumption in favour of releasing land for housing (DoE 1992b)

New settlements merit a section of their own. Based on the experience of such proposals since the mid-1980s, which "have almost invariably been deeply controversial", a series of criteria, or circumstances in which new settlements "should normally only be contemplated", is set out

- the alternative of expansion of existing towns or villages would represent a less satisfactory method of providing land for the new housing that is needed;
- the proposal is a clear expression of local preference supported by local planning authorities;
- the proposed new settlement would present no risk of unacceptable coalescence with existing settlements;
- the option of a new settlement, in preference to the alternative, would result in positive environmental improvements, for example through reclamation of derelict land, or upgrading of areas of poor landscape value;
- the proposal can be considered alongside policies of restraint to protect the rejected alternative locations from development pressure; and
- it is not within a Green Belt, a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a Site of Special Scientific Interest or on the best and most versatile agricultural land (DoE 1992b - paragraph 33).

The ultimate test which is a logical combination of the previous points is that
the net effect of a new settlement will either enhance the environment or cause only modest environment impact, which would be outweighed by the need to meet housing requirements (DoE 1992b - paragraph 33)

The change in emphasis to local plans, flagged by Sir George Young, is specifically endorsed, as a means of reflecting local preference, and so proposals should normally "only be promoted through the district wide local plan or UDP"8 (DoE 1992b - paragraph 34). Policies formulated for new settlements should take account of the range of factors outlined in previous policy, including the need for community facilities, for a wide variety of house types, and for a high standard of design and layout. Following the sustainability theme introduced by Young, and illustrated more explicitly in NPPG 1 developers should be invited to consider the incorporation of combined heat and power systems (DoE 1992b - paragraph 25).

Similarly the wider environmental implications, in terms of travel patterns and their effects, also need to be considered, and again the advice in NPPG 1 on new settlement layouts encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport is reiterated.

Finally the references to infrastructure costs, and in particular for plan policies to be clear about the contributions required from developers, found in previous guidance, is reaffirmed, in the context of local plan policies rather than structure plan policies as in the draft PPG 3.

The main message of the PPG is stated simply in a sentence hidden in the text

the opportunity to start a new settlement will be rare and should not be wasted
(DoE 1992b - paragraph 35 - emphasis added)

The tone of the PPG is therefore fairly negative, stating more firmly than previously that new settlements will only come forward in exceptional circumstances. This tone is reinforced by the comprehensive, exhaustive and restrictive criteria on when such development may be contemplated. There is, then, none of the encouragement evident in the draft PPG 3, or in subsequent Ministerial statements. The emphasis on local choice in

---

8 UDPs are Unitary Development Plans, prepared by Metropolitan Districts, which combined aspects of both structure plans (strategic guidance in Part I of the UDP) and local plans (more detailed guidance and policies in Part II of the UDP).
determining the location and form of new housing development, first outlined in Chris Patten's statement, is heightened, as this appears both as one of the criteria or circumstances to be met, and in a separate paragraph. Local choice becomes 'local preference', although how this is to be demonstrated, and reconciled with wider needs, where the two may be in conflict, is not resolved.

Developed from, and contingent upon, the status given to local preference is the shift from the structure plan review process to the preparation of district wide local plans⁹ and UDPs as the mechanism for promoting new settlements. This had, as I have already indicated, been foreshadowed in the speech by Sir George Young, but it marks a radical departure from the guidance set out in the draft PPG, in its forerunner, the Discussion Paper, and in PPG 15. Young had referred to the role of regional planning guidance, but this aspect is missing from the PPG, which can be said to lack any real strategic element as far as new settlements are concerned. Although he had also not completely ruled out the promotion of a new settlement by the private sector through agreement and negotiation with the local planning authority, this mechanism is firmly eschewed in the PPG.

The circumstances in which new settlements may be contemplated are particularly rigorous and tightly drawn, as is the final requirement that such development positively enhance or cause only modest environmental impact, which may be outweighed by the housing requirements. The implication of this is that, even if it can be demonstrated that a new settlement proposal meets the six criteria and causes only a minimal impact on the local environment, it must still be justified by the need to meet housing requirements. It is fairly evident that proposals promoted by the private sector outside of, or only in partial accord with, the district wide local plan process, are unlikely to be able to meet all of the criteria or circumstances.

The potential role of new settlements discussed in previous policy documents are now abandoned and new settlements are seen as representing an alternative to only one form of urban development - the expansion of existing settlements, and therefore as having only one significant role. This overlooks any other purposes they might serve.

---

⁹ District wide local plans are local plans which it is now mandatory for districts to prepare covering the whole of their area, rather than as formerly when a local plan might deal only with a part of a district. These plans form part of the fabric of a revised development plan system.
Positive environmental improvements are required to be demonstrated by new settlement schemes. This does have some echoes in previous policy statements, particularly in Young's speech, but the PPG states this with considerable firmness. It does, however, tend to limit the choice of sites to two types of land:

- derelict, degraded or underused land - examples had been given by Sir George Young including airfields, depots, hospitals, and former industrial land. However, only proposals on redundant hospital sites have found favour up to now. Other forms of derelict land may have drawbacks in terms of reclamation costs or poor marketability, whilst they may have positive ecological attributes which make their development unacceptable;

- areas of poor landscape quality which do not conflict with any of the other criteria particularly in relation to the protection of designated areas.

It can be argued that the PPG sees new settlements more as a tool for landscape enhancement or for environmental improvement than for meeting demand for new housing. The stress on new settlements achieving positive environmental improvements may be taken to represent a greening of policy, although it could also be seen simply as making it much more difficult to find acceptable sites, thereby limiting private sector new settlement pressure, and forestalling some planning authorities which may be contemplating the new settlement option.

Although new settlements have always been conceived of as potentially contributing towards a reduction of development pressure on existing towns and villages, and on the countryside, the need for complementary restraint policies deflecting pressure from those areas rejected for development has not been so clearly stated before. Chris Patten had made reference to this in his statement, but here the new settlement itself, rather than any specific restraint policies operated by the local planning authority, was seen as the means of reducing pressure. It is the complementarity of restraint policies which is new.

As foreshadowed by Sir George Young, and by the draft NPPG, the concept of sustainability gains specific recognition, both in the overall tone of the PPG, and in particular details. The references to energy use, and to combined heat and power schemes, to the impact of travel patterns, and to the making of provision for public transport, walking and cycling are all new.
In summary, then, the PPG marks a major shift in Government policy, particularly when taken together with structure plan modifications. It is far less encouraging on the general concept of new settlements than its predecessor, or than recent Ministerial pronouncements. It reduces the role of counties and the strategic planning function of structure plans in the whole process by placing the onus on local preference and on districts to determine the need for new settlements through their district wide local plan or UDP process.

CONCLUSIONS

There have been significant changes in the substance and content of policy over the period, and the emphasis of policy has shifted. An increasing sophistication in policy expression is apparent. As the scope of guidance has widened, more detail has been added with successive versions, and in particular, the range of criteria and substantive policy elements has increased over time.

Figure 7.3 charts this widening of policy expression and highlights the main substantive changes. It refers to the main formal policy documents - Circular 15/84, PPG 3, the Discussion Paper, draft PPG 3, and the revised PPG 3 - and indicates the extent and form of advice given on key policy elements.

From the Discussion Paper issued in July 1988 to the speech by Sir George Young in January 1991, Government policy had been reasonably encouraging to the concept of private new settlements. On the whole, Ministerial statements were rather more positive than the more formal expressions of policy.

The Discussion Paper was also fairly positive, but the draft of PPG 3 went furthest in urging that

planning authorities, in formulating their policies for the location of new housing in structure and local plans, should consider whether new settlements have a possible role in their areas (DoE 1988a - paragraph 20, emphasis added)
### Figure 7.3

**The Changing Form and Content of Government Policy for New Settlements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism for NS Promotion</th>
<th>Policy Context</th>
<th>Scale of NS</th>
<th>New Settlement Role</th>
<th>Housing Choice</th>
<th>Infrastructure Costs</th>
<th>Locational Criteria</th>
<th>Other Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15/84 Structure Plans</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 3 Structure Plans</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td>meet housing demand</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>meet all or most</td>
<td>implicit</td>
<td>implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Paper</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; criteria on services, facilities, layout</td>
<td>New village scale 200 - 1,000 dwellings</td>
<td>meet housing needs, relieve development pressure on designated areas and countryside</td>
<td>reasonable choice, inc. meeting local housing needs</td>
<td>meet all or most</td>
<td>explicit locational guidance</td>
<td>implicit - not stated separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PPG 3 Local Plans</td>
<td>Identify district &amp; broad location explicit on services, facilities &amp; social housing</td>
<td>2 scales New village &amp; larger new settlement</td>
<td>relieve pressure on villages, extend housing choice, meet housing demand</td>
<td>NVs - extend variety of housing types LNSs - wider variety inc. social housing</td>
<td>NVs - may not need full range of services LNSs - meet all or most with developer contributions</td>
<td>NVs - explicit</td>
<td>NVs - implicit - not stated separately LNSs - implicit - not stated separately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPG 3 revised Local Plans</td>
<td>explicit on developer contributions on infrastructure</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>alternative to expansion of existing settlements &amp; improve landscape</td>
<td>wide variety of housing including affordable housing</td>
<td>meet all or most with developer contributions</td>
<td>explicit and expanded list</td>
<td>explicit - set out in list</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: LNS = larger new settlements, LPs = Local Plans, NS = new settlement, NVs = new villages, Sps = structure plans, UDPs = Unitary Development Plans

Source: Policy documents noted in table, drawn together by author.
The final version of the PPG on Housing reversed this, as I have noted. The combination of this policy guidance with decisions taken on 'called-in' applications and appeals and on structure plan modifications since 1991, serves to demonstrate a turnaround in Central Government's enthusiasm for the concept of new settlements. Indeed the evidence from the central state's decisions in applications and appeals (set out in Chapter 6) indicates that policy expressed in practice through decisions was at odds with the apparent enthusiasm of Ministerial statements.

The process through which new settlements should be promoted is crucial for a number of reasons, and later Chapters deal in more detail with the relationship between the policy formulation process and the private sector new settlement development process. Policy guidance on the appropriate form or mode of promotion has shifted over the period, from an early, although not wholly unambiguous, emphasis on structure plan preparation and review in Circular 15/84, through continuing emphasis on this process up to the speech by Sir George Young, which presaged the switch to district wide local plan and UDP preparation inherent in the revised PPG 3. Throughout, however, predominance has been given to the development plan process, despite the assertion by the Minister for Water and Planning in 1988 that planning authorities might allow applications for new settlement proposals where they did not conflict with planning policies. The major change is the move away from structure plans to district wide local plans and UDPs as set out in the revised PPG 3. This shift accords with central state proposals for a recasting of the form and role of structure plans and indeed for a more radical change in the nature of local government.

Both of the shifts from a position of positive and, to a large extent, enthusiastic espousal of the concept of new settlements and from structure plans as the appropriate promotional mechanism can be seen in the light of, and partially explained by, the increasing weight being given to local choice or local preference following the Secretary of State's statement in October 1989. This was more formally expressed in the revised PPG 3, but had previously been taken up by Sir George Young, whose message was, according to one commentator,

that it is not for the Government to legislate for the form of development in all areas: it is for local authorities and communities to weight up the alternatives and make their own decisions about the appropriate pattern of development. Any
proposals for new settlements therefore need to be seen against this background  
(Gorman 1991 - paragraph 11)

Rather less attention has been given in the policy pronouncements to the appropriate form of policies for new settlements in either structure or local plans and to policy content. This is not surprising given the nature of Central Government Policy documents, and the view expressed in the Discussion Paper, when suggesting planning authorities may wish to consider developing criteria on the provision of services and infrastructure, that

in view of the widely differing local circumstances, it not considered that it would be useful to lay down general prescriptions .... that would be applicable throughout the country (DoE 1988a - paragraph 41)

Only the draft of PPG 3 went very far in offering advice on policy content. It remains the most radical in suggesting that county planning authorities identify, where appropriate, the broad location for new settlements in their structure plans, and formulate explicit criteria on services, infrastructure, community facilities and social housing provision. There has, subsequently, been a retreat from this position. Similarly the form\(^{10}\) of policy has been largely ignored, although Ministerial (or Department of the Environment) thinking on this, as well as on policy content, is more appropriately demonstrated through an analysis of the modification, by the Secretary of State, of those policies for new settlements which have been formulated in structure plans.

Although there has been sustained support for the development plan process as the most appropriate mode of production for new settlements, little regard has been given as to how this process would mesh with the promotion of new settlement schemes by the private sector. I have referred to the tentative support from Sir George Young for the local plan process adopted by Kettering BC, which appears to have gained favour within the DoE

\(^{10}\) Here form is taken to mean the policy direction (positive or negative), and its phraseology and construction (proactive, reactive or enabling). See Chapter 9 for a discussion of the types of policy for new settlements which have been proposed in structure plans.
the process has reflected well the Department's advice to make use of the development plan system in bringing forward new settlements solutions (Gorman 1991 - paragraph 2111)

Tacit approval of this process relates mainly to the invitation of schemes for assessment by the Borough Council, prior to the incorporation of a specific policy on a specific proposal in the deposited version of the plan. So that

It does seem an eminently sensible way of drawing together the processes of plan preparation and site identification, and creating a clear framework within which applications can be decided (Milne 1990 - page 2).

The objection to simply adopting or including policies in development plans without this assessment of competing schemes, prior to final policy formulation and endorsement, is that it may lead to a number of schemes coming forward, and so to long and expensive public inquiries. Young does, of course, indicate that policies for new settlements should clearly set out the requirements for infrastructure, community facilities and affordable housing.

There has, however, been no more formal advice to planning authorities on how they should structure their plan preparation and policy formulation processes to deal with the type of situation which arose, for example, in Cambridgeshire, with the submission of a considerable number of schemes during the early stages of the plan process. The mode of promotion may be clear, but the precise mechanisms are not.

Although possibly less significant, a change can also be detected in the roles envisaged for new settlements in the policy documents. These have broadened out, from the emphasis on meeting housing demand in the original PPG 3, to the potential for new settlements to relieve the pressure for development being felt in designated areas, like Green Belts or AsONB, and in the wider countryside; to widening the variety of housing available and so extending housing choice; to providing an alternative to the continued growth of existing settlements, where backed by restraint policies to achieve this objective; and finally to achieving environmental improvements. The whole focus on the

11 Martin Gorman is a civil servant in the Department of the Environment's East Midlands Regional Office, and so can be taken as speaking with some authority on that Department's general views.
functions of new settlements has therefore shifted. The issue of the sustainability of urban development has, moreover, assumed growing prominence over the past couple of years. In this context it is interesting to note that new villages are used as a major example of the environmental appraisal of policy options in the Department of the Environment’s guide for civil servants on the systematic treatment of environmental issues in policy analysis (DoE 1991b).

The issue of the scale of new settlements has received limited consideration but it has been of great importance. The 'new village' scale which was tentatively suggested in the Discussion Paper of between 200 and 1,000 dwellings, without any substantial evidence to support it, has been invested with almost reverential significance, being taken by many planning authorities as a firm guideline figure to be used in the new settlement policies which they have developed. I will return to this issue later, but one example will suffice here to illustrate the way in which this size range for new settlements has influenced thinking and practice. In proposing a policy for new settlements in the review of their Structure Plan, Gwent County Council indicate that

such developments would normally be within the range of approximately 200 - 1,000 new dwellings (Gwent County Council 1992 - paragraph 4.20)\(^\text{12}\)

As I shall show later, this example is not untypical of the response of counties, in particular, to the advice contained in what was, after all, only a paper seeking views, prior to the formulation of draft guidance.

Overall then, Government policy for new settlements has become more sophisticated, but less encouraging to the private sector. It has, in line with an apparent wider shift in the last eighteen months or so, placed a firmer emphasis on the role of the development plan system in determining the need for new settlements. However, at the same time, the emphasis has moved from structure plans (and hence from county planning authorities) to district wide local plans and unitary development plans (and hence to district councils). The role of the planning system as a whole has, however, apparently been strengthened.

It is of course important to consider the significance of the shift in the central state’s thinking, and so to consider its role in the policy formulation process, or more particularly

\(^{12}\) This sentence appears in the reasoned justification for policy H3 on new and expanded settlements, and not in the policy itself, which makes no explicit reference to scale.
the limitations of this role, and the extent to which the central state, itself, is able to implement its policy.

As I have already suggested, formal expressions of government policy must be seen in the context of other modes of policy formulation and expression. The decisions taken by Ministers or by the DoE on appeals, on called-in applications, and on structure plans, are all equally important as they indicate the manner in which the central state is implementing its formally expressed policy. They may also indicate emerging or changing policy.

Moreover, the ability of Central Government to implement its formal policy statements is limited to a large extent to these decision making processes. Wider implementation depends upon the extent to which Local Planning Authorities take cognisance of the guidance, and on the ways in which it is interpreted. Government's formal guidance has a precise status and Nott and Morgan (1984 - page 631), writing on circulars, conclude that, whilst they may not be legally binding, they undoubtedly exercise a great deal of influence on the opinions of those involved in the planning process. Local planning authorities may regard them as containing instructions that must be followed...... (but) the constraints imposed by circulars are by no means absolute for local planning authorities, for inspectors or even for the Secretary of State

This remains true also for the guidance contained in PPGs and other policy statements, including White Papers and Ministerial statements. For, as PPG 1 points out,

where such statements indicate the weight that should be given to relevant considerations, decision makers must have proper regard to them. If decision makers elect not to follow relevant statements of the Government's planning policy they must give clear and convincing reasons (DoE 1992a - paragraph 21)

However, there are wider, contextual factors to consider and Bruton and Nicholson (1985 - page 16) outline the relationship between government policy and local planning outcomes, indicating the influence of the former

the impact and significance of central government advice on local planning matters must be seen as part of the operating context within which local authorities
choose or (more likely) evolve local planning strategies. It is this context taken as a whole which will determine the nature of planning strategies. Relevant factors will include the nature of inherited strategic and local policies; required strength at appeal; the perceived need for policy frameworks in terms of timescale, topic and area coverage; the nature of county/district relations; the local political context; the planning issues involved; central government exhortation and advice; resource constraints and opportunities and the influence of other agencies, public and private, within the plan/authority area. Because the relative influence of these factors varies between localities, authorities can be expected to take different approaches to the local planning task.

Local Planning Authorities do have some degree of discretion then and an analysis of the impact of Government policy must take account of this. This discretion is evident in the markedly more permissive stance taken by the local state in relation to the making of decisions on new settlement proposals. It will also be apparent, also, in considering the policy formulation process at structure plan and local plan level.

I have already suggested that government policy, or at least particular elements of it, have been influential, especially in relation to the appropriate scale of new settlement proposals set out in positive policies, although the extent to which the local state has responded to the guidance on the appropriate forum for a consideration of new settlements will only become clear from an analysis of the local state policy formulation process. It is essential to analyse policy outcomes in detail and to consider the way in which policy is used in practice in order to arrive at a rounded view of the degree to which the Government's policy on new settlements has been influential in shaping the course of new settlement production.

Government guidance has also had some influence on the private sector. Putting together the evidence in this Chapter and in Chapter 6, it is possible to conclude that the issuing of government guidance on new settlements and its timing has been related to increasing private sector pressure. The peak of this pressure occurred in 1988/1989, and it is during this period that a flurry of guidance was prepared and issued. No formal guidance emerged between July 1984 and January 1988, although, there had, of course, been indications of government policy in the form of a number of appeal decisions. So the pressure from the market required a reaction from the central state, although the form of this reaction gave varying signals to the private sector.
Similarly the private sector has responded to evolving government guidance in a number of ways. First, there was a limited but growing response to the draft and final versions of circular 15/84, which had flagged a number of far reaching changes in the relationship of the private sector with the planning system. Second, and most significant, has been the switch from larger to smaller schemes following the positive espousal of the new village scale in the DoE's Discussion paper in 1988. From then the number and proportion of small schemes coming forward has grown dramatically. Third, developers have responded positively to the tightening requirements for the provision of, or contribution to, infrastructure and community and other facilities (although this is paralleled by the decreasing ability of the local state to fund these).
CHAPTER 8

POLICY FORMULATION FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS - REGIONAL AND STRATEGIC GUIDANCE
INTRODUCTION

From the analysis of Government policy on new settlements it will be clear that a significant role was not envisaged for regional planning policy in determining the need for, or location of, private new settlements. Indeed, only Sir George Young (1991) made reference to this tier of the planning system, when suggesting that the regional advice submitted to the Secretary of State could say something about new settlements at a strategic scale by possibly indicating criteria and broad locational guidance. However this will not be a matter of pinpointing particular proposals or of forcing this form of development on planning authorities who do not accept the need or have preferred alternative ways of meeting their requirements (Milne 1991 - page 2).

The wider function of regional guidance would be to

indicate how much each county will be expected to contribute to meeting a regional housing requirement ....... Once the Secretary of State indicates the overall requirements it will be for counties and districts in turn to decide how and where the requirement should be met within the broad framework of national and regional planning policy (Gorman 1991 - paragraph 13).

Notwithstanding this, consideration of the new settlement option has taken place at a regional level, and it is important to discuss its form and content in more detail as part of the analysis of policy formulation for new settlements and its interaction with the new settlement development process.

First, the limited guidance on new settlements that has emerged from the regional planning process has been used by the private sector in particular instances to justify or support individual new settlement proposals (Herington 1992). It has, therefore, had some part to play in the new settlements development process, by possibly influencing the form, scale or location of proposals. The regional planning process itself, which involves some degree of consultation, has also given the private sector a forum in which to promote schemes and the opportunity to attempt to influence policy albeit at a strategic level.

Second, in addition to national policy, regional guidance forms the framework for the preparation of structure plans and district wide local plans. In order to establish the
relative influence and the role played by particular forms of policy, it is necessary to assess its influence on this process, and the extent to which planning authorities have had regard to it.

Third, the role of the central state in the regional planning process has become more significant, although the status of regional planning itself has been diminished. Central state intervention through the modification of the regional advice submitted to it is one of the means by which central state policy for new settlements can be expressed and implemented.

Finally, private sector pressure for new settlements has been spatially uneven as indicated earlier, and it is important to determine the extent to which regional policy for particular regions reflects, or has affected, this pressure.

Before looking at the guidance on new settlements which has emerged from the regional planning process, it is necessary to briefly outline the form of the regional planning process.

THE REGIONAL PLANNING PROCESS

The regional planning process in the years since 1980 can be split into two discernible phases - pre and post PPG 15 (Regional Planning Guidance, Structure Plans, and The Content of Development Plans), issued in May 1990 (DoE 1990a). This followed on from the White Paper "The Future of Development Plans", issued in January 1989 (HM Government 1989), and proposed a number of far reaching changes to the development plan system, including radical alterations to structure plans, and the introduction of the requirement for all districts to produce district wide local plans. It also proposed wider coverage than previously of regional planning guidance, issued by the Secretary of State after wide consultation with local planning authorities, and following the submission of draft advice.

1 It is important to make clear the distinction between regional advice and regional guidance. Regional advice is produced by the Conference or Forums of local planning authorities for submission to the Secretary of State, containing the consensus view on the future form of development in the region and on other issues of strategic significance. Regional guidance, which is produced by the Secretary of State, is based on this advice, although it may not necessarily follow it slavishly.
Further changes have been set out in an updated and revised PPG 15 issued in February 1992. These include devolving the responsibility for structure plan adoption and approval to counties, rather than, as before, to the Secretary of State, and the bringing into effect of the requirement for district wide local plan preparation (DoE 1992c, Planning 1992). The new PPG also makes explicit the need for plans and policies to ensure that development and growth are sustainable.

**Before 1990**

In the period before 1990, the Secretary of State issued strategic guidance for the South East and for the metropolitan areas, following advice from ad hoc Conferences or groupings of local authorities. This guidance was issued first in the PPG series, and then after June 1989, in a new series of Regional Planning Guidance Notes (RPGs).

**After 1990**

Following the White Paper, and the original PPG 15, the coverage of regional planning advice was to be widened from metropolitan areas to the standard regions as a whole. In doing so, the onus was placed on ad hoc groupings of local planning authorities, known variously as Regional Conferences (after the model of SERPLAN\(^2\) and other informal conferences of local authorities in the metropolitan areas) or Regional Forums to produce regional advice for submission to the Secretary of State. Following the publication of draft guidance for comment, the Secretary of State would issue regional guidance.

Figure 8.1 sets out the progress on issuing Regional Planning Guidance up to March 1992.

---

\(^2\) SERPLAN is the London and South East Regional Planning Conference.
FIGURE 8.1

REGIONAL AND STRATEGIC PLANNING GUIDANCE ISSUED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION / METROPOLITAN AREA</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>January 1988</td>
<td>PPG 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>September 1988</td>
<td>PPG 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merseyside</td>
<td>October 1988</td>
<td>PPG 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyne and Wear</td>
<td>June 1989</td>
<td>RPG 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yorkshire</td>
<td>September 1989</td>
<td>RPG 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>September 1989</td>
<td>RPG 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester</td>
<td>December 1989</td>
<td>RPG 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yorkshire</td>
<td>December 1989</td>
<td>RPG 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>July 1991</td>
<td>RPG 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted from DoE 1990a

The Content of Regional Planning Guidance

Advice on the content of regional planning guidance is set out in paragraph 11 of the original PPG 15, and the revised PPG 15 adds little to this (DoE 1992c). The issues to be covered are those

which are of regional importance, or which need to be considered on a wider geographical basis than that of individual county structure plans. It will also be limited to matters which are relevant to the preparation of development plans

......guidance will normally include a suggested scale and distribution by county of additional housing over the next 15 years (DoE 1990c)

Brian Wilson (1990 - page 85) amplifies this a little

regional guidance should normally include an indication of the intended pattern of development and the balance of growth and restraint - part of that pattern may well include new settlements
Progress on the formulation of regional advice and guidance

Progress on the formulation of regional advice has been rather slow, with the northern half of the country lagging markedly behind the south. Useful summaries of the development of regional advice, and of the reasons for the tardiness in some regions, are provided by Davies (1991) and Marshall (1992). Figure 8.2 indicates the situation up to the end of March 1992.

The analysis of the approach to new settlements in regional guidance falls neatly into three parts -

- the approach adopted in regional guidance issued by the Secretary of State before 1990;

- the approach in issues reports, draft strategies and submitted advice prepared by regional Forums since 1990; and

- the degree to which the Secretary of State has accepted or modified the advice submitted to him in formulating regional guidance since 1990.

NEW SETTLEMENTS IN REGIONAL GUIDANCE PRE 1990

Introduction

As I suggested earlier, the Secretary of State's Regional Guidance rarely considered the issue of new settlements, despite much criticism of the central state's general approach to regional planning and the many calls from commentators for a coherent regional strategy which included advice on the size, character and location of new settlements (TCPA Strategic Planning Group 1990, Hall 1988a, 1989b, 1991a, 1991b, Smith 1990).
### FIGURE 8.2

**REGIONAL PLANNING - THE CURRENT SITUATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Initial Stages</th>
<th>Consultation Draft</th>
<th>Advice Issued</th>
<th>Secretary of State’s Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td></td>
<td>Published April 1991</td>
<td>Advice submitted January 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>Issues Report September 1990</td>
<td>Published October 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>First Report August 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and Humberside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Spring 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Formation of Regional Forum under discussion Autumn 1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Davies 1991 with additions from Marshall 1992 and other sources
A typical example of early strategic guidance for the Metropolitan areas is that for the West Midlands (PPG 10) (DoE 1988e). Given the problems faced in the area, it is unremarkable that emphasis was placed on revitalising the economy, environmental improvement and urban regeneration. The housing section set out the housing requirement to be met by the metropolitan districts, indicating that the figures

balance the need to maximise house building in inner city areas as part of the strategy for urban regeneration against satisfying the demand for new housing outside the built-up area (DoE 1988e - paragraph 5)

No specific mention is made of the potential role of new settlements in this strategy. This is typical of the regional guidance issued in the years before 1990, except for that on the South East.

**PPG 9 - Regional Guidance for the South East**

In the South East, as I have shown, there had been considerable pressure for new settlements in the period from 1984 to 1990, to which SERPLAN had responded by giving broad consideration to the issue in their regional advice. The Regional Guidance from the Secretary of State tended to avoid the issue. It consisted of three letters from the various Secretaries of State to SERPLAN, the most recent being issued 18 months before the publication of the PPG (DoE 1988f). It does not specifically refer to new settlements, although, within a general discussion of the form of new urban development, paragraph A17 contains some relevant guidance which may be interpreted as dealing with them,

It will rarely be appropriate to designate very large areas for new development. It should be possible to cater for much of this requirement by a more incremental process which is well related to the pattern of settlement, communications and economic activity throughout the region and which does not completely change the character of existing towns and villages (DoE 1988f - paragraph A17)

This advice must be seen in the context of the guidance's strategic objectives, which include revitalising older urban areas, so that a large proportion of the region's housing needs are to be met within urban areas, and accommodating new development while
conserving the countryside. In addition, the Guidance heralds a move away from the designation of regional growth areas, except for a continuation or maintenance of new growth at previously designated locations, like Milton Keynes and South Hampshire, as

...... the scale of future housing provision proposed by SERPLAN does not indicate a continuing need to concentrate a large part of development in major growth areas (DoE 1988f - paragraph A14)

There is, then, no explicit advice on new settlements, although the general thrust of the regional policy guidance tends to militate against large new settlements. This is reinforced by the statement in the Discussion Paper on New Villages that new villages in those parts of the region where growth was not being restrained would

be in accord with the Secretary of State's regional strategic guidance for the South East (DoE 1988a - paragraph 40)

NEW SETTLEMENTS IN ISSUES REPORTS, DRAFT REGIONAL ADVICE AND SUBMITTED REGIONAL ADVICE POST 1990

Introduction

New settlements have not received much consideration in most of the issues papers or the consultation drafts of regional advice published so far. This is, in some ways, not unexpected since the policy documents are concerned with strategic issues and it may well have been appropriate for the conclusion to be reached that new settlements are not a strategic issue to be dealt with at regional level. However, set against this, private sector pressure for new settlements, although decreasing, was widening out from the South East to the other regions, in the late 1980s and early 1990s and some form of response, including an assessment of their contribution to meeting housing requirements and of their other potential roles in a regional context, might have been expected.

Marshall (1992 - page 23), in a discussion of the extent to which the advice produced by the informal forums reflects the groundswell of environmental concern, sums up the situation thus
new settlements are seen as one possible component in most regions, although only at a very small scale (less than 1,500 dwellings) in the East Midlands; their ecological pluses and minuses, which depend very much on their relation to infrastructure and to an overall strategy, are not addressed.

So what kinds of approach or response have merged from the regional planning process? The following analysis concentrates on those regions where the production of draft regional advice is furthest advanced.

**East Anglia**

Apart from the South East, East Anglia is the only other region for which the Secretary of State has issued guidance since 1990. It is, after the South East, the region which has experienced the greatest private sector pressure for new settlements, particularly in and on the fringes of the Cambridge sub-region, and so it would be expected that some consideration would have been given to dealing with such pressure, at least in strategic terms.

The process began formally with the issue, by the Standing Conference of East Anglia Local Authorities (SCEALA), of an issues paper in May 1988 (SCEALA 1988a). This was followed by a consultation draft regional strategy in November 1988 (SCEALA 1988b), and the submission to the Secretary of State of a regional strategy in June 1989 (SCEALA 1989). The Secretary of State’s draft response was published in July 1990, and the final document, RPG 6, was issued in July 1991 (DoE 1990b, 1991c). The regional planning process has therefore been a lengthy one.

The main thrust of the submitted regional strategy continued that in the consultation draft of the strategy and made only minor changes to it (SCEALA 1988b). It sought to relieve overheating in the Cambridge area and to encourage economic growth to the north and east of the region along the main communication corridors in order to tackle major regional disparities in prosperity (SCEALA 1989). A major objective of the strategy is to guide pressure away from areas where there should be a restraint on growth towards areas where economic promotion is desirable (SCEALA 1989 - paragraph 6.6).
Major growth would take place at the larger towns and sub-regional centres along the main road corridors

- A11 Newmarket to Norwich;
- A45 Newmarket to Ipswich;
- A10 Cambridge to Kings Lynn; and
- A47 Peterborough to Great Yarmouth/Lowestoft.

Counties should consider the opportunity for new settlements as an alternative to the expansion of existing settlements. In particular the A45 and the A11 were identified as corridors where new settlements might be appropriate.

In relation to the A45, the strategy indicates that

the policy of restraint around Cambridge requires that any significant new development must take place between Newmarket and Ipswich. Consideration of a new settlement may be appropriate at the beginning of the next century, depending on the rate of growth experienced (SCEALA 1989 - paragraph 6.22)

and the A11 where,

the potential for promoting new "foci"...., either adjoining existing communities or in the form of new settlements should be examined in reviewing county policies (SCEALA 1989 - paragraph 6.21)

The submitted regional advice left it to counties, through the review of their structure plans, to decide how growth should be accommodated. The Secretary of State's response to the submitted advice is considered below. The deliberations on new settlements, prior to the issue of PPG 6, were important in that SCEALA's regional strategy played a significant part in the arguments advanced by the proponents of the various new settlement schemes on the A45 in Cambridgeshire. In particular the Strategy was used in an attempt, alternatively to add weight to, or detract from, the case of a new settlement to the east of Cambridge. The Secretary of State's view on the relevance of the Strategy, and the later regional guidance, was clearly set out in the decision letter on the inquiry resulting from the "call-in" of the Cambridgeshire A45 new settlement schemes.
the Regional Policy is clearly directed towards the next round of Structure Plan reviews i.e. those that commenced 1991 onwards (DoE/DTp 1992a, paragraph 7)

South East

The process of formulating strategic guidance for the South East has been the most complex, and the most lengthy, with detailed consideration being given to many aspects of the emerging strategy. This reflects not only the nature of the region, and of the critical issues, but also the resources available through the authorities constituting the London and South East Regional Planning Conference (SERPLAN). The timetable of the publication of key documents is given in Figure 8.2, but in addition, a number of background papers were produced by working groups dealing with particular topics. The potential role of new settlements in the South East has therefore been subject to considerable scrutiny, in these documents and in the various drafts of the strategy itself.

The Housing Study Group considered new settlements in a background paper on housing published in 1989 (SERPLAN 1989a). The key issues raised were much the same as those covered in other regions, including the overall level of housing land requirements, the balance to be struck between the development of urban land and greenfield sites, and the role of new settlements. However the consideration of new settlements has gone beyond that in most other regions, and has extended to possible scale and location.

On scale, the Group felt that the 'new village' size, advocated by the DoE in the Discussion Paper (200 - 1,000 dwellings), was insufficient to reduce development pressures to any significant degree. There were, also, major objections to larger new settlements (more than 12,000 dwellings or 30,000 population) (DoE 1988a, SERPLAN 1989a). First, it would be difficult to find acceptable sites. Second, settlements of this scale would act as growth points encouraging in-migration, exacerbating development pressures, and running counter to the overall strategy. Third, there was a lack of need since a considerable amount of housing land had already been identified in structure plans in the region, and hence the residual requirement was correspondingly low (SERPLAN 1989a). The Group felt that there might be a case for new settlements in the middle size range of 1,200 to 6,000 dwellings (3,000 to 15,000 population) in the right locations. Such locations might include
(i) areas of major employment growth;
(ii) where conservation was a major objective and continued expansion of existing settlements would be unacceptable because of environmental constraints; and
(iii) in areas of sporadic development, where new settlements could assist in reshaping existing development and provide those community facilities which might be lacking (SERPLAN 1989a).

However the Group concluded that it would be both inappropriate and impractical for the regional advice to prescribe the number, location and timing of new settlements. Rather counties should be urged to address the issue, through their structure plan reviews. Some of these conclusions were similar to those emerging from the background paper on the countryside, which argues for limited and nucleated dispersal, in which new settlements might play a role, alongside expansion of selected towns and villages (SERPLAN 1989b).

The first and second consultation drafts of the strategy built on the background papers, adopting a number of their conclusions, and endorsing the view that large new settlements were unlikely to be appropriate in any part of the region. It was accepted that smaller scale new settlements (1,200 to 6,000 dwellings) might be acceptable provided that they were thoroughly considered as part of the strategy formulated during the review of structure plans (SERPLAN 1989c, 1990a). Significantly, such new settlements should be an alternative to existing development rather than additional to it, for

A key to whether the concept finds favour with the planning authorities will be whether they can find some assurance that a new settlement will substitute for provision elsewhere in the locality rather than act as an addition to it (SERPLAN 1989c).

The submitted strategy adopted broadly the same approach, adding the potential circumstances in which new settlements might be acceptable from the Housing Study Group's paper (SERPLAN 1990b). No further locational guidance was given but the requirement for a new settlement to substitute for, rather than be additional to, growth elsewhere was dropped. The advice which emerged was seen as 'somewhat more welcoming to the concept of new villages' than the draft strategy (Planning 1990a - page 32), although it was, in fact, welcoming settlements rather larger than 'new villages'. This can be seen as a partial response to the private sector pressure, which, in the South East, had been for larger new settlements than elsewhere, although few came
into the large new settlement category as defined by SERPLAN (over 12,000 dwellings).

In fact, about 75% of the schemes coming forward in the South East have been over 1,200 dwellings, with the proportion of larger schemes (3,000 - 6,000 dwellings) declining over the study period.

**East Midlands**

The consideration of new settlements in the initial issues report, produced in 1990, is perhaps typical of the manner in which the general topic has been approached in most of the regions outside the South East and East Anglia. Here the issue is one of land availability for housing, and the balance to be struck between developing land in existing urban areas, greenfield sites and new settlements (East Midlands Regional Planning Forum 1990). The emerging objective is one of assisting urban regeneration through the development and redevelopment of inner urban sites, coupled with the deflection of pressure from greenfield sites.

The East Midlands Regional Planning Forum however raise the issue of whether there is a role for major free-standing new settlements (although without formally defining their scale) where

the further expansion of existing settlements might be detrimental in terms of pressures on roads and services and the surrounding countryside (East Midlands Regional Planning Forum 1990 - paragraph 3.16)

It is clear though that the Forum considered major new settlements as over 1,500 dwellings, which is at odds with the view prevailing in Leicestershire County Council (whose officers carried out much of the initial work on the regional strategy), and later made explicit in their Structure Plan review, that a large new settlement was over 3,500 dwellings. However, structure and local plans would play the major part in determining the need for new settlements, rather than regional guidance.

The draft regional strategy (East Midlands Regional Planning Forum 1991), published about a year later, provides for only limited additional growth in housing requirements above that already allocated in the region's structure plans, and the inevitable conclusion is reached that
for the moment it's not necessary to provide for large new settlements in the region within the period up to 2006, but this will be kept under review (Burton 1991 - page 18)

Despite this, LPAs should consider policies for smaller new settlements (less than 1,500 dwellings) where appropriate.

**North East**

As part of a strategy aimed at economic revitalisation, regeneration and environmental enhancement, the draft regional advice published in April 1991 proposed that the level of housing allocations and their distribution should take account of the need to protect the environment as well as playing a role in the regeneration of the region. Although the amount of housing land already identified generally matches future requirements

in preparing development plans it will be necessary to consider the adequacy and attractiveness of the land available, taking into account local areas of need and market demand. Against this background individual Structure Plans may examine whether or not any new settlements will be required to ensure that the range of housing requirements can be met. In undertaking such an examination account should be taken of the need to secure a satisfactory scale and form of development in existing settlements (Cleveland, Durham and Northumberland County Councils 1991 - paragraph 5.6)

In the formal advice submitted to the Secretary of State, this view had changed somewhat for, given the high level of existing commitments and allocated or identified housing land, and hence a low requirement for new land,

it is unlikely that new settlements will be required to ensure that the range of housing will be met, although this may be examined further in individual structure plans (Cleveland, Durham and Northumberland County Councils 1992 - paragraph 5.7)
West Midlands

In the West Midlands the issue of new settlements is raised in the initial issues paper as part of a consideration of the degree to which particular patterns of development might achieve a sustainable environment whilst stimulating economic regeneration and providing for housing requirements. There is a choice between an emphasis on maximising the use of urban land, or loosening the urban fabric, and more particularly on the balance to be struck between the two, and so questions of urban form are significant, especially

what should be the balance between expanding existing and creating new free standing settlements, including large scale developments? (West Midlands Regional Forum 1991 - paragraph 5.12)

Wales

As in the West Midlands, the regional planning process in only at the first stage (that is the preparation of an issues report). The Consultation Report from the Assembly of Welsh Councils (1992) seeks only to raise what are considered to be important issues for more formal advice to address. It therefore merely poses the question "is there a role for new settlements" in the context of, first, striking a strategic balance between different forms of accommodating urban growth, and secondly in considering the quality of that development (Assembly of Welsh Councils 1992 - paragraph 3.29). In particular

the type of development, particularly in several rural areas and on the periphery of the main towns and cities begs the question of whether in the next century there is a better way of accommodating growth through, for example, new settlements (Assembly of Welsh Councils 1992 - paragraph 3.26)

Summary

Figure 8.3 summarises the extent and content of the consideration of new settlements in draft and emerging regional advice. It demonstrates the slow progress in the preparation of regional advice, and the general approach which has been non-prescriptive. Tentative advice on scale is given only in the South East and the East Midlands, and on location in East Anglia. More striking, perhaps, is the general uniformity of the strategic issues, coupled with the high level of existing housing land allocations, and the conse-
quent lack of need to consider new settlements as an option for providing additional housing land. In most cases, though, it is the LPAs who are to determine the need for new settlements through their structure and local plans.

FIGURE 8.3
SUMMARY OF APPROACHES TO NEW SETTLEMENTS IN REGIONAL ADVICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Addressed?</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Scale/location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible - in A45 corridor after 2000</td>
<td>alternative to expansion of existing settlements + redistribution of regional growth</td>
<td>Two potential locations - A 11 and A 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>Yes-throughout</td>
<td>May be acceptable - LNSs unlikely to be appropriate</td>
<td>alternative to expansion of existing settlements rather than additional to it</td>
<td>Smaller NS - in size range 1,200 - 6,000 d/hs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>Yes - in issues report and Strategy</td>
<td>Large scale unlikely to be needed before 2000</td>
<td>alternative to expansion of existing settlements</td>
<td>Two scales - NVs and LNSs (1,500+ d/hs) Location - not referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unlikely to be needed</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>Yes - in issues report</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>To be decided - alternative to expansion of existing settlements</td>
<td>Possibly large scale - location not referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Yes - in issues report</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
<td>To be decided - possibly improve quality of development</td>
<td>Not referred to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The figure includes issues reports and drafts and submitted regional advice for those regions where most progress has been made. It does not deal with Yorkshire and Humberside, South West and the North West.

Abbreviations: LNSs = larger new settlements, NS = new settlement, NVs = new villages

Source: Author
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NEW SETTLEMENTS IN REGIONAL GUIDANCE POST 1990

Introduction

So far the analysis has considered only the regional advice prepared and submitted by the ad-hoc groupings of LPAs. Since regional guidance is issued by the Secretary of State its examination demonstrates the degree of conflict between the local and central state. However, regional guidance has only been issued for East Anglia (July 1991), following consultation on an earlier draft (in July 1990) (DoE 1990b, 1991c).

RPG 6 - Regional Guidance for East Anglia

The Secretary of State accepted to a limited degree the strategy for redistributing growth from the overheating west of the region to the north and east, but

the extent to which this can be achieved in practice depended on the consistency of the policies operated by the planning authorities. Limits can not be placed on growth in one location unless equally effective arrangements have been made to enable that growth to take place in other locations which are reasonable alternatives (DoE 1990c - paragraph 31)

This approach was carried through into an alteration to the proposed distribution of housing requirements, and in particular of annual building rates, so that SCEALA's objective of encouraging higher growth rates to the east rather than in Cambridgeshire, was diluted (Johnston 1990). The guidance does, however, wish to see consideration being given to new settlements, with structure plan policies or proposals indicating the scale, timing and location, including the district where the new settlement is to be sited. This has clear echoes of the fairly positive line being taken by Ministers and set out in Draft PPG 3, an approach which, as I have shown in Chapter 8, was later radically altered (DoE 1989a).
CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Given the considerable private sector pressure for new settlements before 1990, it is surprising that the Regional Guidance issued before that date offered little or no advice on the role, location or timing of new settlements. However, since much of that Guidance was concerned with largely metropolitan areas, except for the South East, then the scope for addressing these issues was limited. The Secretary of State's Regional Planning Guidance for the South East did not, as I have indicated, directly consider the issue, although it did deal with large scale development per se.

Post 1990 Regional Guidance and advice, especially RPG 6, is aimed at informing subsequent rather than current rounds of structure plan review. It is apparent that some attention has been paid to emerging strategies by individual counties in carrying out such reviews, but on the whole this Guidance and advice has had little influence on current structure plan policies and proposals, or on decisions, (particularly on the Cambridgeshire new settlement proposals). This will become more apparent from the discussion in the next Chapter.

The current round of regional planning advice from the ad hoc conferences and Forums is largely conservative, partly because of the limited time horizon adopted, and since it must, of necessity, be linked to the ongoing structure plan reviews. It is therefore mainly driven by these reviews and by the housing land allocations and other commitments made in them. In most regions, the high level of current land allocations in structure plans, together with the comparatively low residual housing requirement, has meant that little need has been seen for large new settlements at least. In addition any spatial components which emerging strategies contain are, with few exceptions, drawn from existing structure plan policies and proposals. The process so far has produced little more than a continuation of the status quo.
General approach to new settlements in regional strategies and advice

Since the preparation of regional strategies is at an early stage in a number of regions it is difficult to offer any wide ranging conclusions on the general approach being adopted. However some tentative impressions can be put forward from the consideration in the strategies for the South East, East Anglia, the East Midlands and the North East.

On the whole, regional strategies are following the form suggested by Central Government, in outlining broad strategies, and indicating overall housing requirements. Few have offered general locational guidance, or possible criteria, and certainly none have pinpointed specific proposals. Most draft or submitted strategies acknowledge the need to consider new settlements in structure or local plans, or to keep them under review where the option is rejected, either wholly or partially. Advice in East Anglia and the South East has gone furthest, with SCEALA putting more forward broad locational advice in terms of the communications corridors where new settlements might be acceptable, and SERPLAN indicating the circumstances in which they might be appropriate. The latter have a locational element, and go beyond the current guidance given in PPG 9 (DoE 1988f). All of the draft or submitted strategies reject the need for large scale new settlements, although the concept is variously and ill-defined.

Potential New Settlements Roles

The strategy for East Anglia submitted by SCEALA contains the strongest spatial component, and it is the one strategy where new settlements are considered to have a potentially significant role in the achievement of the regional objectives. Here new settlements may

- divert growth pressures away from part of the region;
- protect existing towns and villages;
- act as a counterpart to restraint elsewhere; and
- act as a growth focus.

In the other submitted or draft strategies more "traditional" roles are suggested for new settlements, including protecting or relieving existing settlements from growth pressure. SERPLAN does, however, introduce the notions that new settlements may provide for accommodating major employment growth, and upgrade existing sporadic development.
The Role of Structure Plans

In common with Central Government policy, all of the draft or submitted strategies envisage that the development plan preparation process will be the locus for decisions on the need for, and the scale and location of, new settlements. However, there is some potential for conflict as most see structure plans (and hence counties) as having the major role, whilst the revised PPG 3 places the onus firmly on the districts through their district wide local plans.

The Relationship Between Strategic Guidance and Advice and The Formulation of Structure Plan Policy for New Settlements

It is important to establish the extent to which emerging regional strategies have been influential in the formulation of structure plan approaches to new settlements, and, although this can only be fully demonstrated when these approaches have been analysed, it is possible to make some general observations. First, as already noted, many structure plan reviews are underway, and so can only have regard to the emerging or submitted regional strategy in very general terms. The influence should be more discernible, and more direct, once regional strategies have been formulated more widely, and the next round of structure plan reviews begins, although again there is likely to be a problem of establishing a clear relationship between the two processes.

Second, there is evidence, albeit to a limited extent, in East Anglia (i.e. Norfolk) and the East Midlands (i.e. Leicestershire), of some structure plan reviews having regard to the emerging regional strategy for new settlements.

A general problem is that of timing and the difficulties in linking the preparation of regional advice and guidance with the formulation of structure plans (and to a lesser extent, district wide local plans). It is perhaps inevitable that regional advice has tended to take the strategies in existing structure plans within a region, and more particularly the housing land allocations, as a baseline, and merely roll them forward. Regional guidance tends therefore to become the amalgam of current structure plans, with little fresh thinking or broader strategic vision. This may also be due to the leading role of the county planning authorities in the process of producing regional advice, and, of course,
in formulating Structure Plans. The policies and strategies produced are bound to interlink, influence each other and tend towards a compromise solution (Smith 1990).

**Regional Planning and New Settlements**

Central Government has tended to play down the role of regional planning during the past decade, as part of its ideological 'project', in parallel with a reduction in the strategic role of structure plans. This approach has been subject to considerable criticism, both in general, and in relation to its treatment of new settlements, although there has been support for it in general terms (Hebbert 1990).

The output from the regional planning system, both in terms of the regional advice and the Secretary of State’s Guidance has been bland and generalised. Breheny (1990 - page 328) suggests the reasons for this Regional Advice will inevitably take this form because SERPLAN and other Conferences are caught from above and below as they try to operate the guidance system. From above, they have to accept not an endorsement of their Advice, but a statement from the Secretary of State that might bear no resemblance to that Advice. To date, the minimal Guidance offered encourages Conferences to produce minimal Advice. From below, local authorities will be happy with a system which encourages debate, but in practice imposes virtually no commitment.

Similarly long term thinking or a strategic vision is largely absent (Acres 1990, Roberts 1990). Another fundamental failing is that in practice it simply fails to deliver the quality and firmness of policy that is needed to match the scale of the strategic problems (Breheny 1990 - page 328).

A much more far ranging criticism of the system is that it is not regional or strategic planning at all. Writing in relation to the White Paper on The Future of Development Plans, which introduced the new system, Williams (1989 - page 275) felt that while the very recognition of regional planning represents a welcome step forward, the White Paper is still far too tentative. We are almost alone in Europe in not having a developed regional planning element ......
This view is shared by Breheney (1989 - page 15)

it is now beginning to dawn on many people that paradoxically the South East is facing strategic issues of an unprecedented scale and speed at the very time that the last remaining traces of the strategic-planning system are being dismantled.

For the strategic planning system to propose or deliver more radical solutions to the problems of managing urban growth, including the promotion of strategic new settlements, requires a strategic planning body which is freed from dominance by the "local self interest" of county and district councils (Smith 1990). The TCPA and David Hall in particular have long campaigned for firm strategic guidance for new settlements (Hall 1991a, 1991b).

Both the TCPA and the RTPI want regional planning guidance to address new settlements specifically, identifying locations in general terms according to the RTPI, and for the TCPA, considering their size, character and disposition (TCPA Strategic Planning Group 1990, RTPI 1991). It is evident that only to a very limited extent are these exhortations being met, or are likely to be met, given the form of the current regional planning system.

**The Role of the Central State in Regional Policy for New Settlements**

Government policy statements on new settlements have had some influence on the form of policy emerging in regional advice. This is evident in the emphasis which most strategies have placed on the role of structure plans in determining the precise need for new settlements, and their location, scale and timing, prior to the issue of the revised PPG 3. Emerging government policy on the appropriate scale of new settlements has been possibly less directly influential, with SERPLAN rejecting the 'new village' scale as too small to reduce development pressures. Conversely the East Midlands adopted this general scale, as well as the more specific criteria set out in the draft PPG 3 (East Midlands Regional Planning Forum 1991).

The central state has a more direct and interventionist role in the regional planning process, through the 'approval' of submitted advice. Since only two regions have submitted advice it is too early to determine how far the Secretary of State has accepted
or modified the advice presented, although the East Anglian strategy has been diluted in its effect. The approach to new settlements per se, however, remained largely unaltered.

**Regional Guidance and the Private Sector**

Submitted regional advice has gone furthest in considering new settlements in those regions subject to the greatest private sector pressure for new settlements (the South East and East Anglia). The East Anglian advice is perhaps the most positive in proposing general locations, whilst the South East strategy offers some encouragement to smaller scale new settlements. So where there has been considerable pressure, the issue has been considered at a regional level, and a framework has emerged which at least gives some scope to the private sector, although, as noted earlier, this has not happened in the East Midlands, despite consideration of the issue.

Regional policy, and more importantly, regional growth prospects, have some impact on the identification of areas with potential for the location and development of new settlements, although most private sector proposals have not been floated in response to emerging regional strategies. However, the process itself, with its rounds of consultation, has enabled the private sector, and the housebuilders' representatives, the HBF, to keep the issue alive and make out a general case, as happened, for example, in relation to the East Midlands strategy. The HBF, in fact, see great value in this opportunity, and want the public consultation stages of regional strategy preparation extended (Acres 1990).

**Summary**

Regional advice has tended to follow rather than lead new settlement production, or at least, new settlement promotion. This is in part a matter of timing, given that the 'new' regional planning system has only come into being in the last few years, following a number of years of private sector promotion of new settlements. So, for example, although work would have started some time before, the initial issues report in East Anglia was published in May 1988, and the consultation draft of the South East' strategy in August 1989. By then, the issue of new settlements had been addressed in structure plans in those regions and there had been considerable private sector pressure. So it is unsurprising that in this respect the private sector has appeared to lead.
However, as I have suggested, the content of regional advice has tended to reflect, firstly, the strategy and detailed commitments of current structure plans, and secondly, the nature of private sector new settlement pressure. So, in East Anglia, the general corridors where new settlements might be appropriate are those where there has been some degree of pressure, most significantly in the A 45 corridor. In the South East, most of the new settlement schemes floated have been in the size range from 1,200 to 6,000 dwellings, which is the scale which is considered appropriate for new settlements in the regional advice.

So regional advice has tended to follow existing trends both in relation to new settlements and in relation to wider strategic matters. It has reacted to, rather than led, market pressures.
CHAPTER 9

POLICY FORMULATION FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS -
STRUCTURE PLAN APPROACHES TO NEW SETTLEMENTS
INTRODUCTION

So far the analysis of the policy formulation process for new settlements has dealt with Central Government guidance, and with strategic, regional policy. It has also tended to concentrate on the forms and content of formulated policies, rather than analysing the interactions centred around the policy formulation process itself. The range of actors involved in the process has been fairly circumscribed, although it is apparent that the central state has played a major role, obviously in national guidance, but also in modifying and issuing regional guidance. It was suggested that regional guidance, and the regional strategies prepared by the ad-hoc regional groupings of local planning authorities, have tended to be conservative, reflecting the strategic thrust, provisions and allocations of current development plans, particularly structure plans. On new settlements, it was also concluded that regional guidance and advice has largely reacted to private sector pressure, except in isolated cases, rather than providing a strong regional direction. In this, then, it is possible to discern the downplaying of strategic planning, which, it has been argued, is one of the characteristics of the reoriented planning system of the last ten years or so.

However, from Circular 15/84 - Land for Housing issued in 1984 (DoE 1984a) until the advent of PPG 3 (revised) in March 1992 (DoE 1992b), central government accorded the major role in the determination of the need for new settlements to structure plans, rather than to local plans or regional guidance. The importance attached to local plans and to Unitary Development Plans (UDPs) grew towards the end of the 1980s, with an increasing emphasis by the central state on local 'choice', and with the beginning of work on the UDPs. As I suggested earlier, the revised PPG 3 firmly placed the locus for developing policies and strategies for new settlements in local plans. At the same time, private sector pressure for new settlements increased during the decade, becoming more spatially diverse and more intense, particularly in the Southern half of the country, at least until 1988/1989.

So, with growing private sector pressure, and with positive government advice, it could be expected that the issue of new settlements would be on the 'agenda' of most county planning authorities (CPAs) in the preparation of their structure plans, with new settlements possibly being one option for accommodating new housing growth. Indeed it was also suggested earlier that there may be a relationship between the degree of private
sector pressure for new settlements and the form and content of the local state response through the strategic or structure plan process.

The process of structure plan preparation is spatially focused, dealing with single counties, and it provides greater opportunities than national or regional policy formulation for the direct involvement of a wider range of agencies or actors. The local state, in the form of the county planning authorities, obviously has a central role, although district councils may also be fairly closely involved, in the preparation of the strategy, through informal liaison, and more formally involved, through the consultation process. This procedure, together with the Examination in Public (EiP), enables the private sector to directly challenge strategies, policies and allocations, and to seek to influence the policy climate. Similarly, a wide range of interest groups may also participate through the consultation procedure, and, if invited, at the EiP. Approval of the plan itself rests, at least until recently, with the central state (through the Secretary of State, perhaps more accurately through the Department of the Environment’s regional offices), but it is the potential for the modification of the plan by the Secretary of State, rather than the approval per se, which is crucial as the modifications may radically alter the strategic thrust of the plan or the detailed policies and provisions.

Key Issues

In terms of the author's typology of new settlement development outlined earlier, the analysis in this Chapter is primarily concerned with the 'Planning Response' dimension. This suggested that there is likely to be a broad spectrum of planning policy responses to new settlements, ranging from an absence of a strategic policy framework to a specific policy and plan allocation, with a variety of intermediate positions. It was also later suggested that this may require refinement, by the overlaying of the policy stance adopted by local planning authorities. So the analysis is directed towards an examination of the form and content of the consideration of private sector new settlements that has taken place in the process of structure plan preparation, review and alteration during the 1980s and early 1990s.

In particular, the analysis seeks to address a number of key issues, which are central to the research aims:
Changing state/market power relations over the last decade - a consideration of the process and outcomes of policy formulation for new settlements in structure plans and of the interactions centred around this process can illuminate the nature and extent of the shift of power from the state to the private sector. So, for example, to what degree has the private sector been influential and successful in promoting new settlement policies and proposals, and to what extent have the formulated policies favoured the private sector in relation to other interests? In other works, have the strategies and policies formulated by the CPAs reacted to private sector pressure, or have they directed or led the market response?

Changing local state/central state relations - one of the major contentions has been that the period since 1979 has been characterised by greater centralisation of power with the local state losing power to the centre. The structure plan preparation and approval process is one of the key areas where these power relations are played out, with the central state having a key role in modifying and approving structure plan reviews. The form and content of central state 'intervention' through the modification process will indicate the degree of central control being exercised over locally derived plans;

Changing intra market relations - more specifically, it is possible to focus on the precise role and power of the house building sector, which has been closely involved in new settlement promotion, vis-à-vis other actors in the private sector development process, by looking at the way in which house builders and other private sector developers have used the structure plan process and at the outcomes;

Changing form of planning - has the effect of the shift in the direction of land use planning been the deregulation of house building over the period, and have housebuilders gained more power particularly at the expense of the local state? One of the most contentious issues in structure plan strategy and policy formulation is the amount of new housing to be accommodated, its location and the means by which it is to be accommodated. The scale of housing land provision is therefore a crucial issue and since new settlements represent one way of providing housing land supply, the outcomes of the struggle over new settlements can indicate the extent to which control over the provision of private housing has been loosened or deregulated;
5  **Weakening of strategic planning?** - It has been argued that the effect of legislative and procedural changes has been the weakening of the role and form of strategic planning, not only at a regional level but also in relation to structure planning. Again an analysis of the outcomes of the structure planning process will enable an assessment to be made of the degree to which the strategic planning process itself has become weakened;

6  **Emergence of different styles of planning** - through an analysis of the form and content of structure plan strategies and policies for accommodating growth and for new settlements, and of the process of policy formulation itself, it is possible to assess whether a variety of forms or approaches are apparent, and so whether the argued fragmentation of planning has occurred;

7  **Conditions necessary for new settlement production** - it was suggested earlier that there may be particular conditions which need to be present for there to be new settlement promotion and production. An analysis of the structure plan process will indicate whether one of these conditions is the form of structure plan strategy and of the policy context formulated to deal with the accommodation of residential development, including policy form and content for new settlements. So, for example, to what extent is the form of the strategy or of policy influential on new settlement production by the private sector, and is a positive new settlement policy (that is, one which makes provision for a new settlement, either in general or specific terms) necessary?

It is important, first, to establish where and when new settlements have become an issue in the structure plan policy formulation process, before looking in more detail at the interactions between the various actors in the process and at the outcomes. So the analysis and discussion in this Chapter begins by outlining the 'geography' and timing of structure plan reviews, before considering the form and content of approaches to new settlements and of formulated policies.
NEW SETTLEMENTS IN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEWS

The process of structure plan preparation began in 1971 following the Town and Country Planning Act 1968, with the first plan being approved in 1975 (Solesbury 1983). By 1983, structure plans had been approved for all but one country in England and Wales. The review or alteration process has therefore been continuous since then, and Cross and Bristow (1983), the Journal of Planning Law (1988) and Amos (1990a - appendices 1 & 2) provide further details of the timing of the preparation, submission and approval of these alterations and reviews. The discussion which follows uses the terms alteration and review, which, although sometimes used interchangeably, do have somewhat different and precise meanings. Structure plan review is used here where the whole plan and all of its policies, provisions and proposals have been subject to re-examination, and the original plan has been replaced by a new plan (also known as a replacement plan). Alterations are the limited review of particular topics, or of particular policies, typically those relating to the housing provisions, and do not extend to the whole plan, so that parts of the original remain in force, until replaced by a fresh review or replacement.

Although, as I have indicated earlier, new settlements, whether promoted by the private sector or by the public sector, had been seen as one solution to the problems of accommodating growth during the 1970s, the issue did not emerge during the preparation of the 'original' structure plans, except in a few instances. Significantly these were all growth areas or areas under considerable pressure - North East and South Hampshire, East Sussex and South East Dorset (Brown and Barett 1983, Parker 1983).

The analysis here is essentially concerned with the structure plan alteration and reviews which have taken place since the mid-1980s, when, for a number of reasons, new settlements received much greater consideration at a strategic level, rather than with the preparation of 'original' structure plans.

The Geography of New Settlement Consideration

As I have suggested, with the considerable pressures for development in the mid-1980s, and, in particular, the private sector pressure for new settlements, it would be expected

---

1The structure plans for Cumbria, Dorset (Rest of Dorset) and Lancashire (North and Central) were approved in 1983. The last of the original structure plans to be approved was Avon's in 1985.
that private new settlements have become an issue during the course of the preparation of most structure plan reviews. Table 9.1 indicates those review processes where new settlements have been discussed or considered.

The Table refers largely to those structure plan reviews where CPAs have considered new settlements as an option for accommodating new housing (or for other strategic functions) or where individual schemes have been floated by the private sector during the course of the review or alteration. In a number of cases, however, the initiative has also come from other actors in the development and policy formulation processes.

TABLE 9.1
CONSIDERATION OF NEW SETTLEMENTS IN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE RAISED</th>
<th>ISSUE NOT RAISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Clwyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>Hampshire (N &amp; SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>Humberside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author adapted from Table 1 in Amos 1990a
New settlements have been raised as an option or an issue in over two thirds of the structure plans reviewed or altered since 1980 (in some counties this has occurred in more than one review or alteration). The counties where this has occurred are spatially diverse, paralleling the geographically diverse private sector pressure, although they are mainly concentrated in the South East, East Anglia, South West, East Midlands and West Midlands, and the more pressured areas of South and North Wales, the North West and Yorkshire and Humberside. So, conversely, it is largely the more peripheral areas of Mid, West and North Wales, the North West and North East where new settlements have not been an issue. Here there has been little or no private sector pressure for new settlements in most of the counties. Whilst it is possible to discern some form of relationship between private sector pressure and the strategic consideration of new settlements in the structure plan review process, this is not invariably the case. Four of the counties where new settlements have not been an issue are in the South East, with Essex one of the counties which has experienced the greatest private sector pressure (with 15 proposals in various forms). Similarly the two South Wales counties of Mid and West Glamorgan have also been under some pressure.

Where CPAs have not even assessed the role of new settlements as an option for future development, the reasons are, typically, lack of pressure, the general strategic thrust of reviews and tight constraints, as indicated by Surrey County Council (1988) "almost the whole of Surrey is Metropolitan Green Belt around London where, as a matter of policy, such proposals would be unacceptable" or by Lancashire County Council (1988)

Lancashire is not experiencing the pressure for residential developments felt in many counties in the South and in fact the general philosophy of the Plan is to guide investment and development to existing settlements, particularly the larger urban areas

**Timing of Consideration**

The data on the promotion of private sector new settlement schemes indicated that there were different trends in the number of schemes coming forward over time, and so there had been a distinct response by developers to a range of wider economic and other conditions. As a first step to establishing whether there is a link between the policy formulation process and the promotion of new settlements by the private sector, and indeed whether the form or content of the review process is one of the conditions impacting upon the private sector response, it is necessary to determine when the con-
consideration of the issue of new settlements first took place during the structure plan review processes indicated in Table 9.1.

Table 9.2 indicates the year when the issue was first raised by any of the actors the development process. As I shall show later this relates primarily to the canvassing of new settlement options for accommodating growth by the CPAs, but also in certain cases, to the floating of proposals by the private sector during the consultation process, or at the EiP, or by the EiP Panel in their report. The dates are approximate in some cases.

**TABLE 9.2**

**TIMING OF FIRST CONSIDERATION OF NEW SETTLEMENTS IN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEWS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>1983/84</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1985/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hampshire (N)</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>1986/87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>1986/87</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>1984/85</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: NA = not available. The dates relate to the year when the issue of new settlements was first raised. In several counties the issue has of course been raised in more than one review, notably Berkshire, Dorset (South East), East Sussex, Hampshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire and Warwickshire.

Source: Author adapted from Table 2 in Amos 1990a

Table 9.3 shows the information in Table 9.2 in the form of a chronology, and where the issue was raised in more than one review, adding the date for each such review.
TABLE 9.3

CHRONOLOGY OF THE TIMING OF CONSIDERATION OF NEW SETTLEMENTS IN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Hampshire (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humberside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Berkshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Emboldened counties are those where the issue of new settlements has been raised in more than one structure plan review process.

Source: Author
There is, inevitably, some relationship between the timing of structure plan reviews, and the emergence of new settlements as an issue, since, of course, the review process provides a vehicle for this to take place. However, it is apparent that new settlements have become a more significant issue in the second half of the decade, and more particularly in the period since 1988. In fact, almost two thirds of the review processes where new settlements have been considered took place during or after 1988. It is suggested that this is, in part, a response by CPAs to government advice, in particular to PPG 3 and a DoE discussion paper, which are discussed in a growing number of explanatory memoranda and early 'issues' papers, and to the growing pressure of private sector applications and proposals, which have necessitated a strategic response (Amos 1990a - page 6)

The government advice, especially the Discussion Paper, to which I referred in Chapter 7, had indicated that CPAs should address the role of, and need for, new settlements, in structure plan reviews. The growing geographical diversity of CPAs actually undertaking this or of proposals being floated by the private sector during the review process reflects the parallel diversity of private sector pressure, so that, whereas before 1988 those CPAs were largely in the South East and the Midlands, after 1988 the issue had been raised in most structure plan reviews in the South East, South West, East Anglia and Midlands, as well as in some northern counties.

However, to some extent, this increase in the number of review processes where new settlements were an issue and the widening geographical diversity post-dates the peak of private sector development pressure, both in general terms, and in relation to new settlements. So, it could be argued that either CPAs (where they were responsible for initiating the debate on new settlements) were reacting to a perceived pressure over a period of several years and were attempting to provide a strategic contact and response, or that they acknowledged that pressure had slackened, and that the evolving strategic framework was designed to provide for the long term, once development activity had resumed. The latter is certainly the case in a number of reviews, although here the response is more one of providing for long term housing needs, with little, if any, reference to a downturn in development activity.

As I suggested earlier, only a few CPAs, in the South East of England, had considered new settlement options prior to the beginning of the current wave of proposals, that is
before 1983. Here, in Hampshire (in the Northern and Southern areas) in the late 1970's, and in East Sussex and Dorset (South East) in the early 1980's, new settlements formed a central part of the strategies for accommodating growth pressures. The issue has continued to be significant in these counties, and it has been a recurring theme in a number of other structure plans which have been reviewed more than once during the decade, in particular in Berkshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Oxfordshire and Warwickshire. Again, these are all in or on the fringes of the South East, where development pressures have been greatest and the development opportunities for the private sector the most favourable (Stewart 1990), Stilwell, Boden and Rees 1990).

**Stages in the Structure Plan Review process**

Although a number of distinct stages in the process of structure plan alteration or review may be identified, as indicated in Figure 9.1, the process is, essentially, an iterative and continuous one. Each cycle of alteration or review informs and forms the context for subsequent cycles, although, as I have suggested, alterations are likely to be less broad in their scope than reviews or replacements. However, the isolation of particular stages is important, as, first, options, policies and proposals become firmer with each succeeding stage, and, second, each stage gives varying opportunities for participation by interest groups, and hence for exerting, or attempting to exert, influence over the eventual outcome.

The key points at which the issue of new settlements may be raised can be identified as

1. the pre-submission stages (which can be broadly subdivided into: initial consideration of options, draft(s) alterations/reviews, consultation, and submission document);

2. at the EiP and in the report produced by the EiP Panel;

3. in the Secretary of State's Proposed or Draft Modifications, and in the subsequent representation stage;

4. in the Secretary of State's Final Modifications and Approval of the alteration/review;

In addition, of course, it is necessary to add
at all stages in the review process.

FIGURE 9.1.
STAGES IN THE STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS

1. IDENTIFICATION OF ISSUES
2. OPTIONS REPORT
3. CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS
4. DRAFT ALTERATIONS
5. REVISION OF DRAFT
6. SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY OF STATE
7. EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC
8. PANEL REPORT
9. DRAFT MODIFICATIONS FROM SECRETARY OF STATE
10. FINAL MODIFICATIONS AND APPROVAL BY SECRETARY OF STATE
The structure plan reviews where new settlements have been an issue are grouped, in Table 9.4, according to the stage or stages in the review processes at which the issue was raised by any of the participants in the review process. From this it is possible to determine which stages or key points have been most important, and where new settlements have been a significant issue during the course of review/alteration preparation.

### TABLE 9.4

**STAGES IN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS AT WHICH ISSUE OF NEW SETTLEMENTS CONSIDERED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-SUBMISSION</th>
<th>EIP/PANEL REPORT</th>
<th>DRAFT/FINAL MODIFICATIONS</th>
<th>ALL STAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bedfordshire</strong></td>
<td>Berkshire(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cornwall</strong></td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hertfordshire</strong></td>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lincolnshire</strong></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfordshire(^2)</strong></td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avon</strong></td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oxfordshire(^1)</strong></td>
<td>Warwickshire(^1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wiltshire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berkshire(^1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leicestershire(^1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northamptonshire(^1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambridgeshire</strong></td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Sussex(^1,2)</strong></td>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hereford &amp; Worcester</strong></td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nottinghamshire</strong></td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffordshire</strong></td>
<td>Warwickshire(^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 = first structure plan review in which new settlements considered, 2 = second or subsequent review/alteration, emboldened counties - see text

Source: Adapted and updated from Table 3 in Amos 1990a

It is clear that the issue of new settlements has been raised at two main 'points' in the review/alteration process, either solely during the pre submission stage or during all
stages of the process. It has been less common for it to be raised either at the EiP (or in the Panel Report) or by the Secretary of State in his Draft or Final Modifications. Moreover, the issue has been contentious in at least fifteen review/alterations, figuring during all the stages of those policy formulation processes.

Looking in a little more detail at each of these stages, it is important to note, in relation to the pre-submission stage, that not all of the structure plan reviews/alterations have been submitted for approval or, where they have been adopted and submitted, have not yet progressed through the subsequent stages to approval by the Secretary of State. So it may be that in certain cases the issue of new settlements will be considered at other points in the process. These reviews are emboldened in Table 9.4.

However all of the structure plan reviews/alterations where new settlements have emerged at the pre-submission stage in the process can be divided into two groups, on the basis of policy outcome - those where the CPAs have proposed, canvassed and rejected a new settlement option, and those where a policy on new settlements has been included in the draft or submitted plan. Table 9.5 indicates these groupings, although later sections will develop this theme in more detail.

**TABLE 9.5**

PRE-SUBMISSION STAGE OF STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW - REJECTION OR ACCEPTANCE OF NEW SETTLEMENT POLICY OPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW SETTLEMENT POLICY OPTION</th>
<th>NEW SETTLEMENT POLICY OPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REJECTED</strong></td>
<td><strong>INCLUDED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>Berkshire²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 9.4
Source: Author

Most of these reviews/alterations have taken place in the period since the beginning of 1988. The counties where a positive new settlement policy has been proposed are those where the pressure from the private sector for new settlements has been rather greater, on the whole, than in those where a new settlement option has been rejected.
Of the CPAs which rejected a new settlement option, only in Bedfordshire and Berkshire has there been any significant private sector interest in new settlements. That very pressure may, as I have suggested, be related to the potentially favourable policy framework, which either appeared likely to emerge, or did, in fact, emerge as a result of the review process. The link between growth pressure and the potential of new settlements to play a major role in accommodating that growth is clear, for new settlement were canvassed

where development pressure is significant and where the need is to balance development with the protection and conservation of the countryside and existing settlements ...... they are also felt to have roles as growth points, in relieving pressure on existing settlements and the countryside and in meeting the demand for housing without overloading infrastructure (Amos 1990a - pages 11 & 12)

The rejection of new settlements occurred where

the rate or scale of growth and pressure for development is low and could be accommodated in existing settlements (as in Somerset), because the rate and level of growth has been reduced or it can be accommodated in existing settlements (Bedfordshire), or because of infrastructure or environmental costs (Cornwall) (Amos 1990a - page 12)

The interplay of other actors has also been crucial, with Districts or the wider public, opposing proposed options or policies (Cornwall County Council 1986, Somerset County Council 1988a, 1988b, Harman and Bloxham 1990).

Unlike the pre submission stage, where the initiative has largely come from the CPAs, when the new settlement option has been initially raised at the EiP stage, it has normally been raised by the private sector during the EiP (by, for example, the floating of particular proposals as an alternative to CPA policy proposals or to housing land provisions which do not include new settlements) or by the EiP Panel itself in its report to the Secretary of State. Structure plan reviews are included in this category only where the new settlement issue has not been raised at any other stage in the process (although there may have been a response to the canvassing of the issue by the Secretary of State in his discussion of the proposed or final modifications).
Although the EiP is largely symbolic, and of limited impact in influencing decisions, according to Barker (1983), it does offer a public opportunity for particular, invited interest groups to augment lobbying which may have taken place rather more covertly. To this end the HBF and individual development interests have been considerably less successful in gaining support for new settlement policies or specific proposals at this stage alone (their impact on the course of reviews where new settlements have been an issue throughout will be considered later) (Amos 1990a). Examples include the reviews of structure plans for Avon, Gloucestershire and West Sussex where specific schemes were canvassed but rejected by the EiP Panel or the Secretary of State (Barton Willmore Planning Partnership 1989, Travers Morgan 1989, West Sussex County Council 1985). The case of the Derbyshire review is more interesting and demonstrates intra-authority conflict and a congruence of development and public sector interests. The CPA directly addressed the issue of new villages as a result of pressure from the HBF, which later supported a policy proposal floated at the EiP, from one of the Districts (South Derbyshire) for a new village, despite opposition from the CPA (Derbyshire County Council 1989a, 1989b).

In rather fewer cases, not surprisingly perhaps, has the issue first emerged in the Secretary of State's Draft or Final Modifications. When it has done so, it has either been as a result of a private sector response to the Draft Modifications (as in Leicestershire where Costain Homes unsuccessfully sought inclusion of a policy relating to their then current application for a new settlement at Wymeswold), or a direct intervention by the Secretary of State. In the latter case, the interventions reflect, in part at least, prevailing government policy, but also presage the shift that was to take place later. On the Northamptonshire Replacement Structure Plan (Northamptonshire County Council 1989a, 1989b), the Secretary of State suggested that the CPA should review the policies relating to housing (and employment), and should

examine the contribution to be made to meeting housing need in the rural areas by well-designed small scale new villages where this would not conflict with the conservation of the countryside (DoE/DTp 1989a)

Here the consideration of the role of new settlements was to take place through the structure plan review process, but in Kent, it was the local plan process which was to be mechanism, for the Secretary of State suggested that a Local Plan for Ashford should examine the issue (Kent County Council 1987a, 1987b).
Finally, the 'All Stages' category includes those structure plan reviews and alterations, where the new settlement issue has been raised at all or most of the possible points in the process (in all cases except that of Hereford and Worcester, through a new settlement strategy and policy being formulated by the CPA) and the Secretary of State has made a decision on the submitted plan. It is, with the pre-submission stage, the largest category, which reflects, first, the growing importance and wider consideration of the new settlement issue, and second, the increasing number of reviews in which the CPA has proposed a new settlement policy and on which the Secretary of State has made a decision.

**TABLE 9.6**

NEW SETTLEMENT OPTION CONSIDERED AT ALL STAGES OF STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW PROCESS - COMPARISON BETWEEN 1990 AND 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1990</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Kent³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Northamptonshire²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex¹</td>
<td>East Sussex²</td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk³</td>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>Warwickshire²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire²</td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 & 2 as in Table 9.4. 3 = reclassified from original Table, see text for full explanation.

Source: Author based on Table 3 in Amos 1990a

A comparison with the situation in 1990 illustrates this point, as shown in Table 9.6. This shows those structure plan reviews where new settlements had been considered or raised at all points during the plan preparation process in 1990 and in 1992. Apart from two which have been reclassified from the earlier work², there have been six additions since 1990. So this reinforces the point that more CPAs are considering the issue of

²The two structure plan review processes which have been reclassified from the 1990 work are Kent (previously placed in the Draft/Final Modification stage - the CPA had originally considered a new settlement option together with a policy during the early stages of the process, but had rejected it, and it had been raised again by the SoS during his draft and final modifications to the plan), and Norfolk (previously placed in the 'All Stages' category, although no decision had been made on the submitted plan by the SoS).
new settlements and that there has been some degree of contestation at most of the
stages in the review process. Again, of course, it also reflects the then current govern-
ment advice (in PPG 3 and in the DoE Discussion Paper) on the role of structure plans
in examining the need for new settlements, to which a growing number of CPAs appear
to have had regard.

**Actors responsible for raising new settlements issue**

From the brief discussion so far it is apparent that the initiative for floating the option of
new settlements may come from a number of sources at different points in the review
preparation process

1 CPAs may propose a new settlement option in the early stages of structure plan
review preparation, particularly during the issues and consultation stages (which
may then be rejected during the later stages and deleted from the submitted
plan);

2 CPAs may formulate a policy for new settlements as part of the strategy in the
draft or submission version of the structure plan review or alteration (the policy
itself may take a number of forms, which will be considered later);

3 Private sector interests, or other interests, may, in the absence of an emerging
policy framework for new settlements in the pre-submission stage, put forward
policy options (in a variety of forms) based on new settlements, during the con-
sultation stages (which may or may not be accepted by the CPA);

4 Again developers may canvas the issue at the Examination in Public (EiP), either
in response to a CPA policy proposal or to a strategy which makes no provision
for new settlements;

5 The initiative may come from the EiP Panel in their report to the Secretary of
State, and the Panel are, in any case, likely to comment on any proposal or
general case put forward by LPAs, the private sector or other interest groups;

6 The Secretary of State may initiate consideration of the role of new settlements,
even in the absence of a strategy or policy in the submitted plan which makes
provision for them, in his proposed or draft modifications;
The draft modifications proposed by the Secretary of State are released for comment, and the private sector may, at this stage, either restate a previous case for the inclusion of a new settlement policy, or introduce such a case for the first time;

Finally, the Secretary of State may, as in the case of his draft modifications, include a new settlement policy in the approval of the review, where there has been no previous consideration, or modify or delete a proposed policy. In a few cases, he has intervened in other ways, as I have indicated earlier, in relation to the reviews in Northamptonshire and Kent.

### Table 9.7

**ACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR RAISING NEW SETTLEMENT ISSUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Actor(s)</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Actor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>CPA/DPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>CPA/developer</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>EiP Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>CPA/HBF/DPAs</td>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>EiP Panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SoS/Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>CPA/developers</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>CPA/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SoS/CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td>CPA/developers</td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>HBF/developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 9.4. DPA = District Planning Authority (Council), HBF = House Builders Federation.

Source: Adapted from Table 4 in Amos 1990a.

Table 9.7 indicates which actor or actors played the major role in each of the review processes where private sector new settlements have been raised or discussed. The structure plan reviews are grouped into the four main stages identified earlier.
actor(s) highlighted in the Table was responsible for initiating subsequent consideration through, for example, the floating of a particular scheme (by the private sector), or by the inclusion of a policy proposal (by the CPA). Other actors may, of course, have had a considerable impact on the eventual outcome of the process, and this will be considered in detail later.

On the whole, the initial impetus for new settlement policies appears to have come largely from the CPAs. As is to be expected, the private sector has been much more involved in those cases where the issue has been first canvassed at the EiP, since, of course, this forum provides an opportunity for a case to be made out to a third party (the Panel and/or the Secretary of State), and during the consultation procedure on the proposed modifications.

In some cases, more than one actor has been significantly involved in the initial consideration or raising of a new settlement option. Where this has occurred, the lead actor is placed first in the Table.

Table 9.8 relates the data in Table 9.7 to the timing of the initial consideration of new settlements, in order to ascertain if there is any change over time in the lead actor. This tends to confirm the point made earlier that more CPAs are not only addressing the issue of new settlements, but are also formulating strategies or detailed policies which make provision for them in their draft or submission structure plan reviews.

This is particularly true for the period after 1988, when the private sector has tended to initiate consideration in fewer cases. Prior to 1988, the issue was more often first raised by the private sector, either in the early stages of the review process or during the EiP. Of course, as more CPAs addressed the issue in the early stages of their reviews of structure plans, the opportunities for initial canvassing by the private sector have been correspondingly reduced. It may be also that developers are less enthusiastic about promoting large scale development, like new settlements, in a recession, or that they have become incorporated into the policy formulation process in other ways, which lessen the need for the direct canvassing or promotion of individual schemes.
### TABLE 9.8

**TIMING OF RAISING OF NEW SETTLEMENT ISSUE AND ACTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR RAISING ISSUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ACTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Hampshire (NE)(^1)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>CPA/developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>East Sussex(^1)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Berkshire(^1)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfordshire(^1)</td>
<td>EiP Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire (NE)(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire(^1)</td>
<td>EiP Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>CPA/Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset (South East)(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicestershire(^1)</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>CPA/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>CPA/developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>CPA/HBF/developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Sussex(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>HBF/developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire(^1)</td>
<td>SoS/Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire(^2)</td>
<td>SoS/CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>CPA/DPAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfordshire(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicestershire(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Berkshire(^2)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 9.4
Source: Author
The whole policy formulation process is, however, rather more complex than this basic analysis suggests, as it is the interactions between actors during the process which are likely to be significant and to have an impact on the eventual outcome. This impact will not only be important in relation to the eventual strategy and policy adopted, but also in terms of the form of the policy framework which emerges. The nature of the interactions which took place in particular structure plan reviews will be considered later, but, first it is necessary to establish the general form of the outcomes.

**Outcomes**

Table 9.9 sets out the eventual outcome in terms of the decisions taken by the CPAs or by the Secretary of State on new settlement options or proposed policies. The data is presented in the structure plan reviews groupings used previously.

Taking the *pre submission stage* first, as this stage was defined on the basis that the issue of new settlement was raised only at this point in the review process, it follows that the outcomes of the reviews in this group will either be the rejection of a new settlement option by the CPAs, or a final decision will have not yet been taken. The former hides considerable variation, however, in the nature of the process, since, as I have shown earlier, in a number of cases, positive strategies or policies had been proposed and floated for consultation, only to be rejected at a later stage. In others, a new settlement option was considered in early issues reports, but not incorporated into consultation drafts of the structure plan review.

However, although nine CPAs rejected new settlement options during the initial stages of the review process, at least five CPAs have put forward various forms of new settlement strategies and policies in reviews which have yet to be submitted and/or approved. The counties where new settlements have been rejected show no particular spatial pattern, although they can be split into two broad groups - those areas without significant development pressures (such as Clwyd, Cornwall and Humberside), and those areas with growth pressures in the South East (Bedfordshire, Berkshire and Hertfordshire). In the latter, anti-growth movements can be identified, partly at least, as being responsible for opposition to the acceptance of large scale housing allocations, whether or not in the form of new settlements, and to reductions in proposed overall levels of housing provision (Harman and Bloxham 1990, Short, Fleming and Witt 1986, Planning 1991d).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire²</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>no decision on review policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire²</td>
<td>no decision on review policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>no decision on review policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>no decision on review policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire²</td>
<td>CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>no decision on review policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>rejected by Panel/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>rejected by CPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>rejected by Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire¹</td>
<td>rejected by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire¹</td>
<td>rejected by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>rejected by Panel/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>rejected by Panel/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire¹</td>
<td>rejected by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire¹</td>
<td>rejected by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire¹</td>
<td>SoS suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>rejected/deleted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex¹</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex²</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td>rejected by CPA/SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>accepted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>inserted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>accepted by SoSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire²</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>rejected/deleted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>rejected/deleted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>rejected/deleted by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>accepted and modified by SoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire²</td>
<td>rejected/deleted by SoS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 9.4. A = left to local plan to decide if it was the best option.
Source: Adapted from Appendix 3 in Amos 1990a
At the EiP stage, as indicated earlier, specific new settlement schemes, strategies involving new settlements or forms of new settlement policy have either been floated by the private sector, or the EiP Panel has made reference to the role of private new settlements in its Report to the Secretary of State. In all cases, however, such canvassing by the private sector has been unsuccessful with the cases put forward begin rejected by the Panel and/or the Secretary of State. Even where the EiP Panel suggested that consideration should be given to the inclusion of new settlement policies, the Secretary of State has not accepted this, although on occasion indicating that the issue should be addressed in subsequent review. It would therefore appear that, in these cases, at least, the use of the EiP forum by the private sector for lobbying has been unsuccessful. However, in order to consider the overall success of the private sector it is necessary to analyse the outcome of the new settlement debate at EiPs as a whole, taking into account those reviews/alterations where the new settlement issue emerged during all stages of the process;

Where new settlements have been considered at all stages in the review process, the outcomes fall into three main groups:-

1 the modification of a proposed policy by the Secretary of State:-

Cambridgeshire;
Cheshire;
East Sussex (1&2)
Hampshire (South);
Northamptonshire (2);
Staffordshire;

2 the deletion of a proposed policy from the submitted plan by the Secretary of State:-

Dorset (South East);
Hampshire (North East)
Nottinghamshire;
Shropshire;
South Glamorgan;
Warwickshire (2).
Hereford and Worcester - the insertion of a positive new settlement policy into the approved structure plan alterations (DoE 1990c)

Kent - indication that the new settlement option should be considered through the local planning process (Kent County Council 1987a, Planning 1989).

So only about half of the proposed new settlement strategies and policies have been accepted by the Secretary of State, and even here, there have, in some cases, been significant modifications to the form of the policy approved. These baldly stated outcomes do mask a considerable degree of change over the study period. Most importantly, there has been a discernible change in the central state's approach to the form of policy approved, which parallels the change in formal policy statements discussed in Chapter 6, and to some extent the shift in the accepted forum for consideration of the issue. The degree of controversy which the issue of new settlements has attracted has also varied, not only temporally, but also spatially.

**New Settlement Policies**

In Amos (1990a - page 19) two types of new settlement policies were identified

1. Reactive - where the policy provides a set of criteria for use in development control when determining planning applications for new villages or communities.

2. Proactive - a positive proposal for a new settlement(s) in a particular location(s), aimed at implementing the structure plan strategy. Criteria are specified for assessing the acceptability of proposals in the defined location.

Since then policy approaches have been refined, possibly becoming more sophisticated, and it is now possible to distinguish four forms of policy (as set out in Amos 1991d - page 304)

- negative - a new settlement is not deemed to be necessary or appropriate;
- reactive - setting out criteria for assessing new settlement applications;
• enabling - indicating that a new settlement may be appropriate, but that any proposals should come through the local plan process (a general location in the form of a district or districts and a possible scale may be suggested);

• positive - proposing a new settlement of a specific scale in a general or specific location or district.

The difference between proactive and reactive/enabling policies is that the proactive policy

reflects a positive decision by the CPA or the SoS that a new settlement(s) is desirable, within clearly defined parameters, as part of the plan strategy on the location, scale and distribution of new housing provision, and of growth in general (Amos 1990a - page 20)

By adopting reactive or enabling policies, CPAs (or the Secretary State) have accepted that new settlements may be appropriate but that they do not form part of the overall strategy of the plan. It is left to other mechanisms (i.e. planning applications or local plans) to determine the necessity for individual schemes. Enabling policies are distinguished from reactive policies in that they provide a framework and criteria for District Councils to determine the need for new settlements through their local planning process.

Table 9.10 classifies the policy approaches in submitted or approved structure plan reviews, including the Secretary of State's modifications to these policies. The Table does not include those policy proposals which have been floated by CPAs in draft reviews or alterations, but which have later been dropped from the submission document.

Proactive policies have been the most common type of policy, although the Secretary of State has tended to approve enabling policies, particularly in recent years. A negative policy is unusual as CPAs have, normally, simply rejected a strategy or framework including new settlements, rather than include a negative policy. The Secretary of State has also not favoured reactive policies, and has, in those cases in which a decision has been made on the submitted plan, substituted enabling policies. The following sections analyse these policy types in a little more detail, giving examples of each approach.
TABLE 9.10

FORMS OF NEW SETTLEMENT POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>REACTIVE</th>
<th>ENABLING</th>
<th>PROACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Cheshire&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Cheshire&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dorset (South East)&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hereford &amp;</td>
<td>Nottinghamshire&lt;sup&gt;ad&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Norfolk&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northamptonshire&lt;sup&gt;ab&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>South Glamorgan&lt;sup&gt;ad&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire&lt;sup&gt;gd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Warwickshire&lt;sup&gt;ad&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire&lt;sup&gt;gd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: a = as proposed by CPA; b = as approved by SoS; c = as inserted by SoS (final, approved version differs in content but not form from version in proposed modifications; d = deleted by SoS; e = in Rural Areas policy area; f = in Norwich policy area; g = proposed by SoS
Source: Author

Negative Policies

The only negative new settlement policy is that proposed by Norfolk County Council in the review of the structure plan covering the area of the county outside the Norwich Policy Area, submitted in February 1991 (Norfolk County Council 1991). The County is split into four main policy areas, and in the Rural Policy Area (the largest), policy R.6 indicates that "no provision will be made for a new village" (NCC 1991 - page 126). The structure plan review for the Norwich Policy Area includes a positive new settlement policy (NCC 1989), but the main reason for opposition to a new settlement in the rural area is that

One or two large single allocations, in the form of new villages, in a large geographic area with a relatively low population density could not be justified. It would be likely that a new village in the Rural Policy Area would have only a low degree of self-containment, being dependant on one of the major urban centres for employment thereby encouraging longer distance commuting. There is sufficient capacity within existing settlements to accommodate growth without unac-
ceptable harm to their character and environmental quality (NCC 1991 - page 127)

So, in essence, the rejection of a new settlement there follows the pattern in other areas where the high level of unutilised planning permissions for residential development and spare capacity in existing settlements point to the lack of need for the release of housing land on the scale of a new village.

Reactive Policies

I suggested earlier that a reactive policy is one which provides criteria for assessing new settlement proposals coming from the private sector, but within a framework in which new settlements do not form part of the general strategy of the structure plan review. This is made clear in the policy formulated by Cheshire County Council (1988a, 1988b, 1990), for "the basic strategy of Cheshire 2001 and the scale of development proposed can be met without the development of any new communities" (CCC 1990 - page 26). But, unlike the situation in Norfolk, where a new settlement is seen as having a detrimental effect (lack of self-containment and out commuting), here "the establishment of a new community in the countryside can be an equally satisfactory way of providing new development". Policy GS10 provides a set of criteria for considering proposals

A development to provide a new community may be allowed as an exception to Policy GS7 provided that it has no greater overall impact on the environment or on services than would development on the edge of nearby towns and villages and it meets the following conditions:

- large enough to provide a variety of housing, and range of community facilities

- not so large as to be of a 'town' rather than a 'village' scale

- a provision of community building, facilities for pre-school children and a shop

- a high quality of design and landscaping and a low impact the surrounding countryside

- good access to the main road network, school and health facilities
- the development should not overload local public services such as schools or should provide for them to be upgraded to a satisfactory standard

- some employment opportunities should be provided

- to include a range of house types and, preferably, to provide for different types of tenure (CCC 1990 - page 26)

In addition, any new village proposals would need to be assessed in the light of the policies on housing and on green belts. The policy itself is rather imprecise in relation to the scale or size which would be most appropriate, for, as the reason justification indicates, the development

must not be so large as to cause housing development in any one district to exceed the level set out in policy H1, yet should be of a minimum size to ensure economic provision of essential services and cater for a range of needs of its residents and provide sufficient facilities to provide the basis for the establishment of a free-standing community (CCC 1990 - page 26)

The Secretary of State modified this to an enabling policy, again with a rather general reference to 'village' scale, making it clear that "any proposals for larger settlements would need to be considered as part of the next review of this Plan" (DoE/DTp 1992b - paragraph 8.11).

A reactive policy with the same general purpose but with a rather different emphasis is that included by Gwent County Council in their deposit version of the structure plan review. Here "the clear need for the release of a considerable amount of housing land is seen as the prime justification for the establishment of a new settlement" (GCC 1992 - page 19) rather than, as in the case of Cheshire's GS10, that a new settlement may be an acceptable alternative form of urban development which has no greater environmental or economic costs than 'normal' urban expansion. In this sense, the Gwent strategy and the policy (H3) is rather more positive (for the full text of this and other policies not detailed here, see Appendix 2).

3The plan is interesting as that it is one of the first (if not the first) to be prepared under the revised procedures. So rather than being submitted to the Secretary of State (Welsh Office), it is placed on deposit and may be adopted by the County Council, although the Secretary of State has reserve powers to 'call it in', if necessary.
The policy gives clear guidance on the general areas where new settlements would be unacceptable and on the performance criteria which should be met (these cover the same general areas as the Cheshire policy). It clearly links new settlement provision to the provision of wider benefits (or planning gain, which are set out in more detail in another policy (H10)). It does not, however, specify the scale of new settlement which would be appropriate, although this is set out in the justification for the policy in the following terms:

Such developments would normally be within the range of approximately 200-1,000 dwellings, although in appropriate circumstances they could be larger, when considered beyond Structure Plan time horizons. Smaller schemes may warrant consideration under this policy if they amount to a significant proportionate increase in the size of the settlement (Gwent County Council 1992 - page 19).

The justification also gives more guidance on the locations where a new settlement might be necessary, firmly linking this to the need for the release of additional housing land, especially in Monmouth Borough, where development pressures are likely to be strongest along the M4 corridor in South East Gwent, particularly in the Chepstow and Caldicot areas. It is in this part of Gwent where a new settlement may be most appropriate (Gwent County Council 1992 - page 20).

Policies of this nature dealing with major urban development are unlikely to be totally self contained in that certain aspects of the development, like, as in this case, employment, shopping and planning gain, are covered by other policies. So the new settlements policy needs to be seen in the context of these policies and those protecting agricultural land, green spaces and other environmentally sensitive areas.

The common characteristic of reactive policies is that they provide a framework for decision making in relation to private sector proposals. They may also form a framework for local plans, although this is not usually explicitly stated in this type of policy approach. The form and detail of the framework obviously varies, although reference is made in both the policies outlined here to the community benefits required. Scale is treated less specifically and the preciseness with which appropriate locations are specified varies.
Enabling Policies

I have already suggested that the Department of the Environment (or the Secretary of State) has shown a marked and growing preference for an enabling form of policy, in modifying, for example, both the submitted Cheshire and Staffordshire reactive policies to this form (Secretary of State NDa, Departments of Environment and Transport 1991a). In general, enabling policies provide for new settlements to be considered through the local plan process, and so for a greater role for District Councils in the process. So that, as in the final version of policy 68 of the Staffordshire Replacement Structure Plan,

As part of the examination of the options for meeting housing requirements in the area, the District Councils may consider the contribution that new settlements might make towards meeting those requirements (DoE/DTp 1991a - page 17)

The enabling form of new settlement policy first emerged in 1990, when the Secretary of State approved the Hereford and Worcester Structure Plan Alterations (DoE 1990c). In the proceed Modifications he had considered inserting a new settlement policy which was district specific and which included a reference to the scale of settlement which might be appropriate (Secretary of State NDb). Here it was the 'new village' scale of 200 - 1,000 dwellings.

The final version of the policy was again district specific, although now the appropriate districts or sub areas (Droitwich in Wychavon and Redditch) were indicated not in the policy itself but in the policies relating to housing provision in those districts (DoE 1990c). The policy (H20A) stated

Any proposal for a new village, which will normally be considered only in relation to policies H 5 and H 6, and which should come forward through the local plan process, will be assessed against the following criteria:

i. it is consistent in size with the scale of existing villages in the sub area, and is of a character appropriate to the location;
ii. it will not adversely affect the character and setting of adjacent settlements;
iii. social, community and educational services are available or readily accessible or can be economically provided;
iv. it provides a range of housing types (including low-cost housing);
v. it meets high standards of layout, landscaping and design;
vi. it will not damage the Green Belt by reason of its siting, material design or traffic generation;

vii. adequate infrastructure can be readily provided;
viii. contributions will be expected from developers towards the costs of community facilities and to meet all or most of the costs of providing new infrastructure, road improvements and similar requirements generated by the new development;

ix. it is acceptable in relation to the environment, ecology and historical and landscape quality of the area;

x. additional traffic can be accommodated on the road system without undue environmental, operational and safety consequences, and the road system can be improved to meet those consequences;

xi. it is located with due regard to the availability of public transport, including that by rail;

xii. it will not take the best and most versatile agricultural land, unless there is no other site suitable for the purpose (DoE 1990d - pages 17 & 18).

The specific reference to scale in the proposed Modifications was dropped and replaced by the less precise criterion relating the size of the new settlement to that of existing villages, and by the scale implicit in the description 'new village' to which the policy was directed.

The requirements for infrastructure and community, social and educational facilities, and for developer contributions towards these (planning gain) parallels that in the DoE Discussion Paper (DoE 1988a) and in the draft of PPG.

In the policies on housing provision in the Droitwich and Redditch sub areas, the relationship with Policy H20A was made clear:

As part of the examination of the options for meeting housing requirements in the area, the District Council may consider the contribution that a new village might make towards meeting those requirements. Any new village proposal should come forward through the statutory local plan process, and will be assessed against the criteria set out in the policy H20A (DoE 1990c - page 3).
As indicated earlier, a very similar form of words emerged in later enabling policies as modified by the Secretary of State.

The approved policy (RES 5) in Northamptonshire’s County Structure Plan Alteration no. 1 is rather more positive than the policy in Hereford and Worcester, although it is described by the Secretary of State as "a general development control policy" providing "a framework against which future proposals can be examined as an option for meeting housing needs in the County" (DoE/DTP 1989a, DoE/DTP 1992b). It does however go further than a development control policy (which have here been categorised as reactive policies), for it is perhaps unusually positive in indicating that consideration will be given to proposals, since, in most cases, the qualification 'normally' is added, or the policy is couched conditionally with the use of 'may'. The only guidance on scale is the reference to 'small', although the emphasis here is on new settlements, rather than, as in the case of the modifications to the Hereford and Worcester policy, on new villages. In this way the policy is imprecise, and moreover it lacks any form of locational guidance as well, not indicating the districts or plan areas where new settlements might be appropriate.

However, it emphasises the role of the locals plan process, but, whereas other forms of enabling policy have referred to proposals emerging from this process, it refers to locations. This is, perhaps, an error, since the criteria refer partly to requirements which schemes or proposals should meet (be well designed, offer a range of housing types, meet the costs of facilities, provide local employment, etc.). It may also reflect the lack of clarity in the thinking on the relationship between the local plan process and the promotion of private sector new settlements which has characterised central state policy.

As with the other enabling policies, the performance criteria which would need to be met are fairly stringent, and include a requirement for 'planning gain', including the provision of social housing. Interestingly, in view of the central state’s policy on new settlements in the revised PPG which emerged a couple of months after the Northamptonshire Alteration was approved, there is a requirement for any new settlement to improve the environment, a consideration which, as I indicated earlier, now forms a central plank of the central state’s approach.
Proactive Policies

The main characteristic of a proactive policy is that it positively promotes or proposes a new settlement as part of the overall strategy of the structure plan review for accommodating new growth. It may take a variety of forms, and, in particular, the degree of specificity of the new settlement location may vary.

The first example is from a structure plan process which was lengthy, attracted considerable controversy and resulted in a significant intervention by the Secretary of State - Cambridgeshire. Here the County Council proposed a new settlement, accompanied by a detailed policy (P20/2) and an indication of the site on the Key Diagram (Cambridgeshire County Council 1987a). The policy was fairly site specific, indicating that

The new settlement will be limited to an ultimate size of no more than 3,000 dwellings at a location in East Cambridgeshire to be determined by the Local Authorities according to the following criteria:-

(i) North of the River Great Ouse (Old West River) and south of the A1123.
(ii) Safe and easy access to the A10 Trunk Road
(iii) Maintain physical separation between the settlement and existing settlements
(iv) Minimise loss of high grade agricultural land
(v) Minimise unnecessary infrastructure costs or flood risks (Cambridgeshire County Council 1987 - page 190).

Both the scale ("no more than 3,000 dwellings") and the location are set out in detail, although the precise site, within the narrowly defined area of search, is to be left to the LPAs. The Secretary of State eventually accepted the principle of significant accommodation of housing in the form of a new settlement, but modified the policy radically by providing for two, rather than one, new settlements, and altered the form of the policy as well as the area(s) of search (Secretary of State 1988, DoE/DTp 1989b).

The policy is positive ("provision will be made"), with some locational guidance, in this case references in both parts of the policy to road corridors and broadly defined areas of search ("west or east of Cambridge" and "between Cambridge and Ely") with additional performance criteria on location as well. Again in both parts of the policy the required size of the settlement is specified, with guidance on the time scale of provision. This is
rather unusual, although other proactive policies have tended to make development conditional on developers fulfilling other requirements such as the provision of infrastructure, or on the preparation of a local plan.

However, it is possible to criticise the form of the new settlement policy which the Secretary of State included, and in the light of subsequent events, to which I shall refer later, the criticisms can be seen as being justified, as the deficiencies, perhaps, contributed to the generally unsatisfactory process which resulted. First the areas of search can be seen as being too broad (the whole of the A45 corridor in South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire outside the Green Belt, and the A10 corridor from Cambridge to Ely). The performance criteria set out strategic objectives which the new settlements should help to achieve (make a significant contribution to the development needs of Cambridge, or serve the development requirements of the sub-area and act as a catalyst for growth to the north), but these are too loose and not capable of precise geographical identification. The process of formulating a strategy based around new settlements, and of a policy for them, had been accompanied by considerable private sector pressure, in the shape of a range of competing schemes, and the manner in which the new settlement areas of search were identified and specified in the approved policy did little, if anything, to aid the process of deciding between them.

Second, and linked to this, although the policy was positive, it gave no guidance on the process by which the provision for new settlements was to be implemented. Was it, for example, to be through a local plan or through the determination of planning applications? In both cases, the cross boundary nature of the policy, and of the schemes already submitted, made this difficult, at least for the District Councils, to achieve. It therefore points to some of the problems of providing a strategic framework for accommodating new settlements, which, on the one hand, is not too specific in terms of the precise location, but which, on the other hand, offers sufficient guidance on location to restrict the degree of competition between alternative schemes.

Table 9.10 indicates that the Secretary of State has not always accepted new settlement strategies and policies, and nor has he invariably accepted, perhaps with modifications, a proactive policy. Such policies have been deleted from reviews in South East Dorset, South Glamorgan, Nottinghamshire and Warwickshire. The policy (3/2) in the submission draft of the Nottinghamshire Structure Plan Review dealt with the location of major residential development, including the provision of a new settlement. It was positive, related to a single district, and was fairly specific on the location, if not on the
precise site, of the new village, proposing that provision would be made in Newark & Sherwood for a new village south-east of Balderton.

Neither the policy nor the justification specify the scale of the provision, and although it is included in the figures for the planning area, these do not break down the provision for each major site. So, the only reference to scale is that implicit in "new village". However, since Newark and Sherwood District Council had begun formulating a local plan for the area (the Newark on Trent Local Plan Consultative Draft) which had already proposed a new settlement at Balderton and given some indication of its proposed size, this is unsurprising (Newark and Sherwood DC 1989) (See also Chapter 10).

The Secretary of State first modified the policy in the Proposed Modifications to an enabling policy, with a reference to the areas where new settlements might be appropriate (Secretary of State NDC), and then deleted it entirely from the final, approved version (DoE/DTp 1991b), although without giving any reasoned justification for doing so.

An equally location specific proposal for a new settlement was included by Warwickshire County Council in their alterations to the structure plan. The policy in the draft plan had identified three areas of search and broad locations, and made provision for new settlements of between 1,500 and 3,000 dwellings, with the precise size and locations to be determined through the local plan process (Warwickshire County Council 1989). Development interests put forward a number of schemes, as in a number of other cases where positive policies emerged in the early stages of the review process. The submitted version of the plan refined this, accepting one of the proposals for a particular location, for

following consultation, the County Council decided to include a specific proposal for a new settlement in the Long Marston area, south of Stratford-upon-Avon, but to reject other proposals for new settlements (Warwickshire County Council 1990 - page 67)

The policy itself (H6.1) is short and to the point

within the overall level of housing provision set out in Policy H2, provision shall be made for a new settlement in the Long Marston area (Warwickshire County Council 1990 - page 67)
The location, rather than an area of search, is indicated on the Key Diagram. The policy is significantly different from that in the draft alterations, with the reference to size deleted. The revised policy gives no guidance on this, except to relate it to the housing provision for the rural area of Stratford-upon-Avon District, given as 6,500 dwellings in policy H2. The reasoned justification for the policy, after setting out at length the then current government policy, as expressed in circulars and the draft of PPG 3, goes on to address scale, but without putting forward a concrete figure in deciding on an appropriate size for any new settlement, we have had regard to the need to ensure that these are sufficiently large to make the provision of a range of services economically viable. If this cannot be done there will be the risk of the establishment of dormitory housing estates, divorced from any settlement, which could not be regarded as proper settlements. We are conscious that a settlement of this size would be quite large in relation to the existing pattern of villages in Warwickshire. However, to create a viable settlement that makes a significant contribution to the housing requirements, this may have to be accepted (Warwickshire County Council 1990 - page 66)

The justification for the new settlement is the need for housing land, and for the scale, the need to ensure a range of services. As in the case of Nottinghamshire, the Secretary of State first modified the policy to an enabling policy, deleting the reference to Long Marston, on the advice of the EiP Panel (Secretary of State 1991), and then deleted it from the approved plan altogether (DoE 1991d). It was felt that, as attaining the level of housing provision required in the plan did not depend on the provision of a new settlement, the inclusion of such a policy would give rise to uncertainty.

The final example of a proactive policy is that set out in Suffolk County Council's second Alteration of the County Structure Plan (Suffolk County Council 1990). In the policies for the Ipswich Sub Region, Policy IP16 proposed that provision would be made for a new settlement to the east of Ipswich capable of accommodating approximately 2,000 dwellings. The area of search for the new settlement is shown on the Key Diagram. The policy is largely concerned with the location of the proposed new settlement, and requirements for landscaping, layout and design are set out in the reasoned justification for the policy. Although the provision "for new infrastructure, education and community facilities by or at the expense of the developer" is also mentioned in the justification, a separate policy on developer contributions to infrastructure in general reinforces the requirements (Suffolk County Council 1990 - page 45).
The policy is particularly specific in terms of the required scale, and the locational requirements, but the more qualitative criteria which have been used in other policies of this type are absent. Mechanisms of delivery of the proposal are not addressed in the policy itself, although it is evident from the discussion which precedes it that a major role is envisaged for the district council through the preparation of a Local Plan for the area and of a master plan for the new settlement (Suffolk County Council 1990).

Conclusions on the form of policy for new settlements

There has been a discernible move away from proactive forms of policy towards enabling policies, particularly by the Secretary of State in his modifications to those structure plan reviews on which decisions have been made since 1988. Some CPAs, however, most notably Norfolk and Suffolk, are still pursuing positive new settlement strategies based upon proactive policies.

The form of individual policies in each of the four categories I have outlined has varied considerably. First, the approach to scale has been more explicit in proactive policies than in enabling or reactive policies, although this is to be expected, given that the proactive form of policy emerges from a strategy in which a new settlement(s) has a clear role, normally to meet a determined shortfall in the amount of housing land available and/or to relieve pressure for new housing elsewhere. So, the level of provision to be made in the new settlement will have been determined, and set out in the policy. In many of the positive new settlement policies, the size of new settlement proposed is fairly small, around 1,000 dwellings, and closely related to the new village concept set out in the DoE's Discussion Paper (DoE 1988a). The concept has, then, been influential, on CPAs' policy responses as much as on the private sector, as some of the policies to which I have referred post-date the publication of the Discussion Paper, and often explicit reference is made to it in the reasoned justification for the policy.

There has also been a marked variation in the approach to the identification of new settlement locations, and in particular a retreat from the specific allocation of sites. Table 9.11 indicates these approaches, and shows the range from the definition of broad areas of search through to site specific policies.
TABLE 9.11

APPROACHES TO THE IDENTIFICATION OF NEW SETTLEMENT LOCATIONS IN PROACTIVE POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Broad areas of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Broad area of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Narrowly defined area of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>Narrowly defined area of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>Virtually site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Virtually site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>Virtually site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>Site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>Site specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The Table refers to the policies as finally adopted or approved, although of those which were site specific or virtually site specific, the Warwickshire policy at the draft stage merely defined broad areas of search (and as a consequence generated a considerable response from the private sector, as did the proposed policy in Cambridgeshire). As I have outlined earlier, the Secretary of State has moved away from approving policies which refer in specific terms to particular sites and locations, and even away from defining individual districts where new settlements might be appropriate (except in a few instances).

The approach in enabling policies has also been varied, although spatial definition has largely been at the level of whole districts, rather than more specific locations, as is to be expected from the nature of this policy type.

The number and range of criteria included in policies has increased and broadened over time. It is possible to detect some degree of interplay as the form of policy, and, in particular, the range of criteria adopted in a policy in one structure plan review have later been incorporated into other reviews. This is especially apparent in the modifications made to policies by the DoE (or Secretary of State), where, for example, the approach of the West Midlands Regional Office of the DoE has been consistently applied resulting in
broadly similar outcomes in terms of policy form in the Shropshire, Staffordshire and Warwickshire reviews.

A criterion which has become increasingly important is that relating to the requirements for the provision of community benefits or planning gain. These have increasingly been set out in more detail, although in some cases, perhaps not in sufficient detail to avoid problems at a later stage in the process. Again the influence of government policy pronouncements is apparent, in that the wording of requirements has often been taken almost unchanged from the draft PPG 3 in particular.

Most proactive policies have little to say on the phasing of the development of the proposed new settlement and those that do tend to tie housing provision in the settlement to the structure plan review period. So, for example, the A45 corridor new settlement in Cambridgeshire is required to meet short term housing land requirements, but in Suffolk it is envisaged that the new settlement "would continue to meet some of the housing needs of the area beyond 2006" (Suffolk County Council 1990 - page 44). It therefore has both a short term and a long term role, and although this is acknowledged in the policy itself, phasing of housing development is not specifically included.

Most of the positive strategies and proactive or enabling policies have, however, been rather less clear about the form of delivery mechanisms for implementing the policy provisions. It has been expected that the private sector would take a lead role, and certainly none of the positive policies of the 1980s and 1990s envisage the form of local state involvement that characterised some of the new settlements of the two previous decades. As Smith and Vigor (1986 - page 323) indicate in relation to the Cambridgeshire new settlements "financial and other restrictions will not allow the councils to become the developer". There have, then, been no proposals for local state led new settlements similar to South Woodham Ferrers or Cramlington for example. The local state's role as described explicitly or implicitly in the policy documents can be seen as including one or more of

- the provision of a strategic framework, including policy/planning objectives;
- the identification of general, and in some cases, specific locations through the strategic framework or through local plans;
- the identification of the appropriate scale (possibly through the local plan process);
- the control of development through development control powers, briefs, agreements, or other means;
• involvement in overall layout and design through the preparation of a master plan;
• negotiation over provision of services, facilities etc.;
• the provision of some facilities.

A key role then is envisaged for the local plan process and for Districts in preparing these (see also the following Chapter). First, many policies, or reasoned justifications follow the same pattern as Suffolk (see above) in proposing that a local plan identify the precise location and scale of a new settlement. In some cases, jointly prepared local plans may be necessary, where, as in Berkshire, the area of search for a new settlement spans an inter district boundary (Berkshire County Council 1991). A rather different form of policy was proposed by Kent County Council in their Second Alterations, in which, although local plans were to be the main vehicle, new settlements would be considered as one option where significant releases of fresh housing land were required. The district council are given some location and practical guidance, but it is left to them, through their local plan, to determine the form that housing land allocations should take, and where this land is to be released. The County Council dropped this policy option from their submitted Alteration (Kent County Council 1987b), but, although the Secretary of State did not reinstate it, or insert a positive new settlement policy, he did suggest that the issue should be addressed in a local plan. Although at the time it appeared

that a new settlement should come via the local, rather than structure, plan route
is a seemingly contrary decision in the light of the Secretary of State's own
guidance (Amos 1990a - page 15)

as I have earlier indicated, the local plan route is now the preferred route.

Second, the local plan may have a role in identifying the precise requirements of the development, so, for example,

a local plan will be prepared which will identify the infrastructure services and open space required for the implementation of the development (Dorset County Council 1986, 1988)

Aside from these two roles for a local plan, the precise mechanism for delivery or for implementation of strategic policy proposals receive little, and isolated, attention. In proposing "the properly phased and co-ordinated development of a new settlement" at
Stone Cross, East Sussex County Council tied its development to a local plan and to service provision, for

These proposals will not be permitted until:-
(i) a local plan for the area has been approved and adopted.
(ii) there has been a commitment to make resources available for the provision of all the capital works required to service the development, regardless of where these are located (East Sussex County Council 1982 - page 3)

The Secretary of State modified this, retaining the basic intent, but rewording the requirement for service provision.

Similarly Dorset County Council also consider development mechanisms in their proposal for a large new settlement (subsequently deleted by the Secretary of State)

a local plan will be prepared..... and thereafter financial and other agreements will be concluded with potential developers to reflect the requirements of the local plan. No planning permission will be granted in advance of the provision or agreement on the provision, financing and programming of the infrastructure services and open space identified in the local plan (Dorset County Council 1986)

There is also little consideration of the links between the strategic structure plan review/alteration policies, local plans (prepared by the Districts) and private sector schemes. In few cases has the traditional rational-comprehensive form of planning taken place, with structure plans providing the broad framework, local plans providing greater detail and identifying precise sites, and the private sector following the allocations set out in the local plan. The process of formulating strategic policies has itself generated private sector schemes which have, in a sense, pre-empted the local plan process. This is particularly the case in Cambridgeshire and Warwickshire, although other review processes have also generated a number of competing schemes. The next Chapter considers the form of the Local Planning process for new settlements.
CONCLUSIONS

This Chapter has provided a general overview of the extent and form of the consideration of new settlements in the structure plan reviews which have taken place in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Table 9.12 provides a summary of the information discussed, indicating, for each county (and for each relevant review process in those counties where new settlements have been raised during more than one review process)

- when the issue of new settlements was first considered (the year);
- the actor or actors responsible for forcing this consideration of the issue;
- the initial outcome (whether the CPA accepted or rejected a new settlement policy framework);
- the form of the policy put forward by the CPA (where this occurred);
- the decision made on the new settlement policy framework by the Secretary of State (where a decision has been made); and
- whether there is a current policy context for new settlements, and, if so, its form (in terms of the policy types discussed above).

TABLE 9.12

SUMMARY - THE NEW SETTLEMENT STRUCTURE PLAN POLICY PROCESS AND CURRENT FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>OPTION FIRST RAISED</th>
<th>ACTOR(S)</th>
<th>INITIAL OUTCOME</th>
<th>POLICY FORM</th>
<th>SoS DECISION</th>
<th>NS POLICY CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Option¹</td>
<td>Proposed²</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Option¹</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>OPTION FIRST RAISED</td>
<td>ACTOR(S)</td>
<td>INITIAL OUTCOME</td>
<td>POLICY FORM</td>
<td>SoS DECISION</td>
<td>NS POLICY CONTEXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA/HBF</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Option¹</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected Deleted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (Rest)</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>NOT*</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES Draft - reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling/</td>
<td>Proposed²</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling/</td>
<td>Proposed²²</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>CPA/HBF</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling/</td>
<td>Proposed²²</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling/</td>
<td>Proposed²²</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Inserted</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Enabling/strategic
²² Proposed
b Rejected
³³ Proposed
²²² Proposed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>OPTION FIRST RAISED</th>
<th>ACTOR(S)</th>
<th>INITIAL OUTCOME</th>
<th>POLICY FORM</th>
<th>SoS DECISION</th>
<th>NS CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>CPA/SoS</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Accepted d</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>CPA/SoS</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling options 1</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Glamorgan</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>proactive/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA/DPAs</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>draft -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>SoS/CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Proposed2</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>enabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>EIP Panel</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>OPTION FIRST RAISED</td>
<td>ACTOR(S) INITIAL OUTCOME</td>
<td>POLICY FORM</td>
<td>SoS DECISION</td>
<td>NS POLICY CONTEXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>HBF/developer Accepted</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>CPA Accepted Proactive</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES proactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>EIP Panel Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>CPA Accepted Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Glamorgan</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Developer Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Parish Council Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: NOT = not referred to. 1 = options for housing land provision including a new settlement (with scale and general location specified). 2 = Proposed by SoS. a = except in relation to addition of 'township' at Braintree. b = SoS proposed to inset policy in draft Modifications, but dropped from approved/final modifications, c = SoS proposed substantial provision in Hart District would be in the form of a new settlement, but left to the DC to determine the precise scale and location - later dropped from the final Modifications, d = SoS accepted the general aim of the policy, but did not insert a formal policy, e = modified from the draft version, f = Structure Plans for two different policy areas, one of which has a negative policy and the other a proactive policy, g = policy framework considered in Greater York study, a precursor to the structure plan review, h = from the Draft Modifications.

Source: Author

Both the preceding discussion and the information in Table 9.12 indicate the considerable variety of approaches and outcomes. Only in 13 counties is there a specific policy framework for new settlements. These are largely in or on the fringes of the South East, or elsewhere where there are particular pressures on housing land, linked mainly to green belt restoring policies, such as in Cheshire, Hereford and Worcester and North Yorkshire. In fact in five of these counties the policy is in draft only still to be determined by the Secretary of State.

The areas where there are positive new settlement strategies can be divided into two main groups based on the strategic thrust of the planning policy framework.
considerable growth, as in designated growth areas (like South Hampshire or Ashford in Kent)

restraint strategies, where new settlements can divert pressure, as in Cambridgeshire, North Yorkshire, or Cheshire, or areas of restraint, where the environmental or infrastructure capacity for further development is low (East Sussex)

On the whole, though, many CPAs and anti growth movements have tended to see a strong link between new settlements and high levels of growth, and so

as a result they have tended to be dropped from review strategies when the overall level of new housing development is reduced (for example, Kent, North-east Hampshire, Berkshire and Dorset), or rejected by the SoS in similar circumstances, as in West Sussex (Amos 1990a - page 31)

In addition, new settlement options have been dismissed by CPAs or by the Secretary of State where

• the general trust of policy is towards urban regeneration;
• the overall level of proposed growth is low;
• the proposed level of growth can be accommodated in existing settlements without adverse consequences to their character, etc.;
• there are particular policy constraints on development, including green belt or high quality landscapes;
• infrastructure is overloaded.

As I have shown the form of new settlement strategy or policy framework has tended to vary not only spatially, with different CPAs adopting different approaches, but also over time, especially in relation to the interventions by the Secretary of State through the modification process. This can be explained to some extent by changing policy and by contention within the central state itself, as it is clear that approaches have varied between DoE regional offices, and more fundamentally between Secretaries of State. This is demonstrated by the apparent divergence of view between Heseltine and his predecessor over the content of PPG 3 (to which I referred earlier) (Planning 1991e).
The Key Research Aims

So, to return to the central research themes, it is necessary to consider where the power in policy formulation and implementation lies and which actor has had the major influence. Policy formulation is a complex process in which the interaction of the various actors, including both the local and central state, as well as the private sector and other agencies has an impact. Certainly in some cases, policy formulation has been led by the market in the sense that strategies have been formulated to deal with market driven pressures. The rudimentary analysis so far of the major actor(s) in the new settlement policy process indicates that, on the whole, the local state has been responsible for the initial form of strategies and policies, and that where developers have attempted to directly influence the outcome, through, for example, floating schemes at EiPs, they have been unsuccessful.

Looking first at the role of the central state, it can be argued that it has had a key role in policy formulation for new settlements in structure plans, principally through the modification and approval process. This is demonstrated in relation to the outcomes indicated in Tables 9.9 and 9.12, where the central state has rejected, in six cases, locally formulated strategies, which included provision for new settlements, and policies which were designed to govern this provision. In addition of course, in those instances where the case for a new settlement strategy or policy put forward by the local state (mainly CPAs) was accepted by the central state, the majority of these policies were altered in the modification procedure. The effect of this modification has usually been to fundamentally alter the policy intent. Such intervention is not, of course, limited solely to the issue of new settlements, for in a related policy area, that of housing land allocations, Simmie (1986) has shown the extent to which locally determined housing land provisions have been normally increased by the Secretary of State.

This all tends to confirm Barker's (1983 - page 281) observation that the role of the central state (the DoE) in the structure plan process "has been a close and activist influence amounting to control". Indeed as I suggested earlier when reviewing central government policy on new settlements, the structure plan modification and approval process is one of the main ways in which the central state may implement its own policy and exercise control over the local state. This control of course extends only to the formulation of policy and not its implementation.
In terms of the local state, the CPA is obviously the key actor in initial structure plan policy formulation, although the District Councils have a participatory role as well as consultative one. There may be considerable contention between District Councils and the CPA. In fact lack of support by Districts for the form or content of the policy put forward by the CPA has been responsible for influencing the decision made by the central state in a number of cases. Here again the examples of Berkshire, South East Dorset, North East Hampshire, Kent, Nottinghamshire, Shropshire, South Glamorgan and Warwickshire may be cited, where the Secretary of State rejected or deleted new settlement policies faced with opposition by Districts. However, in Hereford and Worcester, District Council support for a new settlement option influenced the central state to include the option in the fact of opposition from the CPA.

The private sector has influenced the policy formulation process, either directly through representations at EiPs or during the consultation procedure, or indirectly through floating schemes during the initial stages of policy formulation. Private sector pressure for development, and more particularly for the development of new settlements, expressed the form of applications for planning permission or informal schemes, may be influential in creating a policy climate or framework which makes provision for new settlements. It may also have some impact on the form and content of the policy, particularly on the area(s) of search which may be identified, where the policy takes a proactive form.

Some assessment of the impact of the private sector on the policy framework for new settlements in structure plans may be made by comparing the overall number of schemes in individual counties with the type of policy framework which emerged. Table 9.13 combines much of the information in the summary Table 9.12 with the number of private sector schemes overall which have emerged in each of the counties over the last decade.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ACTOR(S)</th>
<th>INITIAL OUTCOME</th>
<th>POLICY FORM</th>
<th>SoS DECISION</th>
<th>NS POLICY CONTEXT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Option¹</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckinghamshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>CPA/Developers</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES Proactive</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES Enabling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clwyd</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>CPA/HBF</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Option¹</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset (South East)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyfed</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES Proactive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucestershire</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwent</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES Draft - reactive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwynedd</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (NE)</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>CPA developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Inserted</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertfordshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberside</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>CPA/SoS</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Glamorgan</td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>ACTOR(S)</td>
<td>INITIAL OUTCOME</td>
<td>POLICY FORM</td>
<td>SoS DECISION</td>
<td>NS POLICY CONTEXT</td>
<td>NUMBER OF SCHEMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Yorkshire</td>
<td>CPA/DPAs</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES draft-enabling</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>SoS/CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Proposed(^2)</td>
<td>Accepted Modified</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>EiP Panel CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Enabling</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Glamorgan</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>HBF/developer</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>YES enabling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>YES draft-proactive</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Glamorgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sussex</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 9.12
Source: Author

In general, where there has been little pressure for new settlements in form of applications or floated schemes, there has been either no consideration of the new settlement issue or consideration and rejection of the option at an early stage in the review process (usually in discussion documents preceding the publication of a draft review for consultation). This is the case in almost all of the counties with three or less schemes. So conversely, but not invariably, positive new settlement policy frameworks have not emerged in those areas where there has been little private sector pressure.
There are anomalies where there has been little manifest pressure, but where a positive policy framework has emerged, including Cheshire (with an enabling policy framework approved by the Secretary of State), and East Sussex (with a proactive policy framework also approved by the Secretary of State).

On the other hand, where there has been the greatest pressure (five or more proposals), then in most cases there has been consideration of a new settlement policy option at more than one stage in the review. Usually the option has initially been formulated as a proactive policy, although it may have later been dropped. The form of the policy process certainly gives the private sector an opportunity for canvassing schemes. So early consideration of a positive (proactive) policy framework by a CPA may generate a private sector response in terms of subsequent schemes, or the policy framework can be argued to be the outcome of such pressure.

The anomaly here is Essex with considerable private sector pressure, but no consideration of new settlements during the review process, and no positive policy framework for new settlements. In Warwickshire, Bedfordshire and Hampshire, early consideration may have generated a degree of pressure, but such pressure did not result in a positive policy climate.

So positive outcomes (in terms of policy frameworks which make some form of provision for new settlements) in relation to a degree of pressure have resulted in Cambridgeshire, Northamptonshire, North Yorkshire (in draft), Suffolk (in draft), Kent, Leicestershire (in draft) and Norfolk (in draft). It is therefore possible to tentatively conclude, that the degree of private sector pressure, in the form of applications and informal schemes, may have some impact on the outcome in the form of the nature of the emerging policy framework. At the least, and in general terms, the existence of private sector pressure can be postulated as one of the conditions necessary for the emergence of such a framework.

A number of writers, including Rydin (1983, 1985), Simmie (1986), Darke (1979), and Flynn (1981, 1983), have pointed to the power of the housebuilders' representative body, the HBF, and to its lobbying, particularly at the EiP. Certainly in wider terms, development interests have become incorporated into the planning process, as have the interests of the housebuilders, through joint land availability studies and the introduction of market criteria. The HBF has used the EiP to argue for increased housing land allocations, and has normally been successful (Simmie 1986). On new settlements,
both the HBF and individual housebuilding firms have appeared at EiPs, as well as making representations at other stages in the process, both for new settlement strategies and in support of individual schemes (Amos 1990b). However the success of such lobbying has not been marked, which may cast doubts on arguments about growing corporatism, and illuminate one of the contradictions of the conservative ideology, which seeks to facilitate the operation of the market but is forced to compromise when faced with anti-growth opposition in its heartland (Barlow and Savage 1986).

Both forms of pressure can have an impact on the content of policy as well as, or instead of, on its general form and nature. So that, for example, the final choice of location in a proactive strategy may be influenced by private sector schemes floated in that area. This may, perhaps, explain the choice of Long Marston in Warwickshire where two separate schemes were put forward, and again in Dorset, where a large scale proposal for a new settlement was endorsed in the submitted review, although, as in Warwickshire, deleted by the Secretary of State. The same is also true in the review policies in South Glamorgan (deleted by the Secretary of State), and South Hampshire and East Sussex (approved by the Secretary of State). There may be other forms of impact, but in order to uncover these it will be necessary to analyse the policy process in more detail.

Evidence on the role of other actors is less direct at this stage but it is clear that local anti growth movements have been prominent and influential, at least in particular cases, and that "anti-growth pressure has often been successful" (Amos 1990a - page 32). The numerous cases where the level of new housing land provisions in draft reviews have been reduced in the submitted document, and where new settlement policy proposals have been dropped tend to support this. As examples, it is clear from the reports of the consultation procedures and of the CPAs' reactions to submitted representations, that local anti-growth pressure was considerable in Berkshire, Cornwall, Hampshire, Kent, Somerset and Wiltshire, and instrumental in effecting change to the proposed policy framework. However conversely, although on far fewer occasions, anti-growth opposition has not always prevailed as in South Hampshire or Cambridgeshire (Amos 1990a - page 33).
Overall then it can be suggested that emergence of positive new settlement strategies can be accounted for by a number of conditions which may not be applicable in every case, but which provide, at least, a partial explanation. These include

- a buoyant housing market, arising from a high rate of growth and the need to make provision for a high level of new housing, coupled with, or, alternative to, the exercising of restraint on growth in particular areas. Most commonly, this restraint has taken the form of green belt policies designed to protect free-standing, historic cities, such as York, Cambridge or Chester, or policies to relieve the pressure on smaller, existing settlements;

- allied to high levels of demand, considerable private sector competition for housing sites, and especially for new settlement sites, the production of which is facilitated by the buoyant housing market;

- a coherent strategy from the CPA which seeks to accommodate growth;

- agreement between the CPA and the Districts on the need for a new settlement strategy, and so, lack of inter-authority conflict within the local state;

- relatively weak anti-growth movements which do not succeed in gaining support from the CPA or from the Districts;

- a new settlement option which is raised (normally by the CPA) at an early stage in the review process, since no new settlement policy has emerged where it has not been included amongst the options for accommodating growth during the stages prior to the preparation of the plan for submission to the Secretary of State.

This Chapter has set out to answer some of the basic questions about the policy formulation process for new settlements, although it has not dealt in detail with the interactions centred around this process in specific cases. Moreover it has not been concerned with policy implementation, which is a more complex process than is suggested by the basic models of the planning process. For, as Paul Cloke (1987c - page 23) indicates, "policy and implementation are not sequential; rather they are dynamic and interactive processes, each creating an impact on the other". It is important to look in greater depth at the policy formulation process itself, since policy options are constrained "by the
state-society relationship” (Cloke and Little 1986b - page 260), and by other relationships to which I have begun to point. These include

- the central-local state relationship, in which the local state has become increasingly constrained by central state control, as emerges from the analysis of the role of the central state in the structure plan review process;

- inter-agency relations, particularly at the level of the local state, between the CPA and District Councils (Cloke and Little 1987c);

- intra-agency relations, with potential conflicts between officers and members (Cloke and Little 1986b, 1987d, Healey and Underwood 1978);

- public-private sector relations, for the implementation of planning policy, particularly in relation to new settlements, depends upon the private sector.

So as Cloke and Little (1986b - page 261) indicate

there is an increasing dependence on private capital to finance development, and as a consequence investment patterns are inextricably linked with the logic of the market and the profit motive. The distribution policy of this investment is beyond the direct control of planning, placing further restrictions upon ‘what is possible’ in implementation terms...... it may not be erroneous to surmise that public aspirations take pretty full account of known private interests prior to the finalization of policy and to the procedures of implementation.

The next Chapter looks in more detail at a number of particular instances, by means of case studies, in order to uncover these relationships.
CHAPTER 10

POLICY FORMULATION FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS - LOCAL CHOICE?

NEW SETTLEMENTS IN LOCAL PLANS
INTRODUCTION

So far the analysis in this Part of the thesis has been concerned with strategic provision and policy for new settlements in structure plan reviews, and with the relative power and influence of the state and the market in this process. However, as I suggested when considering recent central state policy in Chapter 7, the onus appears to have shifted from the CPAs and structure plan reviews to District Planning Authorities (DPAs) and district wide local plans (or in certain areas to Unitary Development Plans (UDPs)), as the forum for determining the need for private new settlements (DoE 1992). Moreover, it is the local planning process which provides one of the means of developing and implementing the strategic policy set out in structure plan reviews, especially where those reviews have provided a positive policy framework. It also provides a mechanism (in addition to development control) for dealing with private sector pressure for new settlements where the structure plan policy framework is deficient or absent.

In one sense it is perhaps too early to consider how DPAs have responded to this in their local preparation, as the change in emphasis has been relatively recent. However, without, or in advance of, formal exhortations from central government, some DPAs have been using the local planning process for a variety of purposes in relation to new settlements for a number of years. So there is a range of experience and evidence to consider.

This Chapter sets out to discuss broadly similar issues to those examined in relation to the structure plan review process. So, the focus is on the relative roles and power of the state (central and local) and the private sector in the process of local planning for new settlements. In particular I shall consider

1. what are the particular roles or functions of Local Plans in relation to new settlements?
2. given that many CPAs have addressed new settlement issues in structure plan reviews, and, as I have shown earlier, positive new settlement strategies and policies have been formulated in a number of counties, what has been the relationship of Local Plans with the structure plan review process?
3. more specifically, what types of approaches to new settlements have been pursued by LPAs in the local planning process?
4. which actors have been involved in the local planning process?
what form have relations and interactions between actors taken and where does the balance of power lie in relation to the outcome of the process?

The analysis in this Chapter will be more selective than that in previous Chapters, concentrating on specific local plan processes, especially in the case study areas, but it will also seek to provide a general overview of local planning in relation to new settlements. In this, it will be concerned with other forms of policy guidance in addition to formal or statutory local plans, recognising that, although there is now a requirement for DPAs to produce district wide local plans, much of the planning activity in relation to new settlements undertaken in the past decade has, of necessity, taken place in a wide variety of forms.

THE ROLES OF LOCAL PLANS

As with structure plans, the legislation in which local plans are introduced is the Town and County Planning Act 1968. Similarly early progress was slow (Fudge 1982), as, for example, Healey (1979 - page 1), in a review of early progress, indicates that "by the end of 1978, only 12 local plans were in full operation". Again, as with structure plans, the local planning process is essentially iterative, with reviews of local plans being carried out in response to reviews of the strategic framework, changing local and national issues and priorities, and the amalgamation of previous plans (Coon 1988, Winter 1989, Morphet 1991).

The general functions of local plans are set out in circulars (DoE 1977, 1984b, 1987), Planning Policy Guidance Notes (DoE 1988g, 1990a), and in the manual on development plans (Ministry of Housing and Local Government 1970). These functions are

1. To develop and apply the strategy of the structure plan, by making proposals for the use and development of land;
2. To provide a detailed basis for development control, setting out the LPA's policies for the control of development;
3. To provide a basis for co-ordinating development to mobilise investment;
4. To bring detailed, local issues before the public, and to act as an arena for debate.

These are, of course, formal functions, and a number of writers, including Bruton and Nicholson (1987); Healey (1982, 1983); Healey et al (1982); Fudge, Lambert, Underwood and Healey (1983); Hill and Healey (1985); Davies, Edwards and Rowley (1986a,
and Loew (1979) point to a range of other purposes or functions which local plans have. These include

1. instruction documents for local authority activity;
2. information documents for a wide set of audiences concerned with land and development issues and public policy;
3. as expressions of how policies affect individual interests, and as a means of identifying those interests and of providing them with an opportunity to object;
4. to provide guidance for the Secretary of State, and support for the LPA, on appeal;
5. as a baseline for negotiation between the planning authority and developers;
6. as local political statements giving the authority's position on different issues;
7. arbitrating between conflicting interests;
8. sustaining a stable resolution to conflicting interests.

There may be significant conflicts between some of these functions, which may be manifest in "dilemmas over the form of the plan" (Underwood 1982 - page 139). In order to carry out the major, formal functions, and some of the other less formal functions, outlined above, Healey (1986a, 1986b) identifies six categories of tasks which are necessary

1. land allocation, typically where conflicts of interest are involved;
2. the co-ordination and progression of large development projects;
3. the attraction of resources for investment in the construction and renovation of the environment;
4. the organisation of investment in land-use change and development where a multiplicity of interests and land rights are involved;
5. the conservation of valued features of the environment; and
6. the management of small-scale change in the environment where this is important for strategic policy (Healey 1986a - page 10)

Of these, the evidence from the work undertaken by Healey and others indicates that local plans are very important for land allocation, especially in the urban fringe or for areas of open land, and for the conservation of open land; of limited use for the organisation of investment and attraction of resources; and normally too general for the co-ordination of resources (Healey, Davis, Wood and Elson 1982, Healey 1986b). Other forms of policy guidance may also be important, alongside, or instead of, local plans,
such as development briefs (for co-ordinating the development of specific areas or sites) or design briefs (for providing greater detail than local plans in relation to specific sites), and for organising investment as a whole (Bruton and Nicholson 1984a, 1984b). However in certain circumstances local plans have proved useful in co-ordinating and progressing development on sites on the urban fringe by securing commitment from public agencies to particular infrastructure projects, and in determining densities, layout and other site considerations (Healey 1986b - page 13)

**Actors in the Local Plan process**

Fudge, Lambert, Underwood and Healey (1983) identify nine groups of actors which are involved in plan preparation, and in the use of plans or are affected by the policies and proposals in plans, and it is possible to indicate their main roles and power in the local planning process:-

A) **Central Government** - direct central state control of the local planning process is less marked than it is in structure planning, but central government is able to exercise control over, first, the procedures of plan making, and second, influence the policy content through circulars and PPGs (as well as the requirement for conformity to the structure plan). Central government control of the local state's expenditure has a more wide ranging influence on plan implementation, particularly in relation to resource allocation (Raine 1982). In addition, more direct influence is exerted through the DoE Regional Offices.

B) **DoE Regional Offices** - which have formal and informal links with local planning, and seek "on behalf of the Secretary of State, to prevent conflict with national policy in local plans and to protect Secretary of State modifications to the structure plan" (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 11). The regional offices have conflict management and advisory roles as well, and so have a wide degree of influence.

C) **County Planning Authorities** -- CPAs have an influence, as I have shown, on the general policy context for local plans through the preparation and review of structure plans, and in some cases, they may be directly responsible for the preparation of local plans. Recent legislative changes have reduced their influence in the latter role, and in relation to ensuring the conformity of local plans to the structure plan, as well as in the
preparation of development plan schemes. There continues to be wide ranging liaison with the potential for inter-authority conflict, both administrative and political, (Fudge 1976, Cloke and Little 1987c, Leach and Moore 1979, Underwood 1982), particularly "over the local interpretation of structure plan policies" (Fudge et. al. 1983 - page 11).

D) District Planning Authorities - these are the main actors, being responsible for local plan preparation and for implementation through their development control powers and through other activities and forms of plans or programmes seeking to co-ordinate and promote development (Carter, Brown and Abbott 1990, Hambleton 1988).

E) Elected Members - although obviously part of the DPA, and responsible for endorsing local plan policies and proposals, elected members are, according to Fudge et. al. (1983 - page 12), discouraged from becoming very involved in the process, because of "the professional and technical emphasis of planning". Detailed studies by Blondel and Hall (1967), McAuslan and Bevan (1977) and Cloke and Little (1987c, 1987d) have examined officer-member and intra-authority power relations, and the mechanisms used to achieve consensus and resolve conflict. In terms of plan implementation, particularly through development control, the elected members play a much more prominent role (Witt and Fleming 1984), although here they may come more into conflict with their own officers (Fleming and Short 1984), and their direct power is circumscribed by external relations and influences (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986).

F) The Public - the public includes a wide range of different groups, as well as individuals. The local plan preparation procedures provide a number of opportunities for public participation, including formal objection. The extent to which these opportunities are used depends on a range of factors, including awareness of the opportunities and the resources (financial, intellectual and time) to take part. In looking at the role of community groups in local planning, and assessing the extent of their influence, Smith, Williams and Houlder (1986 - page 78) suggest that

the demands of community groups are more likely to be accepted by policy makers when they do not conflict with a fundamental policy stance of the authority. This will inevitably be affected by the local political environment, and the perceptions of local politicians as to the acceptability of group influence.

Other assessments of the role of particular groups, including residents associations (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986), anti-growth movements (Herington 1984b), and envi-
ronmental pressure groups (Lower 1977, Lowe and Goyder 1983), tend to support this conclusion and point to their relative ineffectiveness. Recent research by Adams and Pawson (1991, 1992) on the success of objections to local plans suggests that private individuals are relatively successful, and influential, although the success rate increases with an increasing number of objectors, so that

both inspectors and local planning authorities were influenced by substantial numbers of objectors to the same issue. Such multiple objectors were almost invariably opposed to further development ..... The research therefore confirms the recent strength and vitality of 'nimbyism' (Adams and Pawson 1992 - page 13)

G) Other Local Authority departments - the extent of their influence will depend on the degree to which their resources are crucial to the implementation of local plan policies and programmes. There is obvious scope for conflict over priorities, and as Fudge et al. (1983 - page 12) suggest

planners rarely have financial resources to bring to negotiations with other departments and have often to reply on persuasion and bargaining to win co-operation and support

This may introduce a degree of uncertainty into plan and policy implementation.

H) Other Agencies - although other agencies such as statutory undertakers and infrastructure providers, or other government agencies, apparently make little use of development plans (Healey and Elson 1982), their co-operation and positive action is often essential, either during local plan preparation or in the implementation of particular projects and programmes (Payne 1977, Stanley 1979, Raine 1982). As an example I take the regional water authorities (now of course privatised). Synnott (1986) considers that the relationship between their capital investment programmes and the infrastructure requirements arising out of local plan proposals deteriorated during the 1980s, as a consequence of central government's fiscal policy, with a shift to ad-hoc investment and away from programmed investment following the intentions of local planning instruments. In many ways, the operation of infrastructure providers may act counter to an LPA's policy and proposals, by enabling growth to take place in areas other than those where the LPA would wish to see development. However, "planners can have some influence on these agencies by bringing forward developer contributions for infrastructure provision" (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 13), although as they go on to state "the diffi-
culties caused by lack of co-operation between these agencies and local planning should not be understated”. Again this introduces uncertainty into the implementation of the plan, and brings about a dependant relationship with the infrastructure provider.

1) **The Private Sector** - This group covers a wide range of interests which are affected by, or seek to influence, the local planning process and its outcomes. In this analysis I am mainly concerned with the larger development interests, and with their agents, and with landowners. Interests are likely to be involved in the local planning process in different ways, so that, for example,

the larger and more powerful development interests, with more resources at their disposal, will regard local plans as a baseline from which negotiations take place with the local authority (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 13)

Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) and Short, Witt and Fleming (1897) have shown how the type of interaction with the planning process is determined to some extent by the characteristics of the development interest (in this case housebuilders). Certainly, the larger housebuilders have been involved, and are increasing their involvement, in all stages of the local plan preparation process, with particular emphasis on the making of well-argues representations and on appearances at Local Plan Inquiries (LPIs) (Adams and Pawson 1992). They are also likely to make sophisticated use of local planning documents (Healey, Davis, Wood and Elson 1982, Healey and Elson 1982, Short, Fleming and Witt 1986). In addition, landowners have been shown to be both active and influential in the process (Adams 1987, Adams and May 1990a, 1990b, Adams and Kent 1991, Goodchild and Munton 1985). Finally, of course, plan implementation depends to a considerable extent on private sector investment, which gives the larger development interests considerable leverage in negotiation, in particular economic conditions and in particular development contexts.

**The Role of Local Plans in Relation to New Settlements**

There is little specific guidance from Central Government on how local plans should deal with new settlements. However, it is possible to piece together some general guidelines from a variety of circulars and PPGs. Draft PPG 3 sets out the general role of the development plan
Planning authorities, in formulating their policies for the location of new housing in structure and local plans, should consider whether new settlements have a possible role in their areas, and if so where and on what scale (DoE 1989a - para. 20)

The earlier PPG 3 ‘Land for Housing’ (DoE 1988b) adds little to this, but the Planning Policy Guidance Note on the content of development plans (PPG 15) gives some more general indications

Sites for all types of development, in line with structure plan policies and general proposals, should be identified in detailed development plans (DoE 1990a - para. 10)

Developments plans should include land-use policies and proposals relating to the provision of social and community facilities associated with new housing development (DoE 1990a - para. 18)

The Discussion paper on ‘Housing in Rural Areas : Village Housing and New Villages’ (DoE 1988a - page 15) suggests that, when preparing or reviewing local plans

local planning authorities may wish to consider developing criteria for the planning of new or expanded settlements, including provision for essential services and other requirements, including factors relating to layout, design and infrastructure

Finally, the revised PPG 3 on ‘Housing’ (DoE 1992b) provides a more detailed discussion of the factors which policies for new settlements in local plans should address

the need for social, educational and community facilities, and for a wide variety of house types, including an element of affordable housing provision

the need for high standards in layout, landscaping and design, and for creating a more distinctive sense of place and community

any local plan policy for new settlements will also need to include explicit guidance about the contribution which developers will be expected to make towards the provision of infrastructure, community facilities and affordable housing (DoE 1992b - paras. 35 & 37)
So local plans must develop existing structure plan policies for new settlements in more detail, where they provide sufficient guidance, and there they do not, directly address the need for new settlements. Specifically then, local plans have a number of tasks

1. to assess the need for new settlements;

2. to consider their possible role;

3. to determine the general location (these three functions may overlap with, or conflict with, the role of the structure plan in this respect, as they relate to strategic issues);

4. to determine and allocate the specific site (so they have a role both in site finding and in making a choice between competing schemes);

5. to determine the scale/size appropriate for a new settlement(s) and reflect this in any policy;

6. to provide detailed policies in relation to the form of the new settlement and hence in relation to its implementation, by indicating the requirements for infrastructure; services; community and other facilities; and the type, tenure and mix of housing.

7. to provide policies which detail the contributions required from developers, and so which set out the planning gain packages to be provided;

8. to set out detailed criteria on design, layout and landscaping, thereby providing design guidance.

These can be summaries, in the terms of the detailed tasks identified by Patsy Healey (1986a, 1986b), as

A. land allocation (tasks 1 to 4, and possibly 5);

B. the co-ordination and progression of large development projects (tasks 6 to 8);

C. the organisation of investment in land-use change and development where a multiplicity of interests and land rights are involved.
and it is to be expected that DPAs, through local plans or other forms of policy guidance, will undertake these in relation to new settlements.

However, as I have suggested, the current roles of local plans go beyond those highlighted by Healey, partly because of the renewed emphasis placed by the central state on the local planning function, and on the preparation of district wide local plans (Jones 1991a, 1991b, 1991c). These plans are likely to take on some of the roles previously considered appropriate for structure plans. So that local plans have been, and will continue to be, used for addressing strategic issues, which in relation to new settlements, include assessing the need for, and potential roles of, new settlements, and, where considered appropriate, determining their general location.

**Structure Plan/Local Plan Relationships Affecting New Settlements**

As I have suggested, one of the major functions of a local plan is to develop and apply the strategy and policies of the structure plan, and one of the critical inter-actor relationships is that between the CPA and the District Councils. Since this is of particular importance in relation to new settlements it is necessary to highlight some of the potential conflicts and tensions, as these are likely to have an impact on the resulting local planning process.

First there may be uncertainties for DPAs arising out of the strategic framework, particularly "in areas where major growth allocation is involved" (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 79), as is the case where the structure plan framework either provides positively for new settlements, through a proactive policy, or for consideration of a range of options for dealing with growth through an enabling policy. Uncertainty may be compounded where the strategic framework does not deal satisfactorily with the issue of new settlements, especially where there is private sector pressure. In particular, there are three specific problems which may arise, in part at least from the form or content of the structure plan review policies for new settlements.

(a) boundaries - where a positive new settlement policy emerges it may give insufficient or ambiguous guidance on potential new settlement locations, as in the case of Cambridgeshire where the policy as modified by the Secretary of State proposed two new settlements. The relationship of the potential areas of search to the district council boundaries was such that no single local plan relating solely to one district's administrative boundaries was able to deal satisfactorily with the
detailed site identification process, particularly in the face of a considerable number of competing private sector schemes. There are other examples of this type of problem;

(b) site specificity - the degree of specificity with which potential new settlement locations are identified in structure plan reviews may be either too great or too little, giving rise to CPA/district conflict about location (as in Warwickshire, where there was a lack of district support for the location identified by the CPA);

(c) there may be differences between the CPA and the Districts in the detailed interpretation of the policies setting out the strategic framework.

Second, the relationship may involve political conflict between the CPA and the districts, where, for example, districts are unwilling to accept structure plan policies or allocations. There are several cases of objections by Districts to being identified as possible new settlement locations or being required by the proposed policy to consider a new settlement option. Normally, in these cases, as I have indicated earlier, the Secretary of State has tended to modify or delete policies relating to new settlements, where districts manifest opposition. However, where the strategic policy framework which emerges is an enabling one, there may be tension or conflict over the way in which districts respond to this.

Third, the county/district relationship may be affected by external factors, such as the effect of modifications to proposed structure plan policies or strategies by the Secretary of State, which may introduce unexpected or unwelcome changes in strategic policy. These may lead to delay (Planning 1991f), and uncertainty, and are likely to be "a significant cause of a loss of momentum in local plan preparation" since "while uncertainties persist local planners are unlikely to progress local plan work which may prove abortive" (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 80).

Fourth, there is a problem in co-ordinating structure plan and local plan preparation, especially in synchronising their time horizons and the time scales inherent in both the processes, or "of structure and local plans getting rapidly and possibly irretrievably out of phase with each other" (Fudge 1976 - page 175). So, for example, work may begin on a local plan taking into account draft policies in a structure plan review, which may later be modified by the Secretary of State, or rejected by the CPA. This may radically affect the form and content of the local plan, and it may extend to plans already adopted creating
uncertainty about their status. Furthermore local plans have often been prepared when the structure plan has only a short period to run, and it is to be reviewed. Often the requirement for housing land is minimal, given the short time horizon, and local plans are unable to deal with structure plan proposals which have implications for a time horizon beyond that of the plan.

Fifth, long periods between the commencement of structure plan review and the submission of the review, and between submission and approval by the Secretary of State may create uncertainty. It may also give rise to other conflicts, for "there is evidence of county resistance to local plan preparation which might pre-empt the structure plan" (Fudge et al. 1983 - page 83), and local plans may be faced with dealing with strategic issues before these are fully determined in the structure plan. This is the case in a number of the local planning processes to which I shall refer later (especially in Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Nottinghamshire and Warwickshire) where DPAs began preparation of local plans which proposed, or provided guidelines for, new settlements. Alternatively, DPAs may use

the local planning process as a means of gaining political support for a course of action, and then advocating it to the strategic authority (Fudge 1976 - page 175)

This is also apparent from this study, particularly in Suffolk and Nottinghamshire.

Sixth, there may be some conflict over the extent to which new settlements are considered to be a strategic issue, to be dealt with in the structure plan review, or a detailed issue, which can be left to individual local plans.

Last the potential for inter-authority conflict is increased where the CPA is responsible for, or heavily involved in, the preparation of local plans.
LOCAL PLAN APPROACHES TO NEW SETTLEMENTS

The analysis in Chapter 9 indicated the wide range of approaches adopted in structure plan reviews, and the variety of strategic policy frameworks for new settlements which have emerged. I suggested that four types of policy approach could be identified

Negative - policy indicating that new settlements will not be appropriate

Reactive - policy setting out criteria for considering any private sector new settlement applications which come forward, where new settlements do not have a specific role as part of the strategy of the plan

Enabling - policy which places the onus on the local planning process to determine the need for new settlements, their role and location, and which provides a series of performance criteria (which may give guidance on location, scale, form etc.) to shape this process

Proactive - policy which makes positive provision for a new settlement, and may specify a precise or general location, as well as giving guidance on scale.

In addition to these positive (or negative) policy frameworks there are two other general strategic frameworks

where the structure plan review provides no guidance at all because the plan review did not address the issue (and recourse would have to be made, if necessary, to other policies in the plan, on, for example, the general level and strategic location of growth, and the protection of open land and areas of environmental importance); or

where a new settlement option was considered in the early stages of structure plan review and later ejected either by the LPA or by the Secretary of State.

It would be expected that local plans which addressed new settlement issues would be most likely to be required and to emerge in relation to

1 proactive and enabling strategic policy frameworks; and
2 where the structure plan review provides no guidance and where there is development pressure.
The following sections consider each of these strategic policy frameworks in turn and, for each, analyse one or two local planning processes in detail as examples of the outworking of the process. The analysis will also seek to identify plan purposes and functions in the terms set out by Healey and described above. The Chapter concludes with a summary which draws out the main points from these, and from other processes not examined in detail. The main focus is to concentrate on the form and content of the process, and to highlight actor interactions, especially in terms of power relations. Table 10.1 sets out the structure plan policy context types, with an indication of example counties and relevant local planning processes.

### TABLE 10.1

**LOCAL PLANS FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS AND STRUCTURE PLAN POLICY CONTEXT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE PLAN POLICY CONTEXT</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proactive Policy</strong></td>
<td>East Sussex</td>
<td>South Wealden Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>South Cambridgeshire Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hampshire (S)</td>
<td>Fareham Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enabling Policy</strong></td>
<td>Northamptonshire</td>
<td>Kettering Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hereford &amp; Worcester</td>
<td>Borough of Redditch Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staffordshire</td>
<td>Ashford Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medway Gap and Vicinity Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lichfield Rural Areas Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Staffordshire District Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reactive Policy</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Policy</strong></td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Kings Lynn Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Guidance</strong></td>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Uttlesford District Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leicestershire</td>
<td>Loughborough Borough Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Castle Morpeth Rural Areas Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Guidance Policy Option Rejected</strong></td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>North Beds Borough Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Purbeck Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>Newark on Trent Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfordshire</td>
<td>Cherwell Rural Areas Local Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warwickshire</td>
<td>South Warwickshire Local Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author
The South Wealden Local Plan: Part 1 sets out "to determine the sites and boundaries of the land required" (Wealden District Council 1987 - page 2) to meet the provisions of the East Sussex Structure Plan Third Alteration (1982) and the 1985 Structure Plan (which incorporated the Alteration) (East Sussex County Council 1982, 1985). As I indicated in the previous Chapter, the County Council had proposed a new settlement at Stone Cross, to provide additional housing land, and so had formulated a detailed, proactive policy. This was approved by the Secretary of State (with modifications), despite formal objections from the District Council that the settlement would not be self contained, and that it would increase development pressure in the area, rather than relieve or constrain it.

The Structure Plan policy indicated the scale of the new settlement (1,000 dwellings), and the general location ("in the Stone Cross area"), and referred to the need for facilities including "a new primary school". Finally there is a reference to infrastructure in that "the relevant planning authority will require to be satisfied that the capital works directly required to service the development are provided or will be provided". The determination of precise sites and boundaries was left to the local plan.

The Local Plan determines the housing sites by means of a 'sieve' exercise, using a number of criteria, including the effect on the landscape and on the environment, the relationship with the existing built-up area, impact on agricultural land and farm holdings, and on the highway network, and the practicality and cost of providing services. As a result of this exercise, three sites are identified capable of accommodating just over 1000 dwellings and these are allocated in the plan. The location was not, however, precisely where the County Council had intended it to be, since, after the policy in the structure plan review had been adopted, a line for a new bypass was fixed by the Department of Transport, thereby constraining potential development locations (East Sussex County Council 1987). Although, in the County Planning Officer's view, the local plan proposals did not meet the structure plan requirement for physical separation from Eastbourne, the County was prepared to support the allocations as a satisfactory compromise (as a departure from the Structure Plan policy).
Phasing is introduced in order to ensure that previously programmed highway improvements, including the provision of the new bypass, are underway before development begins so that the highway network is able to cope with the traffic generated by the development. The structure plan policy proviso on infrastructure improvements is followed up in a section on utilities, which details the various undertakers' requirements.

The plan also considers the provision of community and other facilities, allocating a site for a primary school (as required in the structure plan policy), and for a small neighbourhood shopping centre. It also allocates land for playing pitches and sets out the requirements for children's play areas. The specific allocation of land for employment uses is rejected, given the proximity of Stone Cross to existing industrial areas in Eastbourne and other centres, although

there may be opportunities for the provision of small starter units for village workshop and rural crafts which may be appropriate in environmental terms through the conversion of redundant buildings (Wealden DC 1987 - page 65)

An illustrative plan sets out the basic pattern of development, and the land allocations (and appropriate policies) are indicated on the Proposals Map. Each of the three sites is the subject of a separate policy (see Appendix 3 for the full text of one of these policies).

Shortly after the publication of the draft Local Plan, there was private sector interest in the development of the new settlement manifest in the submission of outline applications, in mid 1987 and early 1988, by three different developers for the three sites identified. Both the District Council and the County Council were subsequently involved in lengthy negotiations with the developers over planning agreements aimed at "securing a co-ordinated development" and covering "the form and content of development and infrastructure and community facilities" (East Sussex County Council 1988 - pages 1 & 2). The negotiations took over two years, and during their course, the developers agreed to provide land and/or financial contributions towards additional community facilities, including a surgery and social services accommodation on-site and a new library and secondary school off-site.

1The applicants/developers were (i) on the largest site, Gallagher Estates Ltd. (a small/medium sized housebuilder/developer based in Birmingham), and (ii) on the smaller sites, Bryant Homes (Southern) Ltd. (a subsidiary of a large national housebuilder), and Strutt and Parker (Surveyors/Agents) acting for the landowner
Comments on the local planning process and on implementation

In terms of the tasks identified earlier, it is clear that the local plan is primarily concerned, first, with site identification and allocation, and, second, with some degree of co-ordination. It also provided basic information to would-be developers on the LPA's requirements for facilities and on infrastructure, and to the public. There is some basic design guidance in the form of the development principles governing the general form of the layout and on landscaping. However, much remained to be determined or negotiated, through the development brief and through planning agreements, since implementation mechanisms are given little explicit consideration. In this sense, then, it can be said to be a baseline for the negotiation which took place.

Despite Wealden District Council's initial objection to the new settlement proposal, the process of preparing the local plan appears to have been smooth, with little apparent conflict with the County Council, who were involved in the site finding exercise, and agreed to the departure from the structure plan policy intentions. Neither the initial structure plan policy or the local planning process seem to have generated competition between the private sector over alternative sites (as has often been the case elsewhere).

Both the County and the District had a number of roles in the local planning process as a whole. The County Council was involved in the negotiation process, both to ensure that the Structure Plan policy objectives were met (although they were not entirely successful in this), and that the provision of the appropriate facilities and infrastructure was satisfactory. In addition the County were responsible for the provision and funding of particular facilities, and sought a continuing role in discussions on the layout and design of the larger site. The District Council also had a role in facility provision, as well as in co-ordination, design guidance and overall control of the development through their development control powers. Development had begun by October 1990 (Wealden DC 1990).

A number of general conclusions on the process can be drawn

1 the new settlement is unusual in being developed by different developers, who are not acting together as a consortium, and so points to the need for considerable co-ordination by the LPAs;
the local plan policy represents a compromise on the original Structure Plan policy. Moreover the form of development as eventually approved also represents something of a compromise on the local plan policy itself;

the role of the local plan was rather limited, to site selection and allocation, to setting out the basic form of, and requirements for, the development, and to some degree of co-ordination;

the local plan policy itself required elaboration through a development brief, and other planning instruments were necessary to achieve full co-ordination and mobilisation of private and public sector resources. The amount of bargaining and negotiation involved in concluding planning agreements was considerable, not untypical for developments of this size, as demonstrated by Martin Elson (1989);

inter-authority co-operation was essential to the successful implementation of the Structure Plan intentions, first through negotiation on the precise location of the new settlement, and then on the form and content of the scheme. Although the local plan was prepared by the District Council, the County Council sought, and obtained, a significant role in the local planning process.

The whole process therefore reflects the point made by Patsy Healey (1986b - page 9) about the relationship between development plan policies and implementation planning policy formulation and implementation more commonly occur through the contribution of a range of agencies, some public and some private. Each has its own priorities and constituencies. In such situations, the relation between policy and action is an interactive one, with policies being reaffirmed and reinterpreted in action. Policy implementation becomes a process of persuading those who control resources to adopt one policy orientation rather than another. Plans, as documents, stating policies, become tools to be used within the interactive processes through which policies are produced, used and changed.

However, it remains the case that the new settlement was essentially plan led, or in Brindley, Rydin and Stoker's (1989) terms, the planning framework was market critical or regulative.
Cambridgeshire - South Cambridgeshire Local Plan

The planning framework in Cambridgeshire can also be characterised as regulative, again as Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989 - page 27) argue, and "a style of planning appropriate to buoyant local economies". I have described the long and complex process of Structure Plan policy formulation in the county earlier, and the interaction centred around this process, and so will confine this analysis to the local planning process.

South Cambridgeshire District Council had supported the County Council's general strategy, one of containment and restraint around Cambridge, and the dispersal of growth away from the city, and in particular agreed with the concept of a new settlement, although not with the locations advocated by the County (Cambridgeshire County Council 1987b).

Work on the district wide local plan began in early 1988, at which time the Structure Plan proposed only one new settlement (on the A10 to the north of Cambridge). By the time a draft of the plan was published for consultation (South Cambridgeshire DC 1988), the Secretary of State's proposed modifications has been issued, and these, of course, proposed two new settlements, both, or only one, of which could have been within the district, or outside it. However, the consultation draft did not include any policies on location, as

any decision on the precise location of either of these new settlements would be premature in advance of the Secretary of State's final decision on the Replacement Structure Plan (South Cambridgeshire District Council 1988 - para. 2.16)

The plan strategy and policies did, however, offer some general locational guidance by the definition of an Area of Restraint to the south of the A45, which any new settlement would be required to avoid.

The Secretary of State approved the Structure Plan replacement in March 1989, and in doing so, widened the area of the search for the A45 corridor new settlement to include the area to the East of Cambridge (in the area of East Cambridgeshire District Council). Private sector proposals had been submitted in both broad areas of search with schemes in both South Cambridgeshire and East Cambridgeshire, and importantly in relation to the A45 corridor, both west and east of the city. South Cambridgeshire District Council expressed preferences for the new settlement proposals outside their
boundaries - Westmere on the A10 and Hare Park on the A45 to the east of Cambridge (South Cambridgeshire County Council NDa, NDb, 1989a). The Secretary of State ‘called-in’ all of the competing schemes in the A10 and A45 corridors in-mid-1989.

It is unsurprising, then, in the light of all these circumstances, that the Deposit Draft Local Plan, published in September 1989, did not develop the locational guidance or attempt to make a choice between the competing schemes. Instead, the plan contained guidance relating to the shopping, community, housing and recreational provision to be made in new settlements, as well as a policy indicating that 50 acres of land were to be allocated for business uses (South Cambridgeshire District Council 1989b). In particular, because of development pressures, high house prices and problems of affordability in the area (Cooper 1988), a target of 30% was set for social housing

The district council considers that, in the new settlements, a target of 30% for all social housing carried out by local authorities and housing associations should be set. This ‘social housing’ should include a variety of accommodation including provision for first-time home-seekers, for the frail elderly and sheltered accommodation. Such housing should be dispersed through the new settlement (South Cambridgeshire DC 1989b - para. 2.20)

Most of the schemes attempted to meet this provision, although some developers felt that these and the requirements of the County Council might make the scheme marginal or uneconomic (Hargreaves 1989). Considerable negotiation took place between the developers, the County Council and the District Councils to finalise requirements and to produce draft planning agreements. This negotiation however was in the context of the submitted planning applications and with a view to presenting well thought-out proposals at the local inquiries to be held on the ‘called-in’ schemes. It was, of course, guided by the requirements in the local plan, although the details of the planning gain packages discussed or offered during negotiation went beyond what was required in the plan itself.

The plan had very little impact on the eventual outcomes on the two competing sets of schemes, being referred to infrequently in the voluminous evidence presented by their proponents. Nor did it have an effect on the Secretary of State’s decisions to refuse consent for all of the schemes (DoE/DTp 1991c, 1992a). The structure plan policies formed the main policy context, and the main set of criteria for determining the applications. The local plan inquiry began in October 1990, and although it provided a vehicle
for further representations in relation to the new settlement schemes, it has been bypassed as a decision making forum.

Comments on local planning process and on implementation

The role of the Local Plan was particularly limited with only general guidance on facility provision and few specific policies. The Plan, did, however, seek to ensure that Structure Plan objectives were met in relation to the restraint of development to the south of Cambridge and to the wider roles of the new settlement in the provision of the appropriate form of employment. In terms of the tasks identified earlier the plan did not really attempt to perform any except providing information, and specifying some functional requirements. Again, it provided a baseline for negotiation, but was unable to identify or allocate specific sites, or to play a role in the co-ordination of development.

The South Cambridgeshire Local Plan demonstrates the problem, discussed earlier, of typing-in policy formulation with the structure plan, particularly when delay and uncertainty are introduced by the lengthy process of structure plan modification, and by the modifications themselves, which, in this case, had a fundamental effect on the number and potential locations of new settlements. The problem was compounded by the large number of competing schemes which had come forward, in response to emergent structure plan policies, well before the Local Plan preparation process began. In addition, the need to determine an appropriate location for two new settlements, which might be in either one or two districts, and to decide between a range of competing schemes in both districts, could not be handled by a local planning process concerned simply with one district.

There was considerable local and national political opposition to a new settlement within South Cambridgeshire, with the matter being debated in Parliament (Hansard 1988), and the widening of the area of search for the A45 corridor scheme enabled the District Council to adopt a protectionist stance and to ‘reject’ those proposals within its own boundaries and support a scheme in a neighbouring district (Fisher 1990). This opposition may have contributed to the District’s lack of a proactive stance in their Local Plan, and indeed, as Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) suggest, South Cambridgeshire District Council have tended to adopt a restrictive policy stance on development. For

by and large development is discouraged. Giving any possible precedent for future development permissions is strongly resisted. Even specific land alloca-
tions in district plans are viewed warily by some, on the basis that they get taken up so rapidly (ibid - page 47)

Again it is unsurprising that, unlike the South Wealden Local Plan, the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan did not refer to implementation mechanisms, provide more than very general design guidance (such as would apply to any housing proposal), or propose development briefs to guide development.

In terms of the County-District roles and relations, it is apparent that both sought active involvement with the private sector, for, as Smith and Vigor (1986 - page 323) indicated

financial and other restrictions will not allow the councils to become the developer. Nevertheless they will seek an active co-ordinating role, in order to integrate public and private sector investment, and to ensure the timely commencement of development.

and this they did through the mechanism of the planning agreement. However there had been conflict between the County and the Districts over the general new settlement locations, and Fisher (1990) suggests that the County was ineffective once the Secretary of State had modified the originally proposed policy, particularly in failing to give a strong strategic lead to be followed by the districts. The private sector played a relatively small part in the process surrounding the local plan itself, although a number of the new settlement promoters did object to the proposed Area of Restraint on the grounds that it was more restrictive than the area proposed in the structure plan, and thereby affected their proposals. Some also made more general objections, but, on the whole, interaction was 'limited' to considerable and time-consuming negotiation about planning gain packages, more, as I have indicated, in relation to the previously submitted applications, in preparation for the local inquiries and the decision making process by the central state.

Finally, Colin Smith (1990) sums up the whole process as chaotic, partly because of the Secretary of State's intervention, and argues that the District Council should have become involved in the process at a much earlier stage, producing a local plan which identified specific sites. However, although that may be true, the local planning process has been ineffectual, mainly because of the strength of private sector pressure, on which the exercise of a regulative style of planning depends (Brindley, Rydin and Stoker 1989).
and which forced a more ad-hoc than plan-led approach to site (or scheme) identification, and potential implementation.

**Enabling Structure Plan Policy Framework**

**Northamptonshire - Local Plan for Kettering Borough**

In Northamptonshire, the Local Plan for Kettering Borough (Kettering Borough Council 1990a, 1991) had to deal with a number of competing schemes, but did so in a rather different manner to the South Cambridgeshire Local Plan. The local planning process in Kettering gained a good deal of praise from the DoE and from Ministers as I indicated earlier.

The Chapter on structure plan reviews outlined the basic sequence of events in Northamptonshire, and pointed to the emergence of an enabling policy in the Alteration modified and approved by the Secretary of State in 1992 (Northamptonshire County Council 1989a, 1989b, Departments of the Environment and Transport 1989a, 1992c). The Alteration was prepared in response to the suggestion from the Secretary of State that the Structure Plan be reviewed as quickly as possible, in order to deal with housing and employment issues. The policy, as finally approved, although somewhat different in intention than that proposed by the County, placed the onus for the consideration of the need for new settlements on the local planning process, and set out a comprehensive series of performance criteria to aid assessment.

Members agreed to the preparation of a district wide Local Plan in August 1988, and work began in January 1989, being carried on in parallel with the review/alteration process, as Table 10.2 shows. It was clear that new villages would play some role in Kettering, according to Wilcox (1990), for a number of reasons. First, government guidance, in the form of PPG 3 (Land for Housing) and the Discussion Paper on New Villages (DoE 1988a, 1988b), suggested that consideration should be given to new settlements in development plans. Second, the strategy in the emerging Structure Plan Alteration, although not proactive, made it clear that there could be a role for new villages in particular circumstances, and moreover, the Secretary of State had indicated that the review should directly address the issue. Third, there were local political pressures which sought to reduce the impact of development and growth on existing settlements. Finally, the professional thinking and ideology of the officers was innovative and generally sympathetic to the concept of new settlements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRUCTURE PLAN</th>
<th>LOCAL PLAN</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure plan approved</td>
<td>Work begins</td>
<td>1989 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft structure plan Alterations</td>
<td>Consultants commissioned</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Alterations No 1 published</td>
<td>Consultants' report</td>
<td>1990 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan considered by Committee</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Plan approved by Committee</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new settlement schemes invited</td>
<td>March to May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Alterations No 1 submitted</td>
<td>Draft Local Plan published</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Local Plan consultation</td>
<td>May to July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Alterations No 1 Draft Modifica-</td>
<td>Deposit Local Plan published</td>
<td>1991 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tions</td>
<td>Deposit Local Plan consultation</td>
<td>May to July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP Alteration approved</td>
<td>Local Plan Inquiry</td>
<td>1992 January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPI Inspector's report</td>
<td>April to July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993 July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: adapted and updated from Wilcox 1990

The Borough Council engaged consultants, David Lock Associates, to undertake a study of the potential of new settlements as part of the local plan preparation process (David Lock Associates 1990a), and in a sense, to educate the Council "in the way the development industry works" (Lock 1990b).
This study identified five broad areas of search based on a 'sieve' exercise which used a number of criteria, including freedom from constraints, relationship to the settlement pattern and marketability of the location. More than one area of search was chosen in order to overcome the problems of inflating land values and reducing the potential for funding community provision by introducing some degree of competition (Lock 1989e). Of the five potential locations, two were discarded because of land ownership problems. The study also set out criteria for guiding the location, design and implementation/development of potential new settlements.

Early in the process it had become apparent that there would be private sector interest in developing new settlements, as from about mid-1989 onwards, the Borough Council had approaches from landowners and potential developers. The local planning process sought to handle this pressure in a manageable way (Wilcox 1990). In addition, it was argued that consultation on the draft plan would be more meaningful if it took place in relation to specific proposals and sites, rather than a general policy. The Borough Council decided to invite the submission of schemes, according to a strict timetable and with a standardised form of submissions, including a written statement (with a site appraisal, land use budget and consideration of infrastructure, quality control and management issues), supporting illustrative material and an environmental assessment (Kettering Borough Council 1990a). Seven schemes came forward, two of which were outside the areas of search (and one of these was outside Kettering Borough itself). Table 10.3 gives an indication of the size and promoter of each of these and whether or not it was in the identified areas of search.
TABLE 10.3

NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES IN KETTERING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEME</th>
<th>SIZE (d/hs)</th>
<th>PROMOTER</th>
<th>IN AREA OF SEARCH?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mawsley-on-the-Green</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>G.F. Hobden &amp; Sons</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cransley Lodge²</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Stock Land &amp; Estates Ltd</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mawsley</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Lovell Homes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton Wold</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Egerton Homes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke Griffin</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far Gollian</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Wilcon Homes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Faxton</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>William Davis &amp; Balfour Beatty</td>
<td>Part outside District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranford St John</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddington</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Bryant Homes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time as the submission and presentation of private sector proposals, the Draft Local Plan was published for public consultation in May 1990. It contained a specific policy, Policy 14, on new villages (Kettering Borough Council 1990a) which indicated that

Planning permission will be granted for one or more new villages, the housing provision in which will not exceed 750 dwellings in total for the Borough for the whole of the plan period.

subject to a range of criteria covering location (within the three areas of search identified on the Proposals Map); the relationship to the highway network; the proposed balance of land uses; the impact on agricultural land, on the countryside in general and on the

²Cransley Lodge is the preferred scheme and location. A number of promoters put forward alternative schemes (with size difference) in response to the second round of consultation. There were also other schemes put forward which did not take part in the beauty contest having been put forward and then dropped prior to the selection process. Loddington and Far Gollian dropped out the selection procedure, and Upper Faxton was not directly considered by the Borough as it was partly in Daventry District.
landscape and the need to protect the best agricultural land; the arrangements for quality control; phasing and programming and for long term maintenance, management and community development; and the community benefit of the proposal (for the full text see Appendix 3).

Following consultation on the draft plan and on the private sector schemes submitted, the intention was to include a site specific proposal in the deposit plan. The justification for the policy was the need to provide for a scale of growth in the rural areas of the Borough which could not be satisfactorily accommodated in existing settlements, thereby "giving them the opportunity to develop at a rate more appropriate to their own needs" (Kettering Borough Council ND - para. 17), and to

provide a new, balanced and socially viable community in preference to potentially incongruous accretions to existing settlements (ibid - para. 17)

The scale of the proposed new village(s) was less than David Lock Associates had advocated, as the consultants considered 750 dwellings as a minimum, rather than a maximum, based on the economics of viability (David Lock Associates 1990a). The areas of search which the consultants had identified were set out on the Key Map. A 'Planning Brief for New Settlement Proposals' was included as part of the Plan in the form of a Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (no 5) (Kettering Borough Council 1990a). This Brief was comprehensive, covering, inter alia, size, land uses and land use budget, required facilities and infrastructure, urban design, quality control, management, and implementation. It was prepared to

(i) provide a common basis for the preparation and consideration of new village proposals in the Borough within the Local Plan context;

(ii) to give guidance to landowners, developers and the general public on the issue;

and

(iii) to set out the Local Planning Authority's aspirations and requirements for such a development (Kettering Borough Council ND)

The facilities required included a primary school, a multi purpose community/village hall, some local employment, a public house, local shopping facilities, social housing (10% - 15% of the total), local health care and public open space and playing fields (Kettering Borough Council ND). The management and implementation guidance is well thought out, reflecting the advice of the consultants (David Lock Associates 1990a).
The Local Plan consultation process generated two additional schemes, and these, together with those which had been submitted earlier, were subject to an initial appraisal, again carried out by the Borough's consultants, against the criteria set out in the Plan and in the Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (Kettering BC 1990b, David Lock Associates 1990b).

The developers were invited to submit further information, including a confidential financial appraisal, followed by a further round of presentations and assessment, including consultation on two new settlement options (Kettering Borough Council 1990c, David Lock Associates 1990c, Elliott 1992). These two options were, first, a new settlement of 750 dwellings and a smaller settlement of 350 dwellings, and, second, a new settlement of 350 dwellings, with 350 dwellings being absorbed in existing settlements. The results of the consultation exercise showed a marked preference for a smaller new settlement, particularly from the public although some parish councils favoured a larger new settlement (Kettering Borough Council 1990c, Elliott 1992). The general consensus was against further development in the villages, and so for new settlements as an alternative to this, rather than being positively in favour of a new village. There was however no consensus on the appropriate location or scheme. After consultation, and further assessment of the schemes, the preferred option, location and scheme (Cransley Lodge) was chosen (Kettering Borough Council 1990c). The Council opted for a new settlement of 350 dwellings, deciding that

an allocation of 350 dwellings be made in the deposit copy of the Local Plan, to be located in a new settlement, and that the community development and social housing associated with the development be maximised. That by 1997 the Local Plan New Settlement Rural Strategy be reviewed:-
(a) to assess the need for increasing the allocation;
(b) to examine the preferred location of any increase considered necessary at that time (Kettering Borough Council 1990d - page 3)

The Council had therefore adopted a compromise solution, in the face of local political opposition, particularly from a number of parish councils, in opting for the smaller of the two new settlement options, and in reviewing development at a later stage. The Council was, itself, divided, with a significant proportion of members preferring a larger scheme, because of the wider range of community benefits likely to be obtained, or alternative locations. Discussion took place with the promoters of the chosen scheme over social
housing, highway improvements and the provision of community facilities, and the developers indicated their willingness to enter into the appropriate legal agreements (Kettering Borough Council 1990e).

So the Local Plan published in October 1990 and placed on deposit at the end of 1990 contains a site specific policy in relation to the chosen scheme (Kettering Borough Council 1991).

The local planning process is still in progress. The local Plan Inquiry was held from April to July 1992, and the Inspector's report has yet to be submitted. Only three of the promoters appeared at the inquiry to argue that their scheme had advantages over the chosen proposals, although the others made submissions by written representations (Elliott 1992). Depending upon the outcome in the Inspector's report, the Borough Council hope to negotiate with the promoters of the chosen scheme and to agree a master plan and legal agreements, prior to the plan being adopted. Once this has been done an outline application could be submitted and dealt with quickly, followed by detailed applications, with many of those details already agreed. Once development were underway the Council would carry out a monitoring exercise, assessing the impacts of the settlement and ascertaining residents' views, in order to evaluate the scheme. This would be set alongside an assessment of the rate and effects of development in existing villages, as part of a review exercise in 1997 to determine whether the new settlement should be expanded; a further new village might be appropriate; or further development should take place in existing settlements.

Comments on the local planning process and implementation.

The local planning process has been comprehensive and robust. The Local Plan performed a number of functions including

- assessment of the need for new settlements;
- determination of scale;
- determination of areas of search and of a specific site;
- choosing between competing schemes;
- detailed guidance and information on form, content, design, management, provision of facilities and implementation;

It therefore carried out a mix of 'strategic', allocation and co-ordination functions.
It may, perhaps, be more accurate to state that the new settlement selection process continued in parallel to the preparation of the local plan, although being closely linked to it. The process demonstrated its robustness by being able to deal with the structure plan alteration preparation and modification process, which took place alongside it, and which resulted in a change of emphasis rather than a fundamental policy shift (as in Cambridgeshire for example). The Structure Plan policy framework thus appears to have functioned as intended, as an enabling framework, although in a sense it had relatively little influence, once it had become clear that the County Council would be supportive of the Borough Council’s approach. In another sense it did provide general guidance to the private sector in selecting likely locations (as again this process went on alongside the emerging structure plan and local plan), and to the Borough in identifying areas of search.

Noticeable is the lack of conflict with the CPA, who appear to have played little part in the local planning process, except as consultee, and in giving general support. Working relations between the Borough’s officers and those at the County were good, although on a more formal political level there was less co-operation. However the County Council was amenable to the Borough pursuing its own policies, within the general context of the Structure Plan framework.

The local planning process was also able to deal with the volume of private sector schemes that came forward, in part because of the tight control that the Borough Council exercised over the selection procedure, and possibly because it appeared to the promoters that a positive policy framework was likely to emerge. Unlike Cambridgeshire, of course, the schemes emerged alongside the local planning process, rather than well before it, and so were led by it. The ‘beauty contest’ approach was fairly novel, although it has been adopted elsewhere, in Uttlesford and Warwickshire, with less successful results in the latter.

The policy outcome reflects a number of influences. First, officer ideology is important, as Healey and Underwood (1978) and Underwood (1980) have shown. The officers appear to have been favourably predisposed to private sector new settlements (as do those in the County Council), and their general support of the concept fostered an innovative and open approach, as well as dialogue with the private sector. Second, the use of consultants was significant, coming about partly because of the relative lack of manpower and time which the Borough had available to devote to the issue. It also brought
in an expertise which the Borough lacked and which was also committed to the concept of new settlements. However, it was directed to a specific area, unlike some of other consultancies’ involvement in local planning processes (Nadin and Daniels 1992). It is noticeable that the Borough Council eventually opted for a solution which failed to meet the recommendations of their adviser, although a number of members recognised this.

Third, local political pressures played a significant part in the emergence of the preferred option, scheme and location. Here the role of the elected members is important, as there was, as is to be expected, a degree of conflict within the decision making committee, and between officers and members on the appropriate course of action. The eventual policy outcome is a compromise, dictated by political considerations. Such pressures also had an impact on the form of the local planning process, for Kettering is a Conservative controlled authority, which is wedded to the ideology of fostering and facilitating the market. The authority had been involved in public/private sector partnerships before they became common, and were in many ways an innovative local authority. Fourth, government guidance seems to have been influential, in setting the general context within which consideration of the new settlement option took place, and in placing new settlements ‘on the agenda’.

The private sector’s role was restricted to the normal one of finding and acquiring sites, in response to the emerging policy framework. The promoters seem to have had little influence on the form of option and policy which emerged, and most of the schemes sought to provide the infrastructure and community facilities required in the policy, in the brief and in negotiation.

As with the other local planning processes considered so far, supplementary planning guidance had a role to play. It is unusual that the brief was prepared in the context of the local plan, although it performed the essential roles of setting out the Borough Council’s requirements, both for the provision of facilities and for design, management and quality control, and of providing information. It was effective in outlining the general form which the submissions of schemes should follow. Much negotiation went on between the Borough Council and the promoters (and their agents) over the details of the schemes, and on the content of potential planning agreements. These, as elsewhere, are likely to provide the main instrument of control (coupled with the determination of applications).
It remains to be seen what the eventual outcome will be, and how, or if, implementation of the chosen scheme will take place.

*Hereford and Worcester - Redditch Local Plan No: 2*

The Secretary of State included an enabling policy, which made reference to the potential role of new settlements in both Redditch and Droitwich sub-areas, in his final modifications to the Hereford and Worcester Structure Plan Alteration (DoE 1990c). Both LPAs wished to be able to consider a new settlement as an option for meeting their housing land requirements.

The District Council do not accept that the possibility of new villages should be excluded at this stage. In excluding such a possibility the County Council have gone against the advice of their own officers and the Secretary of State. The District Council is of the opinion that a housing strategy for the Droitwich Sub Area should include an examination of the possibility of new villages (Wychavon District Council ND - page 10).

Redditch Borough Council expressed broadly similar views at the Structure Plan EiP:

they would like to be able to consider settlements of 800 - 1,000 houses, where there was existing infrastructure; they were not seeking a specific allocation of a new village to the Redditch Sub Area but similarly did not wish to see a policy where it was expressly forbidden (DoE 1989d - page 10).

The Secretary of State increased the housing land provision for both Districts, significantly in the case of Redditch.

The Redditch Local Plan No: 2 was published in draft in November 1989 (Redditch Borough Council 1989), although there had been an earlier consultation exercise on the options for accommodating new housing growth. The plan sought to provide sufficient land to meet the requirements of the draft Structure Plan, prior to its modification and approval by the Secretary of State. The general strategy of the plan was to restrain the rate of growth, in order to gain a respite from the previously rapid expansion of the town (which had been a New Town until 1985), and because of the constraints on further development arising from the tightly drawn administrative boundaries of the Borough, and the green belt around the town. However, in order to meet the Structure Plan
housing land requirements, it was necessary to consider the release of a major green-field site, to provide about half of the total requirement, and the draft plan sought to identify options for this. Policy H.2 of the plan stated

A major 'green field' site is allocated for residential and associated development under Policy H.1, to accommodate between 800 and 1000 dwellings, and is identified as such on the Proposals Map. However, its release is subject to the satisfactory programming and provision of essential infrastructure and community facilities, and will be required to be in accordance with a detailed Planning Brief to be prepared by the Borough Council (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 6)

The Proposals Map indicated 3 potential, alternative locations for this major allocation - Brockhill (to the north west and contiguous with the existing built-up area), Beanhall (south west and free-standing, to the south beyond the green belt), and Shurnock (freestanding, to the south beyond the green belt). Shurnock was the Borough's preferred option, although, as the plan stated,

equal consideration will be given to comments received for or against any alternative. Furthermore, valid representations can be made with respect to land not indicated for development by this document. The Council has identified a preferred option at this stage only because the law requires it to do so, and its preference is not fixed (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 18)

Policy H.3 dealt with the planning brief, indicating that it was to be prepared by the Borough Council "to co-ordinate the release of land in accordance with policy H.2, in addition to other policies and proposals contained in this Plan" (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 7). It identified some fourteen areas which the brief would cover, including

- the proposed mix and distribution of land uses;
- the phasing of the development in line with the provision of infrastructure and community facilities;
- legal agreements to "secure the satisfactory implementation of the development and its management";
- identification and protection of important visual/environmental qualities;
- the mix of dwellings;
- the establishment of an ecological strategy;
- the location of play spaces;
• the identification and location of community facilities.

The proposed allocation is not actually described as a new settlement in the policy, although it is clear from the physical location of two of the three sites that it would be. In addition the justification for the policy states that "the development must be capable of supporting a 'balanced community' (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 8).

The objective of the draft plan is clear - to determine the preferred location, which would be included in the final deposit version with "an indication of the distribution of land uses, possibly in terms of broad zonings supplemented by proposed sites together with the final boundaries for the development area" (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 18).

Finally the plan struck a cautionary note

Pressure to develop any of these major alternative development options in advance of legitimate decision-making within the statutory Development Plan process is likely to be considered premature and actively discouraged (Redditch Borough Council 1989 - page 19)

With the identification of possible sites in the previous round of consultation and the consideration of the issue of new villages during the Structure Plan EiP, developers had been active in preparing schemes for the likely new settlement locations, and in making representations (Richard Wood Partnership 1989a, 1989b). The schemes are

• Shurnock Green promoted by Heron Homes/Prowtings/J J Gallagher, as a free-standing new settlement - Redditch Borough Council's preferred option

• Beanhall (Bow Brook) promoted by ARC Properties/IRH Developments, as a free-standing new settlement

• Brockhill promoted by Ideal Homes as a self contained, suburban expansion

Indeed, a number had done their own 'strategic planning' exercise in the early stages of the Structure Plan process, and identified the general locations which Redditch Borough Council later canvassed more formally.

As I have indicated the draft Plan had been prepared to meet the requirements of the submitted Structure Plan Alteration. Following consultation on the draft, further work on
the plan was deferred until the Secretary of State had made a decision on the Alteration. This was issued in June 1990 (DoE 1990c, 1990d) and the Borough Council reconsidered the housing allocations in the light of the increased provision to be made. However, the detailed new settlement schemes which had come forward for the three option locations were not considered as they were not particularly relevant to the choice of location for major housing development; they would complicate the choice of location and would be subject to considerable revision before any work commenced on site (Redditch Borough Council 1990a - page 261).

So, unlike the process in Kettering Borough, no attempt was made to base a choice of location on a choice of scheme as well.

Each of the option locations were assessed against the criteria in Structure Plan policy H20A, and against other planning considerations in a comprehensive comparison exercise (Redditch Borough Council 1990b, 1990c). This included consideration of topography; landscape; natural environment; agriculture; ground conditions and land drainage; utilities; road network; conservation; town form; public transport; pedestrian access; and community facilities. As a result, the Beanhall option was dropped as it failed to meet some of the major locational and impact criteria (Redditch Borough Council 1990b, 1990c). Consideration was given to an option which included both a new settlement (Shurnock) and peripheral development to the south west of the town.

The local planning process is still continuing, and the Local Plan Inquiry is to be used to examine each of the new settlement option sites and schemes in detail.

Comments on local planning process and implementation

The Local Plan has performed a number of tasks. First, it has been concerned with identifying a range of potential options for accommodating development, and within this, identifying possible new settlement sites, and then making a specific allocation. The areas of search have been narrow and almost site specific, partly because of the constrained nature of the Borough, with closely defined administrative boundaries and a green belt covering much of the land outside the built-up area. A range of sites were sought and identified as potential new settlement locations early in the process, in order to ensure that landowners were not able to hold a developer to ransom, and thereby
reduce the benefits available for the wider community in the form of social and other facilities. Second, the plan acted as a baseline for negotiation and bargaining with potential developers, setting out the basic form and content of any new settlement. Third, it provided basic information on the LPA’s likely stance and requirements.

It was not however designed to undertake as much of a co-ordination role as some of the other local plans considered, since this was to be the function of the development brief, to be prepared by the Borough Council. This document would have an important role in defining in detail the form, design, phasing, management and implementation of the development.

The relationship with the Structure Plan process proved problematic in some respects, since the Local Plan process took place in parallel with the Structure Plan approval process. The local plan began before the Structure Plan was finally approved, and so early work took the draft plan allocations and strategy as the starting point. There was some delay pending final approval of the Structure Plan, and the impact of modifications, when they came, was to reorient the plan’s strategy to some extent (as additional housing land had to be found). On the whole the local planning process coped with this fairly well. The eventual structure plan policy had an influence, as first, it legitimated the Borough Council’s desire to consider new village options, and thereby reduce the rate of growth of the town itself. Second, the policy formed part of the option appraisal process in that the criteria were used to test each of the potential major housing allocation locations. In this the criteria were used more as performance criteria, rather than as ‘ absolutes’ which had to be met in their entirety.

Although the Structure Plan proved useful, the relationship between the Borough Council and the County Council, as planning authority, had been less satisfactory, partly because of the political opposition to new villages from a majority of County members. Little formal discussion took place with the County’s officers, and the relationship can be characterised as lacking close co-operation and consultation. Moreover, there was little dialogue between the County and the private sector. On the other hand, the County as Highway Authority played a useful role in discussion and consultation with the Borough on the traffic implications of the new settlement schemes, and also had discussions with the potential developers. Relations with the neighbouring authority, Wychavon District Council, were not particularly good either, and a more fruitful dialogue might have been helpful, especially because one of the new settlement proposals was, owing to its
location close to the Borough/District boundary, likely to have more impact on Wychavon than Redditch.

The private sector had a significant role in ensuring that the Structure Plan included an enabling policy, and that a new settlement option was included in the Local Plan. The early expressions of interest by developers in particular new settlement schemes, and representations on both the Structure Plan and on the early consultation exercise in the Borough, indicated first to the Secretary of State, and then to the Borough that the housing options (in the form of new settlements) were likely to be viable and workable. There was, however, not a great deal of competition between schemes or much pressure, because of the lack of potential sites within the Borough and the depressed state of the housing market when the policy options were firmed up.

The role of the officers is, of course, significant. Rather like Kettering Borough, there was officer support for the concept of new settlements and, although accepted and supported by members, the new settlement proposal was essentially an officer initiative. The role of the Chief Planning Officer, D. Woodrow, is central, since he had been a TCPA Council member, and an advocate of planned new settlements, as demonstrated by his contributions to the new settlement debate of the mid to late 1980s (Woodrow 1986, 1988a, 1988b).

The Redditch Local Plan neatly illustrates some of the cross boundary problems that had been evident elsewhere. First, the constrained nature of the Borough meant that ideally its interests could be best served by development outside its boundaries, and possibly by a new settlement in an adjoining district. Second, the effects of the rapid growth of the New Town on the surrounding area were such that adjoining LPAs were unwilling to accept additional growth or to make allocations which would largely serve Redditch. In particular, Wychavon, although at first amenable to a new settlement, later rejected the concept in their local planning exercise (Wychavon District Council 1990a, 1990b). Third, political relations between the neighbouring authorities were poor and lack of dialogue and consultation compounded the problem. Some planners, including some County planners, felt that the form of policy approved by the Secretary of State gave insufficient direction, and had it, for example, been more positive in relation to possible new settlement locations, then some of the cross boundary problems might have been overcome.
Finally, the local planning process is interesting in that, although there were detailed schemes for each of the potential new settlement sites, these were not considered by the Borough in the assessment process, nor were they publicised by the Council. In this, it is markedly different to, for example, the processes followed by Kettering Borough Council or Uttlesford District Council (see below), where a choice was made both on a location and on a particular scheme. Redditch Borough Council sought to identify a location and then to shape the scheme through negotiation and through the use of the brief, in some ways a more lengthy process, and one less sure of a successful outcome.

No guidance - ‘the Local Plan in place of the Structure Plan’

Leicestershire

As David Lock (David Lock Associates 1990a - page 10) suggested

Leicestershire is a good example of an area where there are no policies to control new settlements and unsolicited proposals are being dealt with on an ad hoc basis

This was echoed by Nigel Moor (1990) in that "it is a classic example of where builders have perceived a need and been prepared to develop their ideas".

This has remained true until recently, when, as I indicated earlier, the County Council proposed an enabling policy framework in their review of the structure plan, published in 1991 (Leicestershire County Council 1991a, 1991b, 1991c). However, I wish to concentrate on the period before this, and consider briefly two local plans produced, or under preparation, in the county, in areas subjected to pressure for new settlements, and to look also at a third local planning process which took a different form.

Harborough District Council were faced with two proposals for major new settlements - Bittesby, near Lutterworth, on the Leicestershire/Warwickshire border, promoted by Gazeley Properties3, and Stretton Magna, on the south eastern edge of Leicester. pro-

3 Formerly the property arm of Asda, now independent, Gazeley acquired for site for warehousing/distribution, and then realised the other development potential it might have. The company have a sympathy with the new settlement idea, and have been involved in proposals elsewhere.
moted by CWS, and partly in Oadby and Wigston District. The *Lutterworth and Bitteswell Local Plan* (Harborough District Council 1989) covered the area around Lutterworth, including the new settlement site and the Magna Park distribution centre, to which the new settlement was linked. Magna Park had been supported by both the District Council and the County Council, and a first phase was approved in 1987. An application for the second (and final) phase was submitted early in 1989, and at the same time, although an application was not submitted, the developers publicised proposals for a new settlement of about 3,400 dwellings, designed to provide housing for employees at Magna Park, and to meet wider sub-regional housing demand (Conran Roche 1989, Planning 1989c). Both proposals were current when the draft review of the Local Plan was being prepared. The Plan sought to provide a policy framework and guidelines to control the development proposed at Magna Park, but commented on Bittesby that

> a new settlement would represent a substantial departure from established planning policies. These seek to guide development to specified principal locations. The role of Lutterworth as the main settlement in the immediate area of Magna Park should not be compromised and the proposals in this review of the Local Plan seek to strengthen Lutterworth's position (Harborough District Council 1989a - page 7)

It was clear that the Local Plan review was not to be used as a vehicle for determining the need for the new settlement or for making further provision for accommodating the need for housing arising from the likely extension to Magna Park, except within Lutterworth itself. This role was to be carried out by the review of the Structure Plan, as the District Council considered the new settlement to be a strategic issue for "consideration of a housing proposal of this scale will more properly form part of the review of the County Structure Plan and the plans of neighbouring authorities" (Harborough District Council 1989a - page 12) and consideration of a new settlement option in the local plan "would be contrary to the Leicestershire Structure Plan" (Harborough District Council 1989b). Indeed this was an issue which "should be properly debated in the emerging regional plan for the East Midlands" (Bowen 1991 - page 15) as well. So the Local Plan indicated that

---

4A joint venture between Whatco (itself a joint venture between CWS and a subsidiary of McAlpines) and the PGA (Professional Golfers Association). CWS own the site as part of its agricultural estate.
depending on the future requirements for housing and employment in this area, alterations may be required to the proposals in this Local Plan. There may be a need to consider the release of additional land for housing over and above the proposals indicated in this review of the local Plan (Harborough District Council 1989a - page 7 emphasis in original)

Both the further development of Magna Park (and the proposal for Bittesby) lead to conflict between the County and District Councils, and the neighbouring authorities of Warwickshire County Council and Rugby Borough Council, over the potential wider impacts of the development. The application for the second phase of the distribution centre as 'called-in' after being referred to the Secretary of State by the District as a departure from the structure plan. The lack of co-operation between neighbouring authorities also called into question the means of dealing with regional strategic issues (Hurst 1990a, 1990b).

Stretton Magna is within the area covered by the District's Scraptoft, Thurnby & Stoughton Local Plan (Harborough District Council 1987), and, as the plan was adopted in 1984 and modified following an LPI in 1985, it does not directly address the proposal. It does however provide a basic framework, in terms of the protection of open land on the edge of the city of Leicester by means of green wedges. Part of one of these affects the site of Stretton Magna, and has been taken into account in the design and layout of the proposals (CWS Property Group 1990a, 1990b, 1990c). The Stretton Magna proposal met with considerable local opposition (CASM 1990, Foden 1989, McWhirr and Simpkin 1989, Norton Rose 1990, Simpkin 1990).

The review of Leicestershire's Structure Plan began in 1989, but the programme was subject to considerable 'slippage'. It was not until early 1991 that a draft was issued for consultation (Leicestershire County Council 1991a, 1991b). It indicated in general terms that a new settlement might be required in Harborough, but "related to the growth of Leicester city and not to the Magna Park project", and not of the scale of either Bittesby or Stretton Magna (Bowen 1991 - page 15). Both schemes had been floated to influence thinking on the structure plan review strategy, and certainly in relation to Stretton Magna, this seems to have been successful to some degree. Again the District Council's attitude to both these major settlements in the District was made clear by the Council's Chief Planning Officer, in that both schemes were strategic issues, and "it remains to be seen how far these projects will be pursued in the forthcoming strategic planning debates" (Bowen 1991 - page 15). The evidence is that the County Council
share this view on the strategic nature of major new settlements, seeing a new settlement of up to 1,000 dwellings as being capable of being dealt with in a Local Plan, but defining a major new settlement as about 3,000 dwellings, and as a strategic issue to be addressed in a regional strategy.

The District Council have not determined either application, although they have been involved in considerable discussions with the developers about the content of the schemes, as have the neighbouring authority, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council (1990) about Stretton Magna. In essence Harborough remain opposed to both schemes (Harborough District Council 1991a), although they have indicated that they would wish to determine the location and form of the major housing allocation proposed for the District in the draft Structure Plan.

The question of whether the dwellings are to be accommodated in a new settlement or by expanding existing settlements should be left to the Local Plan process. Harborough District would wish to have the flexibility of considering locations throughout the district including those which do not involve prime agricultural land or attractive areas of countryside (Harborough District Council 1991b - PP 10 & 11).

They have also been faced by other private sector interest in new settlements in the District. The inquiry on Magna Park began early in 1991, and the application was later approved by the Secretary of State, thereby potentially lending support to the case for Bittesby.

**Charnwood Borough Council** were also faced with two new settlements - Wymeswold, to the north of Loughborough, promoted by a consortium headed by Costain⁵, and Garendon, on the eastern edge of Loughborough, proposed by a partnership between William Davis Ltd. and Ideal Homes (Midlands) Ltd⁶.

---

⁵The Wymeswold consortium consisted of Costain Homes UK Ltd., J.J. Gallagher Construction Ltd., David Wilson Homes, Persimmon Homes, Beazer Homes, Jelson Ltd., and Thomas Lowe Homes Ltd., a mix of large and medium producers, most of whom were involved in new settlement promotion or as consortium members elsewhere.

⁶William Davis Ltd are a small/medium Loughborough based firm of housebuilders and contractors, thought, by the firm, to be the largest private, family owned housebuilders in the country. The firm has a large land bank in and around Loughborough. They operate extensively in the East and West Midlands, and into East Anglia and South Yorkshire, building between 250 and 450 units per year. They are also involved in new settlements in Northamptonshire (Upper Faxton with Balfour Beatty) and Hereford and Worcester (Mere Green with Barratt), and were invited to join the consortia promoting Wymeswold and Six Hills in Leicestershire. They are not
The Leicestershire Structure Plan ran until 1996, and so both these proposals, like Stretton Magna, can be seen as an attempt by the housebuilders, in particular, to secure a long term land supply, for which the Structure Plan did not provide.

The Wymeswold new settlement was dealt with outside the local plan process, partly because there was no statutory local plan for the area, the only plan being an informal one dating from 1979, which considered that the site be returned to agriculture (Charnwood Borough Council 1979). The application was 'called-in' in November 1988, and, following a local inquiry, refused planning permission, in 1990, by the Secretary of State, who accepted most but not all of the Inspector's reasoning and recommendations (DoE 1990e, Whalley ND). The Secretary of State departed from the Inspector over the issue of housing land supply, and on the degree to which the new settlement might relieve pressure on other settlements, for

In the Secretary of State's opinion the proposed development, set in the Wolds countryside, would be one way of resolving the shortfall in the Structure Plan housing provision for Charnwood, and could reduce pressure for housing elsewhere in the rural areas (DOE 1990e - para. 7)

This could perhaps be seen as offering a glimmer of hope to the promoters for a further submission, albeit one which addressed the major reasons for rejection - the impact on the landscape and on the highway network. The Secretary of State also drew attention to the on-going strategic planning process in the area

the County Council have embarked on a review of the Structure Plan, and the Borough Council are preparing local plans which will... allow the public to participate fully in the comprehensive planning of housing distribution in the Borough through the development plan process (DoE 1990e - para. 8)

Although the Borough was opposed to a new settlement at Wymeswold (Charnwood Borough Council/Leicestershire County Council 1988), its attitude to new settlements as a whole was by no means negative. Shortly before the Wymeswold application was 'called-in', the Planning Committee considered the DoE discussion document on new villages, and agreed to

equal partners at Garendon, as the landowner preferred a national company as lead firm, and chose Ideal. The latter are a volume housebuilder, with whom Davis had worked before.
call on the Government, the ADC, the Countryside Commission and the ACC to ensure that, in future, structure plans and local plans allow for the provision of entirely new settlements in open countryside (Charnwood Borough Council 1988a - page 99)

subject to certain requirements, including the provision of social housing and of high quality design, and the cost of highway improvements and community facilities being met by the developer.

One of the Local Plans to which the Secretary of State referred in his decision on Wymeswold was the Loughborough Local Plan, published in draft for consultation in May 1988 and for deposit in July 1990 (Charnwood Borough Council 1988b, 1990a). It covered the site of the Garendon proposal, and although it did not, of course, deal with the area around Wymeswold, it did attract some representations from the consortium’s agents on the merits of that proposal as a solution to the longer term problems of land supply (1990b). The time horizon of the plan was essentially short term, being in line with the current Structure Plan and looking only to 1996, so that it had to allocate little additional housing land given also existing commitments. The policies for the Garendon area seek to protect open land, with a green wedge designation over the whole of the site. A specific ‘Garendon Park Protection Policy’ is also proposed to safeguard the historic landscape of the parkland, including a number of listed buildings, although the boundary is defined in such a way that it excludes much of the new village site itself. Overall the policy framework in the plan is heavily weighted against a new village at Garendon, although there is no specific reference to the proposal in the Plan.

The Garendon scheme was initially floated during the early stages of the plan preparation process (Martin 1988a), and submitted as an application early in 1989. It had attracted considerable local opposition from the public, council members and parish councils. A local action group, the Garendon Park Protection Group, was formed, and even SAVE and the CPRE’s senior partner, Tony Burton, became involved in the debate (Grinnell 1988, Martin 1989, 1990). Burton commented

The countryside in Leicestershire is under attack as never before. A spate of speculative planning applications for new villages threatens to re-draw the settlement pattern of the county and destroy its rural character (Martin 1990 - page 1)
However, public objections and representations later in the planning process were more muted (Charnwood Borough Council 1990b), and there was some degree of support from local politicians (Martin 1988b). Both the new settlement promoter (William Davis Ltd) and the landowner's agents made representations in support of their scheme, and against those policy proposals inimical to it, at all stages of the process, including at the LPI which was held in 1991. The Inspector's report was issued in May 1992, and supported the Borough's current opposition to Garendon. It did however indicate that it was one of the options to be considered in future, and that the green wedge should then be reassessed in the light of housing need (Martin 1992).

So, it is clear that Garendon may be considered, and adopted, as an option for the longer term. The Local Plan had pointed to the constraints likely to affect any future major expansion of the town. A wide ranging reappraisal of these constraints and of priorities would be needed, together with an assessment of potential alternative development strategies, in order to provide sufficient housing land. It is evident that there is some degree of support for the concept of new settlements, both from officers, and equally importantly from some members, and indeed some support for the Garendon site itself.

In Melton, the Borough Council have adopted a different form of local planning approach to new settlements. David Wilson Homes7 submitted an application for a new village at Kettleby Magna in August 1988, which the Borough Council treated as a departure from the Structure Plan, and referred to the Secretary of State. Unlike the larger proposal at Wymeswold, it was not 'called-in' and the Council resolved to support it, and grant planning permission (Holmes 1991).

The Borough Council had highlighted potential housing land supply problems in the Melton Mowbray area in a monitoring exercise carried out in early 1987 (Melton Borough Council 1987). These problems resulted from the constraints to further development on the immediate periphery of the town and from more rapid than expected development.

7David Wilson Homes are the housebuilding company of the Wilson Bowden group (construction/property development), based in central Leicestershire at Ibstock. They are a medium/large, regional housebuilder, building about 1,500 units per year, and operating in the South West, South (except the Home Counties), and East and West Midlands. The company has interests in promoting new settlements in Essex (Uttlesford District), Leicestershire (Wymeswold, as a consortium member) and in Northamptonshire (Daventry and Kettering Districts).
David Wilson Homes were themselves looking for land in the area, in late 1987. At first, informal discussions took place, although these were reported to the Council by the Chief Planning Officer (Melton Borough Council 1988a).

The Local Plan for the Area, the Melton Mowbray and Ashfordby Local Plan (Melton Borough Council 1987), had been placed on deposit early in 1988, and the Council considered that it made sufficient provision for housing land (Melton Borough Council 1988a, 1988b). However, the status of, and progress on, the plan became problematic because of the floating of the proposal. The adoption of the plan, although it was to be subject to a LPI in November 1988, would be

prejudiced by any interim statement of support for the proposed new village. It would make the Council's position with regard to existing local plan allocations for residential development impossible to defend (Melton Borough Council 1988a - para. 5.4)

The Plan was of limited relevance since it covered only part of the new village site, although it did set out a general policy framework.

The scheme initially comprised 1,500 dwellings, although this was later reduced to 1,000 dwellings (David Wilson Estates Ltd. 1988, Moor 1990). As David Wilson's planning director, John Holmes (1991 - page 1), indicated "initial officer response...... was negative; the proposal was 'contrary to policy'. The scheme only survived because of local political support". Part of this support, which was from members and from the public, was directed towards the benefits the scheme offered, including the funding of major highway improvements for the town and considerable open space.

The developer used the tactic of carrying on direct negotiations with the Council members, as well as an extensive programme of publicity. Detailed requirements for infrastructure, including highway improvements, and for community facilities were negotiated and formed the basis of legal agreements, and a master plan was produced jointly by the developers and the Borough Council. So overall "the scheme was a demonstration of successful dialogue involving public, local authority and applicant; co-operation and compromise, rather than conflict and confrontation" (Holmes 1991 - page 1). However little discussion took place with the County Council, except as Highway Authority, as the County planners were opposed to the proposal.
The scheme illustrates the effects of the wider economy for
the recession has clearly worked against most large development projects in two
ways: infrastructure costs have risen and potential income from house sales has
fallen (Holmes 1991 - page 1)

and this has led to the re-negotiation of legal agreements, both with the landowners (to
reduce the amount that they will be paid for the land), and with the Borough Council (to
vary the details of the planning gain package).

Comments on local planning process and implementation

In all these cases the Structure Plan provided little, if any, direct guidance on new set­
tlements per se, and as the inspector stated in relation to the Wymeswold proposal

In my opinion it would have been useful for there to have been some reference to
new settlements in the Leicestershire Structure Plan. To that specific, but limited
extent, the Plan's relevance to this project is reduced (Whalley ND - para. 303)

However the Plan did provide a general policy framework, in terms of its general strat­
egy, the housing provision to be made in the District and policies for the protection of
open land, for the assessment of new settlement proposals like Wymeswold. What it did
not do was to provide a strategic lead and it gave little direction where the issues were
wider as in the cases of Bittesby (where cross boundary and cross county impacts were
an issue) and Stretton Magna (again where the scheme sought to provide for needs in
another LPAs area, this time Leicester City). Given this situation, then, the new
settlement proposals posed a problem for the local planning processes, particularly in
Harborough, and to a lesser extent in Charnwood (Amos 1991e).

These three cases highlight some of the other problems of co-ordinating local plans with
structure plan preparation and review. First, the delay inherent in the County's review of
their Structure Plan affected the timing of Local Plan preparation, leading to uncertainty
and delay in the local planning process itself. Second, the lack of clear guidance in the
Structure Plan meant that in Harborough, the Local Plan was unable to address specific
proposals, and come to a view on them. Third, the short time horizon of the Structure
Plan had an impact on some of the local Plans that were prepared, especially in Chan­
wood, as they had to deal with short time-scales and with low levels of housing require­
ments. Since most of the new settlement proposals would have been developed over a period of ten years or more, and so contribute towards future housing needs, the Local Plans could not consider them (or at least did not do so).

So on the whole the local plan as such proved to be of little value in handling the pressure from the private sector, especially in relation to Stretton Magna and Bittesby, and also Kettleby Magna.

Most of these cases demonstrate that the ideology of the officers is important, in terms of their general stance on private sector new settlements. Attitudes varied across the Districts, as did the willingness to negotiate and discuss matters with the private sector. Where there is some degree of support for a proposal, it does appear that there is a need for the officers (and members) to have some understanding of development economics and, also, to have a degree of flexibility about requirements in order to ensure that the proposal can be implemented successfully. It is in this that the importance of negotiation and bargaining lie, for, as Kettleby Magna shows, there may be a need for re-negotiation of agreements in particular market conditions, if plan proposals are to be implemented or if development is to take place satisfactorily.

However in Harborough the general impression of the promoters and their agents was that the District's officers were unable to cope with the magnitude of the developments which confronted them and that they "wished they would go away". Here also the Council adopted an ambivalent attitude to new settlements. First they indicated that they were unwilling to come to a view about Bittesby or Stretton Magna because they were strategic matters which should be dealt with by the Structure Plan. Then when commenting on the proposed policies and strategy in the review of the Structure Plan, they wished to be able to determine the form and location of major housing allocations through their local planning process, despite being reluctant to do so when having the opportunity.

The role of members, and the general relations of power between officers and members, also appears to have been important. In Melton, despite initial objections from the officers, the members were relatively enthusiastic about the Kettleby Magna proposal, and were able to exert a considerable degree of influence on the outcome. They became involved in direct discussions with the developer, and to a large extent shaped the authority's response. In Charnwood also, an undercurrent of member support for the
Garendon proposal seems to have kept it 'alive' as an option for the future, although here there has also been a degree of officer support.

It is possible to detect a number of different strategies or tactics used by the private sector in their promotion of new settlement schemes. First, there was direct confrontation with the planning policy framework, and with the LPAs, in the case of Wymeswold, which can be characterised as a challenge to the planning system. This direct challenge was unsuccessful. Second, schemes were floated to influence both structure plan review and local plan outcome, both in the short and long term. Here Stretton Magna offered solutions to problems both within the district in which it was situated and further afield, and it appears to have some impact on the emerging strategic framework. The Bittesby scheme was less successful in this respect. Both differed in their approach to publicity and to the profile given to the scheme, although neither promoter was 'confrontational' in their dealings with the LPAs. So although these schemes did challenge the existing planning policy framework, they were not pursued with the same vigour as Wymeswold. Garendon also can be seen as a scheme promoted to influence the longer term local planning framework, and again one which was not pursued to an inquiry, but was promoted in a rather 'low key' manner. Third, perhaps the most sophisticated approach was that adopted by the promoter of Kettleby Magna, who identified a range of problems of immediate concern in the area of Melton Mowbray, and sought to offer solutions to these through the vehicle of a new village. The promoter sought public support, and, more importantly perhaps, member support, through appropriate publicity, and through negotiation. Direct approaches to, and discussions with members were used to play down opposition from officers.

In some ways, it is perhaps those promoters who are locally based, or have a range of local contacts, that have been most successful in Leicestershire. Kettleby Magna is the one scheme to gain approval, and its promoter and developer, David Wilson Homes, are a local firm. Of the others, perhaps William Davis Ltd. (Garendon) and CWS (Stretton Magna), can be said to be partially successful, the former in gaining a tacit acknowledgement of the new village as a future option to be seriously considered, and the latter, in getting their general site location identified in the Structure Plan review as a possible new settlement location. Both these promoters have strong local links, William Davis as a house builder based in Loughborough, and CWS as a long-standing landowner. These firms handled the promotion themselves rather than entrusting it to firms of planning or other consultants, although these obviously had a role to play.
knowledge, particularly in developing the appropriate strategy for promotion, may be important.

Finally, it is evident that the development plan, and in particular, the local plan route, is not the only means by which new settlements may emerge. In Melton, the Plan covering the site of Kettleby Magna offered little guidance, and the scheme was negotiated as a departure from the development plan. The decision of the Secretary of State not to 'call-in' the application was, in some respects, crucial, but it was taken in the light of LPA support for the scheme, in contrast to the decision to 'call-in' Wymeswold, where there was considerable opposition.

*Essex - Uttlesford District Plan*

In Uttlesford the Local Plan had to deal with a major issue, that of accommodating part of the additional housing likely to be required following the expansion of Stansted Airport. The County Council proposed that the District should provide for an extra 2,500 dwellings, and the Secretary of State, in his draft modifications to the Essex Structure Plan First Alteration, requested the LPAs to prepare plans urgently to take account of this.

Work on the District Plan began in 1989, and carried on in parallel with the structure plan approval process (the proposed modifications being issued early in 1990). The consultation draft of the District Plan was published in May 1990, and it made specific proposals for concentrating the airport related development in the A120 corridor.

...the consideration of alternative locations has led to the identification of preferred sites at Takeley and Felsted to accommodate 1,400 and 1,100 dwellings respectively (Uttlesford District Council 1990a -page 6).

These were identified following an exercise which considered alternative approaches and which concluded that a strategy which concentrated development would reduce environmental impacts, alleviate development pressure elsewhere, protect existing communities, and have advantages in terms of service/infrastructure provision. A range of criteria were used in this exercise

(a) be well related to the main road system and located in the A120 corridor;
(b) not be located too close to the Airport where aircraft noise is intrusive;
(c) not be located under aircraft flight paths, near the Airport, where aircraft noise is intrusive;
(d) not intrude into strategic blocks of open, remote countryside;
(e) represent a comprehensive scheme, and provide all the necessary infrastructure associated with the development;
(f) not lead to coalescence of free-standing settlements;
(g) be capable of implementation and ensure that some dwellings would be available for occupation from 1996.

Each of the chosen sites performed best against these criteria, although not meeting all of them. The allocation of two sites had the advantage of providing choice for residents, minimising the impacts of development, and permitting the development "of two communities of a scale appropriate to this rural District" (Uttlesford District Council 1990a - page 15). The site at Felsted was formerly a factory, with a number of derelict buildings, the removal of which "would represent a positive gain to the community at large" (Uttlesford District Council 1990a - page 15). Takeley was more of an expansion of an existing village however. Provision for each of these was made in Policy H1, dealing with the general location of housing, but, as the policy made clear,

The provision of 1,100 dwellings at Felsted and 1,400 at Takeley, amounting to 2,500 dwellings, is contingent upon Parliament authorising the development of Stansted Airport from 8 to 15 Million passengers per annum (Uttlesford District Council 1990a - page 17)

This was specified in more detail in Policy H2, Stansted-Related Housing, 

The development of housing sites identified as meeting the requirements generated by the expansion of Stansted Airport up to 15 million passengers per annum (mppa) will be phased in relation to growth at the airport. Two committed sites accommodating 900 dwellings at Great Dunmow will be phased in relation to the Airport's development up to 8 mppa. In relation to the Airport's development from 8 to 15 mppa, a site is identified at Felsted accommodating 1,100 dwellings and sites at Takeley accommodating 1,400 dwellings. Occupation of any dwelling at Felsted and Takeley will not be permitted before 1995 unless 8 mppa is achieved before that date and in any event not until the new A120 is open to traffic (Uttlesford District Council 1990a - page 18)
The proposals are developed in more detail on Inset Maps for each location, and in the form of a set of Development Principles dealing with, at Felsted for example,

- the relationship of the site to the existing village;
- the general concept of the proposed development;
- access;
- housing type and tenure (at least 20% social housing);
- provision of community facilities (including a local centre, with a primary school, sports hall, shopping and possibly a doctor's surgery) on- and off-site;
- layout and provision of landscaping and public open space;
- other design principles;
- phasing;
- site preparation and provision of infrastructure;
- management, including provision for maintenance.

A specific Policy, FEL. 1, sets out the scale, provision of social housing, and the required community facilities; phasing; the need for a legal agreement "to control, inter alia, design principles, tenure arrangements, the retention of the initial subsidy benefit in perpetuity, provision of infrastructure, communal facilities to be provided, landscaping, ownership of open space, future management of the site and the method by which surplus sludge is to be disposed" (Uttlesford District Council 1990a - page 104); and the requirement for a jointly prepared and approved master plan. The detail goes beyond a normal local plan policy and represents the basic outlines of a development brief. The proposals for Takeley follow the same format.

The consultation period ran from May to September, and during this period a number of alternatives were floated by the private sector. A total of eight schemes emerged (details of these are set out in Table 10.4), reflecting perhaps the buoyancy of the local housing market, and the prospects for long term growth in the area. Many of the promoters had identified the area as one with potential for new settlements in strategic planning exercises, and in fact there had previously been an application for a radical expansion/new settlement at Takeley which had been refused. The proposals took various forms, including small scale and major village expansion as well as new settlements.
TABLE 10.4
NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES IN UTTLESFORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEME</th>
<th>PROMOTER</th>
<th>URBAN FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land west of Felsted (the District Plan site)</td>
<td>Berisford Property Group (landowners)</td>
<td>New settlement 1,100 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north east of Takeley (the District Plan site)</td>
<td>British and Commonwealth Properties PLC</td>
<td>Major village expansion 1,300 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land west, north and east of Takeley (part of the District Plan site)</td>
<td>Conran Roche (Takeley) Ltd</td>
<td>Major village expansion 1,300 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton Park (south west of Little Easton) the preferred option</td>
<td>Crest Nicholson</td>
<td>New settlement 2,500 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land south of Stebbing</td>
<td>Pelham Ltd</td>
<td>Settlement expansion 340 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land east of Stebbing (Andrewsfield Airfield)</td>
<td>Beazer Homes Ltd</td>
<td>New settlement 950 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north-east of Stebbing Green (includes part of Beazer site)</td>
<td>David Wilson Estates/J S Bloor</td>
<td>New settlement 1,000 dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land north of Takeley Street</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>Village expansion 300 dwellings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

The only scheme which could provide all the required housing in one location was Crest's Easton Park (Crest Nicholson ND, Chapman Warren 1990, Planning 1990). The developers argued that their new settlement solution would reduce the impact of development on other settlements, whilst the Local Plan proposals "would have significant adverse implications for the villages of Takeley and Felsted" (Planning 1990b - page 31). The company had identified the location early on in the local planning process, in early 1989, and had then discussed it with the Council's officers, obtaining a favourable response. They had also lobbied members. However, the site had received little formal assessment in the exercise to identify potential locations for airport-related housing in
the Local Plan, and appears to have been discounted because it formed a strategic gap of open countryside between a number of other settlements.

These schemes were the subject of additional consultation in October - December 1990, to give residents and others a chance to comment on the developers' submissions (Uttlesford District Council 1990b). Following this exercise there was some division within the authority, as the planning committee opted for a solution involving development on four, rather than two, sites. However, at a Full Council meeting, this proposal was overturned, and members accepted the arguments in favour of the Easton Park scheme (Planning 1991g). It was included in the Deposit version of the District Plan, published in November 1991 (Uttlesford District Council 1991). The Plan made clear the reasons for the choice of the Easton Park site,

the Council's preferred solution which concentrates all airport-related housing in a new settlement sited south-west of Little Easton is considered to benefit from one particular advantage in that development would have direct access to the new A120 at Dunmow west junction affording a high quality route to Stansted Airport and elsewhere, without traffic impact on intervening settlements. In addition there would be limited environmental impact on existing settlements (Uttlesford District Council 1991 - page 13)

The general housing provision policies are in much the same form as those for Felsted and Takeley in the draft plan, and again the development principles are developed in more detail. So, for example, "the development company will be expected to make appropriate provision for facilities which will be required as a result of development, on site where feasible, or alternatively make a financial contribution toward them. The detailed arrangements will be the subject of a legal agreement" (Uttlesford District Council 1991 - page 166). Other elements of the planning gain package included provision of a new access and funding of junction improvements, the provision of public transport to the Airport, at least 25% social housing, and the maintenance of open space. The specific policy on the new settlement is detailed, and includes

- the scale of the settlement and the social housing requirement;
- provision of two primary schools, and undefined community facilities;
- provision of off-site infrastructure and facilities;
- access;
- landscaping and open space;
• phasing;
• provision of a belt of land around the settlement which would be left undeveloped;
• the necessity for legal agreements to control the development and the other matters addressed in the policy;
• the preparation of a master plan.

It is clear that there are differences in the planning gain package required for Easton Park and those for the two comprehensive development sites originally proposed. First the social housing requirement was increased, and second, apart from education, other community facilities are not set out in detail. However, the Council have largely accepted Crest's proposals, and translated these into policy requirements (Crest Nicholson ND).

Comments on local planning process and implementation

The District Plan has performed a number of functions, in relation to new settlements, as well as dealing with other issues. First, in response to the need to find additional land for airport-related housing, it assessed alternative options, and identified and allocated specific sites for new/expanded settlements. Second, it set out to provide for implementation, by outlying guidelines and requirements for the proposed new settlements. In this it undertook both co-ordination and resource mobilisation tasks. Third, it embodied both detailed policy guidance and essential information to would-be developers. Finally, when faced with a number of alternative and competing schemes, it was able to determine a preferred option. This took place within a clear framework provided by the structure plan, albeit one which did not directly address new settlements. The local planning process was therefore robust enough to be able to deal with private sector pressures, and changing political priorities, in a situation with only limited strategic direction.

The elected members had a significant role particularly in determining the preferred solution, against the recommendations of the officers. Again this reflects the impact of local political pressure and opposition to the effects of growth on existing settlements. The outcome indicated the acceptance of central direction (the need to plan for, and accommodate, additional housing), coupled with some degree of innovation in deciding upon a settlement solution.
It is unsurprising that the draft plan generated a number of competing private sector proposals for meeting the required housing provision, given the long term growth prospects which the airport expansion represented. Most of these schemes followed the general direction of the draft plan on the location of growth, in the A120 corridor, and attempted to meet most of the other requirements in terms of the development principles set out for Felsted and Takeley. The outcome itself reflects, for Crest, the success of their strategic planning and of concentrated lobbying. Moreover, their scheme had an impact on the eventual form and content of the policy framework which emerged in that much of the detail of the Easton Park Scheme became incorporated into the District Plan policy.

So overall the local planning process was able to deal successfully with private sector pressure and with accommodating large scale additional housing, in the form of a new settlement, without a specific strategic framework which made provision for, or addressed new settlements. In this there are parallels with the situation in Melton Borough, and the outcome indicates that new settlements do not only emerge where there is an appropriate framework in structure plans.

The switch in preferred solutions, at least in terms of location, if not in basic form, demonstrates the radical changes in policy which may take place during the policy formulation process. Finally the tactics adopted by the private sector in seeking to work with the local planning process, and with the LPA, rather than in confrontation with them, also demonstrate a changing approach, which became apparent in the late 1980s. This was due in part perhaps to the growing realisation that the central state would not, despite the rhetoric, support the housebuilders on appeal, against clearly demonstrated local preference. Perhaps also the DoE had learnt from the experience in Cambridgeshire that large scale public inquiries following the 'call-in' of applications were not the most satisfactory means of dealing with private sector competition.

**No Guidance - New settlement policy option dropped**

The discussion in Chapter 9 suggested that there were a number of instances where the CPA had proposed a new settlement policy at an early stage in their structure plan review only to reject it later, or for it to be deleted by the Secretary of State. This could introduce uncertainty into the local planning process, particularly where a District Council had begun local plan preparation based on the emerging policy framework which later
dramatically altered. It was also suggested that a District may use the merging local plan as a means of influencing the CPA to produce a desired outcome.

**Nottinghamshire - Newark on Trent Local Plan**

Although this may not be a wholly accurate reflection of the situation in Nottinghamshire, Newark and Sherwood District Council had proposed a new settlement at Balderton in their emerging Newark on Trent Local Plan in advance of the submission of the Structure Plan review, and this proposal had been included as a site specific policy in that review as I indicated earlier in the previous Chapter.

In approving the Structure Plan, the Secretary of State deleted the enabling policy which he had proposed to substitute for the explicit reference to Balderton proposed by the CPA (DoE/DTp 1991b). The reasoning for the enabling policy was that precise locations should be determined by the Districts, but a criteria based policy and an indication of those Districts, where new settlements could play a role would be useful, for local authorities should have the option of meeting housing needs through the development of new settlements as well as incremental development in existing settlements. He therefore welcomes the positive attitude of Newark and Sherwood District Council towards new settlements ...... the decision about the scope for and detailed location of new settlements will be for the District Councils to make as part of their local plan policy (Secretary of State NDc - para. 4.45)

In the light of the representations on these proposed modifications, the Secretary of State deleted the policy entirely, despite support from the District for the specific identification of Balderton as a new village location (DoE/DTp 1991b).

However, well before this, Newark and Sherwood District Council had begun preparation of a local plan for Newark-on-Trent and issued a consultation draft in June 1989 (Newark and Sherwood District Council 1989). The District Council had earlier the previous year identified the Balderton site as one with developmental potential and so included it in the plan proposals

The District Council is aware that the Balderton Hospital complex will become surplus to the Health Authority's requirements in the early part of the 1990s ...... it is accepted that a viable and realistic future use must be found for the site. Given
the need for the release of further land for housing development in the Newark area the District Council has decided to respond positively by proposing a new village of 1000 dwellings on the site (Newark and Sherwood District Council 1989 - page 22)

Policy H.2 allocates the site for a new village, but the policy does not go much beyond this, with most of the detail left to other policy guidance as "the District Council will produce a planning brief to guide development on the site in association with the Health Authority" (Newark and Sherwood District Council 1989 - page 23). The County Council accepted the proposal and included it in the Structure Plan review, submitted in January 1990 (Nottinghamshire County Council 1990), although by then the District had become more flexible in relation to the number of dwellings the site could accommodate, in the light of an increased housing provision proposed by the County.

The District Council began preparation of a planning brief for the site, and had consulted on a draft version prior to the final approval and modifications of the Structure Plan. Indeed, as the Council commented in relation to the proposed modifications:

> The 'New Settlements' policy proposed by the Secretary of State has not been marked, to date, by a lessening of the District Council's commitment to proposals for a new community in the Balderton Hospital area (Newark and Sherwood District Council 1991)

Surprisingly for so site-specific a proposal, there two expressions of interest by the private sector in the form of two separate schemes, and the District Council became involved in discussions with both. One came from the landowners, the Regional Health Authority, and the other, which included a larger site with additional land outside the hospital, from developers, A. F. Budge Ltd.

Both the brief and the local plan itself required reworking in the light of the final modifications from the Secretary of State, although these did not have a significant impact on either.
Comments on local planning process and implementation

The structure plan modification and approval process did not, in this case, introduce any great degree of uncertainty in the local planning process, given the District Council’s commitment to the proposal, and the tacit support of the County Council. The District’s approach to the identification of the new village had been implicitly endorsed by the Secretary of State and in turn the Council had followed the approach advocated by the Minister.

The Local Plan’s major role was one of site allocation and legitimation of the proposal. The tasks of co-ordination, mobilisation of resources, and the provision of guiding policies were left to a planning brief and to negotiation. So the content of the scheme, apart from the basic housing provision, and its implementation was to be determined by the brief, which was accorded the major role.

The proposal itself represents the coming together of an opportunity, the likely redundancy of the hospital site; the identification of its development potential by the landowner and by the LPA; and of the need to allocated land for an increased housing provision.

The District Council pursued a firm course towards allocation and eventual development of the site, despite the changing policy form in the structure plan review and approval process. In some ways, then, the absence of a strategic framework, or of a policy dealing with new settlements, had little impact on the outcome in this case.

Other forms of process - development briefs

Planning or development briefs have an important role to play in the local planning process. A number of LPAs have used this mechanism to elaborate upon the requirements for new settlement development set out in local plan policies, and to seek to coordinate development. In a few cases, briefs have provided most of the detail following very limited policy statements.

Nadin, Wood and Middleton (1989) and Bruton and Nicholson (1983, 1987) point to the widespread use of development briefs. The latter detail their functions as being to provide detailed guidance on the form a development should take on a particular site or sites. May also be used to establish framework for development, including
desired land uses and disposal terms where the authority is landowner. Other designations possible depending on content, e.g. 'planning brief', wherein planning considerations for site development are set out (Bruton and Nicholson 1987 - page 253)

Ratcliffe (1982) suggests three categories of development briefs

promotional - which aim to attract potential developers;
exploratory - which adopt a neutral position in relation to a site for which interest has been expressed; and
regulatory - which set out uses, standards and densities for sites.

However "different aspects of the same brief may be promotional, exploratory or regulatory in character as circumstances require" (Bruton and Nicholson 1987 - page 2371), and indeed a number of the briefs to which I have referred combine these characteristics. Elson (1989, 1990) makes reference to a number of instances where development briefs were used to guide large-scale residential development, and Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) deal with the form, content and formulation of the brief on Lower Earley in Berkshire.

Although I have, so far, dealt with development briefs which arise out of specific local plan policies, however limited their scope, there are a number of instances where LPAs have sought to guide new settlement development through briefs alone (backed, of course, by the control inherent in the consideration of planning applications) rather than through formal plans.

Perhaps the most successful example is that of Hertsmere Borough Council who promoted the redevelopment of a redundant hospital site at Shenley in the form of a new settlement through a brief (Anthony 1991, Falk 1988, 1990a, 1990b, Hertsmere Borough Council 1986, 1987, Smith 1987, 1988, 1989). The brief was prepared in conjunction with the landowner, the Regional Health Authority and their agents, the planners/urban designers, URBED, who were particularly influential (Falk 1990a, 1990b). The process itself was lengthy beginning with an initial approach by the landowner in 1984, and preparation of and consultation on the brief in 1986 and 1987. An application was submitted in the late 1986, and 'called-in' in May 1987 (Smith 1987). It was approved by the Secretary of State following a PLI in the autumn of 1988, with an endorsement of the LPA's approach, and in particular of the extensive consultation which had been involved in the preparation of the brief. Similarly, wide ranging discus-
sions took place between the LPA, the landowner and their consultants, and other interests, culminating in the preparation of a series of 'community planning agreements' (Smith 1988, Falk 1990a, 1990b). However, finding an appropriate developer took longer, and it is only recently that development has begun on site (Anthony 1991). As elsewhere this is also due in part to the depressed housing market.

_Forest Heath District Council_ appraised the problems of the small settlement of _Red Lodge_ through a brief in 1986, and suggested comprehensive redevelopment in the form of a new settlement (Forest Heath DC 1986). The brief was prepared more as a basis for discussion than as a formal statement of policy. Again following a lengthy period of discussion and negotiation which took several years, the proposal was included in the structure plan for Suffolk, as well as being elaborated on in a local plan. In addition, private sector interest was attracted in the form of two competing schemes, one of which came from Crest, the successful developer in Uttlesford. In part these were generated by proposals to bypass the settlement, thereby making it a more attractive development proposition. Crest had had an interest in the scheme since 1987 and had been acquiring interests in land in the settlement, as well as preparing a master plan. This plan was broadly accepted by the LPA and included in their District-wide Local Plan. Moor (1990) characterises the process as "a rare example of a new settlement proposal planned from inception by the local planning authorities", although the private sector's role has perhaps been greater than this acknowledges.

Although not in Cambridgeshire, the scheme was debated at the inquiry on the A45 corridor new settlements in Cambridgeshire, since it appeared to fit more closely with the emerging regional strategy (see the Chapter on regional strategic guidance) than either of the two schemes to the east of Cambridge (Simpkins 1990). Moreover it was argued that development of a new settlement nearer Cambridge would conflict with the development of Red Lodge, since the former area was more attractive, with a more buoyant housing market.

_South Derbyshire District Council_ have also used a development brief, produced in consultation with the site owner, the MOD, to promote a new settlement of between 1,200 and 1,500 dwellings at _Hilton_, and to "secure a high standard of design and development" (Moor 1990). This proposal, like the new settlement in Uttlesford, arises from a specific development pressure, in this case, the need to provide additional housing to meet demands generated by the development of a large new Toyota factory in the area.
From this short review of development or planning briefs used to promote new settlements, the major conclusion is that in these circumstances the LPA has acted as an enabler, using the brief to promote, guide, co-ordinate and control development. The briefs have provided a framework for discussion and negotiation with the private sector, and have been influenced by the market. In the Red Lodge case, as with some other areas with growth potential or with new settlement opportunities, the private sector has worked in parallel with emerging LPA policy and shaped it, to the extent that private sector proposals for layout, land uses and design have been formally incorporated into the local planning process. In some senses, the case of Shenley can be seen as a partnership between the private and public sectors. However, whilst the principle and general form of development at Red Lodge was a public sector initiative, the eventual form of the scheme depended to a large extent on private sector ideas. The successful use of briefs to promote new settlements is dependant upon the private sector’s perception of market conditions, and the public sector’s commitment to the development.

**Other forms of process - Unitary Development Plans (UDPs)**

The UDP is a relatively recent innovation, and in general one concerned with metropolitan areas (Angell and Taylor 1985, Thew and Watson 1989, Dent 1990). In many ways it combines the functions of both structure and local plans. It is in two parts, with the first part of the plan outlining general or strategic policies, and the second part setting out detailed policies and proposals for development. Dent (1990 - page 95) in particular has pointed to some of the problems inherent in this type of plan which will be largely the result of collecting together extant policy documents, informal as well as statutory, and repackaging them. The weakness is that extant policies may have only a limited shelf-life. The long term vision for an area may be missed. Planning based on this approach is likely to be market-led, reactive and pragmatic.

She also highlights the difficulties in achieving strategic policies for relatively small parts of urban areas, although Carter et al. (1991) identify some positive features, and see UDPs as offering an improved basis for implementation.

Notwithstanding these problems, a couple of LPAs have used the UDP mechanism to promote or float new settlements. Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (MBC) (1990)
proposed a new settlement of 700 dwellings at Dickens Heath as part of their strategy for housing provision, with contributions to new infrastructure, road improvements and other provisions to be made by the developers. This proposal has recently attracted interest from the private sector.

The proposal in Calderdale MBC's UDP was less firm, in merely encouraging investigations of the possibility of a small scale new settlement at Eastwood, and identifying an area for investigation on the Proposals Map (Calderdale MBC 1991).

**Other Local Plans addressing new settlements**

Finally, a number of other local plans have considered the issue of new settlements, or alternatively new settlement schemes have been floated by the private sector during the local planning process.

First, a number of LPAs have allocated new settlement sites in local plans following consideration of a range of options. In South Hampshire, this followed the designation of a number of growth points in the regional strategy and in the original Structure Plan approved in 1977 (Amos 1990a). One of the growth points, Whiteley, was a new settlement, and the LPAs, Hampshire County Council and Fareham Borough Council, prepared a local plan and development briefs to guide development of the settlement. However, as David Lock Associates (1990a - page 8) indicate

> a problem arose in relation to the length of time taken to complete the statutory process. As a result, in some cases, planning applications were submitted by developers before Local Plans or development briefs had been prepared. As the County's general arguments and strategy were soundly based, however, these speculative proposals were not generally supported on appeal.

Moor (1990) describes the process as a partnership between the private sector and the LPAs, but

> although Whiteley represents the successful working of the strategic planning process, its implementation ..., has not been without problems, related here to land assembly (Amos 1990a - page 23)
and it illustrates "the long time scale for new settlement conception, planning and development" (ibid - page 23), for development only commenced in 1988.

In Kent, the Ashford area has been designated as a growth point in the County Structure Plan, and the LPA have been assessing options for dealing with this. This has been done in the context of the Ashford Local Plan, which considered a range of options, including a new settlement, and potential sites (Ashford Borough Council 1989, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, Hawkes 1992). Although there has been private sector interest in developing a new settlement on the edge of the town for some considerable time, Hawkes (1992) feels that the whole process has not been characterised by co-operation between the public and private sectors. In particular the LPA have little appreciation of the economics of development, and have not undertaken their own development appraisal. The infrastructure and other requirements, including social housing, are considerable, and not capable of being supported by the development.

Other Local Plans in which new village sites have been allocated include

- **Canterbury Local Plan** (Kent);
- **Vale of White Horse Rural Areas Local Plan** (Oxfordshire);
- **Purbeck Local Plan** (Dorset) which proposes a new settlement at St. Martin's Hill, and includes detailed policies on the amount of housing, urban design, phasing, provision of facilities, and the form of the village centre (Purbeck District Council 1990). It is proposed to amplify the requirements for the scheme in a series of design and development briefs. The proposal itself formed an entry to have the TCPA 'Tomorrow's New Communities' competition (Darley, Hall and Lock ND).

Second, a number of LPAs have assessed the option of accommodating growth in a new village and rejected it. In Staffordshire, the **East Staffordshire District Local Plan** proposed a new settlement as a means of dealing with an area of derelict land and then rejected the option, as did the **North Beds Borough Local Plan** (following the Structure Plan rejection of a new settlement option) and the South Northamptonshire Rural Areas Local Plan.
Third, a new settlement option has been considered in several other local planning processes and a decision has not yet been made on whether or not to allocate land or adopt a specific policy. These include

- **Norwich Area Local Plan** in Norfolk where a new settlement is an option for dealing with future growth;

- **Castle Morpeth Rural Areas Local Plan** (Northumberland) in which the brief for the plan suggests a new village. Here such a development would relieve pressure on existing villages, but also provide for an unmet demand for executive housing (Miles 1989);

- **Medway Gap and Vicinity Local Plan** (Kent) where, as in a number of other cases a new settlement is seen as a future option beyond the current local plan period. The Plan identifies suitable locations, including the redundant hospital of Leybourne Grange, and areas damaged by mineral working (Tonbridge and Malling BC 1989, Moor 1990, Planner 1990). There has been private sector interest in this area and a consortium put forward a series of proposals which have found some favour with the LPA;

- **Lichfield Rural Areas Local Plan** (Staffordshire) which considers a range of possible locations to provide for the housing provision set out in the draft structure plan. The scale of existing allocations or commitments is such that sites are required for a limited amount of new development, and the District Council set out four possible options for allocating this growth, in order to relieve pressure on existing settlements (Lichfield District Council ND).

Fourth, in addition to some of those cases outlined above, the private sector has used the local planning process to float schemes, including

- **Kings Lynn Local Plan** in Norfolk, where the plan's strategy is to locate major development within Kings Lynn, in order to protect the countryside, and encourage the utilisation of underused urban land. Here two proposals for new villages in the rural area around the town have been floated by the private sector (Planning 1991);
• **Daventry Local Plan** (Northamptonshire), which used the enabling policy framework of the structure plan to consider the need for a new settlement and generated a number of private sector proposals;

• **South Warwickshire Local Plan** which invited developers to submit sites for consideration in the plan, and generated a significant number of schemes, which were then the subject of consultation. Following this exercise, the District rejected a new settlement option (Warwickshire County Council & Stratford on Avon DC 1989a, 1989b);

• **Fenland Local Plan** identifies Guyhirn as a restricted growth village, but a consortium have put forward a proposal in response to consultation on the plan to radically expand the settlement, by over 1,000 dwellings (Planning 1990c);

• **Cherwell Rural Areas Local Plan** (Oxfordshire) where a new settlement proposal was debated at the LPI.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This Chapter has outlined the complexity of the local planning process, and some of the problems inherent in new settlement development and implementation. In this concluding section, I shall discuss the role of local plans, the various local planning approaches to new settlements, the relationship between the local plan and the structure plan, and the role of actors in the process, before turning to relate the findings from this Chapter to the major research issues.

**The role of local plans**

As I indicated earlier, local plans have a variety of purposes, and the discussion and analysis has confirmed this. However, a number of common functions or tasks can be identified, including

a) the assessment of the need for new settlements, particularly where the structure plan policy framework is an enabling one, or where there is no such framework for new settlements;
b) determining the scale of a new settlement, where the assessment of need has indicated that one is necessary or desirable. The scale may vary later in the process as the result of discussion and negotiation with the private sector;


c) finding an appropriate site. A variety of approaches have been adopted, as with structure plan approaches, including outlining areas of search or identifying specific sites;


d) the allocation of a specific site(s);


e) where areas of search have been identified, and the private sector has responded with a range of alternative proposal, the local planning process has been used to make a choice between competing schemes, either as an integral part of that process (as in Uttlesford or Redditch), or as a parallel but linked process (as in Kettering);

f) determining and setting out infrastructure, facilities and other requirements;


g) providing some degree of co-ordination of the development and of the resources necessary to implement the development.

Local plans have also fulfilled many of the other functions highlighted earlier in this Chapter, including the provision of information. Most importantly the process also provides the opportunity for consultation and participation by a range of interests.

Where proactive new settlement policies have been proposed in local plans, they have varied in the degree of detail they contain, and they have often been supplemented by planning or development briefs. In fact the use of such briefs to specify in more detail the urban form, required community and other facilities, layout, landscaping, infrastructure provision and other information has been common and it can be described as the normal approach to handling large scale development like new settlements.

Briefs contain information to guide prospective or identified developers, regulatory policies to co-ordinate and control the development, and 'shopping lists' of planning gain requirements. In addition to development briefs, planning agreements provide a further arena for negotiation and the main instrument of controlling the implementation of new settlements, linked to the determination of applications.
It is evident, though, that in many cases, local plan policies and development briefs represent a basis for negotiation and bargaining, between the LPA and the private sector, rather than a fixed and unalterable statement. In this the point made by Healey (1986a, 1986b) and others on the iterative and evolving nature of the policy formulation and implementation process is confirmed.

Local planning approaches to new settlements

Although LPA approaches to new settlements in the local planning process have varied considerably, a number of general conclusions can be drawn.

First two distinctly different approaches can be identified - the use of local plans (often supplemented by development briefs) and the exclusive use of development briefs. This is not invariably linked to the nature of the strategic planning framework as the case of Forest Heath District Council (Red Lodge) shows, since here the original development brief was widened into a more formal policy context in both the structure plan and a local plan. However briefs have tended to be used where the structure plan policy framework provides no explicit guidance on new settlements.

Second, a number of different approaches to the formulation of policy in local plans can be distinguished

1. the allocation of a specific site in a local plan, and the specification of the LPA’s requirements, either in the plan policy, or in more detail in a development brief, following a proactive structure plan policy, as in Wealden;
2. the setting out of the LPA’s requirements for a new settlement, without a site specific allocation or policy, following a proactive structure plan policy, as in South Cambridgeshire;
3. the allocation of a specific site(s) in a local plan, in advance of, or in parallel with, private sector proposals for the site, followed by negotiation with prospective developers to shape the scheme to the LPA’s requirements, as for example in the cases of Redditch and Ashford;
4. the identification of areas of search, coupled with the setting out of the LPA’s requirements, followed by a ‘beauty contest’ to determine the preferred scheme, as in Uttlesford and Kettering;
5. the invitation of the submission of schemes by the private sector, without any indication by the LPA of preferred locations, as in Stratford-on-Avon;
the consideration of new settlement options for accommodating new housing and their rejection.

Figure 10.1 provides a summary of the main cases discussed in this Chapter, indicating, for each, the functions of the plan, the other planning instruments used and the policy form.

The approach is conditioned partly by the form of the structure plan policy framework for new settlements, but this is only one of the influences on the nature of the local planning process. So, for example, a proactive new settlement policy in the structure plan is not invariably followed by a local planning process of the type outlined in (1) above; other factors, particularly the role of the central state, are also important.

One of the problems for Districts, particularly in areas of development pressure, is the control of the local planning process and the management of the private sector pressure for new settlements which may result. It seems to have been handled successfully in Kettering and Redditch, but not in Cambridgeshire. The deciding factors may be the stage in the local plan process at which the private sector pressure is manifest, and the nature of the private sector response to the process.
### FUNCTIONS OF LOCAL PLANS FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL PLAN</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>OTHER INSTRUMENTS</th>
<th>POLICY FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Wealden LP</td>
<td>Allocation; Co-ordination; Basic Guidance</td>
<td>Brief Agreements</td>
<td>Proactive Policy Site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Cambridgeshire LP</td>
<td>Basic Guidance</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering LP</td>
<td>Assess need; Manage Competition; Scheme Choice; Allocation; Co-ordination Detailed Guidance</td>
<td>Briefs Agreements</td>
<td>Proactive Policy Site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redditch LP</td>
<td>Assess Need Identify Options; Allocation; Some co-ordination Basic guidance</td>
<td>Brief (major role) Agreements</td>
<td>Proactive Policy area of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melton</td>
<td>No Guidance</td>
<td>Negotiation Agreements</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uttlesford DP</td>
<td>Assess Need Identify Options; Scheme choice; Allocation; Detailed Guidance; Co-ordination Resource mobilisation</td>
<td>Agreements Master Plan</td>
<td>Proactive Policy Site specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark-on-Trent LP</td>
<td>Assess Need Allocation; Basic Guidance</td>
<td>Brief (major role) Agreements</td>
<td>Proactive Policy Site specific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

**The relationship with the structure plan**

There is some form of relationship between the structure plan policy framework and the form of the local planning process.
1 proactive structure plan policy - where the structure plan is site or location specific, as in East Sussex, the task of the local plan is relatively simple. It has to translate the policy into a specific allocation and guide the implementation of the proposal. However, where too broad an area of search is defined in the structure plan policy, spanning more than one district as in the case of Cambridgeshire, then the process is more problematic and it may become impossible for the local planning process to manage;

2 enabling structure plan policy - this allows the District Council to support or reject a new settlement proposal, option or policy, and to legitimate that choice. The positive identification of a new settlement option requires the District to have both an appropriate culture and an appropriate policy stance;

3 no guidance in the structure plan - this policy framework again enables a District Council to pursue or reject a new settlement option although it provides little guidance apart from the general strategic framework, and more detailed policies on housing land requirements, and open land protection. However, as I have shown, some Districts have formulated positive new settlement policies and proposals in their local planning process in these circumstances, and so again the culture and general stance of the authority are important.

So the role of the structure plan policy framework will vary depending on its form and on the District's stance, and indeed the local planning process provides legitimation for Districts wishing to be positive.

The point was made earlier about the adverse effects of delay in the structure planning process, and this is clear from the cases discussed here, particularly in Leicestershire. Similarly some of the cases provide evidence of the problems in the relationship between local plan and structure plan time periods, including the relatively small housing provision which some plans are required to make in the face of new settlement proposals which are geared to longer term land release and development, beyond the local plan period.
The role of actors in the process

Much of the discussion here tends to confirm the points made earlier about the roles of particular actors in the local planning process, by Fudge et al. (1983) and others.

The main roles of the central state (the Secretary of State) have been, first, in relation to the 'call-in' decision, and, second, influencing the general LPA culture. Decisions on whether or not to 'call-in' applications have been crucial to the form of the ensuing local planning process and to the outcome. In Cambridgeshire the 'call-in' effectively bypassed the local planning process, whilst in Melton the decision not to call-in the application allowed the District Council to exercise their own discretion. The central state has also directly encouraged LPAs to address issues, as in Northamptonshire, Kent and Uttlesford, or provided the general ideological and policy climate within which particular LPAs have been 'encouraged' to positively respond to new settlement proposals. It also influences form and content through advice and guidance, and more directly through the DoE Regional Offices.

The interest of developers (the private sector) in the local plan proposals for new settlements is obviously crucial to the implementation of those proposals. In all the cases discussed in this Chapter, the private sector has put forward schemes in locations identified in plans, whether in draft or formal deposit versions, in addition, of course, to floating schemes elsewhere. These locations have often been identified separately by development interests, either in advance of, or in parallel, with the formal local plan process. Many house building firms undertake their own 'strategic' planning exercises to identify areas of potential, and these often involve analysis of emerging regional strategies and of structure plans. So it is unsurprising that in the local planning process, both the private sector and the LPAs will be examining the same general locations.

In general terms the private sector seeks to influence both the short term and the long term policy framework with a view to obtaining the release of land at some time. However, the form in which developers have pursued proposals through the local planning process varies, and in this it is possible to point to particular 'strategies' of promotion and to a range of tactics which accompany those strategies. I earlier suggested that these could be characterised as
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(i) confrontational - where developers challenge the planning policy framework, by the submission of an application for a proposal which is at odds with the policy framework and which is pursued with vigour, if necessary being taken to appeal;

(ii) influential - here developers seek to work with the LPAs and may submit an application but neither it nor the scheme is pursued with a 'high profile'. The immediate aim is to achieve a favourable policy framework, with the longer term aim of gaining consent for a scheme which may differ from the original proposal. The submission of a planning application may be a tactic to register an interest and provide a basis for shaping the policy framework. The extent of negotiation and bargaining distinguishes this from the third category;

(iii) negotiative - here developers work closely with the LPAs and may submit an application but, again, it is not pursued with undue vigour, contrary to the LPA's stance. The approach involves considerable negotiation and bargaining, and an attempt to work with the emerging planning framework. The scheme may be altered to meet the LPA's requirements, provided that these are economically viable. Again the submission of an application is a tactic to provide a basis for negotiation, and it is likely to be withdrawn and superseded by a further application which represents the outcome of negotiation.

Each of these strategies will involve different combinations of, and approaches to, the use of representations on, and objections to, the local plan; negotiation with the district (both officers and members), and with other interests, including the County Council as both planning and highway authority; publicity and consultation with the LPAs and with a range of other interests, including the public; and bargaining over the content of the scheme and the offering of different forms of planning gain. The adoption of a particular strategy reflects individual company 'philosophy', in that 'local' companies promoting new settlements through a local plan are less aggressive than non-local companies and more likely to adopt a negotiate stance. Here local does not refer to the geographical sphere of operation, but means that the company has its headquarters in the district or county where the new settlement site is located. However, this sensitivity to local political situations may also derive from the consultants employed or from the particular capabilities of local staff.

In some cases, also, the private sector has sought to present a packaged proposal or policy framework which the LPA may adopt and include in the local plan or brief. Finally
expressions of interest in plan proposals by the private sector can be seen as an indication of the viability of those proposals, thereby influencing the LPA (or the Secretary of State) to ‘firm up’ intentions into policies.

Little use has been made of private sector planning or other consultants by LPAs in the local planning process for new settlements, except in Kettering, or indeed in the wider preparation of local plans. However the influence of the consultants on the process in Kettering has been considerable, in guiding and shaping the form of that process. However, overall the role of consultants in the public sector has been negligible.

Planning and other consultants are obviously much more important in the private sector, acting for developers, in the formulation of schemes, in negotiations with LPAs and in representing their clients' interests, and in a number of cases, consultants have significantly influenced approaches to new settlement design, and the strategies and tactics used by development companies. The evidence in this Chapter does however suggest that it may be the development company itself as much as the consultants which it uses that influences the form and outcome of the interaction with the local planning process. However, the use of professional representation in the presentation of representations and objections to local plans "may well influence the outcome of issues if not that of objections" according to Adams and Pawson (1992 - page 14).

Elected members have been particularly influential on the outcomes of a number of processes, including those in Melton, Kettering, Newark and Sherwood and Uttlesford, in supporting new settlement proposals. In Melton, for example, members were directly involved in negotiations with the developer, in the face of initial opposition to the scheme from their officers. In Kettering and Uttlesford, the decisions of the elected members went against the recommendations of the officers in relation to particular options or schemes. However, in some cases there has been conflict within the authority between members, as for example, in Uttlesford where the outcome reflected the power of the council as a whole vis-à-vis the planning committee.

I have suggested that the ideology of the officers is particularly important, and in most of those cases where a local plan policy framework which encourages new settlements has emerged, officers have been committed to the concept in general. This may derive in part from the lead of particular officers, as in Redditch, or from the general office 'culture' as in Kettering. As Claydon (1990 page 13) suggests, officers' values may derive from education and training, but "each department would also seem to have its
own 'culture', in which agreed standards, values and ideology play a part. As the analysis and the conclusions above on the role of elected members suggest, in most authorities there has, at some time, been a degree of conflict within the authority between officers and members, more over policy outcomes than procedures. The way in which this conflict is resolved will depend on the existing balance of power between officers and members.

**New settlements in local plans**

Positive new settlement policies have emerged in local plans or in other local planning documents mainly where

- there are significant growth pressures, either generally or in relation to particular projects (like, for example, Stansted Airport expansion); or

- the amount of housing land to be allocated in the local planning process is considerable, rather than a small residual figure, required where the structure plan has a short time horizon; or

- where there are significant constraints on development, including large areas of green belt, or lack of capacity in existing settlements, whether as part of a restraint policy or not, as in Redditch.

Second, selected members must support a new settlement policy option. Third, there must be officer support and commitment to it. Market conditions must also be favourable for without such conditions a positive policy framework will not generate private sector responses. The greatest private sector pressure through the floating of alternative proposals has been generated in such areas (e.g. Uttlesford, South Warwickshire, Northamptonshire, and in Leicestershire).

Whether new settlement production is led by the market (developers) or by the state (planning system) is dependent in part on the type of structure plan policy framework. First, in the regulative planning frameworks, where structure plans have provided a proactive policy context, local plans have adopted and elaborated upon this framework, in allocating sites and co-ordinating private sector development. Here the state can be said to have led new settlement production, although the final outcome may also be the result of negotiation over the precise form of the development.
Second, in enabling policy contexts provided by structure plans, the local planning process has channelled private sector pressure into acceptable forms and locations. Again negotiation has played a major role in shaping schemes. However, in some cases, as in Redditch for example, the private sector has done as much, if not more, than the local state, to lead new settlement production by the identification of potential new settlement locations.

Third, in those circumstances where the strategic framework provides little guidance, the market had tended to lead local planning solutions (or indeed structure plan outcomes) towards particular options and locations, albeit within a framework of general strategic control.

The actual outcomes in each of these cases have depended on - relations between officers and members within each LPA; relations between districts and counties at officer and member levels; on the power of local anti-growth movements and the degree to which they are able to influence the local political climate; and on the interactions between the private sector and the LPAs, including the promotional strategies adopted by the private sector.

So only in certain cases is it possible to indicate that either the state or the market has given a clear direction and lead new settlement promotion. Certainly the evidence here supports the contention of Brindley, Rydin and Stoker (1989) that planning has become fragmented in the last decade and there are a range of styles apparent.

Perhaps the major conclusion from the analysis in this Chapter is that both policy formulation and implementation depend upon negotiation and bargaining between planning authorities and developers. Plans and policies are tools shaped and used through the working out of implementation in the process of development. The policy framework is only one instrument, and a framework which both provides for negotiation and which is itself the outcome of negotiation. As Claydon (1990 - page 13) indicates

traditional rational decision-making models of the planning process upon which much of the statutory process is founded suggest the primacy of policy in determining planning action...... much more useful would be a model of planning which recognises that implementation is the outcome of complex inter-actions, or negotiations, only one input to which is planning policy. To understand planning
implementation it is much more enlightening to concentrate on the actor ...... and
the pressures, constraints and opportunities presented to him/her, while seeing
the outcome as the product of negotiations among a variety of actors and
agencies with different levels of power resources.

I have concentrated on the state and planning system in the analysis thus far, but the
next Part of this thesis considers the role of the private sector in new settlement promo-
tion, policy formulation and implementation.
PART FOUR

PERSPECTIVES ON THE NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
CHAPTER 11

THE PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
INTRODUCTION

This Thesis seeks to understand the strategies and interests of actors in the development process and their relationships with other agencies through institutional analysis. Much of the focus of previous Chapters has been on the state, analysing the actions of the central and local state in the policy formulation process and in decision making on new settlement proposals, and on the way in which these have shaped the behaviour of the private sector. However, the emphasis in this Part is on the actions and behaviour of the private sector.

In terms of the typology of new settlement production discussed in Chapter 3, the analysis is concerned with the Mode of Development dimension which conceptualised production as a continuum ranging from wholly private sector to wholly public sector initiative, with a range of intermediary positions depending upon the combinations of inputs into the process.

The discussion and analysis in earlier Chapters has shown how the private sector has responded to changing market conditions and to the changing ideological and policy climate. So, for example, developers have switched to the promotion of smaller scale new settlements proposals rather than the large ‘new country town’ scale predominant in the mid-1980s, and at the same time have sought to promote them in differing and widening geographical areas. Similarly different development interests have become involved in new settlement promotion over the last decade with the growing importance of single housebuilding companies and landowners as promoters and the relative decline of the volume housebuilders’ consortia.

The actions of the private sector are crucial to the formulation of policy for new settlements and to the implementation of that policy. Private sector pressure has had an impact on the form of the policy framework, whilst at a local level negotiation and bargaining between developers and LPAs has shaped the form and content of both new settlement policy and schemes. Negotiation over ‘planning gain’ packages has been particularly important. Finally, the complexity and variety of interactions between the private sector and the state is evident.

The previous analysis has suggested some of the reasons for these trends and outcomes, but in order to understand them fully it is necessary to consider the factors which affect and constrain the operations of the private sector, and which have shaped their
action or response. The impact of the land use planning system has been considered, particularly in relation to the formulation of policy and to the control of development, but this part of the Thesis is directly concerned with an analysis of the private sector's part in the new settlement development process, and of the ways in which this interacts with the policy formulation and decision making processes. The main aims are

1. to analyse developer behaviour in promoting and producing new settlements;
2. to determine how this behaviour affects, and is affected by, the actions of the state, through the planning system;
3. to determine how this behaviour affects outcomes in terms of policy frameworks, decisions and the form and nature of new settlements;
4. to assess the power and influence of the private sector vis-à-vis the state.

In fulfilling these aims, the analysis will consider some of the analytical questions posed in Chapter 2, and will address other issues, including

- why are new settlements being promoted and produced?
- why are new settlements being promoted in specific geographical locations?
- why have specific schemes been formulated?
- how have specific schemes been formulated?
- what factors govern the nature of the schemes (in terms of their scale, urban form, and content)?
- why have particular promoters been involved in new settlement promotion and production?

THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Although, as I have indicated earlier, new settlements are, by definition, much more than just housing developments, I shall focus on the residential development process, and the housebuilders as the main private sector actors.

There is a considerable body of existing research on the residential development process, which points to crucial relations, interests and approaches. In order to provide a context for the discussion of the new settlement development process, I shall briefly consider the literature on the residential development process, and seek to draw out those aspects which can inform the analysis of the new settlement development process.
Models of the development process

A variety of approaches to conceptualising the development process have been formulated, although most share a common theoretical underpinning. These, and the development process as a whole, have reviewed by, inter alia, Barratt, Stewart and Underwood (1978), Carter, Brown and Hill (1986), Edwards (1987), Grove-Hills, Munton and Murdoch (1990), Gore and Nicholson (1991) and Healey (1991a). In her review of models of the development process, Healey suggests that four distinct approaches can be identified, and she defines them as

1. Equilibrium models - these adopt a neo-classical perspective which "assumes that development activity is structured by economic signals about effective demand" (Healey 1991a - page 221);

2. Event-sequence models - these describe the development process in terms of the stages through which development proceeds;

3. Agency models - which focus on actors in the process, and highlight the interactions and interrelationships. This is essentially a behavioural or institutional approach;

4. Structure models - adopt a political economy approach and focus on the forces structuring the development process.

The first three are grounded in a neo-classical theory, whilst the fourth has a radically different theoretical basis, a neo-Marxist or political economy foundation.

Healey's analysis is, of course, only one way of differentiating the various types of model, and in their review, Gore and Nicholson (1991) adopt a rather different approach, suggesting, again, four categories, described as

1. sequential or descriptive - essentially chronological stages, and the same as Healey's event-sequence models;

2. behavioural or decision making - these, as in Healey's agency category, stress the role of actors and of decision points in the development process in a sequential manner with events secondary to the decisions being made at critical points;
3 production based - here construction is central to the process, and the production of housebuilders, for example, is conceptualised as a form of commodity production. These are essentially the same as Healey's structure models, although some of the approaches she places in this group are placed by Gore and Nicholson in their fourth category;

4 structures of provision - Gore and Nicholson focus on Ball's work on owner occupied and council housing which sets these in their social, economic, legislative and institutional context. Gore and Nicholson suggest that this approach offers the most useful insights into the process as a whole.

For ease of analysis I shall adopt Healey's classification, although recognising that it is by no means the only way in which approaches to the development process may be categorised, and that each approach has its own merits.

The models which are most useful for understanding the residential development process, and the new settlements development process, and which most closely accord with the purposes of the analysis here are the agency and structures of provision models. The event-sequence models focus solely on the stages in the process rather than considering the roles and actions of key actors during each stage (Lichfield 1956, Cadman and Austin-Crowe 1978, 1991, Goodchild and Munton 1985, Punter 1986, Ratcliffe 1978). They offer no explanation of the form of development in a specific case, and, as is apparent from the earlier discussion, development projects do not necessarily follow the same simple sequence. Finally, they remain isolated from subsequent events (for instance, management and maintenance tasks), from the rest of the built environment, and from external factors such as government policy, availability of finance and demographic change (Gore and Nicholson 1991 - page 709).

**Agency Models**

These examine the roles of actors, stressing behaviour especially in terms of crucial decisions. Gore and Nicholson suggest that two broad sub-categories can be distinguished
(i) individualist approaches - with "actors treated being as independent and autonomous, with the ability to make decisions and to take action in their own interests without reference to other actors in the process" (Gore and Nicholson 1991 - page 713);

(ii) interactive models - which illustrate the interaction, in terms of bargaining and negotiation, between actors or interests.

Within this simple categorisation then I would suggest that a number of different approaches can be discerned:-

A) models which illustrate key interactions - Drewett (1973) focuses on the developer and indicates the main agents involved in residential development, as shown in Figure 11.1. It is rather limited in the range of actors included, the form of the interactions is not made clear and it lacks any time dimension. It also fails to tie the behaviour of key actors to the wider political, social and economic relations which surround the process (Grove-Hills, Munton and Murdoch 1990).

Other forms of interaction model include that produced by Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) which is concerned with illustrating some of the forms of interaction and tension between four main groups of agents - the central state, planning authorities (officers and members), developers, and local residents and parish councils. It refers to a specific geographical context (Central Berkshire) where there is high development pressure, a land use planning system differentially accessible to public and builder participation and a government system generating political friction between its different levels. Against this background a number of tensions have been emerging arising from the differing material and symbolic interests in the production of the built environment for profit, its consumption by local residents and its management by a central and local state apparatus (ibid - pages 35 & 36)

and it sees the development process more in terms of conflict, co-operation and negotiation.
B) Models relating agencies to stages of development - One of the earliest of this type of model is that produced by Kaiser and Weiss (1967, 1969, 1971, Kaiser 1968). It seeks to locate the actions of key agencies, landowners, developers and consumers, within the stages of the residential development process, and to relate these to a broader context of factors affecting decisions and outcomes. Similar models have been developed by Bryant, Russwurm, and McLellan (1982) for North America (see Figure 11.2), and by Harmer and Webb (1978) for Australia. All of these tend to confuse "the roles an agent may play in the process, the interests they may have and the actual firms involved" (Healey 1991a - page 225), and in relation to Bryant et al., external factors and their impact on decisions and actions are not considered.

Drewett has extended his simple agency model with an agency/stages of development model similar to those of Kaiser and Weiss and Bryant et al. but applicable to the UK situation. This is reproduced in Figure 11.3. As Drewett (1973 - page 103) says

The urban development process is the aggregate outcome of many decisions in a complex social-economic-political system, which will remain difficult to articulate.
Drewett's conceptualisation of the development process can be criticised for its linearity, for the limited number of key decision agents and key decisions which are highlighted and for its general oversimplification of the process. Although it does not deal with the constraints on the action of developers, unlike the model from which it is derived (Kaiser and Weiss), including the actions of other agents, such as public authorities, other firms or the public, it does provide a starting point for considering some of the key stages, which do not necessarily always occur in the sequence in which they are set out in the model.
### FIGURE 11.3

**DREWETT'S MODEL OF THE LAND DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non urban use</th>
<th>Non urban use under urban shadow</th>
<th>Urban interest</th>
<th>Active Consideration (1) Planning permission</th>
<th>Active Consideration (2) Purchase of land</th>
<th>Active Development</th>
<th>Purchase of Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>In non urban use possibly idle</td>
<td>changed use possibly multiple use possibly idle</td>
<td>decision agent recognises development potential</td>
<td>agent contacts planning authority and/or government for development permission</td>
<td>agent contacts another agent for possible land sale</td>
<td>physical development of land</td>
<td>purchase of land property etc. and occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decisions</strong></td>
<td>Opportunity costs lower than present use</td>
<td>relative location change or pressure of opportunity costs</td>
<td>decision to consider land</td>
<td>decision to purchase land</td>
<td>decision to purchase land</td>
<td>decision to develop land</td>
<td>decision to purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Agent</strong></td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>Landowner Speculator Developer</td>
<td>Landowner Developer Speculator</td>
<td>Planner Developer Landowner Speculator</td>
<td>Developer Planner</td>
<td>Developer Planner</td>
<td>Consumer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial support</strong></td>
<td>Unchanged</td>
<td>Agricultural Mortgage Corporation</td>
<td>Preliminary arrangement of finance</td>
<td>Preliminary arrangement of finance</td>
<td>Purchase of raw land loan</td>
<td>Construction loan</td>
<td>Mortgage etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C) Pipeline models - Goodchild and Munton (1985) and Barrett, Stewart and Underwood (1978) have both produced pipeline models of differing complexity. The former identify three main actors - developers, planners and landowners, and two key points in the process - the identification of land as being suitable for development and the initiation of construction work. From this they suggest six routes along which land may pass to development, with four decision nodes through which a development site must pass - the allocation of land in a plan, the sale of land to a developer, the granting of planning permission and the commencement of construction. Again the model is an oversimplification of the process, which does not explain why any one particular route should be followed. As with some of the other agency models, it fails to consider the impact of external factors, like central and local state policies, or economic circumstances. Gore and Nicholson characterise Barrett et. al.'s approach as a sequential model, but it is more complex than these and than Goodchild and Munton's model. It links an event sequence, with three main stages - development pressure and prospects, development feasibility and implementation - with the context in which development takes place and acknowledges the effects of economic, fiscal, demographic and political forces on the form in which development takes place and the process through which it takes place. It can be criticised for ignoring "elements that together help to create both the general climate and the specific opportunities for (or obstacles to) development, such as central and local government policies, associated public expenditure programme, and local reactions of support or opposition" (Gore and Nicholson 1991 - page 711).

D) Agency Interests - A number of writers have focused on specific agencies in the development process and considered the roles which these play and the interests which they may hold. Massey (1977), Massey and Catalano (1978) and Goodchild and Munton (1985) have examined the roles and interests of landowners, whilst Lauria (1982) focuses on agencies in urban redevelopment and renewal, and Rydin (1983a, 1984, 1986) on the interests of specific groups of actors in the suburban residential development process. McNamara (1983) has extended Massey and Catalano's analysis by relating developers' interests to the purpose of development and to the length of time for which they are involved in the development, both before it is begun and after it is completed (see Figure 11.4). He develops a nine fold classification which identifies interests rather than developer types.
**FIGURE 11.4**

**MCNAMARA'S CLASSIFICATION OF DEVELOPERS**

**AFTER DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Short term</th>
<th>Long term (leasing out)</th>
<th>Long term (owning and occupying)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial builder</td>
<td>Land developer - investor</td>
<td>Developer - user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term (leasing out)</td>
<td>Asset clearing probably investment switch</td>
<td>Property improver/rentier</td>
<td>Expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term (owning and occupying)</td>
<td>Capitalising assets</td>
<td>Change in returns from property</td>
<td>Owner-occupier/developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: McNamara 1983

Whatmore, Munton and Marsden (1990) develop a similar model focusing on changing property rights to indicate their impact on the dynamic nature of rural land use change, and to uncover the variety of relations which any one actor may have. So, for example, owner occupiers may have conflicting interests as extensive land users, as indebted capital using land rights as collateral for capital and as speculators in the investment value of land as a capital asset. They illustrate the effect of these interests on the way in which land is held, used and possibly developed (Grove-Hills, Munton and Murdoch 1990).

These models analyse in greater depth the interests of agencies and demonstrate that agents may have different interests at different times or at different stages in the development process.

From these approaches, McNamara (1988) has attempted to link the interests of actors to their social relations within the mode of production and the socio-political system, with development seen as a production process, rather like the structure or production based models, and agents' interests derived from their interpretation of "their position in the social relations of production and consumption and their non-economic valuing of land,
buildings and environment" (Healey 1991a - pages 229 and 231), as illustrated in Figure 11.5

FIGURE 11.5

MCNAMARA'S MODEL OF THE GENERATION OF INTERESTS IN LAND

Source: McNamara 1988 page 166

All of these models have significant drawbacks, in that they are largely unable to explain relations between actors, or the variability in the nature of the development process from place to place or from time to time (Grove-Hills, Munton and Murdoch 1990). Moreover they lack the capability to address the relationship between the way in which actors behave in deploying resources with the broader processes that drive the strategies and interests of the actors involved (Healey and Barrett 1990).

Structure models

Both Healey, and Gore and Nicholson point to a range of models concerned with commodity production in which the production of buildings is seen as a specialised form of production. Here they include Ambrose (1986), Boddy (1976a, 1976b, 1980, 1981a, 1981b), and Harvey (1978, 1982, 1985). These approaches deal with circuits of capital, and Harvey suggests that the dynamics of the development process arise from trends in financial investment, a locality's role within wider patterns of economic competition, the way this affects the spatial and economic structure of an area and the role of public policy in directing or impeding economic investment. Land is a financial asset, and
it is the complex operation of the credit system and the role which landed property plays in this system in the commodity form which mediates the relations of distribution and production so significantly in capitalist social relations (Hooper 1984 - page 7)

Although these models focus attention on "the way the relations of property development are structured by the broader dimensions of capital-labour, capital-landowner and state-market relations" (Healey 1991a, page 235), they do little to illuminate the detailed events and relationships of particular developments, and so are unable to describe specific development processes.

Perhaps the most useful of the structure or structure of provision approaches is that by Ball (1983, 1985, 1986a, 1986b) as it is directly concerned with housing. So

a structure of housing provision described an historically given process of providing and reproducing the physical entity housing, focusing on the social agents essential to the process and the relations between them (Ball 1986a - page 158)

As Ball indicates these structures can be investigated in specific contexts by use of a series of propositions

1 The production, exchange and consumption of buildings as a usable physical entity feature a series of interconnected social relations between the agents and institutions involved, the legal framework regulating such activity, and the financial arrangements that allow it to proceed;

2 These sets of social agents are defined by their economic relationship to the physical process of provision, which includes the production, exchange, distribution and use of a built structure;

3 Different types of building provision are characterised by different combinations of these elements and by specific relations between them. Wherever a particular combination is identified it can be termed a separate structure of building provision;
4 The exact content of these structures of provision can be identified only by studying the real world, focusing especially on the social agents that are central to the process and on the relations between them;

5 Such structures of provision are intrinsically dynamic, mainly because of the pressures brought about by the way in which the social relations within them operate. Thus, both conflict and collaboration between agents may lead to the imposition of new legal controls or to the provision of new forms of finance, and so on. As well as this internal change, external forces in the wider economy and in society as a whole may also bring about further adjustments in a structure of provision (Gore and Nicholson 1991 - page 726).

A more general and theoretical examination of the structure of housing provision is that by Cardoso and Short (1983), which introduces the concept of forms of housing provision. The authors define these as combinations of conditions of production, elements of the labour process and relations of production articulated through a particular constellation of agents (in the case of housing, the builder, labourer, developer and consumer). They identify five forms of housing production based on these relations - 'pure' capitalist (the volume producers), self produced, individual contract, institutional contract and speculative production.

Conclusions on models of the development process

The structure or structures of provisions models or framework seem to offer the greatest insights, but, as Gore and Nicholson (1991 - page 729) state, greater insights into the way the development process operates can only be achieved by means of detailed investigations of the organisation, operations, financial mechanisms, personnel and hardware involved, of the operating frameworks in which they work, and of the ways in which these all fit together.

Although none of the event-sequence or agency models fully capture the interactions in the development process, and in particular fail to indicate the dynamics of the process or to conceptualise the forces which drive the process, they do provide useful insights into the interrelationships and the key activities. I shall return to these later, but first I shall investigate some of the main features of the structure and operation of the housebuilding industry.
THE HOUSEBUILDING INDUSTRY

Although, as I indicated earlier, new settlement promoters are by no means all house-builders, I shall concentrate on this fraction of capital, whilst demonstrating the role of other forms of agency in the new settlements development process. In general terms, the promoters of new settlements seek to obtain planning permission for, and to develop, housing and other forms of development with a view to selling this development as soon as possible after completion. It is only some commercial or industrial development which is likely to be retained by the developer. So, in terms of McNamara's (1983) classification of developers, the analysis is concerned with entrepreneurial builders and land developers-investors. Housebuilders (who may also be part of larger development companies, or have property development subsidiaries) will have these interests and seek to develop new settlements for these purposes.

There has been a wide range of studies examining aspects of the structure and operation of the housebuilding and construction industry. I have already referred to Ball's (1983) pioneering study which examined in depth the production dynamics of the sector, emphasising the importance of organisational structure in determining the behaviour of the industry. He later extended this to an examination of the whole of the construction industry (Ball 1988). Barlow and King (1991), Bramley (1993), Rydin (1986) and Morcombe (1984) examine the links between housing policy and private housebuilding, looking also at interactions with the planning system. A number of others have looked at housebuilding in particular areas, and Central Berkshire has received considerable study from Barlow (1990a, 1990b), Barlow and Savage (1986, 1987), Bather (1976), Fleming (1984), Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) and Short, Witt and Fleming (1987), whilst Craven (1969) and Lambert (1990) have focused on Kent and Avon respectively. Urban areas have received attention from Nicholls et al. (1980), Pacione (1990a, 1990b), Whitehand (1990) and Whitehand and Larkham (1991). Studies of particular aspects of housebuilders' modes of operation include Smyth (1982, 1984), Hill (1987), Rydin (1983a, 1985, 1988) and White (1986) on land banking and land availability. Many of these studies also deal with interactions with the planning process. I shall refer to some of these in the following discussion.
The structure of the housebuilding industry

The structure of the industry has changed dramatically over the past twenty or thirty years, with the economic crisis of the early 1970s marking an important watershed (Ball 1983). Many medium sized producers were squeezed out and small producers switched to other forms of building (Housing Monitoring Team 1981). Following the slump, a number of new producers entered the industry acquiring existing firms and expanding operations (Ball 1988). The years since 1988 may also mark something of a change with a trend towards decreasing output, a search for more operating capital through rights issues, a restructuring of borrowing, a reorientation of activity and the bankruptcy or take-over of a number of companies (Cooper 1989, 1990, 1991, Cooper and Stewart 1990).

Speculative housebuilding is now dominated by long term development capital, which is relatively immune from the vagaries of the housing market, and does not depend for long term profitability on the fluctuations in the housebuilding cycle, but on the profitability of investment in housebuilding. These producers tend to expand output in buoyant market conditions when housebuilding is more profitable and to contract production in downturns when it is less profitable, switching to, or maintaining profitability through, other activities. The major investment is in land, and so these firms are able to acquire and develop land when market conditions are favourable, and thereby make development gains from the increase in the value of land over time. The major firms are now taking a larger share of the market, at the expense of the small to medium sized companies (Barlow and King 1991). Davison (1987 - page 63) points to another change and one which perhaps reflects a different view of the industry to that of Ball

the number of companies with wide-ranging, unrelated activities which maintain a housebuilding division has reduced in the past five years ..... new rising stars are companies which concentrate on house building and most spring from a southern base

Walker (1986) contradicts this in suggesting that the late 1970s and early 1980s saw the rise of conglomerates with other interests than housebuilding.

Other shifts may arise from the effects of Conservative ideology, especially on the growth of owner occupation and the collapse of public sector housebuilding (Walker 1986). In particular, the nature of the housing product has changed, with a greater
emphasis on design and better standards, and on the identification of profitable locations (Barlow 1989a, 1989b, Chiddick 1987, O'Dea 1989). This is linked with the greater segmentation of the housing market and the consequent growth of specific niches. Here the industry has sought to identify and exploit potentially profitable niches including specialist retirement housing (Williams 1989), although the downturn in the market in the late 1980s saw the collapse of this particular market segment and of some of the firms which had specialised in it. Similarly specialist producers in another niche, that of up-market urban housing, especially in areas undergoing regeneration, also suffered the effects of economic depression (Vision 1988). All these changes in the structure of the industry have significant implications for land acquisition, for the form of development, and for the development process as a whole.

Overall the housebuilding industry is highly speculative, with a substantial degree of risk, and with potentially high returns. However, as Barlow and King (1991) indicate, the housing system is unstable and cyclical, with regular booms and downturns in the market, and "the developer's ability to survive is dependant upon land buying and site identification skills".

**Taxonomies of housebuilders**

Ball (1983) examines the social relations of the housebuilding industry and suggests that it may be divided into four types of producer, distinguishable by distinct interests, strategies and modes of operation. In terms of decreasing size these are

(a) large capital housebuilding firms (the volume builders) - building more than 350 units per year, they tend to dominate production. They are normally public companies with a requirement for large volumes of capital, but legal or economic ownership may be retained in a few family hands. Their major problem, and one which has been evident during the last downturn, is to ensure that the balance between borrowing and equity capital is at the right level. These firms tend to operate in more than one region, although Ball considers that only a few are national in terms of area of operations. The greater size of these firms enables them to minimise the effects of market fluctuations by spreading development over geographically diversified areas and over different types of houses. They also tend to rely on rapid turnover of capital with smaller margins per house, and can afford to pay more for land. The large housebuilders usually but not invari-
ably maintain sizeable land banks. Ball divides these major producers into three types

- **independent contractors** - civil engineering or contracting companies with housebuilding 'arms', such as Wimpey, Tarmac, Laing, Alfred McAlpine, Costain, Balfour Beatty and Taylor Woodrow;
- **independent firms whose main activity is housebuilding** - they may also have other interests like property development, but these are subsidiary to housebuilding. Examples include Barratt, Bryant, Bellway, Wilcon, Westbury, Abbey, Prowting, Persimmon and Crest;
- **subsidiaries of larger conglomerates** - the housebuilding operations of conglomerates with a wide range of interests in other fields outside construction. Examples include Bovis (P & O), Heron, Ideal (Trafalgar House), Galliford Sears (Sears).

(b) non speculative housebuilding capital - these tend to build between 120 and 300 dwellings per annum, and involve a variety of firms, which are often part of larger groups with other production interests. Three subgroups are identified

- **new entrants to speculative housebuilding** - these are expanding family firms or subsidiaries of large construction or other companies;
- **medium sized privately owned contractors** which use speculative housebuilding as an investment, and so expand or contract the size and output of their housebuilding division as a result of market conditions;
- **jobbing builders grown large** - these tend to be involved in a range of other building activities as well.

(c) Small family capital - these build between 25 and 120 dwellings per year, and require both a regular throughput of development and a regular cash flow, and so have to balance borrowing, size of labour force, rate of housebuilding and the size of their land bank. Ball suggests that the family nature of ownership and the need to maintain a steady cash flow tend to mean that these firms do not grow rapidly or indeed beyond this particular size.

(d) petty capitalist - small firms building only a few houses per year, normally under-capitalised, and without land banks. As such this type of firm is vulnerable to changes in market conditions and hence to bankruptcy, although operations may
switch to, and normally would involve, repair, maintenance and other small scale building operations. This type of housebuilder constitutes by far the largest number of operators.

From this analysis it is apparent that ownership, capitalisation, and size are important determinants of operating practices or modes of operation. Ball's taxonomy is by no means the only way to conceptualise the structure of the industry, nor indeed is it necessarily a wholly accurate reflection of it. The industry has changed further in the ten or so years since this classification was produced. Moreover, producers within each category of the taxonomy may exhibit a wide range of behaviour over such matters as land banking, approaches to land buying, type and range of dwellings produced, geographical areas of operation, company structure etc., which is not apparent from the taxonomy itself. Only more detailed study of individual producers can reveal this.

An alternative view of housebuilders is that provided by Fleming (1984), Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) and Short, Witt and Fleming (1987), based on their work in Central Berkshire. Here they classify builders by size (number of dwellings completed per year) and by ownership, as in Figure 11.6. They also suggest that producers can be split into two categories based on their major operating strategy - whether the emphasis is on returns from building or from land appreciation. So 'Constructors' concentrate on production to obtain favourable returns, whilst 'Land finders' seek to make returns from bringing forward unallocated land for development.

**FIGURE 11.6**

**SHORT, FLEMING AND WITT'S CLASSIFICATION OF HOUSEBUILDERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>Very small 0 - 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small 5 - 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium 21 - 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large 100+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Companies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Short, Fleming and Witt 1986 Tables 3.2 and 3.3
Finally, they have analysed housebuilder behaviour, and in particular interactions with the planning system, and from this, produced a fourfold typology based on, first, the success rate of applications and, second, on the "degree to which an applicant probes and explores the limits of planning" (Short et al. 1986 - page 109). This suggests that the form and success of interaction with the planning system is not solely related to the size of a firm. The typology is

A  **Cautious** - a high application success rate but with little involvement in planning, so this category usually acquire and develop sites with planning permission, or seek uncontentious land. They concentrate on output and production. This category is not limited to any one particular size of firm;

B  **Naive** - have little knowledge of, and interaction with, the planning system, and so have a low success rate, often putting forward unacceptable proposals. This category is limited solely to very small producers;

C  **Negotiators** - have both a high success rate and a high degree of interaction with the planning system. As the name suggests, this category are involved in a wide range of negotiations and bargaining with planning authorities, particularly over planning gain agreements. They often make use of planning or other consultants, and tend to develop a range of sites, including both safe sites and those with a greater degree of risk in terms of obtaining planning permission. Although the larger producers are predominant, other size groupings may also be found in this category;

D  **Aggressors** - high degree of knowledge and interaction, but a low success rate. Predominantly small producers, they tend to profit more from land than from output, and so seek sites without planning permission, becoming involved in confrontation with the planning authorities and in appeals.

Again this is a useful means of conceptualising housebuilders' modes of operation, and serves to point to some of the differences in behaviour which may be overlooked by a typology based solely on the ownership, structure and size of a firm. Leung (1987) has also examined the relationship between the structure, size and mode of operation of housebuilders and their performance in the development control system, this time in Canada. This work suggests that firm size is the most important variable, and that, although large firms did less well in negotiation with planning authorities, they were able
to implement development much more quickly. This is explained by the imperative to eliminate uncertainty for

developers are rational in the development control (subdivision approval) process to the extent that they try to avoid and reduce the uncertainty of that part of the process over which they have less control, and to increase the certainty of that part of the process over which they have more control. They do this by using the specific resources and expertise they have. Large and non local firms rely more on financial and organisational resources. Small firms rely more on local connections and knowledge. Such behaviours are compatible with the financial, production and marketing characteristics of the firms concerned, especially the large firms (Leung 1987 - page 31).

**Crucial stages and decisions in the residential development process**

From the models and the brief analysis of the operation of the housebuilding industry, a number of important stages in the residential development process may be identified, and I wish to use these as a convenient means of briefly examining the housebuilders' modes of operation and the constraints on such operation. It is necessary to bear in mind some of the comments made earlier on the models of the development, especially that development does not always take place in such easy stages. However such an approach does provide a useful means of structuring the discussion, if not the process itself. I shall not deal with each possible stage in the process, but will concentrate on those which are likely to be of greatest relevance to the new settlement development process:-

- **Land search**
- **Land assembly (including land banking);**
- **Land purchase**
- **Construction**
- **Marketing and sale**

**Site finding or land search**

There are two important issues to consider - the size of site which housebuilders seek to acquire, and the procedures they use for finding sites. The size of site sought by housebuilders is determined by a number of factors including the cost and availability of
finance for land purchase, and the overheads of a particular firm (Drewett (1973). It is therefore related to the size of the firm, and Fleming (1984) indicates the following general relationship between firm size and preferred site size:

very small firms - single dwelling plots;
small firms - sites for between 5 to 10 dwellings;
medium firms - sites for 30 to 50 dwellings;
large firms - sites for around 100 dwellings or more.

This does of course vary over time and spatially depending on the buoyancy of local housing markets, and a trend over the past few years has been the development of smaller sites by the larger producers (Davison 1987), although a similar trend was noted by Drewett (1973) in the early 1930s. As Short, Fleming and Witt (1986 - page 46) suggest:

preferred sites and acceptable sites are of course quite different concepts and in difficult times developers are often forced or encouraged to build on sites which are very much smaller than preferred. It is much more difficult to consider sites which are larger than normal limits because financial restrictions impose very definite prohibitions.

Larger sites are likely to be particularly profitable, or at least to provide a steady flow of returns over a long period. In particular they offer the housebuilders economies of scale "where costs are minimised and profits maximised" (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986 - page 74), and the ability to absorb, or at least cover initially, the cost of planning gain packages. Fluctuations in the housing market can be smoothed out and the 'up-front' costs of preparing and servicing land can be met from returns in boom years (Ball 1983).

There are a number of methods by which land may be sought and these will vary depending on the size of the firm, its methods of operation and operating area, its degree of sophistication and its trading position. These methods are not necessarily mutually exclusive but include:-

(1) Contact with estate agents;
(2) Contact with solicitors and building societies;
(3) Advertising - either by the firm or by agents acting for landowners, etc.;
(4) Contact with planning officers;
(5) Saturation - study of planning policy documents etc. to identify areas with growth potential, either in-house or by consultants employed for the purpose - this is commonly employed by the larger housebuilders, particularly those involved in new settlements and large scale projects, as I have indicated earlier;

(6) Land offered by land owners or direct contact with land owners;

(7) Purchase at auctions;

(8) Acquisition from other companies by a variety of means (purchase, land swap or acquisition of another company for its land stock).

Other work has tended to confirm the importance of these methods, and of particular agencies, including estate agents and planning and other consultants, in general residential development (Bather 1976, Craven 1969, Craven and Pahl 1967, Larkham 1986b, 1988, McNamara 1984, 1986, McNamara and Turner 1987).

Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) characterise the approaches to land finding as either saturation or opportunist, picking up sites which come to the attention of the developer through some of the means indicated above. Land search strategies, sources of information and sources of land for purchase vary according to the size and mode of operation of the housebuilder, as the larger firms tend to have more direct dealings with landowners. However some may buy on the open market, through agents or auctions, thus obtaining more expensive land, and putting a greater emphasis on the final marketing of a quality product, in order to attain acceptable returns.

The saturation or systematic approach will later be seen to be important in relation to finding sites for new settlements for some of the reasons outlined by Short, Fleming and Witt (1986 - page 47)

one of the main purposes of the saturation strategy is to acquire land for which no great demand is apparent. The landowner of a promising site is approached directly by the developer so that the land may be secured at a relatively low cost. Identification of development sites prior to official designation should therefore provide a wide choice and enable cheaper acquisitions

Indeed from the discussion of local planning it will be apparent that a number of developers have used this method to locate land for new settlements. Certainly many of the major housebuilders use this method, either in-house by their own planning and land buying staff or by external consultants specifically and perhaps continuously engaged for
the purpose of carrying out broad strategic land search exercises coupled with more
detailed sieve exercises on specific localities.

Baerwald (1981) has analysed the site selection procedure in more detail, in the USA,
and suggested that three stages can be identified

- determination of the general nature and scale of project;
- evaluation of relatively large areas aimed at identifying areas where suitable sites
  might be found;
- evaluation of specific sites in highlighted areas.

At each stage, an appraisal using the same general criteria will be carried out. The
major determinants are - "will the houses built be sold at a profit? Will their construction
and sale be financed? Will legal authorisation for their construction be granted?" (Baerwald 1981 - page 345). This suggests a rather different process than in the UK,
where land of a scale appropriate to the firm, and with a varying likelihood of obtaining
permission is sought, with the nature of the project only loosely defined at the outset. It
is of course necessary for the housebuilder to undertake an appraisal of potential sites,
in terms of their size, the appropriate density and mix of housing, the likely planning
response, the costs of development and the potential returns and from this to determine
the potential price or price range for which the site can be purchased. Work by Kaiser
(1968), Goldberg (1974), Goldberg and Ulinder (1976), Bather (1976), Nicholls et al.
(1980) and Pacione (1990b), in a variety of contexts, including urban and suburban loca-
tions in the UK and USA, has extended the work by Baerwald. This suggests that
housebuilders use two sets of criteria in determining the suitability of sites, particularly
urban or suburban sites, for development. First, a range of criteria concerned with the
nature of specific sites, such as ground conditions or marketability, based on the location
and the social and other character of the area, and second, general criteria like the
chances of obtaining permission.

The planning status of the land being sought will depend upon a number of factors.
These include the size of the firm, for small firms normally do not carry long land banks
and will tend to seek immediately developable land; the stages of development of exist-
ing land held by the companies; and the entrepreneurial approach of the firm, for some
firms are more likely to take risks than others and therefore to consider land without
planning permission and only a long term likelihood of development. The operating
practices of the firm are also important in this respect, for, as I have suggested, some
firms tend towards high output rather than high margins (and thereby make a return by selling large volumes of houses at a low margin for each house) and therefore need to develop high volumes on land which has planning permission, whilst others will produce a lower output on cheaper land, taking a more long term view, and thereby making a relatively high return for each dwelling (cf. Short, Witt and Fleming's (1987) distinction between constructors (high volumes/low margins per house) and land finders (lower volumes/cheaper land/high margins per house)). These illustrate the extremes and some housebuilders will seek a mix of the two, trading on some land acquired and selling other land on with an enhanced return.

**Land banking**

Housebuilders require a guaranteed supply of land to ensure a steady output of dwellings, and so may hold a bank or portfolio of land (Smyth 1982, 1984). This land will be held in different ways, and it may also have a varying planning status. So, according to Anderson (1979 - page 49)

> the prudent company will attempt to bank land in different stages of 'fashioning' - from land with planning permission to land which unlikely to be ready for development for several years

Anderson and Bramley (1989) point to some of the other reasons for the necessity for firms to have a bank of land:-

- to achieve continuity of production;
- to meet changes in the house buying market;
- to minimise the effects of problems on one or more sites, i.e. to have the flexibility to switch production;
- to minimise the effects of planning delays;
- to prevent some competition from other new housing;
- to achieve partial local monopoly;
- to benefit from enhanced land values;
- to meet long-term potential markets;
- to offset unprofitable markets and spread development over different market areas;
- to cope with tax and other legislative uncertainties;
- to optimise cash flow;
• to have collateral for borrowing money;
• to ensure utility companies include the land in their capital programmes;
• to provide economies of scale in infrastructure provision;
• to influence the local planning process through the assembly of sites;
• to achieve more control with large sites (which can support more infrastructure);
• to provide a hedge against inflation;
• to utilise sunk investment in company overheads efficiently;
• to remain in a traditional market area.

Some of these reasons for land banking have been couched by Bramley (1989) in terms of an attempt by the housebuilders to reduce the uncertainty of market conditions, including fluctuating demand and limited supply, and this accords with Leung's (1987) view of developer behaviour.

The size of a firm's land bank will be related to its size (and hence to its ability to raise the capital required for land purchase or holding), and to its mode of operation (Smyth 1982). Larger developers tend to hold long land banks, of three to five years supply (or more). However, the practice varies, and, as I have suggested, some firms place as much emphasis on land holdings as housing output. So, some firms operate only with minimal land banks, about a two year's supply of developable land (such as Berkeley Homes, CALA, and Redrow), whilst others hold ten or more years supply (often acquired on option or at historically low values), like Bryant, Heron and Wilcon (Barlow and King 1991). Smyth (1982) has suggested that for a company to profit from the land element it is necessary for it to have a land bank of about ten years.

Access to land and the ability to land bank is crucial to the success of housebuilders, particularly the larger producers. Moreover, the reliance on profits from land purchase has meant less emphasis on competition by raising productivity, and so has had an effect on the form and efficiency of the UK housebuilding industry (Barlow 1990b, Barlow and King 1991). So land banks may not only be seen as part of the operating strategy of the housebuilders, but also as the means of the acquisition and retention by developers of large scale development profits. As Ball (1983) argues, the acquisition of land represents a struggle between landowners and housebuilders over the appropriation of those development gains, and in this it is necessary to see landowner action in deciding whether, and at what price, to sell as a constraint on land supply and on the operation of the housebuilders (Bramley 1989, Goodchild and Munton 1985).
**Land availability**

The other major constraint on the supply of land to the housebuilder is the planning system, or rather the operation of particular policies by the local and central state. The housebuilders have long argued that the planning system has delivered insufficient stocks of land and that this has, in consequence, forced up the cost of land and houses (Gracey 1973, Humber 1984, 1987, 1990, Humber and Jones 1984, Blincoe 1987, Blincoe and Dobson 1985, Evans 1987). These arguments have been tested and found to have partial validity in particular areas and market conditions (Adair, Berry and McGreal 1991, Cheshire and Sheppard 1989). They have also, to a large extent, been accepted by the Conservative government, with the introduction of market criteria into assessments of land availability and supply (Coopers and Lybrand 1985, and, Cuddy and Hollingsworth 1985, Rydin 1983b, Chiddick and Dobson 1986), and the seeming relaxation of planning controls.

The central importance of land to the housebuilder suggests the reasons for the continued pressure for further land release, especially of land in highly marketable locations. However, Rydin (1984 - page 435) suggests that as the large-scale housebuilders are also landowners

from the point of view of maximising the value of their land, they will favour a degree of restraint in the operation of planning together with an ability to obtain planning permission for specific sites in their ownership when necessary.

Moreover they would wish for a situation which enables them to constrain the supply of development land. She concludes that although

the rhetoric of the housebuilder interest groups may suggest that a large scale release of land is being sought, but in fact what is being sought is a shift in the control of land release, such a shift not necessarily resulting in a large scale land release at all (Rydin 1984 - page 436)

Smaller producers, particularly those who do not, or are unable to, hold large land banks, will have different interests in seeking a more widespread release of land.
Land purchase

The decision to buy land is seen by Drewett (1973) as the most important development decision, including as it does both the decision to invest in land and the decision on the location of that land. The price paid for the land will be one of the factors which determines the amount of profit to be made (the others include management skill, marketing strategies, skill to deal with planning process, the availability and cost of finance and the availability of consumer credit for house purchase). The land purchase decision involves an assessment of the risk in terms of the value of the land in relation to the probability of selling houses (Ball 1983, Drewett 1973). This decision is affected by a number of considerations, which determine the price of the land. These include:

(i) the nature of the planning permission and of any conditions imposed;
(ii) the cost of developing the land, including preparation costs and the cost of infrastructure provision;
(iii) the buoyancy of the local housing market, and the estimated demand for housing in the area and the likely rate and prices at which houses will be sold;
(iv) the size of the site;
(v) the type of contract with the landowner, and the arrangements made for payment and for apportioning the extraordinary development costs, including infrastructure and planning gain, and the value of any discount on the purchase price of the land;
(vi) the type and cost of borrowing which the developer needs to undertake;
(vii) going beyond the nature of the planning permission and its conditions will be the form of the planning permission, including the type, design, density of the dwellings, and any additional costs imposed by required planning agreements, which may cover social, education, community and other facilities, and infrastructure.

Land may be purchased outright or it may be acquired under option or by conditional contract. This decision is influenced primarily by the planning status of the land, and by the company's approach to housebuilding, to risk and to land banking. Planning status (whether or not land has planning permission, the form of the planning permission, and the likelihood of obtaining planning permission in future if it does not already have permission) is crucial to the price to be paid for the land and to the form of the contract with the landowner. The greater the likelihood that planning permission will be obtained, the higher the price of the land will be, so that land with an existing planning consent will be
the most expensive, land without permission but with a reasonable likelihood of obtaining permission in the future (such as an allocation in a local plan) will have a relatively high hope value, and land without a reasonable likelihood of obtaining permission will have no or a low hope value, depending upon local circumstances.

Firms are likely to purchase outright land with planning permission or allocated in development plans, and to seek conditional purchase (options or conditional contracts) on land without permission. The form of the option agreement will vary, depending upon the firm's normal practice; its assessment of the risk and of the value of the land; the awareness of the landowner and of any agents he/she may use of the land market situation; and the general likelihood of obtaining planning permission. Options vary both in their length and the discount which they attract. Bramley (1989) suggests that options are a cheap way to add to a firm's land bank, and indeed a sizeable proportion of some firms' land is held in this way. He indicates that in general terms options involve the down payment of about 10% of the current use value of the land in return for the right to purchase the land when planning permission is obtained, with a discount of 10% of the enhanced, residential value of the land. The form and length of the option vary, and so Bramley's figure must be seen as an example which is not necessarily typical.

Construction

The construction process has also received much attention, particularly in the literature from the USA where models of consumer choice have been developed and integrated with developer decision models (Kaiser and Weiss 1967, 1969, 1971), and from Ball (1983, 1988) in relation to the UK. One of the major characteristics of larger producers is their relatively large geographical area of operation, and their ability to overcome fluctuations in local housing markets by switching production between areas and sites. In terms of house types, they are also able to "span wide ranges, and to exploit the lowest end of the market where profit margins may be slim but fast" (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986 - page 70).

Marketing

The marketing and selling of the completed product has assumed greater importance in recent years, particularly with growing competition amongst the larger producers. Image, both of individual houses and of residential areas, is all important, both to attract purchasers and to make new development more acceptable to existing residents and
planning authorities. Standards of design, layout and landscaping have all improved (Ball 1983), partly in response to pressure from LPAs, although higher standards of design have an impact on margins (Davison 1987). I have already noted the importance of image in relation to the commodification of housing and the marketing of rural imagery, for the volume housebuilders in particular are concerned with selling the image of the residential areas as a whole, and "the main effort has been directed towards tapping popular images of rural harmony and village cohesion" (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986 - page 79).

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions on models of the development process

The major conclusion from the review of models of the development process is that none of the approaches is able to deal with all aspects of the process. Structure of provision approaches come closest to explaining the dynamics and driving forces of the process, but have little utility in analysing specific processes leading to specific forms of development. Agency interaction models may lack adequate reference to the structuring forces of the development process, but they are useful in capturing relations between actors. It is, as Ball (1983) suggests, the social relations of the process which are important and conceptualisations of actors' interests indicate that they may have a range of interests which need to be considered. This point has also been illustrated by the discussion on the housebuilding industry and its mode of operation, since a wide variety of different behaviours are apparent even between what may appear to be similar forms of producer. This behaviour is driven by the imperatives of capital accumulation and reproduction, but the way in which different firms react to these imperatives, and so structure their operations, vary.

Conclusions on the housebuilders' modes of operation

Decisions made by developers involve a wide range of expertise, and occur at a number of critical points in the development process. Decisions are made in relation to location, operational, production and investment matters, and the way in which these decisions are made, and the mode of operation, are related partly to the size of the firm and to its form of ownership. So, large-scale producers have distinctly different modes of operation from the small 'petty capitalist' producers, partly arising from their different forms of ownership and control.
The operations of the housebuilders involve not only the firm itself but interaction with its agents (in various forms) and a variety of other key actors, including the local planning authority. Housebuilders come into conflict with the planning system over land - the release and adequacy of a developable and marketable supply of land for housebuilding; the scale of its release; the timing of release and the location of release. To a lesser extent there may be conflict over the form of development (density, layout, design, house types) which may be permitted on the land.

Aside from the profit imperative, it can be argued that housebuilders operate with two other main imperatives

• to reduce uncertainty - uncertainty arises from a number of sources, including the fluctuating economy and housing market; difficulties over land acquisition; conflict with the planning system over land release; problems in the housing production and construction process etc. Housebuilders will seek to reduce that uncertainty to manageable levels, and so, for example, hold land stocks in advance of immediate development requirements, have a wide area of operations and production, or press government and LPAs for the release of further land;

• to control the development process - control of as much of the process as possible reduces uncertainty, and enables the appropriation of development gains. Again, modes of operation like land banking, the acquisition of options on potentially developable land, and the seeking of controlled land release in areas of restraint, enable housebuilders to gain control over more aspects of the development process as whole.

The development process can be seen as a struggle between housebuilders and other agencies over control and uncertainty, as well as profit. In many ways the primary struggles are first, with landowners, and, second, with the planning system and the local state. With landowners, the struggle is about who appropriates the development gain to be made from the increase in land value through development. The acquisition of land without planning permission, or with little hope value, is cheapest, but riskiest, for the housebuilder, whilst the landowner is likely to be able to retain the largest profit elements from land with planning permission. With the planning system, the struggle is centred around the scale and location of land release, and the form in which this release takes
place. An ordered release through the development plan system tends to favour landowners, whilst release of land on appeal, possibly counter to prevailing policy, will favour housebuilder interests.

The struggle with landowners is largely worked out through the planning system, and so it is unsurprising that housebuilders have been so active in seeking to influence government to switch the emphasis of the planning system from controlling to facilitating market operation.

From the analysis in this Chapter it is possible to point to a number of reasons which go some way to explaining the interest of the private sector in new settlements -

(i) they offer potentially cheap land;
(ii) they offer continuity of production;
(iii) they offer partial monopoly or control over land supply and release in a particular locality;
(iv) they offer greater control over the development process, particularly in relation to standards of layout, design and landscaping;
(v) under the right circumstances they may offer relatively little conflict with the planning authority;
(vi) they reduce uncertainty.

The following chapter will examine the new settlement development process, and will seek to address both these issues and the questions posed at the beginning of this Chapter.
CHAPTER 12

THE PRIVATE SECTOR NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS
INTRODUCTION

This Chapter focuses on the process by which private sector developers identify, acquire and develop sites for new settlements and on the ways in which they interact with the planning system. It sets out to answer the questions raised in the last Chapter, and in particular to explore some of the potential reasons for private sector interest in developing new settlements.

As I have already suggested, new settlements are a distinct spatial, urban form, with characteristics which distinguish them from other forms of urban development, such as large scale peripheral housing developments. Although there are notable exceptions, they can be seen as the diversification of larger scale capital interests into new locations and new forms of development. They can also be conceptualised, together with the expansion of planning gain, as part of

the increasing 'privatisation' of both the development process and the impacts of that process. Not only has the public sector been pulled back from an active role in undertaking development (except in some form of private-public partnership), but it has also been under pressure to internalise the costs it imposes on the community (Healey, Ennis and Purdue 1992 - page 39)

So in private new settlements it is possible to see this 'privatisation' of the development process, and I have referred to this in the Mode of Development dimension of the typology of new settlement production developed earlier. The role of the public sector in the development process itself is subordinate to that of the private sector.

Private new settlements may also be conceptualised as part of the struggle between housebuilders and a variety of other interests. First, there is a struggle with landowners over the appropriation of development gains to be made from the land. Second, new settlements have become a forum for the expression of conflict between local anti-growth or anti-development interests and the private sector, and third, there has been considerable conflict between development interests and the local and central state, both in relation to new settlements per se, and over the release of land for development. New settlements may offer private sector interests considerable leverage in these struggles or conflicts.
However, as the primary development objective of new settlement promoters is the provision of housing on a large scale, it is appropriate to consider their behaviour within the context provided by existing models of the private sector residential development process. I shall focus on the roles and activities of the private new settlement developers and on certain of the crucial decision areas in the development process, in order to illuminate the relative power and influence of new settlement promoters, and especially of the housebuilders, in the development process, and to lead to a greater understanding and awareness of the land development and new settlement development processes.

I shall first briefly consider existing work on the new settlement development process, before looking in more detail at new settlement developers. I shall then address some of the major issues arising out of the analysis of the residential development in the previous Chapter, and in particular those aspects of the process which can aid in explaining developer behaviour. So I will consider the issues of

- factors governing the choice of project (i.e. why new settlements rather than other forms of development?);
- how potential areas for new settlements are chosen;
- how new settlement sites are chosen;
- land acquisition, and negotiation with landowners;
- factors affecting decisions on the form and content of new settlement schemes;
- the negotiation of planning gain packages;
- interactions with the planning process.

**THE NEW SETTLEMENT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

Although, as I indicated in the last Chapter, there is a considerable body of work on the residential development process and on the operations of housebuilders, there has been little study of the process of large scale residential development and of new settlements in particular. The work that has been done can be grouped into four main areas (and I have already referred to some of these studies in the preceding analysis.

(a) the overall development process, including developer-landowner relations, planning gain, and the private sector's role in new settlements (Lock 1988a, 1989a, 1989b, 1990a);

(b) development costs, finance and landownership (Blincoe 1990, Cadman 1991, David Lock Associates 1990a, Meikle, Pattinson, Wheeler and Zetter 1991);


Outside the UK the only other major 'programme' of private sector new settlement or new community development has been in the USA, and although it is perhaps worthwhile looking at this work, there has been little of relevance which has addressed the issues that I am considering here. Burby and Weiss (1976) and Corden (1977) have provided more general reviews of new community development, whilst, perhaps most pertinently, Siembieda (1988) focused on the characteristics of large private land development companies engaged in new community development, and thereby also shed some light on the overall development process. Siembieda focuses on a number of key questions -

- who are the large scale land development companies?
- what are their organisational characteristics?
- how are markets and project locations chosen?
- how are the products chosen?

Despite the differences between the UK and USA planning systems and development industry, they remain useful as a framework for considering the process of new settlement development in the UK, and I shall use this work, together with the accounts of the residential development process discussed previously, as a basis for structuring the discussion. The analysis also draws on the surveys (including interviews) of developers undertaken in the case study areas, as have preceding Chapters, and these are integrated into the text. Since much of this material is qualitative rather than quantitative, it has been presented in the form of an impressionistic account, as it is not susceptible to the quantitative analysis undertake particularly in the Chapters on the new settlement proposals.

**New settlement promoters**

From the data set out in Chapter 6 I indicated that the following main categories of new settlement promoters could be identified:

- single housebuilding, construction or property development companies;
partnerships between housebuilding, construction or property development companies;
• consortia of housebuilding, construction or property development companies;
• landowners;
• 'mixed' partnerships or consortia;
• others.

I also pointed to the overall dominance of housebuilders in new settlement promotion, accounting for about two-thirds of schemes coming forward, and also the importance of landowners, involved in the promotion of about a quarter of current schemes. This pattern has not been static, and landowners have assumed a growing importance, whilst housebuilder partnerships and consortia have declined over time.

Although it is possible to distinguish promoters in this way, each category will, in general, have the same interests, and in terms of McNamara's (1983) typology of development purposes and interests, I suggested that they can mainly be conceived of as 'entrepreneurial builders' seeking a short term interest in the development site, both before and after development. Their objective will therefore be to acquire a site, develop and sell the development as quickly as possible. The only exceptions to this are, first, where commercial or industrial development within the new settlement may be held after completion, and, second, the position and interests of landowners.

Here it is necessary to consider institutional landowners, as well as housebuilding firms which may have purchased sites, and other pre-existing landowners. In general their purpose in development is, according to McNamara, in capitalising assets. In this way, it is evident that some housebuilders may have, or seek to have, the twin purposes of profiting from building and from increased land values (in capitalising the land assets which they hold). The greater involvement of landowners in the promotion of new settlements can be explained by their attempt to maximise their returns from the land value and to capture some of the returns from development as well. So the categorisation of new settlement promoters above indicates the nature of the corporate entities involved, but not their interests. In many ways it is the latter which are significant.

**New settlement developers**

There may, in fact, be a distinction between the form of the promoters and that of the developers of new settlements. I have used the term promoter to denote the entity
responsible for seeking to obtain planning permission for the development, and have already indicated that, particularly in the cases of single housebuilder promoters and landowners, other firms have become involved in the development once permission is granted. Normally, however, there will be a considerable degree of overlap between the promoters and the developers, in that promoters have almost invariably retained an interest in the development.

In the USA, Siembieda (1988) describes the companies engaged in new community development as those which add value to the land and which are engaged in land development as opposed to speculation. There are specific and distinct functions implicit in the term developer in the USA and UK contexts. While it is more common in the USA for developers merely to acquire and prepare land for development (in much the same way as amenageur-lotisseurs in France (Booth 1991)), selling it onto housebuilders or to the developers/constructors of commercial buildings, in the UK this form of development is usually undertaken by a company which will also carry out some, if not all, of the housing or commercial construction. Companies dealing solely in land speculation are less common in the UK (although some housebuilding firms will trade in land and may seek to make a return on these deals). The adding of value to the land, by for example the provision of infrastructure, the carrying out of landscaping or the construction of community facilities, distinguishes the land development company from the land speculators, with the latter seeking to gain permission for development and doing nothing else to add value to the land. It can of course be argued that the act of obtaining consent for development is itself an act that involved the adding of value to the land but it is not normally one that requires the investment of large amounts of capital, an act which also distinguishes the land developer1.

Work on new community developers in the USA by Siembieda (1988) suggests that three types of land development company involved in new community development can be differentiated on the basis of the ownership of the firm. These are

---

1 One of the features of the private new settlement development process is the often lengthy period of promotion, that is the period between the initial decision to promote a particular new settlement proposal and the eventual decision on a planning application. This latter decision may well be in relation to an appeal against the refusal of planning permission, or the result of an inquiry on an application called-in by the Secretary of State for his own determination. The costs of such a lengthy promotion period and process, particularly where an inquiry is involved are such that they do represent a significant investment for any one particular company, and help to explain why a significant number of new settlement promoters are either joint ventures or consortia of one kind or another.
In the UK, the distinction between companies involved in new settlement development on the basis of the form of company ownership is less valid, and is certainly less useful, partly because of the differences in the structure of UK and USA industry, especially the housebuilding industry. Examples of all three types are to be found in the UK housebuilding and property development industries, and hence amongst new settlement promoters. For example, new settlement promoters who are subsidiaries of large multi-function conglomerates include Ideal (the housebuilding subsidiary of Trafalgar House), Bovis (the housebuilding subsidiary of P & O), and Galliford Sears Homes (the housebuilding arm of Sears). There are a number of other examples. Privately owned companies involved in new settlements include Charles Church Developments and Heron Homes. Many of the other new settlement promoters are publicly quoted companies. As I suggested in the previous Chapter, based on the work of Ball (1983), the form of ownership of a company is likely to have some influence on its entrepreneurial ethos and approach, and on its social relations.

An alternative categorisation (but again one which is open to criticism) is that of the primary function of the company. Here the following categories of large scale UK new settlement promoters can be identified:

1. Corporate subsidiaries of large multi functional, industrial conglomerates which are engaged in housebuilding - Ideal Homes (Trafalgar House), Bovis (P & O), Galliford Sears Homes (Sears);
2. Housebuilding subsidiaries of construction/civil engineering groups - Wimpey, Alfred McAlpine, Taylor Woodrow, Costain, Laing, Balfour Beatty etc.;
3. Pure housebuilders - Barratts, Prowling, Persimmon, Crest, Wilson, etc.;
4. Property development and investment companies - Stanhope, Speyhawk, Rosehaugh, Gazeley, Mountleigh, etc.;
5. Financial institutions involved in property development and investment - Abbey Life, Eagle Star, etc.;
6. Large institutional landowners - CWS, Cambridge colleges (Trinity, Churchill) etc.;
7. Other forms of landowner.
It should be noted that many of these firms have other interests as well, and in particular the "pure" housebuilders may have a more diverse range of interests in that many are involved in property development and/or investment. The other activities of the corporate subsidiaries are extremely diverse.

**Housebuilders and new settlements**

Turning to the involvement of housebuilders in new settlement promotion and development, I have referred earlier to Ball's typology of housebuilding interests based on the size of the company and its ownership. Within the industry as a whole, Ball (1983) suggested that large scale production interests have become dominant. So what is the pattern in relation to new settlement promotion? Table 12.1 sets out the number of schemes promoted by housebuilders of different size. Since more than one firm may be involved in the promotion of a specific new settlement scheme, the figures involve some double counting of schemes.

I have adopted a categorisation of size which approximates to that used by Ball. However, there is a problem in attempting to categorise firms by the size of their output, in that this will vary yearly, and is related not only to the firm's corporate strategy but also to the state of the housing market. There may be quite extreme variations over time and so, for example, based on figures from a number of sources, Costain's output ranged from 2,140 units in 1986 to 617 in 1990. Other firms may not show such an extreme variation, but there are likely to be fluctuations. I have taken the production figures as those at the firms' reporting date in 1990. Production or output figures are more reliable as an indication of a firm's size, however, than figures based on turnover or profit. These are, first, subject to variation (again arising from wider economic circumstances), and, second, for some companies, particularly the corporate subsidiaries, difficult or impossible to obtain, as reporting practices vary, and not all firms give separate turnover or profit figures for their housebuilding divisions. Output in terms of the number of units completed or produced per annum remains the most useful comparative tool.
TABLE 12.1

THE NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES PROMOTED BY HOUSEBUILDERS OF DIFFERENT SIZES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM SIZE (number of dwellings per year)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF SCHEMES</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 350</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350 - 749</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 - 999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 - 1,999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000 - 2,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 3,000</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Figures relate to the number of schemes which a firm is involved in and so there is double counting of schemes.

Source: Author

Large scale production interests are predominant, with firms producing more than 1,000 dwellings per year involved in the promotion and development of over 70% of those schemes promoted by the housebuilders, which as I indicated in Chapter 6 accounted for about two thirds of all new settlement proposals. The size category responsible for promoting most proposals (in the 1,000 - 1,999 dwelling output group) are large producers, but not in the volume production category of the ten major housebuilders. Nevertheless there is also a surprising degree of involvement by the smaller scale producers.

As I have indicated many firms are involved in more than one new settlement, often in partnerships or consortia. Table 12.2 sets out the major promoters together with the number of schemes in which they have an interest. It includes all housebuilders having an interest in three or more new settlements whether as sole or lead promoter or a member of a partnership or consortium.
### TABLE 12.2

**NUMBER OF SCHEMES PROMOTED BY EACH HOUSEBUILDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEBUILDER</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DWELLINGS PER YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Homes</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beazer</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Woodrow</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcon</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred McAlpine</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croudace</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wates</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowtings</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Circle</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Church</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costain</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twigden</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Firms in bold were members of CDL. N/A = not available.

Source: Author

A number of points can be made. First, there is some relationship between the size of a firm and the number of new settlement schemes in which it is involved, either as lead promoter or as a member of a consortium. The larger firms tend to promote more schemes. Second, many of the largest firms were members of CDL and this accounts for at least some of their activity. Company operating strategy especially with regard to
risk taking has had some impact since Laing has not promoted a new settlement outside CDL. Conversely, of the larger firms with about 1,000 dwellings per annum output, six have promoted five or more schemes - Bryant, David Wilson, Alfred McAlpine, Crest, Croudace and Wates (the last two have promoted most of their schemes together in a consortium with Countryside, whilst McAlpines have also normally been part of a consortium with CWS). Bryant, David Wilson and Crest have operated in the main as sole promoted or in a limited number of partnerships. Third, some smaller producers have promoted or been involved with others in the promotion of a surprising number of schemes. So, for example, Taylor Woodrow have been particularly active, as have Twidgen, Pelham and William Davis amongst the small producers.

In order to point out more clearly the relationship between size and involvement in new settlements, Table 12.3 sets out housebuilding firms by size and indicates the number of schemes promoted. It indicates the top thirty housebuilders based on output in 1989 and 1990.

This confirms the dominance of the volume builders, but even amongst these there is a variation in performance, with fourteen of the top thirty promoting or developing less than two schemes each, and of these Redrow, Walter Lawrence, Abbey and Tay not having any involvement at all. There are evidently differences in opportunities for promotion, and in company philosophy and operation which explain this lack of involvement.
TABLE 12.3
THE TOP THIRTY HOUSEBUILDERS AND NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSEBUILDER</th>
<th>ANNUAL OUTPUT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beazer</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Homes</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellway</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassall</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrow</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfour Beatty</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliford</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred McAlpine</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloor</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wates</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALA</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lawrence</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowlem</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Output data is approximate, is based on the last full year available and is taken from company reports, "Building" and other technical press.

Source: Author

The involvement of smaller scale production interests is shown in Table 12.4. This takes those firms producing between 150 and 750 dwellings on 1989/1990 output figures, and for those involved in new settlements, indicates the number of schemes they have.
promoted. Of the 39 producers listed by Laing and Cruickshank per year, just under half have been involved in the promotion of at least one new settlement.

**TABLE 12.4**

SMALLER HOUSEBUILDERS' INVOLVEMENT IN NEW SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>OUTPUT (d/hs per year)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF NEW SETTLEMENT SCHEMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Church</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croudace</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowling</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costain</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twigden</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Woodrow</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trencherwood</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Davis</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erostin</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhold</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: As in Table 12.3

Source: Author

This confirms that there is not only a range of behaviour and activity between firms of a similar size, but also that particular firms have quite a widespread involvement equal to that of some of the larger producers. So, for example, Charles Church, Croudace, Prowting, Costain, Twigden, Countryside, Taylor Woodrow, William Davis and Pelham have all been involved in 3 or more schemes.
So involvement in new settlement promotion and development is not solely dependant on a firm's size, and, although the larger producers tend towards involvement in more schemes, this is by no means universal.

Overall, of the 69 firms producing more than 150 dwellings (listed by Laing and Cruickshank) 43 or about two thirds are involved in promoting or developing new settlements. Interest in new settlements is (or was) fairly widespread in the housebuilding industry.

There appears, at first glance, to be little difference in the pattern of involvement between the three categories identified earlier - corporate subsidiaries, housebuilding subsidiaries and pure housebuilders. Table 12.5 shows the distribution in these three categories of those firms which are the most active producers, those promoting three or more new settlements.

### TABLE 12.5

CATEGORIES OF COMPANIES INVOLVED IN NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORPORATE SUBSIDIARY</th>
<th>HOUSEBUILDING SUBSIDIARY</th>
<th>PURE HOUSE--builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Homes</td>
<td>Beazer</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>Lovells</td>
<td>Barratt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Circle</td>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>Wilcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>Crest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor Woodrow</td>
<td>Croudace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>Wates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alfred McAlpine</td>
<td>Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gallagher</td>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>Prowtings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Costain</td>
<td>Charles Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persimmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twigden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author

This indicates that, based on the average number of schemes per category, on the whole, housebuilding subsidiaries of construction, civil engineering or property development companies (average of 6 schemes each) tend to have a greater degree of
involvement in new settlement promotion, followed by the corporate subsidiaries (5.75 schemes each) and the pure housebuilders (4.6 schemes each). This suggests that both the housebuilding subsidiaries and corporate subsidiaries are better able to finance the promotion of schemes, given their generally greater financial resources as part of larger groups. The housebuilding subsidiaries also have a greater impetus to acquire this type of land than the other categories, particularly at a time when construction work in general is depressed, as a means of maintaining profitability in the group as a whole. Finally, new settlement schemes have an added advantage for the housebuilding subsidiaries of construction and civil engineering groups or firms in that they would provide work for other divisions of the parent company, in addition, of course, to house construction. So, for example, most new settlement schemes require off-site road improvements, and on-site road and other engineering works, which the appropriate divisions of these companies can carry out. Moreover, the provision of industrial or commercial premises would also benefit those firms with property development 'arms'. For these producers, then, new settlements offer the chance of added returns and, in particular, diversified activity.

**Organisation of development**

Ball (1983) suggests that there is a relationship between company size and ownership and the way in which it operates. I also indicated that there were variations in organisation and behaviour within, as well as between, the housebuilders in each category of his taxonomy. The categorisations of housebuilders and new settlement promoters by ownership category and type of activity presented earlier in this Chapter give some indication of the type of firms involved in new settlement promotion, but do not shed any light on their organisation nor on how the development of new settlements is organised.

The work by Siembieda (1988) suggests that amongst the new community developers in the USA there is a great deal of variation of organisation, both by product and by function, and that there is no preferred way of structuring the firm. He puts forward a number of factors which influence the structure of a firm, including the degree of horizontal or vertical integration, the sources of capital, the number of market areas within which a firm operates, and whether the company is a subsidiary or wholly owned private company. These tend to support the analysis by Ball (1983, 1988) and others of the structuring of the construction and housebuilding industries.
Horizontal or vertical integration

The degree of horizontal or vertical integration (although this is not so much a factor influencing structure as an indicator of structure) is perhaps the most useful of these concepts for the analysis of housebuilders' operations, for it can be applied both to the firm as a whole and, perhaps more usefully, to individual new settlement projects, and to their development process. The sources of capital and the number of market areas within which a firm operates can be seen as functions of the size and form of ownership of the company, and are of less significance for explaining behaviour in relation to new settlement promotion (although the larger firms have wider geographical areas of operation, and hence wider market areas, and these tend to predominate in new settlement production in the UK).

As already noted in the previous Chapter, the land development process can be conceptualised as a series of stages. The predevelopment and active development stages outlined in the event-sequence and agencies models (see for example Drewett's model in Figure 11.5) can be further divided into a number of sub-stages, seen as a continuum, according to the state of development of the land. These sub stages are illustrated in Table 12.6, and although they relate directly to the situation in the USA they do have parallels in the development process in the UK.

These sub stages begin with the acquisition of 'raw' or undeveloped land and then range through the obtaining of planning consent and the provision of major off- and on-site access, services and facilities, to the subdivision and servicing of individual house plots. Each of these stages (or sub-stages) represents an opportunity both for development itself and for the marketing or sale of the land in its undeveloped, semi-developed or developed state.
TABLE 12.6

THE HORIZONTAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage in process</th>
<th>Possible point of sale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured entitlements</td>
<td>major parcel or project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major platting filed</td>
<td>bulk parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major land form work</td>
<td>bulk/tract/major parcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major access installed</td>
<td>parcel/tract/subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major utilities installed</td>
<td>parcel/part subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major amenities installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot platting filed</td>
<td>parcel/lots/sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor land form work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor road installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor utilities installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor amenities installed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Siembieda 1988 Table 3

*Horizontal integration* refers to the way in which companies may undertake activities at one or more of these stages, but not at all of them. Some companies, according to Siembieda, may undertake activities in different stages on different projects. One important feature is the tendency for the larger and longer projects to be the subject of horizontal integration - thus companies are likely to sell off land in various states of development in order to minimise costs and maximise the rate at which profit is obtained on the capital invested. Land may be sold off to meet capital needs, especially by smaller firms. However as Siembieda (1988 - page 42) indicates

Firms with a capital base large enough to carry them through cycles in the building industry may elect to continue a vertical-only system of development

One of the problems associated with the horizontal development process is the lack of control which any one development company may be able to exercise over the form, design, and phasing of the development.

*Vertical integration* relates to the development and servicing of the land, the construction of buildings and the sale of the completed buildings being carried out by the same
company or group of companies, perhaps through partnerships, joint ventures or consortia.

In the UK, most housebuilding companies, and most new settlement promoters, tend towards the vertically integrated form, in that they are capable of, and largely do, undertake all the range of operations involved in land development (from site finding, land acquisition, and planning and design, through to development and marketing), although many of the operations may be subcontracted out. If this occurs then the lead company retains control.

In terms of the organisation of new settlement projects, a variety of forms have been, or would be, exhibited, depending in part on the nature of the promoters. I suggested earlier that in general three particular forms of arrangement for the promotion and development of new settlements by housebuilding or development companies may be distinguished:

(a) the sole developer - new settlements being promoted and developed by a single firm;
(b) the partnership or joint venture - new settlements being promoted by two companies in partnership (although one of the companies may take the lead in promotion); and
(c) the consortium - new settlements being promoted and developed by three or more companies or entities. These companies may be mainly housebuilders, or may have other interests. They may also not be development companies in the strict sense, rather they may include landowners or other bodies, like Housing Associations.

2A couple of examples will suffice to demonstrate the potential and actual range of interests involved. The new settlement of Chafford Hundred at Thurrock in Essex is being developed by Chafford Hundred Limited, a consortium made up of Blue Circle (the cement products company with interests in housebuilding and landownership), Pearson (a multi function conglomerate with diverse financial and publishing interests amongst others), and Pelham Homes (the housebuilding subsidiary of Rosehaugh, a property development and investment company). Here the promoting consortium is composed of diverse capital interests, and has acted as developer, acquiring the site, obtaining planning permission, designing and master planning the scheme and providing services. Land is being sold off to a variety of national and local housebuilding firms by tender, with the promoting consortium retaining a significant degree of design control. The second example is that of the proposed new settlement at Norton Bridge in Staffordshire. This is a joint venture between Orchid Housing Association and Newby (a housebuilding firm with landownership interests). There are also examples of consortia including landowners.
The degree of horizontal or vertical integration is likely to differ in each of these forms. For the sole developer, the factors which affect the kind of integration include the size of the new settlement; the number of houses to be built; the time scale for development; the type, size, capitalisation and experience of the company; and the local housing market situation. Except in very small new settlements, the sole promoter would exhibit a degree of horizontal integration, in that serviced land would be sold off to other developers at particular stages in the development of the new settlement. This may be to raise capital to ensure that the scheme remains viable for the company, or because the number of dwellings to be constructed is too great for an individual company, or simply because some degree of customer choice in terms of the range of housing which more than one firm can provide is seen to be desirable in marketing terms.

With partnerships and consortia, as a general rule, the more companies involved in promotion, the more likely it is that the operation will be integrated vertically, particularly where the firms involved are housebuilders. Where non house builders are involved then the promoting firm or consortium is more likely to exhibit horizontal integration, and sell or lease land to housebuilders, so in this situation the promoter acts as a traditional developer acquiring, planning and servicing the site and then disposing of serviced parcels.

In most of the proposed new settlements studied, however, there will be some degree of horizontal integration for interests, other than the promoters, will be engaged in some activities. In particular, the provision of social housing, which is a key element in many new settlements, would involve Housing Associations or Building Societies. In addition most proposals include some provision for limited housebuilding by the smaller local companies (about 10% in the case of CDL's new settlements), or for self build, sometimes at the insistence of the LPA. New settlements which include some form of business or science park or other large scale employment provision are also likely to be subject to horizontal integration, with the promoting company or consortium leasing or selling land to a commercial property developer to undertake this aspect of the development (unless the promoter is also involved in commercial property development).

Even within vertically organised development, most new settlement promoters indicated that they would involve other developers, not only for the reasons given above, but also to improve their trading position. The exchange of land between housebuilders has become a significant means of land acquisition, and obtaining consent for a new settlement places a firm in a good bargaining position with other companies, with the potential for
swopping developable land. This also, of course, enables the firm obtaining consent to benefit from the increased land value, and make a significant return on the sale or exchange of sites.

The size of a new settlement scheme also has an effect on the organisation of the development process, for there is an upper limit imposed by management and production factors, as well as marketing, first, to the number of dwellings which can be physically developed; second, to the number which can be marketed on any one site; and, third, to the number which any one firm can build. This upper limit varies in accordance with the level of demand in an area, but in general most housebuilders considered that about 400 dwellings per year was the maximum which could be developed in total (in the buoyant conditions of Cambridgeshire at least) and the optimum might be rather less than this (normally put at around 250 per year). Most firms would be looking to build about one third to one quarter of that total. So, in large new settlements of about 3,000 dwellings with a development time scale of around ten years, three or four producers would be required to meet the output target. In smaller new settlements the required number of housebuilders would be less, but the annual output might also be lower given potentially slower sales.

In all cases of horizontal integration the question of control of the project remains important, and most promoters seek to ensure that they have some degree of control over the type, location and standard of development undertaken by other developers in the new settlement. This can be achieved simply by retaining ownership and leasing land (particularly for commercial development), or by agreements with purchasing builders. It can also be done through the process of selecting other housebuilders to develop on the site, and a number of promoters indicated that they would only sell or lease land to firms which had the required standard of product design and construction. Finally, of course, control can be maintained through the design approval process, either by relying on the local planning authority to control new development through its normal powers (usually in accordance with a master plan and design guidelines which the promoter has drawn up, independently or jointly with the LPA), or through a more rigorous process of dual design control by the promoter and its agents. Some developers would also seek to control not only the standard of other housebuilders' output, but also the rate at which it is produced. In this way they would seek to limit competition, to their advantage.

Although consortia have become increasingly important in the residential development process, especially on large sites, they have declined as promoters of new settlements.
New settlements promoted by consortia tend to be larger in order to provide each member with sufficient development to make involvement viable. Conversely, where the planning policy framework requires the provision of a large scale new settlement, as in the case of the A45 corridor new settlement of 3,000 dwellings in Cambridgeshire, a consortium is necessary to provide that scale of development, because of the management and production constraints limiting a single firm's output. Attitudes to consortia vary within the housebuilding industry, since it is recognised that each consortium member is likely to have different interests, budget, corporate philosophies, modes of operation, commercial objectives and trading practices, and so this could lead to conflict over, for example, rates of development or emphasis on design quality. In general four or five firms were seen as the maximum number for a workable consortium. Some firms are therefore reluctant to join consortia, preferring to promote new settlements themselves, or in partnership with a firm with whom they have a good working relationship. A number of developers also indicated that they had been invited to join consortia or partnerships, but had declined, either because the new settlement scheme was unsatisfactory from their point of view, or because the consortium agreement or members were unacceptable.

Consortia (and partnerships or joint ventures) tend to come together in different ways. Some are adventitious, where several housebuilders have options or own sites in the same location and decide to work together. Others are more 'premeditated', being based on a conscious decision by a number of firms to operate in conjunction, as in the case of CDL or the consortia promoting Bourn Airfield or Highfields in Cambridgeshire. Alternatively, a developer may obtain an option on a site and then seek development partners to spread the costs of development. Consortia arrangements vary but usually involve a formula for apportioning the costs and returns based on the amount of land or capital participating firms bring to the deal. As part of these arrangements, there will be a mechanism for evening out costs and returns where one firm's land holding may, for reasons of design or layout, or because of the requirements of the LPA, not be used for housebuilding but for open space or some other low value form of development.

The advantages of consortia are the sharing of the risk and of the promotion and development costs (which may be considerable, with promotion costs of the order of £1m or more in the case of most of the Cambridgeshire new settlements). They also enable the development to provide for different market segments more easily than a single housebuilder could. Most developers interviewed would wish to be the lead developer,
which could certainly give rise to clashes of interests, and many expressed a preference for a partnership or joint venture, for this reason.

**Project Management**

Turning now to the structure of project management, Siembieda suggests that a wide variety of approaches can be discerned in the USA, with firms structuring management on a geographical basis or on a project basis. The amount of centralisation of control is also likely to vary, with some functions being carried out in the central office and others at a local or project level. In the UK, however, project organisation does not depend so much on the form of the promoter. In most cases, new settlement projects would be managed in a similar way, by a single company, often established specifically for the purpose of managing the development of a specific new settlement. Thus the consortium of volume housebuilders making up CDL proposed to form a separate company in which all of the participating firms would be shareholders for each of the new settlements that CDL has promoted. Other firms propose similar arrangements, even where a single company is involved in promoting and developing the new settlement, and so, for example, Alfred McAlpine would form a separate cost centre and a separate company to run the Swansley Wood new settlement project in Cambridgeshire, as would Charles Church at Hare Park. Most other firms indicated that they would set up broadly similar arrangements.

In terms of overall firm structure, most of the larger UK companies involved in new settlement promotion have a regional structure with a series of regional firms or subsidiaries covering different parts of the country. The degree of centralisation of control or of the autonomy of individual regional companies varies, as does the approach to, and locus of, certain important functions like strategic planning, land search and purchase and design. Some firms tend towards a centralised strategic planning and/or land finding department, whilst in others these functions are separate and more localised.

**Locational Decisions**

One of the crucial decisions in the development process is that of choosing areas for new settlements, and then finding the actual sites. From the analysis of the models of the development process in the previous Chapter, and in particular the event-sequence models, and from Siembieda's account of new community development in the USA, a number of distinct activities can be isolated for analysis:-
the method and important criteria by which project locations are identified;
the specific site search procedures;
the sources of potential sites; and
the relationship of these processes with land use plans and policies.

Identification of new settlement locations

It is difficult to separate out the location and site search activities in practice as they are closely linked. I referred to the strategies for site search adopted by housebuilders in the last Chapter. From his study of American new community developers, Siembieda (1988) suggests that a saturation approach is adopted. The criteria used in the search for new land are similar to those outlined by Baerwald (1981), Goldberg (1974) and Goldberg and Ulinder (1976). These factors relate to the growth potential of particular areas, in terms of population, employment and urbanisation, and the basic strategy adopted by the companies is to identify a set of market areas and narrow down the search for sites to specific sub sectors.

So, in general, locations for North American new settlements are chosen for their long term development potential, with the land being acquired in anticipation of the growing or developing pattern of urban development, and not so much on the basis of municipally approved land use plans.

In general, the process of identifying locations for UK new settlements is based on either a saturation approach or the slightly more intuitive approach outlined by Siembieda, or they come through an opportunist route (Short, Fleming and Witt 1986). The saturation approach is adopted in particular by those firms with central strategic planning staff, and it involves identification of growth trends on a regional basis, the close monitoring of structure plan (and local plan) processes, and from this the highlighting of areas with potential for new settlements. It has much closer links with the statutory land use planning process than is suggested by Siembieda in the USA, but this may well be due to the differences in the two planning systems.

In other cases, particularly where the planning policy framework regarding new settlements is not well developed or is not favourable, a more adventitious approach is based, again, on the identification of long term growth prospects, followed by the identification of sites which meet both the firm's requirements and the anticipated policy requirements.
In some cases, the sites chosen will be those already held by the company, especially where the firm is a large and long term landowner. Anticipation of future growth trends and patterns, and of likely planning policy responses, is an important activity for those firms that wish to become involved in new settlement production, and is often carried out by the growing sector of private planning and development consultants. There are instances where these consultants have adopted a more entrepreneurial role in promoting a new settlement or in acting as a broker in the sense used by Siembieda, as in the case of Allington in Cambridgeshire.

**Sources of new settlement sites**

According to Siembieda, sources of potential sites for new communities in the USA are, in order of importance

- brokers;
- unsolicited sellers;
- direct contact with landowners; and
- the acquisition of companies with land assets.

Most land came from brokers, with the others being much less important. This points to the greater role of land dealers or speculators in the residential development process in the USA.

However, in the UK the situation is somewhat different, and the following can be identified:

- direct approach to potential landowners - many new settlement sites have come from this source, arising out of a rational or intuitive site selection process. This method of search may mean that the firm's optimum choice may not be available for a variety of reasons (including a landowner's unwillingness to sell);

- sites offered by landowners or by their agents, although more usually by agents acting for the landowner - this method has been fairly common in most of the case study areas, as in the cases of Scotland Park and Swansley Wood in Cambridgeshire. Networks of contacts exist within particular geographical and functional sectors of the development industry and these contacts are useful in
bringing potential sites forward for consideration (McNamara 1984, 1986, McNamara and Turner 1987, Larkham 1986b);

- an invitation to join a promoting partnership or consortium (again this is an important source of sites for many of the housebuilder promoters);

- sites suggested by consultants; and

- existing ownerships (like CWS at Stretton Magna, Gazeley at Bittesby, or Dry Dayton Estate/Cambridge Colleges at Scotland Park), although these are in the minority.

Owing to the nature of new settlement development, which normally involves promoting a site without planning permission, no new settlement sites have been brought forward by methods more commonly used for normal residential land like purchase at auction or advertisement.

Identification of new settlement sites

In general then the approach adopted by many of the new settlement promoters in the UK can be characterised as a hybrid of the saturation and opportunist approaches. Areas with growth potential are sought, and in particular those areas with a likely shortfall in the amount of land currently allocated for housing in relation to likely future requirements, and where the shortfall is large enough to justify a new settlement. This is then an exercise at the strategic planning level to identify potential areas for new settlement development, with sites being identified or sought through a wider variety of methods. These will include a more localised saturation approach, using a sieve technique to identify areas without planning or other constraints, or a more opportunist coming together of landowner and developer through existing contacts.

Few developers actively seek to identify areas for new settlements as a separate exercise, but these arise more out of emerging planning policy contexts, or through a degree of opportunism. They are then seen as one of a range of development opportunities with which a particular company would wish to become involved. There are a few companies with strategic planning units, such as Crest, which actively seek out large scale development opportunities, including new settlements. The general approach to site finding may partially explain involvement in new settlements, or at least the...
involvement of particular promoters in several schemes, as active firms with a strategic view are more likely to have the expertise and resources to identify potential new settlement locations.

The criteria used to identify and assess potential sites are largely those noted by Goldberg (1974) and others, including site location; its marketability; and the general site conditions. However in relation to large sites, such as new settlements, a number of developers also had regard to the number of landowners involved, since a large number could make negotiations and land acquisition difficult; to the ease of land acquisition itself; and to the strategic planning context. The last of these was important, but it is evident from the many schemes floated in Cambridgeshire or Kettering, for example, that their promoters had different perceptions or interpretations of the emerging policy context and the degree to which it supported their particular scheme.

**The purchase of land for new settlements**

One of the crucial decisions highlighted by Drewett (1973), but considered unproblematic by Siembieda (1988) is the land purchase decision. Except where new settlement promoters were owners of new settlement sites before beginning the process of promotion, conditional purchase is almost universal. There are three main methods

(a) **conditional contracts** - where in return for a monetary consideration the landowner agrees to sell land to the housebuilder. If the conditions of the contract, including the granting of planning permission, are fulfilled, the developer is legally obliged to buy the land;

(b) **option agreements** - these allow developers, on payment of an option consideration, to purchase land when certain conditions have been satisfied (usually the granting of outline planning permission) for an agreed price at a discount on the value of the land as housing land. The landowner is obliged to sell, although the developer is not bound to buy, losing the option consideration if he does not; and

(c) **conditional outright purchase** - there are very few instances of this, but a typical arrangement is for land to be purchased at agricultural value, with an agreed uplift if planning permission is obtained, of around 40% to 50%.

In a few cases, and in specific circumstances, especially where the landowner is involved in promotion and would seek further involvement in development, specific agreements have been reached which take the form of a combination of an option and a
conditional contract. However, option agreements are sought by housebuilders in preference to the other methods.

Information on the length of options and the discount percentage is hard, if not impossible, to obtain, but Lock (1990a) suggests that, for new settlements, the discount ranges between 7% and 45% depending upon the degree of risk inherent in the scheme, in relation to the chances of obtaining planning permission. For most schemes it has been in the range of 10% to 20%, and, for example, the discount at Foxley Wood (CDL's proposed new settlement in North East Hampshire which was dismissed on appeal) was thought to be about 10% (Mitchell 1990). The discount will reflect the cost of promoting the new settlement; the likelihood of getting planning permission; the degree of hope value attached to the land (which is itself related to the planning policy context); and the amount paid for the option.

Most options seem to be long enough to allow the promoters to pursue a new settlement proposal through more than one round of structure plan reviews, and so are of the order of 10-15 years. There may also be provision for re negotiation after a set period of time. Most promoters felt that long options for new settlements were crucial given the risks involved and the lengthy process of steering a proposal through the planning system.

The negotiation of the option agreement and bargaining over its terms form an important part of the initial discussions between landowners and housebuilders. They are also part of the struggle between the landowner and the developer over the appropriation of development gains. The precise form of the option has important implications for the viability of development and for the extent to which the housebuilder is able to make an acceptable return. The precise matters over which bargaining will take place include

(i) the size of the initial option consideration - this is normally not great but is based on a percentage of the value of the land in an undeveloped state;

(ii) the ability to re negotiate an option - this may be important in changing market conditions, or where LPA requirements alter over time. As I noted earlier in the discussion on the local planning process in Leicestershire, David Wilson Homes were able to re negotiate their agreement with the landowners on more than one occasion, and thereby ensure that the scheme remained viable (for both parties);

(iii) the actual timing of negotiation and signing of the initial option agreement - this is of importance in relation to prevailing market conditions and land prices. The
length of time taken to promote or float a scheme through the planning process may, in certain cases, be such that land prices fluctuate, as has happened in Cambridgeshire. Where developers complete agreements early in the process, before a firm policy context emerges, and land prices subsequently fall, they may be faced with a situation where the agreed price to be paid for a site is more than prevailing land values, and the scheme becomes unviable. This occurred in relation to CDL’s site at Westmere, where the cost of the required infrastructure and planning gain was such that it could not be recouped from the likely increase in the value of the land, given the historically high prices which CDL would have had to pay for it. Inflation, particularly of infrastructure costs, also had an effect;

(iv) the price to be paid for the land - as noted in (iii) the price to be paid for the land is crucial to the viability of a proposal. Arrangements for this vary, and are, in any case, almost impossible to discover, but in one of the Cambridgeshire new settlements, it was stated that the price was little above agricultural land value, in consideration of the costs of providing infrastructure and developing the site. Normally the price to be paid will be either a percentage of the market value for housing land or an actual figure based on land values prevailing at the time the agreement was concluded. Also in most cases only developable land is purchased at prevailing market rates for housing land, and the remainder of a new settlement site is acquired at agricultural value. Later variations in the amount and area of housing permitted will, therefore, either benefit the housebuilder, where the area of developable land increases, or lead to reduced returns where it is decreased. The price paid for the site will also take into account the costs of planning gain packages, so that these will be borne by the landowner. In this respect, it is vital for housebuilders to undertake accurate appraisals, and to have a firm indication of the required facilities before land deals are concluded, since later requests for facilities from LPAs will need to be met by the housebuilder, rather than the landowner, unless the agreement can be renegotiated;

(v) the timing of payment for the land - again arrangements vary, with, in some cases, as at Tircoed, payment being deferred until houses are being sold. In most other cases however, payment for the land would need to begin when planning consent is granted. Some of the options negotiated in Cambridgeshire had a flexible provision enabling the developers to draw on land when they required it, and so defer payment in this way;
(vi) the amount of land to be purchased at any one time - developers may be re-
quired to purchase agreed amounts of land at specified stages or times, or they
may be free to draw on land as they need it, as I have noted; and

(vii) the components of extraordinary costs which are passed on to the landowner -
again arrangements vary, but normally all the extraordinary development costs
would be passed onto the landowner, or at least the housebuilder would seek to
do this.

All of these considerations are important to the developer, in that they affect the cash
flow of the development, and ultimately may influence its success or failure in commer-
cial terms. Cash flow is all important, for new settlements are inherently risky, being a
long term development, with the likelihood of fluctuating market conditions during the
development period. Their costs are greater than normal residential development, with
many of these costs having to be met early in the development. Most new settlement
developers would not expect to begin to make positive returns until half way through a
ten to fifteen year development time scale in a new settlement such are the 'front end'
costs of the development.

The impact of infrastructure and provision of facilities - planning gain

Rowan-Robinson and Lloyd (1988, 1989) have examined the general effect of infra-
structure costs in the development process and refer to the 'infrastructure lottery'.
Meikle, Pattinson, Wheeler and Zetter (1991 - page 7), in a more detailed study, suggest
that for a typical 3 bedroom dwelling in the South of England the greatest costs are land
costs and housebuilding costs (see Table 12.7) but

housing site costs, off-site infrastructure cost and community facilities typically
constitute around 16% of total residential costs. Of this, housing site costs con-
tribute around a half, off-site infrastructure costs contribute around one third,
while community facility costs contribute to the remainder

In this analysis housing site costs and off site infrastructure consisted of the same ele-
ments

- site clearance, roads and associated works;
- hard and soft landscaping;
services and service connections.

TABLE 12.7
TYPICAL BREAKDOWN OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development component</th>
<th>Cost per dwelling</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land cost</td>
<td>£40,000</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housebuilding cost</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing site costs</td>
<td>£9,000</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site infrastructure</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community facilities</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer's overheads</td>
<td>£23,000</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>£117,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Meikle et. al. 1991 Figure Four

Of these costs, the land, off-site infrastructure and community facilities costs were subject to the greatest variation. This work demonstrates the potential impact of the costs of providing infrastructure and community facilities, as well as off-site roads and a high standard of design and landscaping, on overall development costs. It also illustrates the reasons for extended negotiations over planning gain packages, both between housebuilders and LPAs, and housebuilders and landowners. For the housebuilder, keeping the housing site, off-site infrastructure and community facilities costs to a minimum helps to ensure higher margins.

So the amount of the extraordinary development costs which a local authority may seek to extract is important in relation to the overall viability of a new settlement scheme. In general these costs are passed onto the landowner and the land is purchased by the developer at a percentage of market value less the costs of the planning gain package. The developer will still have to bear these costs until a return is made from the sale of completed houses, so the cost of the planning gain package has implications for project cash flow. Developers need to know or anticipate the likely requirements in order to cost them and include them in financial viability appraisals and in negotiations with landowners. Alternatively, as I suggested earlier, they need to be able to re-negotiate the terms of option agreements with landowners during the process of promoting the new settlement through the planning system.
It is to the developer's advantage for LPAs to state their requirements at an early stage in the process, and for them not to be varied. In this sense, a planning policy context in which these extraordinary costs are clearly specified removes some degree of uncertainty for the developer, and assists in the struggle with the landowner. For the process of negotiation over planning gain between developers and landowners should be seen as one aspect of the struggle or conflict between them, and as Elson (1989 - page 6) indicates, "...... housebuilder-landowner negotiations amount to bargaining over the relevant shares of the increased value, created by the granting of permission, retained by each". Here planning gain can be seen as a 'tax' on betterment and an imposition on the increment gained by the landowner rather than the developer.

**The choice of size and type of new settlement**

One aspect which receives little treatment in traditional approaches to the development process is the choice of what to develop once a site has been identified. In certain cases, the choice of the type and size of development will be dictated by the planning permission or by the land allocation in a local plan (or by structure plan policy). This applies more to normal residential development than it does to new settlements, where there is much closer interaction between the private sector development process and the planning process. I have indicated in the earlier Chapters that the extent to which planning policy frameworks have specified the form, location, size and content of new settlement schemes has varied, and much of this has remained to be determined through the process of negotiation in context of individual schemes. However, policy frameworks have provided some degree of guidance.

The involvement of the private sector with a new settlement site usually begins before planning permission has been granted or before planning policy formulation has advanced to any great extent, although, as I have shown, there are a few cases where the private sector has followed up the positive identification of a new settlement option in a strategic policy, particularly in relation to proactive new settlement policies. So what determines the choice of the particular components of a new settlement scheme?

In relation to size, Siembieda (1988) suggests that minimum project size depends upon a number of variables, which apart from the regulatory climate and the potential absorption of the land by the amount and type of uses, include:
(a) size of the company and its capabilities, including capital base, staff experience and size, and other projects underway - in general smaller companies seek smaller development opportunities, although the analysis in this Chapter has shown that in UK new settlements, there are a number of quite small house-building firms involved, and given the possibilities for various forms of horizontal integration, with other companies becoming involved as development goes on, it is apparent that firm size is not one of the most significant variables in determining size and type of new settlement;

(b) net usable land - this is related to the size of the site that can be optioned, the size of the site required for the development, the mix of uses, the amount of open space to be provided, and the number of dwellings. This will obviously have an impact on the size of new settlement scheme promoted on a particular site, although again it is only one of the subsidiary factors in determining the size of scheme promoted;

(c) financing - this is one of the crucial factors and relates to the costs of the project (including both the normal development costs and any extraordinary costs which may need to be borne), the point at which these costs need to be met (most infrastructure costs are met early on in the development, before a return on the housing development is being made and so require the carrying of a heavy interest burden), and the point at which land costs may have to be met. These all have a determining effect on the size of project that is viable;

(d) time to be taken to complete the development - this tends to be a function of the size of the new settlement, rather than a determinant of its size. It is also related to housing market conditions, the number of housebuilders involved in construction, and the speed with which they wish to build and release land;

In addition to these variables, there are other factors in the UK which have been important:-

(e) the national planning policy context - the Chapter dealing with central government advice on new settlements indicated that, until recently, the central state's policy guidance suggested new villages of between 200 and 1,000 dwellings would be an appropriate scale in a range of circumstances. The response to this advice by developers and by Local Planning Authorities has had some impact on
the size of project which is promoted, as I have indicated, with the shift to smaller scale settlements in the late 1980s;

(f) the local planning context - again, as I have shown earlier, this is crucial. Developers have tended to attempt to anticipate emerging policy frameworks, both at structure plan or local plan level, and to influence the formulation of that policy context. So the policy context has had some impact on the size and form of schemes promoted, although the relationship is not invariably direct or close. The discussion on local planning has pointed to a number of examples where scheme location, size and content has been markedly at odds with the local planning policy framework. In many cases, such proposals have been unsuccessful in either influencing the policy framework or in obtaining permission, although some schemes, including Crest's proposal in Uttlesford, did have a direct impact on the planning process, being ultimately preferred by the authority;

(g) the size of new settlement perceived to be necessary to provide a reasonably balanced and self contained development, one which is seen to be marketable by the developers - this is related to the provision of a range of facilities, so, for example, a primary school is seen to be almost essential in order to produce a viable 'community' in social terms and to be able to market the development to consumers, as developers' perceptions are that consumers will resist new settlement schemes which do not provide schools. So marketability of the settlement is a crucial variable, and this is linked to actual and perceived thresholds for a number of community facilities;

(h) nature of promoter - although I suggested above that the size of the firm involved in promotion or development was not a significant influence on the size or form of new settlement, earlier evidence shows that, for reasons to which I have referred, partnerships or consortia of housebuilders tend to promote larger schemes that single firm promoters.

Opinion on appropriate or manageable size varies, according to the context. In the USA, Siembieda indicates that most new community developers cited the range of between 2,000 and 4,000 acres, as being a manageable size. In the UK, the size of new communities being promoted at present is much less than this with the largest in the range of 1,000 - 1,200 acres. Expressing size in terms of the number of dwellings, most UK new settlement promoters see projects within the range of 1,500 - 3,000 dwellings as the optimum from their point of view. However, as the data presented ear-
lier indicates, the average size of new settlement schemes coming forward has declined, towards and below the lower end of this range. Most developers suggested that they would not wish to be involved in a new settlement of less than 750 dwellings, and saw 5,000 dwellings as the upper limit. The reasons for this are primarily those of marketability, organisational capability and the strength of local housing markets. Most felt that new settlements of less than about 1,000 would not be viable in commercial or social terms (and of course the two are inextricably linked in developers perceptions). However, as the evidence in Chapter 6 shows, although about 45% of schemes of less than 1,000 dwellings have been promoted by housebuilders, they have, in general, tended to float proposals within their optimum size range.

Why new settlements?

The question remains - why have so many housebuilders, as well as other forms of developer, become involved in promoting and seeking to obtain permission for new settlements? The reasons most commonly cited in the interviews were

- Land supply;
- Continuity of production;
- Cheap housing land;
- High design standards and quality of environment;
- Prestige.

Land supply

The most commonly cited reason for seeking to promote and obtain permission for a new settlement was to provide a long term land supply for the firm. Although a new settlement may not by itself be that important for a particular firm in terms of providing a land bank, it does provide a guaranteed source of land. So, for example, a new settlement of 1,200 to 1,500 dwellings with a development period of ten years would, for a firm with an output of 1,200 to 1,500 dwellings per year, provide a tenth of its output per year or a ten year land bank (assuming that it developed all the dwellings). For smaller firms the significance of this scale of land supply increases and for larger producers it is of less importance. So a new settlement provides a steady supply of land. Table 12.8 details eighteen of the top 30 new settlement producers for which land bank figures are available and compares the size of a firm's land bank with the number of new settlements promoted. The figures for the land bank are taken from various sources, and are
based on the number of years supply of land they would provide at 1990 production levels.

**TABLE 12.8**

**COMPARISON OF SIZE OF LAND BANK AND COMPANY INVOLVEMENT IN NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>New settlements</th>
<th>Land bank yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beazer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor Woodrow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowlings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Circle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Church</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costain</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twigden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author and various trade sources, including Building

First, the figures illustrate the wide range in land holding behaviour, and hence operating or trading practices, with land banks ranging between 17.5 years at one extreme and 2 years at the other. Second, of these major new settlement promoters, just under half (8) have long land banks of five years or more, and three have less than 3 years supply of land. So there appears to be little relationship between a firm's land banking practice (and hence mode of production) and the promotion of new settlements.

Table 12.9 explores this further and looks at the relationship between land banking and new settlement promotion for the top thirty housebuilders. Again the Table illustrates the general point made in the previous Chapter that the volume or larger producers tend to have short land banks, therefore buy land relatively expensively, and so rely on high output but low margins per dwelling. It also indicates that land banking practice is not
solely dependant on the size of firm, since some of the smaller firms also have short land banks.

Based on this relationship between a firm's land banking practice and involvement in new settlement promotion, four categories of housebuilders can be identified

(i) **Long land bank - high level of new settlement activity.** Here there are several medium/large producers, including Wilcon (the only member of CDL in this group), Bryant and David Wilson. These are amongst the firms identified as having the most successful land buying policy, with large supplies of cheap land (Building 1990). Their widespread involvement in new settlement promotion would accord with their general land strategy, and indeed arise out of it. It can also be seen as a further attempt to acquire cheap land. These firms are adventurous and entrepreneurial.

(ii) **Long land bank - low level of new settlement activity.** Few of the major producers fall into this category - Heron and Tay. These are also fairly shrewd land buyers with possibly little need to become involved in new settlement promotion, or limited resources with which to do so. The latter applies particularly to the smaller producers;

(iii) **Short land bank - high level of new settlement activity.** In this category are the volume and larger producers, including many members of CDL - Tarmac, Wimpey, Barratt, Beazer and Bovis, and a non member, Crest. Several of these tend to buy expensive land and have been characterised as unsuccessful in land buying (Building 1990). Involvement in new settlements, largely as members of a large consortium, would spread risk, as these producers seem to be rather conservative, with the possible exception of Crest, and would enable them to maintain their output;
### TABLE 12.9

**THE TOP THIRTY HOUSEBUILDERS - THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAND BANKING AND NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTION AND DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Number of new settlement</th>
<th>Land bank years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wimpey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barratt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beazer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Homes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovell</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persimmon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy &amp; Stone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassall</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairclough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wilson</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrow</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balfour Beatty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galliford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred McAlpine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wates</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Lawrence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowlem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Producers in order of decreasing output. Blanks indicate no data available. Sources of information as in Table 12.6.

Source: Author

**(iv) Short land bank - low level of new settlement activity.** The firms in this group span the output range, with one member of CDL (Laing), and tend on the whole not to be southern based firms or to have a large southern operation. The price
they pay for land varies (Building). Limited involvement in new settlements may be explained by company philosophy, and, as with (iii), these firms tend to be conservative.

So there is some general relationship between a firm's involvement in new settlement promotion, and its general operating practices. There are some other general points which can be made. A firm's involvement in new settlement promotion will also depend on its perception of the chances of success, and I suggested earlier that CDL in particular had expectations of obtaining permission for more than one of their proposals, based on the 'signals' received from central government. Second, opportunities for new settlement promotion will vary, and in general it is the southern based firms, or those national or regional firms with a strong presence in the southern half of the country that have been most involved in promotion. This must be linked to strong growth pressures, and to the form of policy context emerging in many counties in this part of the country.

Continuity of production

As well as potentially providing a guaranteed source of land, equally importantly for the housebuilder, a new settlement provides economies of scale and continuity of production in a particular market area, and perhaps a partial monopoly of production as well. In a local housing market the amount of land coming forward through the planning system may well be limited, and as the discussion of policy formulation indicated, land requirements may be low. A new settlement is likely to provide a sizeable proportion of the land supply in any one area, thereby giving its developers control over that supply to a considerable extent.

Cheap housing land?

Linked to the control of local land supply, a new settlement may provide a source of relatively cheap land. Particularly where developers are able to anticipate the emergence of favourable planning frameworks, and acquire options, land may be acquired at less than the prevailing market rate. The promotion of a new settlement will therefore offer higher returns than normal residential development, but of course it carries with it a considerable risk, either that permission will not be obtained or that development itself will prove problematic.
High design standards and quality of environment

Most developers also referred to the ability to achieve a high standard of design and environment in a new settlement development. This indicates the growing concern within the industry, and the importance of design and quality in the marketing and sale of speculative housing. New settlements enable the developer to exercise greater control over the total 'package' - layout, density, landscaping, house design, and to shape it according to their own perceptions of market requirements.

Prestige

A number of firms saw involvement in new settlements, and in particular their successful development, as likely to give the participating firms a certain degree of prestige. For this reason, they place emphasis on the quality of the end product. Successful development would also potentially make it easier to obtain land and negotiate with landowners, and it would raise the general profile of the firm.

Other reasons

I have noted previously the benefits which new settlement development offer the construction and civil engineering companies with significant housebuilding subsidiaries. In addition, there may be property development opportunities.

Significantly perhaps, some housebuilders saw advantages in obtaining speedier land deals in new settlements than in other forms of development. Moreover the nature and risk of new settlement promotion places the housebuilder at an advantage over the landowner, since not only can cheaper land be obtained but the extraordinary development costs can also be passed on by the housebuilder. Some landowners are aware of this and have sought involvement in promotion and development, or, particularly in the case of large landowners with corporate resources, like CWS, they have themselves sought to act as developer, thereby seeking the benefits from enhanced land values which might otherwise go to the housebuilders.
Interactions with land use planning system

Much of the discussion in this Thesis has been devoted to the analysis of interactions between developers and the planning system. In terms of the new settlement development process as a whole, I would suggest that interaction takes place at three crucial points:

(a) the policy formulation stage;
(b) during the lifetime of a scheme prior to it obtaining planning permission;
(c) after it has obtained planning permission.

These stages may overlap and may in the case of new settlements be significantly longer than for other forms of residential development. The period from initial policy formulation and inception of schemes to initial decision has often been of the order of 6-7 years, and where successful, perhaps a further 2-3 years for more detailed permissions, continued negotiation on details of the schemes and planning agreements, ground/site work and provision of basic infrastructure. The development cycle is therefore likely to be considerably longer than for other residential development. It may be two or three times as long based on Roger Tym and Partners' (1989) estimate of an average period of 6 years from the date of submission of the first 'outline application to the final completion on site.³

³There are considerable methodological problems in assessing the length of the development "pipeline", and in ensuring that the data on new settlements is compatible with that given by Roger Tym and Partners. The latter see the planning phase occurring before site purchase, but do not include the period prior to the submission of an initial planning application during which the new settlement promoter may be seeking to influence planning policy, or may be in more detailed discussions with the local planning authority about the nature of their scheme.

At the policy formulation stage, the housebuilders and their representative organisation, the House Builders Federation (HBF), have been active in lobbying at central and local government level for the production of a legislative and policy climate that facilitates their operation (Rydin 1983a, 1986, Simmie 1985). New settlement promoters see involvement in the early stages of structure plan preparation in particular as being crucial in order to try to influence the precise form of policy for housing land and for new settlements. Most have appeared at EiPs, as has the HBF, and many now appear at LPIs as well. Certainly many schemes have been initially floated in order to influence the emerging policy framework with a view to obtaining a favourable policy.
Important also for those developers who have been able to anticipate a policy consideration of new settlements is the need to influence the locational component of the emerging policy so that it will favour their site. Developers therefore see participation at the EiP as crucial firstly to lobby for an increase in the amount of housing land to be released, and secondly for the consideration of new settlements to be debated. Although EiPs normally do not deal with site specific matters, developers, usually through their planning consultants, put forward detailed, comprehensive cases for their proposals. This is seen as essential to indicate to the EiP Panel and to the Secretary of State that well thought out schemes, which are capable of implementation, have been formulated. This type of process has occurred at a number of EiPs, including those on the Cambridgeshire, Warwickshire and South East Dorset Structure Plan Alterations (Amos 1990b). It has been argued that the private sector were successful in Cambridgeshire in persuading the Secretary of State to modify the proposed new settlement policy to include two rather than the one new settlement originally proposed by the County Council (Fisher 1990), although ultimately the Secretary of State refused planning permission for all the schemes put forward.

Developers have also lobbied at the draft modifications stage for the inclusion by the Secretary of State of policies in structure plan reviews that either provide a favourable climate in general, or perhaps even favour one particular location. Again in Cambridgeshire developers "flagged" the possibility of a new settlement to the east of the city and the Secretary of State widened the area of search accordingly.

Having perhaps been successful in securing a policy context which provides for a new settlement, the next major interaction is between the developers and local planning authorities over the form and content of the scheme. As I have shown earlier, this may take place in relation to a local plan proposal, a development brief or a negotiated planning application. Crucial aspects here are those to which I have referred earlier, including the requirements for social, community and other facilities and infrastructure, and other planning gain. This process is essentially one of bargaining and negotiation over the components of the scheme, and will involve the developer in an assessment of the social and other infrastructure which is considered to be desirable or essential to the success of the scheme, the extent to which the cost of this can be passed on to the landowner and the implications of the possible package for the developer's cash flow. Negotiation will also take place over the content and mix of land uses, in so far as this is amenable to discussion, given the form of planning policy that has emerged.
Lastly, there will be interaction in relation to the design of the scheme and the degree and form of control over the details of the scheme which will be exercised by the local planning authority. This is likely to take place before consent is granted but given the long term nature of new settlement development, discussions and negotiations will take place continuously. Interaction in the form of negotiating detailed consents for particular phases of the development will be an ongoing process throughout most of the life of the new settlement.

Strategies adopted by developers in negotiation and in interaction with the planning system vary, as Short, Fleming and Witt (1986) suggested. I would identify the following

**Confrontational** - this approach is characterised by the volume producers forming CDL, and typical also of some of the other early large new settlement schemes. The strategy is really a challenge to the current policy framework. CDL's schemes were largely promoted in contexts of restraint and constraint, including Tillingham Hall in the green belt, and in the absence of a policy context which made a specific reference to new settlements. The approach was unsuccessful, partly because of the choice of sites, and because of the size of the proposals, necessary as they were to the promoting consortium, as they engendered considerable local opposition. Although there was considerable negotiation over the content and form of the schemes, this negotiation took place in the context of planning applications, rather than emerging policy frameworks. It is an approach which has become less common over time, as strategic policy frameworks either provide for, or discourage, new settlements, and as it has become clear that the central state, despite its encouraging rhetoric, will not grant consent for schemes on appeal and in the face of local opposition and policies;

**Influential** - particular schemes have been floated in an attempt to influence the emerging policy context, and such proposals include Garendon, Bittesby and Stretton Magna in Leicestershire, and the proposals in Redditch. Here the promoter takes a longer term view, and although perhaps submitting an application does not pursue it with the same degree of pressure as the 'confrontational' schemes. The success of such tactics inevitably varies;

**Negotiative** - schemes which have involved considerable negotiation and bargaining between the developer and LPA, in a policy context where there is little direct guidance. Some of the schemes which have resulted from development briefs, like
Shenley, may be placed in this category, as may Kettleby Magna in Leicestershire, Tircoed in South Wales, and perhaps Easton Park in Uttlesford. This form of promotion has become more widespread over time.

CONCLUSIONS

The promotion of new settlements by the private sector, and particularly by the larger housebuilders has come about for very specific reasons. It is centred around control of land supply and of the development process as whole. CDL was initially formed to mount an attack on local planning policies of restraint, which limited the supply of land for housing. New settlements offer guaranteed land supply, and large amounts of it, for as Bruton and Nicholson (1987 - page 391) state

this is especially relevant to those builders who emphasise turnover in their operations, and whose land banks, although large, are rapidly depleted. Large sites also offer continuity of land supply and housing production, together with economies of scale. The new settlements reflect the land requirements of Consortium members in seeking to respond to effective regional housing demand rather than flowing from existing public development strategies

Although CDL's challenge was unsuccessful, many other housebuilders and developers have pursued new settlement schemes for some of the same reasons. They accord with the general imperatives of speculative housebuilders, to reduce uncertainty, to control the development process, and to maintain profitability.

The involvement of speculative housebuilders in new settlement promotion varies, as I have indicated, but it is possible to point to particular categories of producer which have been particularly active in promotion (although not all producers in each category show the same degree of involvement):-

(a) the volume producers - those housebuilders with an output of over 2,000 dwellings each year, who require access to large land supplies, but who normally do not hold large land banks. New settlements offer them the land supply they require and the ability to maintain output;

(b) medium size regional housebuilders - like David Wilson or Bryant, with a sound approach to land buying, and large land banks. For them, new settlements offer cheaper land, in line with their general buying policy, and guaranteed
output, as well as the opportunity to monopolise local supply and sell on some of the land to other producers, thereby making a developer's profit as well;

(c) **smaller regional/sub regional builders** - their involvement may be as a partner or as a consortium member, but promotion offers a sizeable land bank and the ability to profit from land deals or swaps. They also tend to promote smaller new settlements within their local area of operation.

To a large extent, the decision to become involved in new settlement promotion or development will depend on the firm's attitude to risk, on its general mode of operation, and on the perception of key personnel, particularly in the strategic planning and land buying roles. As with LPAs, there is within some housebuilding firms, a general culture of support for the concept of new settlements, which has had some influence on company decisions.

The new settlement development process can be seen as an iterative process, and one which has links with the process of the formulation of planning policy for new settlements. New settlement proposals are influenced by emerging policy and also influence it, both in terms of location and content. The process of promoting new settlements can be characterised, up to the late 1980s, as one of confrontation with the planning system, although there is now more evidence of a closer working between the housebuilders and LPAs, in particular circumstances. These in part include the lack of strong strategic direction through the structure plan, as in Kettering, with an enabling policy framework, or the examples of Kettleby Magna and Shenley, where the structure plan provided no specific guidance for new settlements.

In some ways the privatisation of planning has extended to strategic planning, since it can be argued that the housebuilding industry's response in the early and mid 1980s to a perceived lack of strategic planning for land supply and release by the local state was the undertaking of strategic or local planning exercises. Certainly new settlement proposals have been promoted on the basis of quite sophisticated exercises in strategic thinking which may have an impact on the outcome of policy formulation by local planning authorities. As further evidence of privatisation, and at the other extreme, dual design control exercised by both the promoter and the LPA is seen as necessary by many new settlement promoters in order to maintain their control over the form and details of the development. Again much of this control is being delegated to their agents. The role of agents in the development process is being broadened out.
The promotion and development of new settlements is a risky business however, both in the likelihood of obtaining planning permission and in economic viability for the developer. It is certainly more risky than normal residential development which involves the acquisition of land with planning permission or land that is allocated for development. Few new settlements have actually been granted planning permission yet. The lengthy time scale, the often considerable promotion costs, planning gain, and the cyclical nature of the housing market are such that the development of new settlements involves promoters in a degree of risk beyond that in most other forms of residential development. This is demonstrated by the problems that occurred in those new settlements developed in the late 1960's and early 1970's, when developers in New Ash Green and Bar Hill went bankrupt.

It is therefore evident that the potential returns to the housebuilders are such that they have justified the taking of these risks, although the decline in the promotion of new schemes since 1988/1989 indicates that economic recession and the accompanying downturn in the housing market have led many producers to re-examine their priorities. Lack of success, the need to reduce capital outlay, and a more cautious attitude to land acquisition in a period of falling land prices have led many to withdraw from promotion (as in the case of CDL), and to a less confrontation approach to promotion itself.

Traditional approaches to the development process have not paid a great deal of attention to the form of integration exhibited either by developers or in projects. The form of integration is seen as an important factor in the explanation of the way in which new settlements are being developed. True vertical integration in the sense used by Siem-bieda is unlikely to be found in large new settlements, which are almost certain to involve some degree of horizontal integration, with land in various states of development being sold off at various stages to other developers. This will apply in all but a few cases where a large consortium like CDL may be involved, which is able to undertake development of the whole new settlement. Even here however some land will be sold to local, or self, builders, and passed onto housing associations to meet local planning authority requirements.

The choice of what to develop is also not often considered in approaches to the development process. Again in the case of new settlements this choice is a complex one but it is iterative in the sense that by promoting schemes early in the strategic planning process, developers seek to influence the form and content of planning policy and its
locational implications. The promotion of schemes can influence policy content, but schemes are also influenced by the anticipated policy response. Other factors relating to the nature of the promoter and to the nature of the site chosen as well as the precise details of the deal struck with landowners are influential in developer decisions on the size and mix of uses in a new settlement scheme.

Overall then, the study of the behaviour of developers in the process leading to the promotion and development of new settlements is crucial to a complete understanding of the new settlements phenomenon and to a more complete understanding of the development process as a whole.
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NEW SETTLEMENTS AS AN ARENA FOR COMPETITION AND CONFLICT -

FINAL PERSPECTIVES ON INTERACTIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING PROCESSES
INTRODUCTION

Private sector new settlements are both a specific form of urban development which merit study in themselves and a representation of the wider conflict centred around the land use planning system in the 1980s. That they are a specific form of urban development has been demonstrated. They have demanded policy attention by the local and central state, they have raised a complex range of issues and generated wide and, at times, acrimonious debate, and they have been one of the key planning issues of the 1980s. New settlements normally require greenfield sites, in the countryside, and, by their scale and combination of land uses and facilities, can be seen as distinct from large scale housing development. For these reasons too, the new settlement development process has a number of distinct features which mark it out from the normal residential land development process.

Although they are not a new phenomenon and have antecedents in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as well as in the 1960s and 1970s, it is the volume of proposals in the years since the early 1980s which is new, different and requires explanation. That the scale of the new settlement project of the last decade arises out of the particular configuration of political, social and economic factors in the Thatcher years, there is no doubt, for once these conditions started to shift in the past three or four years, the number of proposals coming forward declined.

This Chapter draws together the discussion and analysis, and offers some conclusions on the key research issues. It begins by looking at the conditions which aided in the resurgence of private sector new settlements in the last decade, and then deals briefly with the response of the planning system, before returning to the main research issues and summing up the evidence which has been presented. It finally considers the approach to the research adopted in this Thesis and the appropriateness of the research method.

THE CONDITIONS FOR NEW SETTLEMENT PROMOTION AND PRODUCTION

As I have suggested the explanation for the rise of the private new settlement in the 1980s lies in a particular set of circumstances which held for much of that decade. There are perhaps five main factors which are now dealt with in turn.
The nature of the policies pursued by the local state through the planning system, particularly in the South East

Here restraint on development and on the release of land for housing has been exercised, and the responses of the speculative housebuilders was to mount an attack on these policies. This came first, through the HBF, at central state level in an attempt to create a policy climate favourable to land release and to housing development, and second, in specific localities, through the promotion of new settlements, in order to force land releases on a large scale. This challenge, on the whole, was unsuccessful, at least in terms of gaining consent on appeal, although it had the effect of placing new settlements on the wider agenda, and in introducing wider criteria into the selection and allocation of land for housing in local plans. The meeting of housing demand rather than simply allocating land to meet housing need, and the use of market driven criteria in the selection of land for housing, including its location, availability for development and marketability, have become accepted as part of planning practice.

The growing and continuing demand for private housing

The buoyant economic conditions of the early 1980s, the widespread availability of credit for house purchase, population shifts from the cities to smaller towns and to the 'outer city', and the policies of the central state in restraining local state expenditure on house construction and fostering owner occupation, all combined to produce a strong and continuing demand for housing. In conjunction with the general restraint on development, and the shortage of housing land perceived by the housebuilding industry, these produced the conditions in which the private sector sought to provide for that demand, and thereby increase their output and profitability, by the promotion of new settlements. Previous upturns in the housing market cycle in the 1970s had seen a similar reaction, although not of the scale of that in the last decade. A booming housing market represents an opportunity to the housebuilders, whilst depressed conditions normally result in a cutting back in production and a restructuring and rationalisation of land holdings. So high levels of demand and a buoyant market are important factors, first, in explaining promotion and second as one of the necessary conditions for successful production.
Central government policy and ideology

Although the central state's general ambivalence to the planning system in the 1980s has been seen as an attack on land use planning per se, it can also be argued to have been an attempt to reorder planning policies and practice to new goals and directions. The impact of government ideology has been to fragment the planning system, so that different styles of planning operate in different areas. In general though, the planning system shifted from the exercise of strong control over the operation of the market to the facilitation of the market. Early measures to 'free' the system gave the private sector a series of 'signals' that attempts to secure land release would be likely to be received with more favour than before. The first wave of new settlement proposals, from CDL in mid-1983, followed closely after new circulars on housing land and green belts, which appeared to weaken the power of the local state in decision making within the planning system, and centralise control to a greater degree, through the appeal system, besides relaxing the exercise of restraint on land release. In these circumstances, CDL, along with other housebuilders, felt fairly certain that their pressure would eventually be met with a favourable response, if not from the local state, then from the centre.

That this did not happen points to one of the tensions of Conservative philosophy, that centred around authoritarianism, with attempts to exercise strong central control on the operation of local planning authorities, faced with strong local resistance by anti-growth movements particularly in those areas targeted by the housebuilders - the areas in the South and South East where political support for the government was at its strongest, and the reaction to the effects of growth greatest. There were, then, strong political pressures to maintain the rhetoric of giving a free reign to market forces, whilst at the same time, taking a rather different approach in practice. So central state policy and ideology both appeared supportive of the case for private new settlements, although in practice, decisions on appeals and applications called in by the Secretary of State, went, with one exception, against the private sector. Furthermore they also provided a seemingly favourable policy climate at national level, at least until the late 1980s/early 1990s, when the weight of decisions, both on appeals and on structure plan modifications, indicated that the underlying policy stance was rather different and that the chances of success through confrontation were extremely limited. Not only did the volume of proposals coming forward start to drop with the downturn in the housing market, but also at the time when the central state appeared less supportive of the housebuilders' case for new settlements than the rhetoric suggested;
The structure and operation of the housebuilding industry

Although housebuilders have not been the only promoters of new settlements, they have been predominant, either singly, in partnerships or consortia with other housebuilders, or in conjunction with other actors in the development process, including landowners. The structure of the housebuilding industry is subject to periodic changes in response to prevailing market conditions, with such a shift taking place in the 1970s following recession, and another in recent years. The general effect has been to weaken the position of the smaller and medium producers, with less resources to be able to withstand downturns and reduced returns. In general large scale producers dominate the industry, although even here, they have altered their operations, with a number, like Costain, drastically reducing their output, and others, like Galliford Sears, ceasing production altogether. As in the crisis in the 1970s, the recent downturn has seen some firms go into liquidation or be taken over.

Notwithstanding these shifts, large scale capital interests predominate within the speculative housebuilding industry, and these are relatively immune from the effects of the housing cycle. The particular forms of social relations within the industry, and the modes of operation of the major producers, have suggested the reasons for their involvement in new settlement promotion and production. Housebuilders require access to supplies of land suitable for housebuilding, and the effect of the operation of planning policies in the 1970s and early 1980s was to reduce the amount of land coming forward for development. If successful, the promotion of a new settlement offers the housebuilders access to a guaranteed supply of land. Moreover it may also be land which is cheaper than that which they are normally able to acquire, because of the particular arrangements made for acquisition, and since it is usually land on which the chances of obtaining consent are low. The search for guaranteed land supply and for cheap land helps to explain housebuilding interests' involvement in new settlements, and indeed one of the potential advantages of such forms of development to the housebuilder is that such land is invariably cheap.

Although these may explain housebuilder involvement in new settlements in general they do not necessarily explain the involvement of particular firms. To do this it is necessary to look in more detail at the operating practices of particular types of housebuilder, and especially at approaches to land buying, risk taking and interaction with the planning system. Certain firms are more adventurous and entrepreneurial than others, with a success in gaining access to supplies of cheaper land. It is this rather than size...
which is important since several of the firms which have promoted the greatest number of new settlement proposals have been the small rather than the large scale or volume producers. I also suggested that the influence of key figures, particularly planning professionals within housebuilding companies, may be important, as a number have shown the same kind of ideological 'sympathy' to the concept of new settlements, that characterises a number of LPA planners.

I would suggest that housebuilder involvement in new settlements, or indeed in other large scale development, can be explained by attempts to increase control of the development process, and to minimise uncertainty. A new settlement is a large scale development, and the promoting firm or lead developer is in an excellent position to seek to control not only the process of developing the settlement itself, but also to control the operation of competitors. So, new settlements give partial monopoly of land supply, and control over the design, standard and rate of production of other firms. They also reduce uncertainty by providing a long term supply of developable land, and a long term output of housing. Finally their nature and the form of relations with the planning system give their promoters a degree of control over landowners.

**The struggle with landowners**

The removal of more formal arrangements for taxing gain from selling and developing land and their replacement by planning gain is a particular characteristic of the 1980s. Planning gain is an informal land development tax, although it is becoming more formalised as more development plans make specific proposals for development projects to provide wider, community benefits as a matter of course.

Planning gain packages for new settlements are considerable partly because of the scale of the development, and partly because of the nature of the development. The range and extent of community, health, social and other facilities and buildings which are required to be provided in new settlements is extensive as they are new and self contained urban development. Furthermore LPAs have sought to attain balanced 'communities' where a range of facilities appropriate to the size of the population are available for the residents. Developers themselves see this aspect of the development as important in marketing the housing to consumers, and so there are a number of imperatives to the provision of facilities.
In addition, infrastructure costs are often considerable, as new highways or improvements to existing roads may be necessary, as may upgrading to the whole range of utility services. These costs, imposed partly out of development requirements and partly out of negotiations with the planning authority, represent a significant proportion of overall development costs. It is unsurprising that there has been a struggle with landowners over how these costs are borne. New settlements represent one means for the house builders of passing on these costs to the landowner.

Of course the struggle is centred more around the appropriation of the development gains arising from the increase in land values as a result of development. Here developers are able to use the planning system, as they are in relation to planning gain, to seek to reduce the cost of land. Although there have been a number of specific allocations of land for new settlements through proactive forms of policy, which will, by conferring a degree of certainty that planning permission will be granted, increase the value of the allocated land, other policy frameworks have been more flexible, permitting a degree of competition and choice. In those circumstances where the policy framework is not site specific the value of land is not increased to the extent of allocated land, as uncertainty about whether planning consent would be obtained remains. It is in the new settlement promoters' interest that this uncertainty persists, particularly in circumstances, as in Cambridgeshire or Kettering, where a considerable number of alternative schemes are generated through the policy formulation process.

NEW SETTLEMENT PRODUCTION IN THE 1980s

So in the 1980s there has been a set of circumstances which have provided the conditions for new settlement promotion and production. However, production has been more problematic than promotion, since only twelve out of about two hundred proposals have actually gained planning consent in the past decade. So promotion has been remarkably unsuccessful, and this may be traced to some of those conditions which have facilitated promotion. The central state despite its rhetoric has been unwilling to overturn local decisions, especially in the face of concerted opposition, or to impose new settlement policies on structure plan policy frameworks where districts do not give their support. The local state itself has also been subject to anti-development pressures, to which it has acceded. Many of the proposals themselves have been a challenge to local policy frameworks, like Tillingham Hall in the green belt, and have not been able to demonstrate sufficient justification for a departure from these frameworks.
Promotion has been most successful where it is either in accord with the local policy framework, or where a negotiative strategy is adopted by the potential developer. In the first group are proposals which have been floated in response to the local plan framework, like Easton Park (Uttlesford) or Cransley Lodge (Kettering), where the private sector has responded to, but also shaped emerging policy. Proposals in the second group include Shenley (an LPA initiative with the landowner), Tircoed (where negotiation took place over several years), and Kettleby Magna (where the developer was able to offer a solution to local problems and virtually negotiate a planning consent). Direct confrontation has invariably been unsuccessful.

THE RESPONSE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM

The Central State

As I have suggested, the central state has been partly responsible for creating the conditions within which the private sector has been able to promote new settlements. The specific policy of central government in relation to new settlements has been largely encouraging, at least until the late 1980s, and particularly until the emergence of the new PPG on housing in early 1992. However, before then, it had become apparent that the central state was decidedly less permissive than the local state when determining applications or appeals for new settlement proposals. In terms of modifications to structure plan policy frameworks, enabling policies were generally substituted for proactive or reactive policies, thereby charting a shift away from the specific provision for new settlements at this level. In addition the central state has deleted positive policies from a number of submitted structure plan reviews, particularly where there was little support for such policies from districts.

Regional Policy

Policies for new settlements at regional level have tended to be bland, with little locational guidance. In general, because the regional policy framework is still being put in place, the regional guidance issued by the central state has had little direct relevance to the current debate on the role of new settlements, nor to the more practical matter of providing guidance for structure and local plan strategies. Most regional forums have addressed the issue although few have been particularly positive, partly as regional advice has tended to derive from existing structure plan policy frameworks. Only in East Anglia is there any great degree of direction in the regional advice, in part a response to
the private sector pressure in Cambridgeshire, and to a lesser extent in Norfolk and Suffolk. Even here the regional advice had no role to play in determining what was a major strategic issue - the location of the new settlements on the A45 corridor in Cambridgeshire.

Developers see opportunities for participation and for exerting influence in the process of preparing regional advice and guidance, and so consider that it is of value to participate. In addition, many of the more adventurous firms seek to follow, and, if possible, anticipate, regional growth trends and the general strategic thrust of regional policy. On the whole though regional policy has been of little relevance, despite the calls from many commentators for a firmer strategic framework and for more effective planning at this level. The general lack of relevance can be seen as an outcome of the downplaying of strategic planning as a whole by the central state, at least until the last couple of years.

**The Local State**

The local state is not monolithic, and operates at a number of levels. The split of planning functions between counties and districts is a potential source of conflict, and the issue of new settlements has been one area where there has been some degree of tension between the two arms of the local state. However, in general, the local state (or more accurately, the districts) has been more permissive than the central state in relation to the granting of planning consent for new settlements.

The policy context has provided a variable degree of guidance, and the process of policy formulation itself has also been the arena for conflict and contention.

**Structure Plans**

There have been a variety of approaches to new settlements in structure plans, in part conditioned by the degree of pressure for growth to which a particular county, or parts of it, are subject. In general new settlements have been seen as a solution for areas under considerable pressure for new development, and so have been proposed as part of strategies for regionally or locally designated growth points, or where the strategic objective is to constrain development and reduce the impact of growth on existing settlements. It is the association of new settlements with growth which has led a number of counties to reject new settlement policy options, and which has generated much local anti-growth opposition.
The form of policy framework proposed in structure plan reviews has ranged from one which makes a positive provision for a new settlement (proactive policies) through the setting out of a framework for determining private sector proposals which might emerge (reactive), to an enabling framework which places the onus on districts through their local planning process to determine the need for, and location of, any new settlements. In rare cases, the policy framework has been negative, indicating that new settlements are not appropriate. More normally where this has been decided, any reference to new settlements is dropped from the submitted version of the plan.

The structure plan process gives considerable scope for interaction, in that the private sector may, first, float schemes to influence the emerging policy framework, and second, where new settlements have been considered positively as an option for dealing with growth, seek to anticipate both policy and locational decisions. This occurred in Cambridgeshire where developers, in parallel with the continuing structure plan review process, identified their own new settlement locations, both inside and outside proposed areas of search, and then promoted schemes. Such competition may be difficult to handle as it was in Cambridgeshire, and it may have the effect of shifting both the plan strategy and the specific locations in favour of one or more of the promoted schemes.

Local Plans

The degree of direct relationship between structure plan policies and the local planning process varies, and in some cases has not been as great as would be suggested by traditional models of the planning process, which conceptualise a hierarchy of plans. Local plans are obviously influenced by the strategic framework, but deal with priorities and pressures at a local level, and have, recently, been accorded greater importance within the planning system.

Local plan approaches to new settlements have differed, although it is possible to point to particular forms of policy approach, related to the structure plan framework and the scope or discretion which it gives to districts. The structure plan gives particularly strong direction where the policy framework is a proactive one which has identified a new settlement as part of the plan strategy and highlighted a specific location or area of search. This has generally although not invariably occurred where the district also favours a new settlement solution. Such an approach has usually given rise to consid-
erable private sector pressure which the local planning process has not always been able to cope with successfully.

Some districts have eschewed formal local plan policy frameworks, and where they have identified opportunities for new settlements, pursued these through other means, particularly development briefs. This diversity of approach points to a degree of fragmentation of planning practice, and supports the notion of the development of a range of styles of planning.

THE KEY RESEARCH ISSUES

This research has sought to describe and explain the rise of the new settlements in the 1980s and early 1990s and to relate this to wider ideas about the role, influence and power of specific actors in the planning and development processes, and about their interactions. The discussion now turns to address these questions.

The Central State

The central state has had an important role in both policy formulation and decision making. It has been more restrictive than the local state in dealing with appeals or applications, although its ideological stance and initial policy pronouncements might have suggested otherwise. It has also become less welcoming over the past decade as formal policy expressed through PPGs has switched from encouraging to discouraging.

The central state's impact on other policy formulation has also been as marked, particularly through the modification of structure plan policy frameworks, by deleting proposed new settlement policies in a number of cases and in others by modifying strategies. The effect of this in Cambridgeshire for example was far reaching.

The Private Sector

The private sector has attempted to influence the policy climate through participation in the structure planning process, by appearing the EiP and representations, and similarly has sought to have an effect on local planning processes. I have noted where it has been successful in this but part of the strategy of participation is designed to secure favourable decisions. Participation in the EiP and the floating of schemes either through this mechanism or beforehand is designed to convince LPAs, Panel and Secretary of
State that particular proposals are viable. This can be especially important where a positive policy framework is being considered or is likely to emerge, and considerable developer pressure for new settlements has arisen in those cases like Cambridgeshire, Kettering or Uttlesford, where it is apparent that the LPA are likely to propose a positive new settlements framework.

Just as the structure of the industry has influenced the form of new settlement promotion, so it has affected the nature of interactions with the planning system, particularly over policy formulation. It is now becoming increasingly common for developers to participate in all formal forums for influencing or attempting to influence policy. The larger housebuilders are able to exert influence through their representative bodies, the HBF and the VHBSG (and of course, the latter formed the nucleus for CDL). The extent to which they have been successful is varied. They have been incorporated into the planning process through land availability studies, and criteria of marketability and developability have become absorbed within planning practice. However success in affecting policy is more limited whilst in terms of obtaining consent for large scale new settlements, the larger builders have been noticeably unsuccessful.

I have suggested that the social relations of the housebuilding industry are important in explaining new settlement promotion. So not only are size and type of ownership important determining factors, but the nature of a firm’s operation, and in particular its approach to risk taking and land buying. However general company philosophy is also a significant factor, in that a number of firms, especially those with professional planners in-house tend to have a culture, as do some LPAs, which is favourably predisposed to the concept of new settlements. This, linked with the growing emphasis on design standards and the overall quality of the residential environment, which new settlements are an excellent vehicle for demonstrating, helps to explain why some firms, rather than others, have been prominent in promoting new settlements.

The way in which new settlements are promoted, in opposition to, or in co-operation with LPAs, and therefore as a challenge to planning policies or seeking to work with and through the strategic and local planning process, also arises out of the particular social relations of the industry. The larger producers appear to have sought, at least in the early and mid 1980s, to directly attack existing planning policies, and promote new settlements through confrontation. This has changed and more now seek to promote their schemes through the development plan. The evident lack of success, despite central
state rhetoric in favour of the private sector, has been influential in bringing about a shift in promotional tactics.

**The Local State**

The local state has of course a crucial role through first policy formulation and second in decision making on new settlement applications. Local state reaction to new settlements has been varied both at county and district level.

The extent to which counties have actively sought to provide for new settlements in their structure plans has been considered and only in a few cases has a positive framework been set out, partly because of local anti-growth pressures and partly because of the power then exercised by the central state, through the Secretary of State, in the structure plan modification process.

District Councils have a greater role in decision making (on applications) and have been more active in negotiating with the private sector on particular new settlement schemes. The local planning process has been significant in providing a framework for consideration of scheme, even where a strategic lead has not been provided by the county through the structure plan. The greater permissiveness of districts in granting consent has been noted, and a number of schemes have emerged successful from negotiation, rather than through a formal development plan route. Again this points to the fragmentation of planning, and to the extent to which practice has varied from the norms set out in formalised policy guidance statements.

The existence of a general culture favourable to the consideration of new settlements can be seen as one of the factors leading to local state acceptance of schemes. The role of individuals within the local state is nonetheless important, at least in particular circumstances, especially in fostering such a culture, and this was apparent in a number of the authorities studied.

**Landowners**

Landowners have a key role in the development process, not only in the passive sense, concerned with decisions whether, when and at what price to sell land, but also a more active role as developer or partner. I noted the considerable number of schemes either promoted by landowners or with landowners as part of a consortium. Greater landowner
involvement in the development process has become more marked, with greater participation in local planning in particular. That this should be so, it is not unsurprisingly, linked to the struggle with housebuilders over the appropriation of development gain.

The form of the bargain over the land is crucial to the successful development of a new settlement for the housebuilder, seeking, as they do, cheap land, and to pass on the extraordinary development costs.

**Consultants**

The consultants employed by housebuilders have had a number of roles, including representational and promotional, as well as being directly involved in negotiation and bargaining over planning gain. Many of the larger housebuilders have their own planning staff, who not only influence company philosophy, but also represent, along with outside private consultants, the growing privatisation for the planning function. The undertaking of rigorous and close monitoring of ongoing policy formulation processes at structure and local plan level, as well as generally anticipating regional growth trends, is vital for the successful operation of the industry. Many of the housebuilders in the case study areas had independently identified those general new settlement locations which were later formally identified by the LPAs. There may be an element of post hoc rationalisation in this, but nevertheless, these firms were able to follow the processes closely and select sites in parallel with identification by LPAs.

The degree to which consultants were able to influence the content and design of schemes has varied, depending upon how strong a lead was provided by the housebuilder. Some firms were content to be led by their consultants, whilst others gave them a tight brief. In the public sector, few LPAs have used planning for local planning work and even fewer for advise on new settlements. Where they have it has had an effect on the form and content of policy, although not necessarily on the outcome, as in Kettering.

**Summary**

Finally, has new settlement production been led by the market (developers) rather than by the state (planning system)? The apparent effects of the Conservative ideology over the past ten years have been to both fragment and to reorder the planning system, and to facilitate the operation of the market. However, different modes and styles of planning
operate in different localities with different mixes and forms of social relations. In some areas new settlement promotion has been led by the market, certainly in the early and mid 1980s in the south and south east. However new settlement production has taken place much less frequently, and on the whole it can be characterised as a negotiative outcome. Rarely have the new settlements currently underway come from confrontation, but more from a strong planning policy framework, backed or replaced by, cooperation and negotiation.

CDL's challenge to planning policies and the planning system may ultimately have been unsuccessful, but it provided a lead both for other developers and the state to follow. It typifies the conflict centred around development, around land, and around the nature and role of the planning system which has marked the last decade.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The key elements of the research methodology have been, firstly, a political economy approach, focusing on the power of actors in the development process and in policy formulation, and, secondly, the use of case studies. The latter have been integrated into the general analysis rather than presented separately.

The case studies have provided material for the description and analysis of the processes of policy formulation for new settlements and of new settlement development. Their use was justified as the most appropriate method for this type of study, and in particular as they enabled specific analysis of the interactions in specific locales and policy processes. It is considered that this approach has been fruitful in illuminating a range of different forms of process in different counties, whilst, at the same time, permitting generalisation to the wider theory which underpins this and other examinations of these processes. In this way, then, this study is able to contribute to the wider understanding of the development and policy formulation processes and to the wider theory.

The political economy approach is concerned with the goals, ideologies and relative power of the institutions and actors in the land development process, and in the interaction which are centred around the planning system. Again this theoretical focus has been justified, and it is indeed crucial to the study. For example, in relation to new settlements at least, the power of the housebuilders has been seen to relatively weak, despite their incorporation into the planning process, and despite assertions of their power in relation to the housing land supply issue. Although new settlements may be
explained partly as an attempt by the housebuilders to control land supply, they have not on the whole been successful either in obtaining planning permission, or in fostering a favourable policy climate at a local level. However, some have been, where they have adopted a negotiative rather than a confrontational position in relation to the planning system. There is also a divergence of interests amongst housebuilders, to which others have pointed, in part dependant upon their size, especially on housing land release.

The focus on particular actors has been appropriate, combined with the analysis which has sought to probe more deeply into the development process, and uncover particular types of interest, rather than assuming these from the nature of the actor. So, again, in relation to the housebuilders, the approach has been to consider firm structure and operating practices, as well as more general and wider imperatives, as these help shape interests and behaviour. All of this, of course, must be set within the broader context of particular social formations which also constrain and channel action.
APPENDIX ONE

METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS WITH THE USE OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL DATA
INTRODUCTION

This Appendix discusses the problems which must addressed when development control data is used, as in the study presented in Chapter 6. This data is of a number of types and includes planning applications (including approval and refusal rates) and appeals (including success rates), as well as the general temporal and geographical distribution of these.

Development control studies have been concerned particularly with the investigation of the effectiveness of planning policy instruments, such as designated areas (like AsONB or National Parks) or other forms of policy, and in comparing the effects of policy instruments in several areas. They thus have considerable relevance for this study, and they also raise a number of theoretical and methodological issues. A considerable number of the more accessible of these studies have been reviewed for this methodological discussion. Figure A.1 lists these.

Figure A.1

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL STUDIES

| Buller and Hoggart 1986 | Craven 1969 |
| Curry and McNab 1986 | Curry, McNab and Hayes 1985 |
| Gregory 1970 | Hebbert 1987 |
| McNamara and Elson 1981 | McNamara and Healey 1984 |
CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS

There are a number of conceptual problems relating to the use of development control data which have been raised in these studies and which must be considered here:

Development pressure - development control data, i.e. the number of applications submitted, do not give a true picture of the degree of development pressure, because of the deterrent effect of restrictive policies, so that it is necessary to consider

both the demand for development and the barriers placed in the way of the satisfaction of that demand (McNamara and Healey 1984 - page 94 - emphasis in original)

or because

the submission of a planning application often represents only the formal stage in what has often been a lengthy negotiative process between the applicant and the planning authority. Negotiation may thereby act to filter out those development proposals that would almost certainly not gain planning consent (Buller and Hoggat 1986 - page 169)

This is acknowledged here and is overcome, to some extent, by analysing the total number of new settlement schemes, whether or not they become formal applications. The data is limited to those proposals which have been made public, as I have stated, and so it is biased to some degree, as there will be a number of schemes which are not yet public, or which have not or will not become public. Interviews with key agents during the course of the study confirmed this, although it is not capable of quantification. The use of case studies and the focus on key decision agent behaviour will also help to uncover the negotiative process, and it is this as well as, or more than, the submission of formal applications which is the object of study here. Interactions between the private sector and the local state have an effect and an outcome whether the interaction is centred around an informal proposal or a planning application. It is the interaction, the effect and the outcome which are of concern, although the process of making decisions on applications and appeals is one aspect of that interaction.

The conceptual problems associated with arriving at a definition of development pressure per se, which were the subject of some debate between McNamara and Healey (1984) and Brotherton (1982, 1984), and of work by Larkham (1990b, 1990c) are not at
issue here, as I am not seeking to compare the pressure for the development of new settlements with other forms of development.

**Double or over counting** - the most common situation where double counting can arise is when an outline application is followed by one or more detailed applications. However, as Anderson (1981 - page 6) points out, whether or not these should be recorded will depend upon the purposes of the analysis

if the analyst is interested only in whether sites are developed or not, then all applications should be ignored except a final detailed permission. On the other hand, if interest lies in pressure to develop, or in types of application permitted, then each complete submission is of interest and should be recorded.

The number of cases where double counting of outline and detailed applications for new settlements may occur is limited as comparatively few schemes have been permitted (in outline) and even fewer have been the subject of detailed applications. Where this has occurred, I have not counted both types of application separately. However where there has been more than one application for a new settlement on the same site, I have counted both in the data set, as I am concerned with illustrating the extent of development pressure for this type of development as a whole. I have also double counted decisions on applications and appeals, where an application has been refused and an appeal has been made. Disaggregated decision data is also presented to overcome this and to enable separate analysis of both types of decisions, but it is considered valid to record the nature of all decisions on new settlements since I am concerned with describing the response of the planning system to such proposals.

**Measurement and weighting** - most studies using development control data have weighted planning applications, usually by the number of dwellings applied for or by the area of the site, in order to provide a standardised basis of comparison to overcome the problem of isolating the inherent characteristics of different geographical areas. This is not a problem which is encountered in this study, as I am not solely seeking to compare the pressure for new settlements in different areas, although this does form part of the analysis of the spatial distribution of proposals. However, I have used both "crude" and weighted measures where appropriate, and this is indicated in the text and in the relevant tables.

---

For a discussion of the various forms of weights used, and of their advantages and disadvantages, see Curry and McNab 1986.
**Effect of other factors on the submission of applications** - even when using a long time series and wide spatial distribution of data, it is not always possible to disentangle policy effects from other wider events or from other factors, like economic trends or the state of the housing market. Some writers have "argued strongly against using development control statistics in isolation from qualitative information about individual cases, and especially the private sector side of the matter" (Hebbert 1987 - page 9). In this study I am not solely reliant on development control data, nor am I seeking to compare the effects of policy designations between areas. The adoption of a case study approach, combined with a broad range of data, should make it possible to disentangle wider effects from policy effects. Indeed it is these wider effects on the form, timing and nature of new settlement promotion that are of as much interest as the potential policy effects (put at its most simple, because of the iterative effects of the one on the other).

**The link between decisions and policy implementation** - this link is "neither simple nor deterministic in nature" (McNamara and Healey 1984 - page 96), for, to evaluate the implementation of planning policies, it is necessary to examine the less formal aspects of the decision making process, including, as noted above, the extent and form of negotiation between local planning authorities and developers. This study does, of course, consider these links in greater detail later. The data presented in Chapter 6 is designed less to analyse this link than to give an overall indication of the degree, location, form and timing of new settlement activity, in the form of informal proposals, formal applications and appeals, as a prelude to examining the implementation of policy as one aspect of the interactions between the development process and the planning policy formulation and decision making processes.
APPENDIX TWO

STRUCTURE PLAN POLICIES FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS
INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains the full text of the new settlement structure plan policies referred to in Chapter 9.

REACTIVE POLICIES

Gwent County Council - Policy H 3

Proposals for comprehensively planned new settlements or substantial expansions to existing settlements outside the Brecon Beacons National Park or the Wye Valley Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be considered against the following criteria:

i  The need for housing land in the area;
ii The ability of the proposal to reduce pressure for development in neighbouring or adjacent settlements;
iii The impact on areas which are environmentally sensitive;
iv The impact on better quality agricultural land in accordance with Policy C6;
v The impact on 'Green Spaces' as defined under Policies C1 and C2;
vi The provision of access to the strategic and county road network as defined in the Key Diagram and its capacity to accommodate increased traffic;
vii The relationship of public transport services;
viii The balance between houses, jobs and community facilities;
ix The distance to other urban centres to which it will be related for the provision of facilities and services.

Where new settlements and substantial expansions are acceptable, appropriate benefits to the community will be required in accordance with Policy H10 (Gwent County Council 1992 - page 19).
ENABLING POLICIES

Northamptonshire County Council - Policy RES 5

Consideration will be given to proposals for well designed small free standing new settlements. Detailed locations, which should come forward through the statutory local plan process, will be assessed against the following criteria:

A Be located a suitable distance from existing settlements in order to avoid coalescence and the overuse of existing facilities;

B Be located so that the new settlement does not adversely affect the character and setting of adjacent settlements;

C Be well located in relation to the primary road network, centres of employment and settlements where school, health and a range of other facilities are available;

D Offer a range and mix of housing types and tenures suitable for both local and wider housing needs and in particular make a contribution towards meeting the need for low cost housing of all forms in the local area;

E Meet all or most of the requirements for, and costs of, relevant local infrastructure and community facilities, as well as providing any necessary road improvements. Contributions will be expected from developers for these costs;

F Offer a high standard of design, layout and landscaping within a new settlement, which harmonises with or improves the existing environment;

G Provide local employment opportunities;

H Not normally be located within the Special Landscape Areas, and will not have a significant or detrimental impact on the landscape;

I Have regard for the requirements of agriculture and the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land for development which is irreversible;

J Not sterilise known mineral reserves; and

K Not adversely affect sites or areas of nature conservation, archaeological, scientific or geological interest (DoE/DTp 1992c)
Kent County Council

(a) The fresh land releases should be identified in local plans...... if the scale and local circumstances justify it, in the form of new free-standing communities, and based on criteria which minimise the conflict with the structure plan's countryside conservation policies and make efficient use and provision of infrastructure

(b) At Ashford, the scale of fresh land release required necessitates examination of the several possible locations available, including the option of a free-standing community to the south of the town, the choice of the location must take into account the practicality and costs of providing new public infrastructure (Kent County Council 1987b - page 73)

PROACTIVE POLICIES

Cambridgeshire - Policy as modified and approved by the Secretary of State

(1) Provision will be made for a new settlement on the A45 corridor west or east of Cambridge which will:

- be close enough to Cambridge to make a significant contribution to its development needs, but be located outside the Green belt;
- complement the existing settlement pattern and not prejudice the expansion planned for Papworth Everard;
- make use as far as possible of land which is under-used or of little environmental value and minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land;
- minimise infrastructure costs and flood risks;
- provide the opportunity for a business park development;
- be capable of accommodating about 3,000 dwellings with some reserve capacity for future expansion, 2,000 of which should be available before 2001;
- provide a safe and easy access to the A45 Trunk Road.

(2) Provision will be made for a new settlement or settlement expansion in the A10 corridor between Cambridge and Ely which will:-
- be capable of accommodating dwellings 1,500 by 2001, with a final size to be
determined, amongst other matters, by the physical characteristics of the
particular site chosen;
- be located where it can serve the development requirements of the
Cambridge sub-area, and act as a catalyst for growth north of Cambridge;
- make use as far as possible of land which is under-used or of little
environmental value and minimise the loss of high quality agricultural land;
- minimise infrastructure costs and flood risks;
- provide safe and easy access to the A10 (DoE/DTp 1989b).

**Nottinghamshire County Council - Policy 3/2**

(a) provision will be made for major residential development in the following
locations:
Newark & Sherwood (ii) in a new village south-east of Balderton, East of the A1

(b) The new village south-east of Balderton should include a wide variety of
house types, including social housing, and adequate community facilities. In
these cases, developers will be expected to contribute towards the costs of
providing such facilities and to meet all or most of the costs of providing the new
and improved highway and other infrastructure required by the development. All
major residential development should be to a high design standard
(Nottinghamshire County Council 1990 - page 79).

**Suffolk County County - Policy IP 16**

Provision will be made for a new settlement to the east of Ipswich capable of
accommodating approximately 2,000 dwellings. Development of this settlement
will contribute towards meeting the future housing needs of the Ipswich,
Felixstowe and Woodbridge policy areas up to and beyond 2006. The location of
a new settlement should:

a) be north of the A45 and east of the A12 and provide for safe and easy access
to the primary road network;
b) avoid high quality agricultural land;
c) avoid the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas;
d) avoid conflict with villages of the area;
e) minimise the impact on the landscape of the surrounding rural area (Suffolk County Council 1990 - page 45)
APPENDIX THREE

LOCAL PLAN POLICIES FOR NEW SETTLEMENTS
INTRODUCTION

This appendix contains the full text of the new settlement local plan policies referred to in Chapter 10.

Proactive Structure Plan Policy Framework

East Sussex - the South Wealden Local Plan: Part 1

Policy 13B for the largest site, and fuller, but typical of the form and content of the others states:

Land at Site 1, Red Dyke Farm, south of Dittons Road (A27), and north of the railway land as defined on the proposals map is allocated for housing purposes. Proposals for new housing development will be permitted subject to the following:-

(1) the land allocated for housing purposes shall be developed in a number of smaller individual housing areas by making good use of existing tree belts and hedgerows, open spaces, natural features, road network and dwelling layout and design.

(2) vehicular access shall be taken from two points off the Dittons Road (A27) and from Lion Hill. The access roads through the site shall link these access points. Highway works shall be constructed to Local Planning and Highway Authority standards.

(3) a safe and convenient system of pedestrian ways shall be provided, separated from the access roads wherever possible.

Particular importance shall be attached to safe routes to the primary school, playing areas and the tunnel under the railway leading into Eastbourne Borough.

(4) provision shall be made for a formal recreation area capable of accommodating three full size playing pitches and associated requirements in the south east part of the site.
(5) land beneath the 132 Kv electricity line and over the 18 inch gas main shall be used for open space subject to the detailed requirements of the respective statutory undertakers. Additional informal open space and play areas will be required elsewhere in the site and will be defined in the development brief.

(6) provision shall be made for a new primary school, a neighbourhood shopping area and appropriate car parking in the north eastern part of the site.

(7) they are required for a primary school, formal recreational use and open space will be brought into public ownership through appropriate planning agreements.

(8) the existing hedgerows, trees and tree belts within the site and at the boundaries shall be retained and improved where possible. New landscaping shall be provided within the housing areas.

(9) appropriate measures shall be taken by the developers to mitigate the effects of traffic noise, and noise and vibration from the railway. The impact of the proposed A22 New Route and the possible re-opening of the disused rail link will be considered.

(10) a development brief will be prepared for the site.

Enabling Structure Plan Policy Framework

Northamptonshire - Local Plan for Kettering Borough

Policy 14 (Kettering Borough Council 1990a)

Planning permission will be granted for one or more new villages, the housing provision in which will not exceed 750 dwellings in total for the Borough for the whole of the plan period.

Proposal will be considered in relation to:

i. the scale of the proposal (proposals in excess of 750 dwellings will not normally be considered appropriate);
ii the location of the proposals in relation to existing settlements, the need to avoid coalescence of existing settlements and need to protect the character and setting of existing settlements (proposals within the three areas of search identified on the Proposals Map will receive preferential consideration);

iii the relationship to the highway network and the adequacy or otherwise of existing highway or other infrastructure to cater for the development;

iv the proposed balance of land uses, the form and layout of the settlement and the approach to urban design and architecture;

v the impact of the proposal on neighbouring agricultural land, on the countryside in general and on the landscape (proposals in the Special Landscape Areas will not be appropriate);

vi the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from development which is irreversible;

vii the impact of the proposal on the local environment including Sites of Special Scientific interest and other sites of natural, wildlife, geological or archaeological interest;

viii the arrangements for quality control; phasing and programming of the development;

ix the arrangements for long term maintenance, management and community development;

x the community benefit deriving from the proposal including infrastructure provision, community facilities, social housing and public open space.
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