



SCRUTINY REVIEW PANEL ON THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF AN ECO-TOWN

MEETING WITH JOHN DEAN, FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE ROYAL TOWN PLANNING INSTITUTE ON 2 OCTOBER 2008

The Panel met with John Dean, a former President of the Royal Town Planning Institute. Mr. Dean discussed the proposed development in relation to town planning policy.

The Panel NOTED the following points that arose from that meeting:

- The process the proposed development had gone through was not consistent with planning policy. The County Council had gone through the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) process and had identified suitable sites for housing development and the proposed site in Stoughton was not considered suitable. The RSS Panel had concurred with this view;
- The Department for Communities and Local Government were not involving the appropriate bodies in coming to a decision appropriateness of the location of Eco-Towns. The process did not allow for comparison with other sites at a local level;
- Substantial green wedge in the area would be lost to the proposed development;
- Ashton Green in the north-west of the City appeared to be a suitable alternative site for an Eco-Town that had long received approval for development;
- The proposed 15,000 dwellings at the 420 hectare site in Stoughton would result in very high densities and this may have an effect on the number of families who would wish to live in the area;
- Planning policy placed a priority on brown field regeneration, rather than in the case of the proposed site – green field development, which was the lowest priority. Due to its close proximity to the City, the Eco-Town could be viewed as an extension to the City, rather than a freestanding development;
- The proposed development would be able to attract new employment to the area, however there was a possibility that it would not be self-contained, resulting in vast levels of traffic movement, primarily to and

from the City;

- There were examples of large scale employment that had been attracted to areas similar to 'Pennbury', however large scale employment often relied on good motorway access, which 'Pennbury' did not benefit from.