

Examination Statement

**Examination Elmbridge Local Plan 2037:
Response to the Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions for
Stage 2 of the Examination**

Matter 5: Housing Delivery

Prepared by Savills on behalf of The Crown Estate

1. Introduction

- 1.1. See Introduction to The Crown Estate (TCE) and Telereal Trillium (TT) Group in the **Matter 2 Statement**.
- 1.2. Included with this **Matter 5 Statement** are two Appendices. **Appendix 1** provides analysis of other Local Authorities with recently adopted Local Plans that made alterations to the Green Belt. **Appendix 2** provides more information in respect of The Crown Estate's Purpose and Strategy.

2. Response to MIQs – Matter 5: Housing Delivery

Issue 8 – Whether the approach towards the delivery of housing land is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared.

Question 4.1: Please can the Council update the housing trajectory (Appendix A5 of the Plan) with the latest figures from the AMR and to reflect the updated Plan period (see Inspector’s initial letter ID-001).

2.1. Savills wishes to reserve its ability to comment on an updated trajectory through the submission of an addendum Hearing Statement, and/or oral submissions to the Matter 5 Hearing session.

Question 4.2: The spatial strategy focus is on brownfield sites, with a significant component of the supply coming forward on small sites. In accordance with paragraph 60 of the Framework, in what way would this approach ensure that there is a sufficient variety of land to come forward?

2.2. It would not. Whilst making no objections to any specific site, it is considered that the proposed strategy will not result in a balanced housing land supply, boosting the supply of homes, as required by NPPF para. 60.

Question 4.3: Is there any other non-green belt land which could contribute towards meeting the boroughs housing and employment needs in a sustainable manner? I note that Appendix 6 of the Land Availability Assessment 2022 (HOU002) lists a significant number of discounted urban sites however the reasoning is not clear as to why they have been discounted. For example – ‘site with Planning permission’ (for what?) or ‘owner has not confirmed availability’ is also applicable to a number of sites which have been included within the housing land supply. Given the significant shortfall in housing numbers to be provided by the Plan, is the Council satisfied that all sites within the urban area have been fully explored? Please could the Council clearly explain the rationale for the sites which have been discounted.

2.3. It is clear from Options 3 and 5 in the Reg. 18 version of the eEBLP (as advanced as Hybrid SA Options, including Option 5a in 2021) that some Green Belt release would be required to fully meet Elmbridge housing needs (Savills TCE’s Reg. 18 and 19 consultation responses provide helpful commentary on this, including evidence of how those sites perform against the purposes of the Green Belt¹)

2.4. Paragraph 5.15 of the eEBLP states:

“Most of the open space and countryside in Elmbridge in designated as Green Belt and the designation covers 57% (approximately 5,490ha) of the borough.”

Question 4.4: Will the Plan provide for a five year supply of deliverable housing sites upon adoption with particular reference to the definition of deliverable contained within Annex 2 of the Framework?

2.5. No. On adoption, the eEBLP will be delivered via the NPPF December 2023 version, which no longer requires EBC to demonstrate a 5YHLS for the five years following adoption. It is thus important that, on

¹ NPPF para. 138.

adoption, the eEBLP sets a robust onward supply, with a suitable buffer/contingency, (see TCE's **Matter 3 Statement**). It is important that each and every proposed site allocation is considered, including whether a balanced mix of housing types and sizes will be achieved.

Question 4.5: HOU002 states that the five year housing supply position is 4.36 years. How does this accord with paragraph 74 of the Framework which requires Local Planning authorities to identify and maintain a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements? Is the Plan positively prepared in this regard?

2.6. No. HOU002 – the 'Land Availability Assessment 2022' (LAA 2022) identifies a 5YHLS of 4.36 years. However, this has now been superseded by LAA 2023, which identifies a 5YHLS of 3.81 years (note – this is not yet an Examination document). It is important that consideration is provided as to how positively prepared the eEBLP is.

Question 4.6: Is the identified housing supply contained within the Plan and set out in the trajectory based on a sound understanding of the evidence? In responding to this question, the Council should provide an updated housing response which identifies the completions, existing commitments, site allocations and any other sources of supply it is seeking to rely upon.

Question 4.7: In addition to the trajectory required by the Framework, the Council should prepare a spreadsheet to support the trajectory which confirms how many dwellings each site allocation is expected to deliver in each year of the Plan period, and identify any windfall allowance which is being relied upon. This information should be supported by cross references to the evidence base where necessary.

2.7. Savills wishes to reserve its ability to comment on the information requested by Questions 4.6 and 4.7 through the submission of an addendum Hearing Statement, and/or oral submissions.

Question 4.8: The Planning Practice Guidance provides advice in relation to the preparation of housing and economic land availability assessments, and sets out that when carrying out a desktop review, Plan-makers need to be proactive in identifying as wide a range of sites and broad locations for development as possible. It goes on to note that identified sites, which have particular constraints (such as Green Belt), need to be included in the assessment for the sake of comprehensiveness but these constraints need to be set out clearly, including where they severely restrict development. An important part of the desktop review, however, is to identify sites and their constraints, rather than simply to rule out sites outright which are known to have constraints. Is the approach adopted by the Council in terms of the Land Availability Assessments completed consistent with this and if not why not?

2.8. No. The approach is not consistent as it is not clear, from the final evidence base, that all suitable and available sites have been considered, despite the clear options testing, as outlined in previous consultations on the eEBLP, and the SA (for example SA Section B2). The evidence base demonstrates that there are some potentially suitable and available brownfield / Green Belt combination sites that meet the SA Objectives.

2.9. It is suggested that this information submitted by Savills is considered along with any update to the evidence base (information to assist the land availability assessment exercise was submitted as part of TCE's Reg. 19 representations).

Question 4.9: The Housing Needs Assessment (HOU005) notes the greatest demand is for 2 bedroomed units (50%). Are there any implications for the spatial strategy adopted and the dwelling types which will be delivered?

Question 4.10: Policy HOU1 cross references to appendix 5 of the Plan however appendix 5 lists two alternative indicative approaches to the housing trajectory. Which is the trajectory the Council is relying upon and is this a justified approach?

2.10. Savills notes the Inspector's request for an updated housing trajectory and wishes to reserve its ability to comment on the Council's response to Question 4.10 through the submission of an addendum Hearing Statement, and/or oral submissions to the Matter 5 Hearing session.

Question 4.11: What is the justification for the dpa figure to be included within the policy wording? Is this approach positively prepared and consistent with national policy? Should the policy refer to the homes to be delivered across the Plan period and if so what should this figure be? (noting the actions raised under question 2.2 for the Council in relation to the Plan period).

2.11. The eEBLP should include a policy setting out the overall housing requirement (see the discussion in TCE's **Matter 4 Statement**), and then a policy setting out how that requirement is to be delivered. Policy HOU1 as submitted is more akin to the latter, but with elements that one would expect to find in the former.

Question 4.12: Is it clear what the 30% affordable homes in part 2 of the policy relates to?

2.12. This should be deleted as the affordable housing requirements for different types of sites are set out within Policy HOU4.

The Green Belt

These questions relate to the Council's consideration of the release of green belt land to meet their housing and employment needs in the context of the overall spatial strategy. In addition, it does not address the wording of policy ENV4: Development within the Green Belt which will be addressed under the stage 3 hearings. It will not address specific sites and this is not an opportunity for those seeking to promote omission sites to make specific reference to them.

There is a significant amount of evidence concerning the existing Green Belt and how this land performs against green belt purposes including a Green Belt boundary review. An assessment has been made as to the potential contribution the release of some areas of green belt could have towards meeting housing need over the Plan period. The Council do not agree that there are exceptional circumstances which would warrant the release of any green belt land. The Council also disagree with the assessment made in relation to a number of areas which ARUP have identified as weakly performing areas of the Green Belt.

Question 4.13: Do the exceptional circumstances identified at paragraph 6.18 Topic Paper 1: How the Spatial Strategy was formed (TP001) represent all of the exceptional circumstances which the Council have taken into account?

2.13. There are a number of recent national and local examples of housing need being recognised as a driver of Exceptional Circumstances to justify a review of the Green Belt as permitted by NPPF paragraphs 140 and 141. **Appendix 1** to this Statement provides relevant national data since 2019. It should be noted:

- There is nothing different in EBC compared to other LPAs in respect of the proportion of land

area which is Green Belt. 58.3% of EBC is Green Belt, the average area of Green Belt in the 19 example Local Plans was 54.8%. There are instances where Authorities with substantially less, or more Green Belt, have chosen to engage Exceptional Circumstances. In summary, it's the evidence of factors contributing to Exceptional Circumstances, alongside the specific quality of the Green Belt that matters, rather than any perception of the amount of Green Belt.

- The land area of Green Belt release varies between 70ha and 1,470ha. The average proportion of existing Green Belt release is 4.3%, ranging between 0.8% and 19.7%. In many cases, sustainable objectives have been achieved without the need for a significant amount of Green Belt release.
- Of all the 19 LPAs in the data range, EBC is the least affordable for housing (ratio of 20.04, against an average of 10, average earnings to house price). The combined average of planned housing against the latest LHN of these 19 LPAs is 101.7%, demonstrating that following the difficult decision to review Green Belt boundaries, LHN is broadly being met, in some cases exceeded.

2.14. There would be nothing abnormal should EBC decide to engage Exceptional Circumstances, as the SA indicates, that dependent on the Option (or Hybrid Option) between 188ha (3%) to 2,920ha (53%) of Green Belt land could be released. This is a significant range to work from, and is not at odds with the levels of Green Belt release in the 19 recent other Local Plan examples (average 4.3%). Indeed, anywhere up to meeting 100% of LHN would be justified when interpreted against the evidence of more weakly performing Green Belt.

2.15. Topic Paper 1 does not fully embrace all the potential factors which can (or have elsewhere) been demonstrated to contribute toward Exceptional Circumstances. What is known is via the ARUP Study (2016) and subsequent updates is that EBC does have a number of weakly performing areas of Green Belt. This includes the Land west of Claygate station, which is in a highly sustainable location.

2.16. In *Calverton Parish Council v Nottingham City Council* [2015] EWHC 1078 (Admin), the Court determined that Exceptional Circumstances are a planning judgement, though in exercising this judgement, the following five factors should be identified and considered (paragraph 51):

“(i) the acuteness / intensity of the objectively assessed need within the LPA and neighbouring authorities (matters of degree may be important);

(ii) the inherent constraints on supply / availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development;

(iii) the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt;

(iv) the nature and extent of the harm to this Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and

(v) the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent”.

2.17. Inspectors examining other Local Plan concluded Exceptional Circumstances on criteria which are not too

dissimilar to EBC. In Guildford (2019), the Inspector concluded a limited brownfield land supply (c. 4,600 dwelling capacity including villages), alongside housing needs, business needs and the opportunities created for new infrastructure as all factors contributing to Exceptional Circumstances (6.5% of Green Belt released). In Central Bedfordshire (2021) the Inspector concluded that Exceptional Circumstances on the basis of unmet needs (arising from Luton), housing needs/ historic undersupply, and the need to revitalise areas which had not sustained owing to Green Belt (4.8% of Green Belt released). In both Guildford and Central Bedfordshire, the Plans were sound on the basis of a Housing Trajectory, which proposed more growth than the LHN at the time and the case for Exceptional Circumstances was based on evidence of the poorly performing Green Belt. There are other examples, for example Epping Forest (2023) and Brentwood (2021) where some Green Belt was released, but the LHN not met, on the basis that those Plans were examined under the NPPF (2012) and had a LHN set by local evidence (i.e. a SHMA).

2.18. Broadly, the situation with the eEBLP is:

- An emerging plan which falls short (by a considerable margin) of the LHN, in a Surrey / outer London context where the delivery of housing is not meeting needs. The situation is acute, noting the past poor delivery of affordable housing and the present Plan does not even make any strides toward the LHN, let alone exceeding it for contingency;
- A plentiful supply of other options to address this need (see Options 3, 5 and 5a as outlined in the SA) all with consequential benefits for a range of SA Objectives, environmental gain and infrastructure;
- Negative consequences, for example on deliverability (i.e. affordable housing amongst others) arising through the absence of plan flexibility and contingency;
- Evidence, from ARUP, which demonstrates that some areas of Green Belt perform weakly against the NPPF purposes.

2.19. Context is also important. The last EBC Core Strategy (2011) did not make any significant alterations to the Green Belt. A comprehensive review, to meet modern development and infrastructure requirements is long overdue. Thus, should the Inspector decide there are reasons why the present eEBLP spatial strategy or approach to housing is unsound, there is a remedy, should EBC embrace it – which does not sit counter to Case Law, or many other Local Plans nationally.

Question 4.14: What is the relevance of the fact that the current housing need is significantly higher than the existing target set within the Core Strategy (Paragraph 6.24 of TP001)?

2.20. This is not relevant. The housing needs have moved on substantially, the housing need and affordability issues are only worsening. The previous Core Strategy was largely prepared when the former Regional Plan, the South East Plan, was part of the development plan, and the Local Plan was required to be in conformity with this. This provided for an artificially lower housing requirement for Elmbridge.

Question 4.15: The Council have stated that the need in Elmbridge is no more acute/intense than in neighbouring boroughs. However, a majority of neighbouring boroughs (Guildford, Waverley, Runnymede, Spelthorne) have progressed a strategy with an element of Green Belt release and/or are able to meet their housing need in full. If the Council consider the need to be no more acute than these neighbouring boroughs, what is the rationale for Elmbridge not following this approach?

2.21. There is a pressing need for housing in all neighbouring areas and across the county. Indeed EBC is the least affordable and, if anything, there is thus a greater likelihood that exceptional circumstances exist in Elmbridge than elsewhere. EBC could be doing much more to positively contribute (See response to

Question 1.3 in TCE's **Matter 2 Statement**.)

Question 4.16: In general terms, the Framework seeks to support the Governments objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. Paragraph 35 states that Plans should provide a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs. Paragraph 11 of the Framework sets out the approach to Plan making. In what way does the Green Belt in Elmbridge provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development?

- 2.22. As some Green Belt is clearly performing more weakly against the NPPF purposes, EBC is no different to other Green Belt Authorities. This is evidenced in TCE's Appendix 5 submitted with the Reg 19 Representations. Indeed, as outlined in the **Matter 3 Statement**, the options consulted in the preparation of the eEBLP considered anywhere between 188ha and 2,920ha of potential Green Belt release.
- 2.23. EBC's strategy should be based on a review of the Evidence Base to establish areas of selective Green Belt release (a process touched upon in the SA, Section B2, Tables 9 and 10, Map 7). EBC should view this positively and should seek to maximise opportunities on these sites for open space enhancement, BNG and delivery of community/ other infrastructure. These factors are all exemplified on Land west of Claygate station, which features in Tables 9, 10 and May 7 – as a sequentially preferable site.

Question 4.17: CD034a which was updated in November 2023 states that the Council consider the release of land from the Green Belt for housing purposes would negatively effect the boroughs existing settlement pattern and thus cause harm to the character of Elmbridge's existing communities. Where in the evidence base is this assessment undertaken which explains how this conclusion has been reached?

- 2.24. Selective release of Green Belt will ensure that the existing settlement patterns is not compromised. It is not clear what harm would be caused to character which might otherwise be avoided/ mitigated by design controlled by policy. This was the whole purpose of the ARUP evidence, to ascertain how the Green Belt is performing. There is the opportunity, via Green Belt compensation measures, to enhance buffers between settlements, whilst avoiding the coalescence. Through the indicative masterplans Savills has prepared for the TCE sites additional landscape led planting can create stronger defensible boundaries to strengthen the wider Green Belt (see Appendices to the TCE Reg 19 Representations).

Question 4.18: Paragraph 145 of the Framework advises, amongst other things, that local Planning authorities should Plan positively to enhance Green Belt use. Such as looking for opportunities to provide access, to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation, to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity or to improve damaged and derelict land. In what way does the Plan address this?

- 2.25. This is a missed opportunity. Policy SS1 does not focus on opportunities for Green Infrastructure. There is an opportunity to update this policy through Main Modifications and require that new developments create wider positive environmental and social benefits for both the local area and the Borough. There is reference to "*Increasing the extent, connectivity and diversity of wildlife habitats to enable animals and plants to adjust*". It will be more challenging to make a meaningful impact on town centre sites.

Question 4.19: With reference to paragraph 143 (e) of the Framework, are the Council able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the Plan period?

- 2.26. The plan period could extend (see TCE's **Matter 2 Statement**). The NPPF refers to the need to ensure Green Belt boundaries endure (para. 140).
- 2.27. A more positively-planned approach could embrace appropriate new allocations, and new compensatory Green Belt (e.g. North Hertfordshire), to ensure wider enhancements to green infrastructure, strengthening the quality and function of the resulting Green Belt. The eEBLP proposes the status quo (as did the Core Strategy in 2011), and does not include obvious enhancements to the existing Green Belt.

Windfall Allowance

Issue 9: Is the approach to the windfall allowance justified and consistent with national policy?

Question 4.21: The Housing trajectory includes a windfall allowance of 987 dwellings over the Plan period, 15% of the overall housing land supply. As 32 of the proposed site allocations contained within the Plan are on sites of 5 units or less, is this approach justified?

- 2.28. See TCE's **Matter 2** and **Matter 3** Statements.

Circa 2,067 Words.

Appendix 1
Green Belt release in LPAs with recently Adopted Plans

APPENDIX 1: Local Authorities with Recently Adopted Local Plans, which have engaged Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances

Local Authority (LPA)	Green Belt area (hectares)	LPA area (hectares)	% Green Belt	Land released from Green Belt (c. ha)	Proportion of Green Belt released	Median house price to workplace-based earnings ratio	Adopted Housing Requirement (dpa)	Year of Adoption of Local Plan (or Part 2 Plan)	Standard Method LHN (2023)	Adopted Housing Requirement as % need	Selected Notes re: Surrey LPAs
Guildford	22,620	27,090	83.5%	1470	6.5%	12.67	562	2019	779	72%	c.5,500 dwellings on strategic sites
Central Bedfordshire	26,920	71,570	37.6%	1290	4.8%	10.6	1,968	2021	2,320	85%	
St. Helens	7,970	13,640	58.4%	900	11.3%	5.32	486	2022	398	122%	
Epping Forest	30,830	33,900	90.9%	840	2.7%	15.48	518	2023	981	53%	
Calderdale	22,330	36,400	61.3%	480	2.1%	5.27	997	2021	756	132%	
Brentwood	13,290	15,310	86.8%	430	3.2%	13.65	420	2021	535	79%	
Halton	2,080	7,910	26.3%	410	19.7%	4.68	350	2019	217	161%	
Nuneaton and Bedworth	3,240	7,900	41.0%	350	10.8%	8.09	703	2019	442	159%	
Rushcliffe	16,240	40,920	39.7%	330	2.0%	9.53	774	2019	595	130%	
Broxtowe	4,900	8,010	61.2%	220	4.5%	7.87	362	2021	388	93%	
Doncaster	23,020	56,800	40.5%	220	1.0%	5.24	920	2019	540	170%	
Windsor and Maidenhead	16,260	19,840	82.0%	210	1.3%	14.15	712	2021	870	82%	
Sunderland	3,180	13,740	23.1%	160	5.0%	4.61	745	2019	528	141%	
Vale of White Horse	8,090	57,870	14.0%	140	1.7%	9.15	1,028	2019	628	164%	
Wycombe	15,630	32,460	48.2%	120	0.8%	11.94	546	2019	723	76%	
Reigate and Banstead	8,770	12,910	67.9%	110	1.3%	14.38	460	2019	1,123	41%	c.1,000+ dwellings reserve allocated
Hillingdon	4,870	11,570	42.1%	100	2.1%	13.86	425	2019	2,047	21%	
Runnymede	5,800	7,800	74.4%	0	0.0%	11.98	500	2021	587	85%	New designations resulted in no net loss
Woking	3,950	6,360	62.1%	70	1.8%	11.07	292	2021	437	67%	c. 550 dwellings allocated on GB land
Selected Averages			54.8%	413	4.3%	10.0				101.7%	
Elmbridge	5,610	9,630	58.3%	0	0.00%	20.04	225	TBC	650	35%	

Appendix 2
The Crown Estate - Purpose and Strategy



The Crown Estate Purpose and Strategy

Elmbridge Borough Council - Local Plan Examination in Public




ABOUT The Crown Estate

The Crown Estate is a significant national landowner with a diverse portfolio that includes urban centres and development opportunities, one of the largest rural landholdings in the country (including land within Elmbridge and Claygate) substantial areas of London's West End and Windsor Great Park. It also manages the seabed and much of the coastline around England, Wales and Northern Ireland, playing a major role in the UK's world-leading offshore wind sector. The Crown Estate's work on renewable energy, climate resilience and nature recovery is helping to address some of the country's biggest challenges.

The Crown Estate's responsibility and purpose is to ensure its portfolio and actions create lasting and shared prosperity for the nation.

OUR PURPOSE DEFINES OUR ACTIONS

We achieve this purpose through the pursuit of three strategic objectives, targeted at tackling some of the UK's most pressing concerns:

-  To be a leader in supporting the UK towards a net zero carbon and energy secure future.
-  To help create thriving communities across the UK.
-  To take a leading role in stewarding the UK's natural environment and biodiversity.

WE CREATE VALUE

We adopt a holistic view of value and we measure our success in the following ways:

Environmental: We are committed to helping tackle the global climate and biodiversity crises by creating greener, healthier and more sustainable places, and accelerating renewable technologies.


Social: Through tackling inequalities, putting health and well-being first and foremost in our decision making, and creating inclusive opportunities and outcomes, we play a positive role for our stakeholders.


Financial: We aim to balance short-term and long-term financial value, achieving returns today while also creating value for future generations. In addition, our investment drives employment, creating economic benefits for local communities.


OUR DIFFERENCE IS OUR STRENGTH


Our unique position underpins our ability to operate in a different way.

 Through our ***national ownership and expertise*** we successfully oversee the management and stewardship of large areas of our land, where we shape, protect, regenerate and produce on behalf of the nation. We have a large footprint across a diverse geography, and a unique combination of holdings in London, the regions, on the coast and in rural communities.

 We are a ***trusted brand, with a reputation for excellence***. We are known for quality, longevity and integrity. We act in the public interest and invest for the long term.

 We benefit from ***independence and simplicity of role***. We have clear targets and an emphasis on good management. We have long-term flexibility, and we are responsive to change over time.

 We have the ***power to convene and catalyse***. We use our reach and capability to bring together our networks of public and private sector partners, stakeholders and customers to tackle challenges and issues of common interest that cannot be solved by individual organisations.

 We have a ***long-term view***. We have an obligation to create value over the long-term, maintaining and enhancing our holdings in a sustainable way.

These factors combine to position us as credible long-term partners in delivering much needed homes, community and green infrastructure in a sustainable location in Elmbridge Borough. Our ambition is to work in partnership with local people and the local stakeholders to understand their aspirations and achieve their objectives through collaborative and sustained relationships.

WORKING TOWARDS Net Zero

We are working hard to support Net Zero. For example, we have made huge strides in supporting the development of the offshore wind sector, which currently powers around 11 million homes and contributes to the UK's reduced reliance on fossil fuels. We seek to have the same degree of impact in our approach to building communities.

ADOPTING A HOLISTIC APPROACH

Achieving sustainable development requires the right development in the right place, with a holistic approach to placemaking. This means we must consider every aspect of the new community; from the earliest site-wide masterplanning to the final tree planted, we are motivated to achieve the best possible outcome for the community and our planet.



SOURCING RENEWABLE AND LOW-CARBON ENERGY

In addition to procuring renewable electricity across our real estate holdings, we have installed onsite renewables to generate operational electricity, including renewable sources from solar, wind, biomass and ground source heat. Across our Windsor Estate, for example, our biomass boiler and district heating system now heats 75 homes.

We aim to transfer our knowledge to our wider landholding, with the intention of sharing the benefits of clean and affordable energy with communities.

PROMOTING NEW METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION

In the definition, design and construction of all our building projects we will aim to promote methods of construction that generate less waste, minimise embodied carbon, and result in homes and public buildings that consume less energy, are cheaper to run and maintain, and importantly are a joy to inhabit.

We are already establishing demonstration projects for highly sustainable homes in Bedfordshire and Cheshire. We will build on our learnings and successes from these projects to increase the scale of our operations, and we will explore all opportunities to generate local employment in sustainable construction. We intend to explore the potential for developing an MMC (Modern Methods of Construction) facility on site to manufacture eco-friendly homes where they are needed. This would reduce the carbon impact of delivering new homes and also bring new job and training opportunities to the area.



MMC homes in production and a completed scheme

CARING FOR AND Enjoying Our Land

We will care for our land through a holistic stewardship programme, ensuring access and wellbeing for future generations, and providing time and space for nature to recover.

As landowners and stewards, we have significant experience in protecting, managing and enhancing our environment.

At Windsor Great Park we are currently undertaking a ten-year restoration programme, to restore parks and farmland with new trees and avenues, wooded areas, hedges and other green lanes. We can use the knowledge and understanding gained across centuries of experience to ensure we are supporting nature growth and improving biodiversity.

BIODIVERSITY

We are hard at work to increase biodiversity in many locations, and through investment we are growing knowledge, for example, our investment in research to increase our understanding of how coastal wildlife can co-exist and thrive alongside other seabed uses through our £50m Offshore Wind Evidence and Change programme.

Inland, achieving biodiversity net gain is now a central tenant of all new development.

We intend to utilise this requirement to local benefit, by creating spaces where people can be closer to nature, where children can learn about the value of the UK's multitude of natural species, and where innovative approaches can be tested.

NATURE RECOVERY

Much of the land within the Growth Area has been farmed for many centuries. Modern farming has not always benefitted nature. We intend to continue our nationwide efforts to reverse this trend by promoting nature recovery.

Drawing on our successes elsewhere, we will build in room for nature, replenish soils, and re-establish natural eco systems.

GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Access to an abundance of greenspaces is a hallmark of Elmbridge quality of life. The health benefits of being outdoors are well evidenced, particularly in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic.

At Land west of Claygate Station, we will work with local stakeholders to establish a comprehensive and highly accessible green infrastructure network, characterised by formal and informal greenspaces, with abundant opportunities for local food production, children's play, sport and outdoor activities and relaxation.



MOVING AHEAD

Together

We believe that we are uniquely placed to draw on our experiences across the communities in which we operate, along with the experience in our Rural, Windsor and Marine portfolios to bring forward comprehensive development with BT at Land west of Claygate station, Oxshott.

We are committed to engaging with local community, the Local Councils and other key stakeholders to develop any future proposals for development.

We look forward to engaging with you soon.



Contact

1 St James's Market,
London
SW1Y 4AH

THE CROWN
ESTATE

Charles Collins

Director

+44 (0) 7870 999 596

ccollins@savills.com

Jonathan Dixon

Director

+ 44 (0) 7870 000 576

jonathan.dixon@savills.com