



Campaign to Protect
Rural England
Bedfordshire

New Towns Draft Programme Consultation

A response by CPRE Bedfordshire: 18 May 2026

INTRO

CPRE National Office have provided a comprehensive response separately covering all the new towns. This submission from CPRE Bedfordshire is in respect of Tempsford. We have included some general comments contained in the CPRE National Office response which relate to Tempsford and the new towns programme as a whole.

1. Which of the following best describes how you are responding to this consultation?

- on behalf of an organisation
 - CPRE Bedfordshire
 - info@cprebeds.org.uk
 - MK40 2AA

2. Which area are you responding about?

- Tempsford

3. What is your connection to the proposed location/region?

- Environmental organisation
- CPRE Bedfordshire
- Trustee

4. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the type of organisation you are responding from below:

- Charity

5. What is the name of your organisation

CPRE Bedfordshire

6. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what size is your organisation?

Micro

Assessment of locations

7. Thinking about the 13 locations listed, which locations do you believe have positive features that could help achieve the objectives of the New towns programme?

What do you believe are the positive features of the location(s) you have selected?

In relation to Tempsford, we consider the following are positive attributes.

Contribution to Local Housing needs

The government has stated that housing within a new town will count towards the Local Authorities' housing targets. This is a fundamental issue to us, underpinning our conditional support for Tempsford. The delivery of over 40,000 homes will help significantly to meet the identified housing needs of Bedfordshire and some of the adjoining counties. At present none of the 3 Local Authorities within Bedfordshire have a 5-year land supply. All are also in the process of preparing Local Plans. A new development at Tempsford will ease the pressure for new housing within Bedfordshire's rural areas and protect what remains of the Green Belt, halting the plethora of recent speculative unplanned development proposals in unsustainable locations.

Connectivity

The new Tempsford station will have connections to the East Coast main line and the new East West railway. This improved level of accessibility to the region, London and the North will encourage both housing and employment development. The new public transport links should, if timely and well planned, significantly reduce reliance on private car usage.

Opportunity to create a flagship development.

We appreciate that creation of a new town at Tempsford will result in a massive transformation from a location which is currently characterised by small rural villages and open countryside, to the creation of an extensive urban area.

However, we recognise that the new towns programme represents a flagship government policy designed to create economic growth and boost housing supply.

CPRE has long been an advocate for the re-use of brownfield land however we have also recognised that in some instances this is simply not possible due to the scale of development required. As a concept, focussing development in one location rather than spreading it across a wider area has its merits, providing it is planned, designed and developed appropriately.

CPRE wants to see new towns in the right places delivering ambitious climate, nature and well-being friendly towns built to high design standards providing genuinely affordable homes.

Tempsford with its new station and strategic location offers the opportunity to achieve this.

New employment opportunities

The site falls within the proposed Ox Cam corridor. CPRE have made their position on the Ox Cam Corridor clear.¹ Irrespective of whether the Growth Corridor initiative proceeds the new station will ensure the employment opportunities provided at Tempsford will be accessible across the region. Tempsford has the opportunity to become an economic centre in its own right as well as strengthening the local economy.

Positive government intervention will be needed to ensure employment is based on the science and technology sector as envisaged by the Ox Cam concept. Not large-scale warehousing or data centres which could be located anywhere.

8. Do you think any of the 13 locations listed face barriers which could hold back delivery of the New towns Programme objectives?

If you answered yes, please tell us what you believe the barriers to delivery in the location(s) you have selected are.

Yes

Viability

To create a new town on the scale and form envisaged by the government will take time and extensive government funding. There are significant abnormal costs associated with development at Tempsford. These will need to be identified and budgeted for upfront.

In particular costs associated with:-

Flood mitigation measures.

It is recognised that part of the area is likely to include existing flood plains. Any development of this scale, particularly in these times of climate crisis, will need to plan for and manage this at a very early stage in a comprehensive fashion.

Water capacity measures

We are extremely concerned over the environmentally sustainable supply of both potable and non-potable water and sewage treatment capacity in this area, which is already designated as being “under severe water stress” by the Environment Agency.

Anglian Water states in its current Forward Plan: “.....without long term planning and action, there will simply not be enough water to supply our customers in the future...”

¹ [CPRE-policy-on-the-Oxford-Cambridge-Arc.pdf](#)

Anglian Water has also now stated, in response to recent planning applications that it may no longer have the capacity to accept sewage from housing developments in Bedford Borough and Central Bedfordshire before 2030.

With the cumulative scale of development in the area, including Universal Studios, 5,000 new homes at Marston Vale and Luton Airport expansion this issue needs urgent attention. Following the approval of the Universal Studios application we wrote an open letter to the Secretary of State (SoS) for Housing Communities and Local Government, highlighting the potential impact of the Universal theme park and other major developments such as new towns in Bedfordshire on the water supply. This called for an “independent” comprehensive review of both Water & Sewage Treatment Resources across Bedfordshire.

This matter needs urgent attention.

Provision of physical and social infrastructure

The timing of the openings of the new station and passenger services will be fundamental to building confidence in the location. East West Rail has not started well, with no passenger services running on the completed section from Oxford to Milton Keynes despite it being finished in 2024. Government will need to play an active role with the rail stakeholders to resolve any disputes, deliver the infrastructure and the rail services very early in the programme. Delivery should not be dependent on completion of housing numbers.

Government funding requirements

As stated above extensive up-front funding will be needed to provide early infrastructure. The government needs to be clear and open about the costs they are prepared to meet and how these will be financed. In addition, cross party support will be needed across the lifetime of the programme.

Delivering the right social housing

Ensuring that 40% of homes are affordable will require additional funding and long-term investment from government as currently there is insufficient funding for social and affordable housing to be delivered at the scale required. While the proposed 40% affordable housing is welcome, greater clarity is needed—particularly around social rent provision and whether shared ownership homes will be genuinely affordable relative to local household incomes.

Transport Planning

Transport for Tempsford should follow CPRE’s Sustainable Transport Hierarchy² to reduce the dependence on the private car.

² <https://www.cpre.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/04/CPRE-Transport-Policy-FINAL.pdf>

The new station will play a significant role with this. Sustainable public transport and active travel options should be prioritised, with an effort being placed on movement within Tempsford and from existing settlements. Government intervention, in delivering high quality public transport options, is the best way to reduce car dependency and to reduce transport emissions. In addition, minimising car usage reduces the tranquillity harm caused by these developments in some instances.

Construction and Labour supply.

There are a number of other major developments with planning permission in the County. In particular Universal studios, Marston Vale and Luton Airport expansion. There will therefore be competing demands on the planning, the construction industry, materials and work force. An awareness of this is shown in the draft policy on phasing of new town development, (see response to question 16 below). Following Brexit, there has been a smaller workforce in construction, and this could cause delays to the delivery of the new towns generally not just Tempsford.

Working within the existing landscape

Historic landmarks need to be protected and, in some instances, could become an integral part of the new town. CPRE believes that the new towns need to work effectively in their landscape context and better reflect local housing need. This includes more sensitive design that is complementary to that of the local area³ (avoiding visually intrusive materials), prioritising smaller, higher-density homes over large executive properties avoid wastefully low residential densities with heights gradually increasing to the centre of the new town.

Political Pressure

Tempsford has been identified as one of the 3 target towns where early development is expected. However as detailed in this response there are a lot of unknown costs and major uncertainties, such as the timing of delivery of services on East West Rail. It will take time to obtain greater certainty on these issues and pressing ahead with Tempsford for the sake of political commitments could be a disaster.

9. Do you have any comments about whether the SEA report has identified the main environmental issues relevant to the 13 locations?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered YES, please expand here.

Yes

³ [Rural Housing Design Guide SP](#)

General Comments

The current SEA report did not take into account any new information submitted post the new towns Taskforce report. It was based on very broad assumptions on location and development content. The SEA report did not include any additional areas of assessment and CPRE feels that there have been some omissions:

- Transport impact assessment.
- The impact of Luton airport expansion (Temsford is under the flight path)
- Noise/ loss of tranquillity
- Light pollution/impact on dark skies
- Food security
- Whole life carbon assessment (WLCA)
- The impact of other major developments in the area including Universal Studios and Luton Airport expansion.

As the government has confirmed, new housing within Tempsford will count towards Local Authority housing targets. We consider this is the most environmentally effective means of meeting the high targets for 'housing need' specified by the government. In the past, these targets have been met by designating new estates in small country villages, on BMV agricultural land, and removal of land from the Green Belt. These developments usually have poor public transport and so become carpark-to-carpark developments. The cumulative effect is to substantially increase vehicle use. Grouping new housing in a single new town facilitates greater use of public transport, cycling and walking, either to work or to local services.

10. Is there any additional environmental information about these locations that the SEA should take into account?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered yes, please tell us what additional information the SEA should take into account.

Yes

General

CPRE reiterates the concerns raised in the Wildlife and Countryside Link consultation response (to which we are also signatories) on the lack of SEA analysis of the land, including habitats, ecological corridors and species populations surrounding the proposed new town site land designation. Individual green or open spaces appear to have been missed from the report at the various new town sites which may be impacted by the development on the site. In addition, there seems to be limited information given to the impacts on the existing landscape.

CPRE feels that greater detail should be included within the SEA. The SEA needs to recognise and analyse the effects of various travel patterns during and post construction when looking into air quality and how to mitigate against this. New towns must prioritise sustainable public transport which would provide fewer carbon emissions and pollutants than if the new town was developed to be car dependent.

The SEA needs to address the cumulative impacts of multiple major developments occurring simultaneously such as the Luton Airport expansion, Universal Studios development and significant housing at Marston Vale on Tempsford.

Additionally, there should be an inclusion of how nature and green space can be used as carbon sinks. Using green spaces can be beneficial for areas prone to flood risk. There is limited information on flood risk and mitigation within the SEA. The SEA is missing the potential damage caused by flooding by the increase in hard surfaces to the environment, including natural waterways, and the wider social and economic costs.

A more detailed SEA would be welcomed for Tempsford and the other sites which are being taken forward under the new towns programme.

Tempsford Specific

See answer to Q 9

11. Do you have any suggestions for practical mitigation measures to address effects identified in the SEA report?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered yes, please set out the practical mitigation measures here.

Yes

Public Transport and active travel infrastructure need to be included within the master planning and infrastructure documents with it clearly outlined how the various projects will be delivered simultaneously. It is important that there is clear design integration with public transport within the new towns and connecting to any existing developments. Making sustainable public transport an integral part of any development of a new town will ensure a behaviour change away from a private car and help reduce emissions from transport.

The new towns placemaking principles must be strong on nature recovery and biodiversity gain during and post construction of any new town such as diverse green spaces with a range of flora and trees. There should be a nature recovery mitigation hierarchy applied to the new towns from outset: avoid harm to designated sites and ecological networks first, then minimise and restore.

Local wildlife sites, ancient and veteran trees and hedgerows, and priority habitats should be treated as non-negotiable constraints that shape the framework, with measurable biodiversity uplift secured and maintained for the long term. Furthermore, nature recovery and green spaces have a multitude of proposes for health and wellbeing, habitats for a biodiverse ecosystem and in some instances used as a floodplain where appropriate.

The SEA does not identify any specific mitigation measures. These need to be quantified at the earliest opportunity and costed to ensure they are affordable.

12. Do you have any other feedback on the SEA report, including the issues and effects identified therein?

Yes.

The SEA was conducted at an extremely high level which makes it uncertain how relevant this is for the new towns programme.

Tempsford and the other new towns are major developments however they have been assessed on the basis that the extent and form of development is unknown.

Proposed New town Locations

13. Do you think the 7 locations proposed for the new towns programme are the ones most likely to meet the programme's objectives?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If no, please set out why you think the proposed locations do not meet our objectives.

Not sure.

The Tempsford new town should offer scope to meet the programmes objectives due to its strategic location, new station and the prospect of creating not just state of the art housing but also an economic base in its own right (see answer to Q7).

This will require extensive investment in infrastructure and a clear economic purpose to meet the objectives. Government funding and intervention will be required.

The government also needs to make clear at the outset, to assist with Local Plan preparation, how they will deal with their commitment to offset the number of homes within Tempsford against the Local Authority housing targets,

Government Offer

14. Do you agree with the overall government offer for proposed new town locations?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, is there any additional support you think should be offered?

No

Each location will require different levels of support from government. The aim is to create new towns (albeit a number are urban extensions) this means focussing on encouraging a balanced mix of uses.

In the case of Tempsford, predominantly a greenfield site, the government will need to establish a new town in effect from scratch.

At Tempsford various reports indicate that the speed of development has to be much quicker than other established locations.

To achieve this the government should commit to a programme of direct development for both private and social housing as well as the other financial measures available.

It will be essential that Tempsford does not just become a dormitory town, providing housing for employees in London, Oxford, Cambridge and Milton Keynes. It must, with government intervention, develop its own economic base, attracting inward investment, building on and strengthening the whole regional economy.

An economic plan needs to be prepared at the outset showing how investment and jobs can be attracted to and retained as part of the new town. Tempsford will also need to be given a clear economic role within the Ox Cam Growth corridor should it proceed.

To encourage appropriate development government, need to provide a package of financial incentives – such as those previously provided to Enterprise Zones to attract inward investment for the right types on employers.

At Tempsford there are known significant upfront abnormal costs the government will need to identify and agree how to forward fund. These are the station costs and measures to overcome flooding and water capacity issues. They will be in addition to the costs of land acquisition and physical and social infrastructure.

A fully costed infrastructure plan must be prepared, identifying these, the sources of funding and the timings of provision to ensure this project is viable at the outset.

Additionally, government need to ensure that the New Towns Taskforce gold standard of 40% affordable housing is met at a minimum and there is ample social housing for rent within the new towns by providing funding and incentives to deliver. The government should redefine the term 'affordable housing' in policy so that homes are affordable to people on average local incomes, this will help encourage internal migration to the new towns and help tackle the affordability and housing crisis.

15. Do you think there are any additional interventions that government should consider to ensure design and placemaking quality in new towns?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered yes, please set out the additional interventions government should consider

Yes

- **Viability and deliverability**

Viability and deliverability considerations need to be included within the terms of reference of the New towns Place Review Panel. This will ensure what is being proposed can be afforded and delivered. Where the land is publicly owned, government should be able to ensure what is proposed actually gets built through a variety of land disposal mechanisms. Additionally, government should have the ability, through an agreement for the overall new town programme, to penalise or in extreme circumstances bar developers for non-performance of any delivery obligations.

- **Funding**

A clear funding package is provided together with a proposed value capture process or other funding mechanisms to ensure early provision of infrastructure and no later dilution of quality and social housing provision due to viability issues.

- **Consultation**

The Development Corporation or other Body that is appointed to take forward Tempsford is required to engage with town and parish councils and with environmental NGOs and conservation groups as statutory consultees. The land surrounding Tempsford should be given protective planning designations such as Green Belt to ensure there is not continuous urban sprawl, as this provides access to open space for social, health and wellbeing purposes.

New towns Planning Policy

16. How clear do you find the proposed planning policy?

If you answered unclear, which elements are unclear and how would you suggest changing them?

Somewhat unclear

We welcome the provision for new towns to be included within local plan housing targets (in the plan-making section) this is essential to our support for Tempsford. Tempsford may fall within a number of Local Authority areas, so it is essential clarity is provided at an early stage on the division of housing numbers between Authorities. Both Central Bedfordshire and Bedford Borough are in the process of preparing their Local Plans.

Under the section New towns and plan-making there should be more emphasis placed on the economic benefits of new towns. For example, new towns should be contributing to the Local Authorities' employment and economic strategies.

The draft policy calls for development plans to ensure infrastructure delivery, CPRE welcomes this. Furthermore, CPRE welcomes the refusal of proposals *'with clear adverse effect on the proposed scale, location, or phasing of New town proposals'*.

It is not clear whether developments outside of the new town area will be expected to contribute towards shared infrastructure provided by the new town e.g. highways, schools. There should be mechanisms for capturing this. In addition, there will need to be agreement on what happens to CIL contributions for projects the new town may deliver.

It is not clear if development proposals outside of the new town can be refused if they have an adverse **economic** impact on the new town.

The government will need to be satisfied this policy is sufficient to base any future compulsory purchase powers on.

In general, if Green Belt land is being developed there should be provisions to replace this with appropriate land of equivalent area and protection within the Local Authority area. CPRE has concerns around how nature will be protected and encouraged to thrive by having clear and required nature friendly design as a standard condition across the new town in its entirety.

The planning policy environment is in a state of flux with the updated NPPF expected to be out during summer 2026, the introduction of Spatial Development Strategies and the local government reorganisation. It is important that the government can provide clarity and certainties as to how the New towns Planning Policy relates and fits into the changing environment.

17. Do you think establishing the placemaking principles in the proposed planning policy is an effective way to implement the placemaking ambition of the programme?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, how do you think the placemaking principles should be implemented?

Yes/Not sure

There is a general alignment between the Placemaking principles and CPRE's Principles for New towns Done Well⁴. The current placemaking principles needs to be tighter and more enforceable for them to be effective within the policy framework and to be aligned with other policies such as Local Nature Recovery strategy. The placemaking principles are excellent but towns are not built with reports. It is important that developers are held to these principles more effectively than they have been in the past.

It is important to note that placemaking comes after infrastructure delivery. Tempsford cannot be built without all the appropriate infrastructure in place. More detailed documents are needed to help reinforce the placemaking principles such as masterplans and design codes. Within placemaking principles community-led housing models should be encouraged. This should include securing long-term community stewardship of land and shared assets; and using strong delivery standards to lock in high-quality design and lasting affordability.

18. Do you think the proposed planning policy provides sufficient flexibility to new town locations to meet the placemaking principles?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, what other measures could create a flexible approach to the placemaking principles?

Not sure

We would not want any further flexibility to dilute the placemaking principles.

19. Is establishing a 40% target for affordable housing an effective way of delivering an ambitious number of affordable homes?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, what changes to the target are needed?

No

It is a good start.

⁴ <https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/principles-for-new-towns-done-well/>

The new towns programme provides a once-in-a-generation opportunity to deliver Social Rent and genuinely affordable housing at scale as was the case in the first wave. Major schemes on publicly owned land present an opportunity to rebuild the supply of social rent and genuinely affordable housing in a way that matches long-term need therefore tackling the affordability and housing crisis. There needs to be a minimum of at least 40% for affordable and separate minimum targets for social housing. The affordable and social targets should be treated as a standard to ensure delivery and completion. Developers should not be able to renege on meeting the affordable and social housing standard. This could result in penalisation. Furthermore, the government should provide packages of financial aid to incentivise the development of social and affordable housing for small and medium enterprises, and this encourages a diverse mix of developers which helps local growth.

20. Is the proposed planning policy on giving substantial weight in decision making to the social and economic benefits of new towns clear?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, please provide your reasons

Yes / Not sure

See answer to Q16.

21. Do you agree with the government's approach to decision making policy on the Green Belt?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

No

If you answered no, what further change to plan-making or decision-making policy are needed?

The fundamental purpose of the Green Belt is to preserve open land and prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open (National Planning Policy Framework 2024, para. 142). The current approach to decision-making policy on the Green Belt risks undermining this long-established objective.

The draft wording states '*Where development proposals within a New town would comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it is likely that such development would constitute the very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt*'. This wording presents several of the following concerns.

Firstly, there is no explicit safeguard against proposals that fail to adequately justify inappropriate Green Belt development. The use of the term '*likely*' implies a presumption in favour of development rather than a requirement to demonstrate evidence of '*very special circumstances*'.

It should be explicitly stated that proposals which fail to fall under the ‘*very special circumstances*’ should be refused.

Secondly, the term ‘*very special circumstances*’ is not clearly defined. This lack of clarity increases the risk of inappropriate Green Belt development.

Consequently, the current policy risks weakening Green Belt protections and facilitating urban sprawl, particularly if development is permitted without requiring compensatory provision. If the policy is to proceed, it should be clearly stated that such development proposals are limited to new town designations only, with explicit safeguards to ensure that any loss of Green Belt land is offset by improvements in the quantity and quality of remaining Green Belt land nearby.

Green Belts have been a major achievement of the planning system in England and have played a vital role in protecting the environment around major urban areas. Although we are in support of the social and economic benefits of new towns, this needs to be balanced with other socio-environmental considerations – the policy should seek to strengthen and expand Green Belt protections rather than create mechanisms that could erode them over time.

22. Do you think the proposed planning policy is sufficient for the purposes of safeguarding land for development as New towns.

(Yes/No/Not sure)

If you answered no, how could the policy go further?

Not sure

Early work will be required on boundaries and masterplan to provide certainty to landowners and developers. Generally, CPRE is in support of the phased approach to new town proposals as this helps secure and prioritise land for new town developments. Also, the masterplan can outline protected green spaces which gives clarity to residents and allows for wider mitigation for wildlife and habitats.

23. Do you think any additional planning policies are needed to support the delivery of the programme objectives?

(Yes/No/Not sure)

Yes

If you answered yes, please provide details.

Firstly, policies should ensure that developers are not able to renegotiate the scale of housing delivery and affordable housing targets. Providing greater certainty and stricter policy would help ensure that objectives relating to the scale and economic growth of new towns are met.

Secondly, new towns will need to align with updated national planning policy requirements, including achieving net zero and meeting high environmental standards. Although net zero was mentioned in the objectives, it was not included in the policy. Embedding these expectations in policy will be essential to ensure that developments are sustainable in environmental terms and support the programme's placemaking objectives.

In addition, planning policy will need to underpin any government land acquisition strategy, particularly in relation to how land is valued and how compensation is assessed. This is likely to include land for non-housing uses, such as employment. If the government is to capture land value uplift effectively, there may need to be a clear policy position on disregarding 'hope value' in land transactions.

Enabling development corporations to acquire land at or near existing-use value and subsequently release it to developers could help secure funding for infrastructure and delivery at an earlier stage, supporting the programme's objective of robust and sustainable funding.

There may also be a need for policies addressing future boundary changes and the long-term protection of green space, ensuring that growth does not undermine environmental and community assets over time.

Finally, some of the programme's terminology would benefit from clearer definition and measurable standards. Phrases such as 'ambitious environmental standards', 'high quality public transport', and 'active and liveable neighbourhoods' should be supported by more precise metrics or benchmarks to ensure consistent interpretation and secure delivery.

24. Do you have any views on the potential impacts of the New towns Draft Programme on people or groups with protected characteristics?

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) should be embedded throughout the planning, design and delivery of new towns to ensure they are genuinely accessible and inclusive places for all residents. While several of the Placemaking Principles indirectly relate to EDI outcomes (e.g. Healthy and safe places, social infrastructure and Community engagement), there is currently no explicit principle that addresses accessibility and inclusivity for disabled people, older people, neurodiverse communities, or minority ethnic and cultural groups.

The policy would benefit from the inclusion of a dedicated placemaking principle focused on accessible and inclusive infrastructure and services, ensuring that EDI is embedded as a core objective and not a secondary requirement.

We suggest adding an 'Accessible and Inclusive Places' placemaking principle: New towns should be planned, designed and delivered to be inclusive and accessible for all, following universal design principles and proactively addressing the needs of disabled people, elderly and diverse cultural and ethnic communities. These include accessible housing across all tenures, inclusive transport networks and infrastructure that caters to people with physical, sensory and cognitive impairments and culturally appropriate social infrastructure.

To meet the diverse needs of the local community, early engagement with under-represented groups should be set in place throughout the planning and delivery of new towns.

Suggested additional Placemaking Principle:

Accessible and inclusive places:

New towns should be planned, designed and delivered to be inclusive and accessible for all, embedding equality, diversity and inclusion throughout spatial planning, infrastructure, housing, transport and services. Development should follow universal design principles and proactively address the needs of disabled people, older residents and diverse cultural and ethnic communities.

25. Is there anything else you would like to tell us that you think is relevant to this consultation but has not been covered in previous questions?

National CPRE published in summer 2025 when the outcome of the work by the New towns Taskforce was being awaited: 'Principles for New towns done well', which is available on the website here: <https://www.cpre.org.uk/resources/principles-for-new-towns-done-well>.

The guide expands on the following 10 key principles –

1. Brownfield first, sustainable locations
2. Meaningful community engagement
3. Integrate and protect green space and nature
4. Housing diversity for inclusive communities
5. Encourage market disruption
6. Integrated transport planning
7. What goes where to create a sense of place
8. Carbon neutral development
9. Transport accountability
10. Secure long-term success

National CPRE have signed onto the Wildlife & Countryside Link response to the New towns Draft Programme consultation response.