

Summary of Responses for Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation

Please search by individual/client name or your reference number. Please note columns have been left blank where no information has been provided,

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
00629		Martin Grant Homes Ltd	Jeremy C. Woolf	Woolf Bond Planning							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>There must be an agreement at the sub-regional level for the district to continue to work with other LPAs including Milton Keynes to ensure strategic economic and infrastructural issues are no adversely affected. There is a clear requirement in the NPPF and Section 11 of the Localism Act 2011 concerning the 'duty to cooperate'. By looking at narrow parameters within Aylesbury Vale only, the Council appear to believe that this justifies ignoring housing needs study and the affordable housing shortfall. The scenarios proposed simply fail to adequately consider such matters. In respects to distribution Wing represents a sustainable location and has available and deliverable sites that can help meet defined needs.</p>
5303	Pippa Cheetham	O&H Properties Ltd	Tom Whild	Terence O'Rourke Ltd							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>O&H Properties strongly disagrees with the overall approach that has been taken by the council, which underplays the urgent need for housing and particularly affordable housing in the district. Concerned that the Council appears to have abandoned the prior work and evidence that was produced to inform the South East Plan and for the Council's Local Development Framework. Overall, while the approach of providing a range of options for the level of new housing and jobs to be delivered is welcomed, we consider that not all potential scenarios for housing and employment in the district have been identified. The options present a limited range of housing growth scenarios that we consider are skewed towards lower growth. While there is some evidence put forward to support the housing figures presented, this is derived from economic growth scenarios only. In taking this approach, the Council has failed to address the issue of housing need and particularly affordable housing over the plan period. This is borne out by the fact that not even the highest growth scenario would meet the district's housing or affordable housing requirements. We therefore consider that a further scenario should also be considered, which is based on delivering sufficient housing to meet these needs. In describing the levels of delivery for ranges C and D, the consultation document states that the housing figures would, along with existing commitments, deliver more homes than before. However, these statements do not recognise the fact that the Council has historically failed to meet its own housing targets, and has failed to maintain 5 year's supply of deliverable sites, which meet the requirements of being available, suitable and achievable. In this context the options presented seem to be set at a level which maintains a low delivery of housing, which is insufficient to meet identified needs. The options also fail to achieve the truly bottom-up approach to plan making, which the government has sought to bring about through the Localism Act. While not wishing to express specific support for any of the options presented, O&H Properties would be supportive of a strategy that seeks to distribute development across the district, rather than concentrate it in a smaller number of locations. In preparing the options for the consultation documents, we do not consider that the Council has identified all of the suitable options, and has adopted an unduly insular approach. The options presented within the consultation paper all treat the district in isolation and fail to recognise the impact that major settlements in neighbouring</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											districts may have on the housing market within Aylesbury Vale. Notably, the presence of Milton Keynes, immediately to the north east of the district is not recognised despite the new Duty to Cooperate. As with the growth scenarios, we consider that the consultation fails to identify all appropriate options for locating development within the district. At the developer and technical forums, which were held during autumn 2012, the potential of development locations being chosen based on the location and extent of existing infrastructure was discussed. This approach to delivering both housing and employment development would allow the district's needs to be met with a minimum need for investment in new infrastructure projects which generally have long delivery timescales and require significant levels of investment. This suggested approach has not been carried forward into the consultation, in favour of a range of approaches, such as the concentration of development at the major settlements of Aylesbury and Buckingham, which have failed to meet housing requirements to date.
6059		Connolly Homes and Bellcross Company Limited	Anna Gillings	Rapleys LLP	Worst			Best			Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. In summary, my client supports Range D, for the maximum level of housing growth for the district as the 'best option', which is considered necessary to provide sufficient housing for the area. The 'worst' option would, conversely, be Range A, for the smallest level of growth. In respect of the location for growth, we promote my clients interests at Salden Chase on the north east boundary of the District, which primarily about the administrative boundary of Milton Keynes, of which I believe you are already aware.
1021	Cllr Mrs Rachael L Webb	North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium				Best		Worst			Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Concerned that the outstanding planning applications (e.g. 2000+ at Berton) and expected applications could potentially determine the VAP on their own and might not be the most sustainable option. At our meeting of 10th January, NBPPC members were consistent in their reports that their residents had stated a preference for low numbers of new homes in their respective communities, and that any new affordable homes (see 5 below) should be for people with strong local connections. In this respect, Options A or B are more consistent with these preferences than Options C or D. All options appear to polarise advantages and disadvantages: for example, maximum economic gain results in maximum environmental pain. The most acceptable scenario is therefore to strike a balance and to compromise on economic gain in order to protect the rural environment, i.e. the principle of sustainable development ¹ . After all, it is the rural environment that defines the Vale and is the reason many people choose to live here. Options B and C are therefore more acceptable than Options A or D. In the current prolonged difficult economic climate, and with the demise of the top-down pressure of housing allocation, and with the significant land banks with planning permission as mentioned above, it is difficult to see how the building rates would realistically exceed that of the previous 'boom' years. Options A and B are therefore more realistic than Options C or D. Because of the need for sufficient jobs and affordable homes, there was some support at NBPPC for Option C. Please therefore note: NBPPC fully supports the objective of building more affordable homes, the priority being for families with strong local connections. Therefore, the persistent shortfall in affordable housing, whichever option is considered, is

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											<p>cause for concern. This issue requires additional and more sophisticated attention at strategic and policy level. One way forward is to negotiate with local communities to redirect part of the New Homes Bonus or Community Infrastructure Levy to the provision of affordable housing. Another tool is a more determined use of the Rural Housing Exception Scheme. The causal link between the volume of new development and economic progress is also questionable, given the significant housing growth experienced by Aylesbury and Buckingham in recent years that failed to account for the persistent pressure on employment opportunities. The link between housing and economic progress also depends on the quality of the homes, not just their quantity. The VoA Plan should therefore be one of iteration, imagination, flexibility and quality, not quantity and finger-crossing. The causal link between the supply of homes and their cost is simplistic and misleading. The cost of homes is determined by many other factors, including the demand for homes, mortgage availability and interest rates, salaries, and the attractiveness of the area and the homes themselves. Our policy is not to 'favour' one community over another. In this regard, it is consistent for us not to favour one Distribution Scenario over another. Having said that, there were strong representations against a new settlement in open countryside, and also for the disproportionate expansion of an established community. We therefore request that the following principles be adhered to during the decision making process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The responses to this and the previous consultation that ended in December 2011, i.e. the wishes of the local communities and their first-tier councils, should be respected whenever and as far as possible, and meaningful mitigation, in consultation with the communities, be provided when appropriate. b. The principle of sustainable development¹ and not local politics should determine the best Distribution Scenario for the Vale c. Brownfield sites should be developed rather than greenfield sites, and sites should be considered as brownfield or greenfield depending on their current / recent use and aesthetic qualities. d. Community coalescence as a concept or consequence is not discussed in this consultation so cannot be introduced at a later stage of the Plan's development without overwhelming support for such a concept during this consultation. e. The concept of social cohesion should be factored into the decision-making process at this stage. The needs of, for example, households without transport, teens and the elderly should all be accommodated. f. When considering new settlements, the Plan must consider this concept as not only "settlements as self-contained entities," but also "settlements as community extensions" depending on where they may be sited and their impact on other communities. For example, a settlement that is calculated to be sustainable on its own and is touted as bringing some benefits to other communities, may overall adversely impact the sustainability and desirability of one or more of those communities, so should be deemed as unacceptable. g. One concern regarding new settlements is that strategic and service investment would be directed to the new settlement(s), to the detriment of those communities who have needed additional investment for many years. h. A reasonable view must be taken of whether other future developments might proceed, e.g. HS2 and East-West rail, and how these might impact the emerging Plan. However, even the most reasonable views may turn out to be incorrect, in which case the emerging Plan should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the alternative scenarios. i. A significant portion of the New Homes Bonus should be paid directly to those communities who will be affected by new developments, as intended by central Government:

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											we attach our email to AVDC for reference.
00706	Keith Robinson	The Aylesbury Society			Best						<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>It is disappointing to note that the ratio of jobs to new households has fallen from 1.0 to 0.6. this will inevitably lead to an increased proportion of commuters and a greater demand for 'affordably housing'. We would wish to be given an indication of the effect of reverting to the original 1.0 ration. We would prefer that the distribution of residential development should be related to the location of new employment. i.e. Scenario 2. However we are of the view that account should be taken of adjoining districts. For example, the continued success of Milton Keynes in attracting employment should be a factor when determining the proportion of residential development in Buckingham and the north of the Vale. Before determining the location of residential development much more detailed consideration needs to be given to employment locations. Housing should then follow to minimise travel distance. Again an example if the attractiveness of Aston Clinton and surroundings due to the presence of the motorway standard A41. Due to the Green Belt and AONB development further south is constrained. In this context further residential development to the north of Aylesbury is a nonsense. We are concerned that there are no substantive figures on net employment changes in the Vale. Perhaps any future studies should avoid number crunching and concentrate on surveying actual employment levels. It is alleged that net employment is falling in Aylesbury but rising in the surrounding areas. In our view this urgently needs to be addressed. Given its good rail connections, Haddenham has considerable potential for increased employment but is isolated from the major links in the national highway network. In the longer term, a resurrection of the A418 corridor (Swindon-Oxford-Milton Keynes) at least between the M40 and the A41 would be beneficial. In our view, residential development should follow employment. Basically, our view is that Range A should be the starting point with additional housing (Range B) being provided if/when net employment growth exceeds 2 per cent. Chairman Aylesbury Society</p>
6123		Taylor Wimpey	John Hargreaves	Woods Hardwick Planning							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The proposed range of jobs and homes being consulted on is insufficient in the context of recent household projections and the shortfall in provision of affordable homes which is acknowledged in relation to the highest range of jobs and homes being consulted on. Comprehensive submissions have also been made on our behalf in respect of SE Aylesbury and Salden Chase, SW Milton Keynes. These make clear that none of the options address housing need adequately, based on household projections and the Vale's wider role in absorbing housing pressure from constrained areas adjoining. In formulating the options, the duty to co-</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											operate with adjoining authorities appears to have been ignored. There are deliverable sites available in sustainable locations which will enable the Council to adopt a strategy which will achieve greater economic benefits for the area in conjunction with meeting all the housing needs which are likely to come about over the next 20 years. In terms of the distribution of this growth in housing and jobs, our view is that bases on which the strategic distribution of growth is being considered are not well founded. No single parameter is likely to provide a satisfactory response to the complex interactions of factors which need to be taken into consideration. What is clear from the analysis already undertaken is that development in the Aylesbury sub-market area is necessary in order to achieve the objectives of best meeting population and demographic change, satisfying housing need and achieving sustainable development through urban concentration. Allied to this is a need to address the housing need of other sub markets and that implies a distribution which apportions some growth to each.
06126	Julia Foster	David Lock Associates		New College and Hallam Land Management							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>This submission is made on behalf of New College and relates to land north of the Weedon Hill MDA and west of the A413. Attached red edged plan provided. HLM have commissioned independent growth modelling from dlp Planning ltd (dlp). dlp has used the Chelmer model to test the assumptions underlying the work undertaken by GL Hearn (GLH). dlp have identified two areas of weakness in the modelling undertaken by GLH: 1.By projecting forward from 2006 the baseline figures for the VAP, commencing 2011, are incorrect. 2.The projections are based upon unrealistic assumptions regarding patterns of migration and commuting. The dlp modelling demonstrates that the even the highest levels of growth put forward for consultation by the Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) would be insufficient to maintain the existing labour force and would put a significant constraint upon the local economy. Given the constraints that exist within neighbouring authority areas to deliver even a scale of growth that can accommodate need as result of demographic change within the existing population, AVDC is remiss in not engaging with neighbouring authorities at this early stage, to identify and then consult upon the need to accommodate higher levels of in-migration. The Chelmer modelling shows that all of the growth scenarios currently being consulted upon would lead to a reduction in the existing labour supply. This would risk contraction in the local economy, threatening economic prosperity and the prospects and opportunities open to the residents of the District. An annual target of 1,334 dwellings per annum (2011-2031 26680 in total) represents a robust, evidence based assessment of housing requirements to support ambitious but realistic prospects for economic growth, in line with national policy and AVDC's own stated objectives with regard to realising economic potential. This representation promotes an objectively assessed housing figure which is in excess of the upper range presented in the consultation paper. If a higher level of development is to be accommodated in a sustainable way the distribution approach should be guided by the principles set out below. These principles draw upon: • the findings of the SA with regards to possible impacts within each of the sub-markets (particularly the sensitivity of the Southern Vale); •the underlying demography (particularly patterns of commuting, anticipated distribution of employment growth and travel to work areas); •the need to support existing</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											centres of employment and the vitality and viability of the main town centres; and •a strong preference for a high level of urban concentration, in relation to Aylesbury, Buckingham and Milton Keynes. Development should therefore be focused within and adjoining Aylesbury and Buckingham, as the main urban centres serving the northern and southern rural hinterlands and on the edge of Milton Keynes. This will place new homes in close proximity to the main centres of employment and services and support the most sustainable patterns of movement. Policy intervention is necessary to achieve a split of the following order, to be tested and refined through capacity analysis: Aylesbury - 60% Buckingham -12% Northern Vale (Milton Keynes) – 15% The remainder of the District (Rural Northern and Southern Vale) -13%
06126		New College	Julia Foster	David Lock Associates							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>HLM have commissioned independent growth modelling from dlp Planning ltd (dlp). dlp has used the Chelmer model to test the assumptions underlying the work undertaken by GL Hearn (GLH). dlp have identified two areas of weakness in the modelling undertaken by GLH: 1.By projecting forward from 2006 the baseline figures for the VAP, commencing 2011, are incorrect. 2.The projections are based upon unrealistic assumptions regarding patterns of migration and commuting. The dlp modelling demonstrates that the even the highest levels of growth put forward for consultation by the Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) would be insufficient to maintain the existing labour force and would put a significant constraint upon the local economy. Given the constraints that exist within neighbouring authority areas to deliver even a scale of growth that can accommodate need as result of demographic change within the existing population, AVDC is remiss in not engaging with neighbouring authorities at this early stage, to identify and then consult upon the need to accommodate higher levels of in-migration. The Chelmer modelling shows that all of the growth scenarios currently being consulted upon would lead to a reduction in the existing labour supply. This would risk contraction in the local economy, threatening economic prosperity and the prospects and opportunities open to the residents of the District. An annual target of 1,334 dwellings per annum (2011-2031 26680 in total) represents a robust, evidence based assessment of housing requirements to support ambitious but realistic prospects for economic growth, in line with national policy and AVDC's own stated objectives with regard to realising economic potential. This representation promotes an objectively assessed housing figure which is in excess of the upper range presented in the consultation paper. If a higher level of development is to be accommodated in a sustainable way the distribution approach should be guided by the principles set out below. These principles draw upon: • the findings of the SA with regards to possible impacts within each of the sub-markets (particularly the sensitivity of the Southern Vale); •the underlying demography (particularly patterns of commuting, anticipated distribution of employment growth and travel to work areas); •the need to support existing centres of employment and the vitality and viability of the main town centres; and •a strong preference for a high level of urban concentration, in relation to Aylesbury, Buckingham and Milton Keynes. Development should therefore be focused within and adjoining Aylesbury and Buckingham, as the main urban centres serving the northern and southern rural hinterlands and on the edge of Milton Keynes. This will place new homes in close proximity to the main centres of employment and services and support the most sustainable patterns of movement.</p>

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											Policy intervention is necessary to achieve a split of the following order, to be tested and refined through capacity analysis: Aylesbury - 60% Buckingham -12% Northern Vale (Milton Keynes) – 15% The remainder of the District (Rural Northern and Southern Vale) -13%
		South West Milton Keynes Consortium (Hallam Land Management, William Davis Ltd, Taylor Wimpey Developments UK Ltd, Connolly Homes and Bellcross Homes)									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. The SWMK Consortium considers the emerging proposals to be unsound. In summary, the Consortium does not consider that any of the options put forward by the Council in terms of 'ranges' are either appropriate or justified, and the level of new housing and employment proposed will not enable the District to thrive or to make its fair contribution to meeting local and wider needs in the South East of England. The Council needs to better reflect the relationship between the District and Milton Keynes for providing housing growth in light of the significant number of District residents who work in the City of Milton Keynes. There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that the Council has prepared the proposed employment and housing range figures in co-operation with adjacent local planning authorities. The evidence base (in particular the Housing and Economic Growth Assessment prepared by GL Hearn and which DLP comment on in more detail in their addendum) fails to address what is planned to happen in the locations that are the major source of in-migration to Aylesbury Vale. Consideration should be given to the inspectors report for the recent Newton Leys appeal decision.

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06126		New College	Julia Foster	David Lock Associates							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>HLM have commissioned independent growth modelling from dlp Planning ltd (dlp). dlp has used the Chelmer model to test the assumptions underlying the work undertaken by GL Hearn (GLH). dlp have identified two areas of weakness in the modelling undertaken by GLH: 1.By projecting forward from 2006 the baseline figures for the VAP, commencing 2011, are incorrect. 2.The projections are based upon unrealistic assumptions regarding patterns of migration and commuting. The dlp modelling demonstrates that the even the highest levels of growth put forward for consultation by the Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) would be insufficient to maintain the existing labour force and would put a significant constraint upon the local economy. Given the constraints that exist within neighbouring authority areas to deliver even a scale of growth that can accommodate need as result of demographic change within the existing population, AVDC is remiss in not engaging with neighbouring authorities at this early stage, to identify and then consult upon the need to accommodate higher levels of in-migration. The Chelmer modelling shows that all of the growth scenarios currently being consulted upon would lead to a reduction in the existing labour supply. This would risk contraction in the local economy, threatening economic prosperity and the prospects and opportunities open to the residents of the District. An annual target of 1,334 dwellings per annum (2011-2031 26680 in total) represents a robust, evidence based assessment of housing requirements to support ambitious but realistic prospects for economic growth, in line with national policy and AVDC's own stated objectives with regard to realising economic potential. This representation promotes an objectively assessed housing figure which is in excess of the upper range presented in the consultation paper. If a higher level of development is to be accommodated in a sustainable way the distribution approach should be guided by the principles set out below. These principles draw upon: • the findings of the SA with regards to possible impacts within each of the sub-markets (particularly the sensitivity of the Southern Vale); •the underlying demography (particularly patterns of commuting, anticipated distribution of employment growth and travel to work areas); •the need to support existing centres of employment and the vitality and viability of the main town centres; and •a strong preference for a high level of urban concentration, in relation to Aylesbury, Buckingham and Milton Keynes. Development should therefore be focused within and adjoining Aylesbury and Buckingham, as the main urban centres serving the northern and southern rural hinterlands and on the edge of Milton Keynes. This will place new homes in close proximity to the main centres of employment and services and support the most sustainable patterns of movement. Policy intervention is necessary to achieve a split of the following order, to be tested and refined through capacity analysis: Aylesbury - 60% Buckingham -12% Northern Vale (Milton Keynes) – 15% The remainder of the District (Rural Northern and Southern Vale) -13%</p>
6062		Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd	Jayme Radford	Drivers Jonas Deloitte							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Supportive of both housing and employment growth across Aylesbury and the scenarios which allocate a significant level of growth to the Aylesbury Central Area and Southern Vale. For housing distribution, Council should locate commercial units within close proximity of major</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											roads to provide sufficient access.
6063		Barwood Land and Estates	Mike Taylor	GVA	Worst				Urban Concentration		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Barwood Land supports the main reasons for planning for new homes and jobs in Aylesbury Vale. The Council should have the ability to meet changing circumstances during the lifetime of the Plan. Concern expressed regarding using the two economic forecasts as the upper range for future growth. When translated into Range A this provides a zero increase in jobs which is unrealistic. Range B would fail to create sufficient new employment to meet the needs of the growing population. Neither of these job targets represents a sustainable policy approach. Additional economic sensitivity analyses should be carried out. Concern regarding quantitative nature of distribution scenarios. The future distribution of homes and jobs needs to include an assessment of potential land supply in order to allow meaningful consideration of each Scenario. The distribution of jobs and homes should be examined in parallel and as such there is insufficient information presented about the scenarios. Scenario 7 is preferred as it continues the valid and tested spatial policy approach for the District established by both the RSS and the Adopted District Local Plan. It supports a sustainable pattern of new housing growth that is integrated to the existing centre of population and employment opportunity; higher order town centre and community facilities and the greatest levels of transport accessibility in the District. It provides the basis for securing appropriate contributions to infrastructure and will make the best use of available, deliverable brownfield and greenfield land without undue effects on the District's environment, heritage and landscapes. In contrast, the other potential Distribution Scenarios (particularly Scenarios 1, 2, 4 and 6) represent, to a greater or lesser extent, a more dispersed approach to the District's future housing growth. These more dispersed distributions lack the scale and emphasis of growth to allow potential transport, economic or environmental effects to be overcome or mitigated.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6064		Gladman Development Limited; Greenway Land LLP & G W Fox Limited		Hourigan Connolly							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>SQW's initial assessment identifies several reasons for why higher employment numbers should be considered. New employment data for 2010 is now available which was not included in GLHearn report. This suggests that the actual extent of job losses experienced so far in Aylesbury Vale has been around 500 over the years 2006-2010, which is a much smaller rate of employment loss compared to that expected under both sets of employment forecasts. Also there is no evidence-based explanation for the time periods for employment recovery growth. The report has also has little regard to the influences of neighbouring employment centres notably London, Oxford, Milton Keynes and Hemel Hempstead which may have 'overspill' into the district. Also the Government's recent commitment to investing in the East-West rail infrastructure project will further reinforce economic linkages between Aylesbury Vale and Milton Keynes, and the wider Oxford-Cambridge knowledge 'Arc' which has not been considered. There is strong evidence that the revealed employment trend over the 2006-2011 period will be significantly better than is assumed in either of the Cambridge Econometrics or Experian models that have been utilised by GLHearn. As a whole the employment land topic is given a relatively 'light touch' treatment in the GLH report and that additional further work is surely required on the part of the Council and/or its advisors. Future employment work is needed for reviewing the existing supply (allocated sites), commercial and industrial property market review, business and developer survey/consultations, review of the situation in neighbouring authority areas and a synthesis to review of the net need for additional provision. SQW's initial assessment, for employment-led housing demand projections for Aylesbury Vale is likely to lay in the range of 1,025 to 1,090 dwellings per annum for the period to 2031. A settlement hierarchy has been established for the VoA Plan where Winslow is identified as a second tier settlement as it is considered an area for growth, having regard to its strategic location on the East West Railway. 90% of growth in the Northern Vale should be directed at Winslow, with the remaining 10% of the residual growth to Fourth and Fifth Tier Settlements.</p>
6065		Hallam Land Management Limited	Julia Foster	David Lock Associates							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>There are key weaknesses in the GLH model: by projecting forward from 2006 the baseline figures for the VAP commencing at 2011 are incorrect; and the projections are based on unrealistic assumptions about patters of migration and commuting. The David Lock modelling demonstrates that even the highest levels of growth in the consultation options would be insufficient to maintain the existing labour force and would put significant strain on the local economy. On these figures the VAP would fail to promote sustainable economic growth. A target of 1334 dwellings per annum is more realistic. Distribution - development should be focussed within and adjoining Aylesbury and Buckingham and on the edge of Milton Keynes. This will place new homes in close proximity to the main centres of employment and services and support the most sustainable patters of movement. The apportionment should be Aylesbury 60%, Buckingham 12%, Northern Vale (Milton Keynes) 15%, Remainder of the district (rural northern and southern vale) 13%. *Comments summarised by AVDC. Original</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											copy of responses available on request.
6066	Maraid Keswani		Jennifer Lambert	Jennifer Lambert Associates Ltd	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The focus of this new plan should be to generate growth in homes and jobs and to utilise previously developed land such as the land at Calvert, which will benefit from a comprehensive new approach. The objectives are to deliver a variety of sizes and tenure of homes and jobs appropriate in scale to the location and to sustain the rural settlements in this area rather than to continue with the lack of investment and reduced community facilities that are currently being applied.</p>
6067		Gleeson Homes and Linden Homes Strategic Land	Ian Sowerby	Bell Cornwell					Economic led		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The growth assumptions for all four ranges for growth fundamentally under-estimate the level of housing that is required to meet future need and demand. They are likely to be unsound because: there is no justification for a significant reduction in the level of housing planned for in the South East Plan; Economic and employment growth outside of the administrative boundary are not taken into account; does not account for accrued backlog of housing land supply identified in the SHMA and AMR. The range of options should be reviewed. NPPF and the Coalition Government ask LPAs to make every effort to identify and meet the housing, business and other development needs of their areas and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Welcome dividing the district into four housing market areas. This reflects the evidence in the most recent SHMA (2008) which supports high housing growth in the district as a whole but identifies that the least strong demand is in Aylesbury town where demand is being met by actual completion rates since 2001. Scenario 2 Economic Led is most appropriate, although a higher figure still may be appropriate. Scenario 4 places too much emphasis on predicted demographic change. Scenario 6 is unrealistic as it envisages a drop in overall employment levels. Scenario 5 is inappropriate because although affordable housing is an important factor it should not determine overall level of housing in the district. Scenario 3 is inappropriate because new development should be concentrated in and around existing settlements to produce much-needed jobs and homes with associated community benefits. The current Local Plan strategy to concentrate development in and around Aylesbury town has failed to produce sufficient housing to meet locally-generated demand. Whilst Aylesbury town is the most sustainable settlement in the district, and thus should take the majority of growth, adopting Scenario 1 or 7 is only likely to produce more exaggerated negative impacts on the</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											rest of the district including an increase in commuting and a deterioration of infrastructure and community facilities for the rural parishes. A combination of growth at Aylesbury and other sustainable settlements is most appropriate. Winslow, as the major settlement in the Northern Vale, should accommodate the main proportion of new growth in the sub-market area. It would not be appropriate to allocate significant growth to smaller settlements (including Wendover and Haddenham) where the wider community benefits are likely to be less effective than similar investment in Winslow.
6068		Hampden Fields Consortium	Tim Burden	Barton Willmore				Best	Urban Concentration		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Generally supportive of the higher housing and job growth option (D) but this should be considered a minimum figure. Also, seeking to agree an apportionment without first agreeing a housing and job figure is confusing and unhelpful given the interlinkages between them and other factors. In particular none of the projections make an allowance for meeting any cross-boundary (including Greater London) development needs within Aylesbury Vale. This contrasts with the South East Plan which provides a higher housing requirement than all options consulted on here, and identified Aylesbury town as a major centre to focus growth within the region. The Hearn report needs to go beyond the administrative boundaries because historically Aylesbury has accommodated growth 'on behalf of' other more constrained authorities in Buckinghamshire including Chiltern and South Bucks who have recently adopted their Core strategies based on the low housing figures apportioned to them in the South East Plan. So D should be the minimum number with the potential for higher levels to be examined following adoption of the NPPF. Also the Hearn report has a number of flaws. On their own admission (see attached email), further work on the report and SA is needed to demonstrate robust housing and employment requirements for the District that will stand up to scrutiny at Examination. AVDC should publish the full evidence base related to each of the scenarios otherwise it is not possible to assess whether even range D is sufficient to meet future demographic and economic needs within the District, especially the level of resident labour force available at the start of the Plan period (2011). Given Aylesbury town's status as a</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											regional hub within the South East Plan, and the extent of available employment land within the town, in order to provide a balanced mix of homes and jobs, and reflecting Aylesbury's role within the wider District, the urban concentration scenario is most appropriate, apportioning 78% of future housing to Aylesbury. Not in a position to comment in detail on the distribution scenarios but Aylesbury should be the preferred location for the majority of growth in order to meet wider sustainability objectives and ensure the delivery of appropriate infrastructure. Diluting the distribution around the district will not result in sustainable development and the SA recognises the important role of Aylesbury.
6070		Gallagher Estates	Michael Knott	Barton Willmore				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Generally supportive of the higher housing and job growth options (D). Concerned that the options and projections do not appear to make an allowance for meeting any cross-boundary (including Greater London) development needs within Aylesbury Vale. It is therefore in stark contrast to the approved South East Plan which provides a higher housing requirement than all options considered through this consultation, and identified Aylesbury town and Milton Keynes as major centres to focus growth within the region. Also the options ignore the potential to deliver higher levels of sustainable economic growth including strategic housing development to the south of Milton Keynes. This includes land at Eaton Leys promoted by Gallagher Estates. The higher housing growth option of 13,500 (in addition to the 7336 homes with permission) is the minimum which should be taken forward with potential for higher levels to be examined having regard to the NPPF and the duty to cooperate in the planning of sustainable development. The lower growth options do not meet tests of national policy so we are not in a position to comment in detail on the distribution scenarios but would raise the following issues: - the consultation provides no details about the distribution of housing and other development which already has permission (the housing 'pipeline') and which would be in addition to the ranges consulted on. - scenario 7 (urban concentration) proposes just 5% of housing in the rural North Sub-Market. For any of the housing growth ranges A-D this would be less than the housing pipeline capacity of 503 dwellings or no new housing would be permitted in this area in the next 19 years, which would be unsustainable. Conversely the urban concentration scenario should but does not allow for growth in the district on the edge of Milton Keynes. This ignores the proximity of Milton Keynes city to Aylesbury Vale and the availability of land adjoining this major centre for growth as offering a clear opportunity for contributing toward the urban concentration approach. The distribution could be significantly different to the option presented, if strategic development needs including those of Milton Keynes were adequately taken into account in determining the total housing figure i.e. it would more closely reflect the South East Plan strategy which provided approximately 30% of the Vale's housing requirement on the edge of Milton Keynes. The 150 homes per annum which the Hearn report indicates as necessary in the rural North Sub-Market should be a minimum for this part of the district.</p>

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
05462		Barratt/Ashfield Land	Andrew Blackwell	Bidwells				Best	Urban Concentration		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>D encourages a level of growth that will meet affordable housing need, make significant improvement to job provision and lead to infrastructure improvements particularly strategic roads to serve Aylesbury. Barratt/Ashfield have been able to demonstrate from the evidence which supports their current planning application at east of Aylesbury, that there is environmental capacity to take 2500 homes and 35,000sqm of employment space as part of an urban concentration strategy at Aylesbury. Barratt/Ashfield have, by the evidence which accompanies their current planning application at east Aylesbury, demonstrated that there are advantages posed by an urban concentration approach without compromise to areas of environmental sensitivity.</p>
06069		Arnold White Estates	Geoff Gardner	Hives Planning Ltd				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Aylesbury should be the main focus for new jobs and housing, with existing commitments and sustainable urban extensions. The Southern Vale is the next priority for growth. Specifically Waddesdon offers the opportunity for major expansion to the existing settlement - utilising supporting and expanding an already good standard of provision of service and secondary/primary schools; providing a bypass, the need for which will become critical over the plan period; utilising and supporting a strategic employment site; addressing areas of educational deprivation, ameliorating the effects of HS2, and with the opportunity of easy access to East West Rail either from Quainton or Aylesbury Parkway.</p>
62		Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance		Hives Planning Ltd				Worst			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>In line with the evidence base (Experian, Cambridge Econometrics and GLH) Aylesbury should be the main focus for new jobs and housing, with existing commitments and sustainable urban extensions. Although there should be flexibility to allow modest, sustainable and proportionate development at villages throughout the Vale (e.g. Tingewick), the Southern Vale, after Aylesbury, should be the next priority for growth. In addition to development at larger, sustainable villages in the Southern Vale (e.g. Waddesdon and Haddenham, both of which are close to Aylesbury), the strategy should allow for some development at smaller villages particularly where this would assist in achieving other community objectives - frequently this will be in accordance with Neighbourhood Plans. Some settlements in Southern Vale, particularly Haddenham, are capable of accommodating a higher growth than other smaller village because of their sustainability and relationship to Aylesbury. The VAP also offers opportunity for significant development at Waddesdon, which is close to Aylesbury having regard to existing facilities and services both within Waddesdon and nearby.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6072		Regeneration Homes						Best	Economic led		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Range A and B should not be considered as the economy is likely to recover swiftly due to good skill levels in the district. Providing less housing will affect the deliverability of jobs and therefore undersell potential economic benefits. Support is given for range C and D. Growth should be directed at the principle settlements, before considering smaller settlements. There are too many distribution scenarios which are similar in their approach. The large number is confusing and misleading. In essence the scenarios can be summarised in economic led or demographic led. The scenario relating to demographic trend does not take into account expected growth in jobs. Scenarios 4 and 5 are recommended to be removed. Scenarios 2 and 6 are economic led, which are the only ones which are in accordance with the aspirations of the draft NPPF.</p>
6074	Terence Kealey	University of Buckingham							Continue past trends	Economic led	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The University of Buckingham has acquired land on the other side of the river and have developed a Campus Development Plan that should allow student numbers to double to around the 3,000 level over the next 5 to 10 years. The most important consideration about expansion within the University is what size of University can be sustained by the town of Buckingham. From the University's point of view, the larger the town and the better its concomitant facilities, the easier it will be for University expansion to be accommodated. Of the various scenarios presented, scenario 1, 'continue past trends' would be the one favoured by University. Would question scenario 2, 'economic led' that suggests no growth in the Buckingham area, as the development of the University alone would make such a scenario implausible. The labour intensive nature of universities would suggest a considerable growth of jobs in line with the growth of the University within the town.</p>
6075	Steven Smith	Denison Investments						Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The upper figures in Range D are supported as the minimum number of homes and jobs that should be provided for in the District. These are the figures of need that are supported by robust evidence in the absence of an assessment of the evidence base which underpinned the South East Plan and which indicated a still higher level of growth. They are also the level of growth that should be planned for, given the requirements of the draft NPPF for local authorities to plan for their full housing needs. Do not support a single distribution scenario because in reality it is a combination of factors that will influence the most appropriate spread. Distribution of housing across the District should reflect the primacy of Aylesbury town but thereafter seek to focus growth on the Southern Vale in locations such as Waddesdon which are suitable and sustainable and where land is available to accommodate an appropriate level of growth.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6076	Jason Miller						Best		Maintaining working age population		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. The best option appears to be one of the two intermediate numbers of new homes - option B or C - and, most importantly, the plan that maintains a working age population in all parts of the Vale. It seems obvious, looking at the projections, that if we adopt any of the other plans the small villages will end up with ageing populations and almost no shops or other services available to that population.
06122		The Garden Centre Group		Gregory Gray Associates	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. In summary, my client is keen to promote housing growth and considers Range D. This is seen to be the most appropriate to meet future anticipated demands. This option is the highest range being consulted on and would mean an increase in jobs of between 11-14%, which would provide significant opportunities for future economic growth, enabling local businesses to grow and attracting new businesses. Although this Range would exceed the identified housing needs, it will enable the delivery of a larger number of affordable homes and help contribute towards the reduction of the cost of buying market homes. For housing distribution scenario 6 is to be the most appropriate option, which should be adopted by the Council. This approach will ensure a focus of housing growth in Wendover, where our client's site at World's End Garden Centre is located.
5440	Jamie Gibbins	Barwood Development Securities Ltd									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. BDSL control land to the south west of Milton Keynes, south of the A421 and north of the proposed Oxford-Cambridge railway line and adjacent to the land owned by the South West Milton Keynes Consortium. The online questionnaire does not provide adequately for detailed commentary and reasoning. In summary the options put forward by the Council are not appropriate and the level of new housing and employment will not allow Aylesbury Vale to prosper or meet local or national needs. AVDC needs to recognise the undoubted relationship between itself and Milton Keynes in accommodating some of the required growth to satisfy the large numbers of residents who work in Milton Kenes which was a key principle of the abandoned AVDC Core Strategy. This approach has been endorsed by the recent Secretary of State decision at Newton Leys. The work does not address the statutory requirement to cooperate with adjoining LPA (Duty to Cooperate). Unclear how the evidence base to the proposed housing numbers and distribution takes into account the developing strategies of adjoining LPAs. Need further evidence of cooperation with Milton Keynes and addressing the implications of continuing economic growth of Milton Keynes on the proposed distribution of housing in Aylesbury Vale. Even Range D represents a significant shortfall in the required level of housing as per guidance in PPS3 and the emerging NPPF.

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6079		The Brill Society									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Community engagement is at the heart of the new localism based planning system. It is, therefore, up to the District Council to engage more fully with the many communities around the District rather than presenting the stark and seemingly top down “targets” or spatial strategy of the past. The village has, we believe, coped well with the type of growth we have seen over the last 20 years and thus we believe that we can continue to accommodate and assimilate similar types and levels of development over the next 20 years. The community would be very keen to work towards the creation of a neighbourhood plan, setting out our priorities for development and identifying sites of importance where development should not occur and, conversely, identifying sites where development would be not just appropriate but could contribute positively to the sustainability of existing and new facilities within the parish. Aylesbury Vale cannot be considered an island, rather it is a dynamic area serving the needs of many markets outside of the administrative boundary. Therefore we reject all of the scenarios that merely cater for “local need only”. The Council should create a vision for the District drawing upon the role of the different areas and communities within the District and take account of the influences from adjoining authority areas. This “duty to co-operate” is clearly set out in the requirements of the Localism Bill 2011.</p>
06078		Kier Ventures	Jane Gardner	Marrons	Worst			Best	Economic led	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Responding on behalf of clients who have interests in land to the north of Newton Longville. Objects to the council’s assessment of housing requirements for the following reasons: - The inter-relationship between Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale and cross-boundary movements cannot be ignored. The plan should not proceed until the duty to co-operate is put in place. - Housing market areas do not take account of administrative boundaries and not providing for households who wish to relocate to the area will make it more difficult for emerging and existing households. - As no account has been taken of the needs and demands of adjoining areas, it is maintained that none of the four options will provide sufficient dwellings to meet needs. Suggest a range E should be assessed: Jobs 600-750 (per year) 12,000 – 15,000 (total over 20 years) Homes 675-785 (per year) 13,500 – 15,750 (total over 20 years) 70% of outstanding commitments are in the Aylesbury area and if the Range A lower was selected, 43% of the total provision for the entire plan period would already be committed, thereby limiting the plan’s ability to make a significant impact on the strategy for the distribution of homes and jobs across the district. The plan should focus on job creation by enabling the provision of a wide range of job opportunities in the right locations. The council should adopt an optimistic stance to employment growth. The Experian forecast is considered the most appropriate. The council should recognise the advantages which derive from its proximity to Milton Keynes. The distribution strategy should provide for a significant amount of development in the part of the district closest to Milton Keynes. By planning for employment growth in close proximity to Milton Keynes, there is a possibility of reducing out-commuting. The scenarios which are economic led or maintain working age population are best and new settlement is worst. The lead in time for new settlements is significantly longer than for</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											other forms of development as there is no infrastructure to connect up to. If this option were chosen, it is unlikely any dwellings would be completed before the end of the plan period. If new settlement(s) are to be considered, the associated dwelling contribution should be additional to the identified housing provision requirements. The fact that the South East Plan is to be revoked should be no reason to conclude that a sustainable urban extension to the south west of Milton Keynes is no longer a suitable solution. All the advantages still exist and there are additional benefits including east west rail and the Bletchley Transport Strategy which has identified the Bletchley southern bypass for further study.
05306		Prudential Pensions Ltd		Pegasus Planning Group				Best	Housing need		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Except that the short term housing market is somewhat dysfunctional. Support for the highest housing and jobs numbers, to support in-migration to Aylesbury Vale and provide for future needs of existing population. Planning for the highest levels of growth will provide an essential injection of confidence into the local economy, ensure the delivery of a large number of affordable homes and help to reduce cost of buying market homes. Smaller settlements around Aylesbury (in southern vale) can provide supplementary opportunities for sustainable growth at Aylesbury sub-market, through utilising existing infrastructure.
05264		National Grid Properties	Mike Woolner	First Plan (on behalf of National Grid)				Best	Economic led	Urban Concentration	Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. National Grid Properties own land on the edge of Newton Longville (see attached plan). Area to the north and west previously allocated for 5,390 additional dwellings in the South East Plan and the draft Aylesbury Vale Core Strategy. Whilst the South East Plan may be withdrawn, the principle of the land as a sustainable location for development remains. An extension to Newton Longville will ensure the village services remain viable while the new occupiers will also benefit from the amenities available in Milton Keynes. It is a sustainable location for growth as it is one of the larger villages in the area, where local services and facilities are concentrated. For the distribution, the 'economic led' and 'maintaining a working population' are preferred. Higher levels of growth in the Northern sub-market are shown to have more positive impacts than lower growth levels in the SA.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06081		New College		Patrick Swan Planning and Development Consultant				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Development should be focused at Aylesbury and Buckingham, which is economically and environmentally justified and would help to support community facilities in these locations. New College is not in favour in growth being scattered throughout the district as benefits to local communities will be less dissipated. A new settlement is also not supported. Overall a concentrated growth policy is supported, which has the greatest potential for new job creation.</p>
6127	Mark Jackson	Gleeson Homes							Urban Concentration		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The consultation document and the options available to comment on are misleading and fail to take account of the necessary evidence base. The published options ignore the previous sound evidence base which informed the South East Plan figures. The projections for both housing growth and jobs do not demonstrate a strategy for growth as encouraged by the Government. The housing figure is significantly too low, ignores PPS3 and the draft NPPF. The 2008 SHMA gave a very positive message for growth and appears to have been ignored. Evidence for the South East Plan also indicates that numbers should be higher. The growth assumptions underestimate the level of housing growth required. There is no basis for a housing figure any lower than that identified in the South East Plan, indeed there is evidence it should be higher. Distribution - concentrating growth around Aylesbury would benefit the entire district.</p>
03924		Broughton Trust	Simon Milliken	Milliken Company			Best		Continue past trends	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The medium level range option is the most sustainable, being focused at the Aylesbury sub-market. This would lead to a reduction in out commuting for employment and higher house prices at Aylesbury. Range D is not support as higher levels of jobs and homes is unlikely to be delivered, based on economic trends and past delivery rates. Broughton Trust considers land on the South East side of Aylesbury to be the most sustainable (north and south side of A41). Developments on the western sides of Aylesbury should be strongly resisted on environmental grounds.</p>
06082		Rolfe Trust		Hawkins Eades Planning							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Promotion of potential development site adjoining College Road North of Aston Clinton. It is proposed this site could help meet the district's future employment needs. The location is sandwiched between existing and permitted employment uses including Arla Foods facility, which is funding improvements for the local road network. The site would be a logical expansion to the existing employment uses.</p>
06083		Harding's Trustees		The Crendon Observatory							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Identifies the major development area in Aston Clinton to be considered for residential use</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											only, rather than the current mix use policy due to economic reasons.
05142		Society of Merchant Venturers	Mike Robinson	Carter Jonas LLP	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. .</p> <p>The South East Plan (SEP) housing figures (approximately 1,075 per annum) were tested by a panel of Inspectors and found to be appropriate. Range D falls well below the requirement in the SEP. The evidence behind the assessment of housing need has not changed so significantly as to justify a reduction of approximately 8,000 homes, even after completions have been taken into account. Range D is the 'best' level of growth to plan for, although the proposed number of dwellings in range D is still inadequate. Note that range D has the greatest number of 'pros' and that all of the 'cons' are 'dependent on location of development'. Agree that development should be directed to the most suitable sites. It is noted that the council's SHLAA identifies land at Croft Meadows, Cheddington, as being suitable for residential development. Consider range A to be the 'worst' level of growth as it would nowhere near meet the identified housing need in the District. Consider scenario 6 (maintain working age population) to be the 'best' scenario. The scenario is based on the demographic need projections in the Housing and Economic Growth Assessment and therefore has the most defensible justification. Scenario 7 is the 'worst' option as the majority of development would be concentrated in Aylesbury leaving little growth in the rest of the District. Growth is needed in smaller towns and villages to help sustain and enhance services and facilities and will help deliver affordable housing.</p>
06046		Ewelme Almshouse Charity		Kemp and Kemp Property Consultants					Housing need	Urban Concentration	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The preferred location for housing is in the northern vale housing market area. Previously development has been to Aylesbury and Buckingham. The new approach should focus more to the northern vale where there is genuinely land available for development and which could help sustain economic wellbeing and the lifeblood of the local communities.</p>
06084		Strutt & Parker LLP		Trustees of the Claydon Estate				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>We consider affordable housing to be a key issue that should be addressed in the emerging plan. If insufficient economic growth or affordable housing is planned for, the prosperity of the rural economy will be threatened; as such range D is the best option. The location of new homes is also an important issue for the rural economy. It is imperative that the rural areas benefit from an appropriate proportion of housing development so that existing rural businesses can flourish and so that new jobs are created. We do not support Distribution Scenario 3 'New settlement(s)' or Distribution Scenario 7 'Urban concentration'. Instead, we propose that the Council adopts a scenario that would result in the distribution of new homes throughout the District based on a settlement hierarchy, where all settlements capable of growth (including villages) would receive a proportion of housing through site-specific</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											allocations.
06084		Trustees of the Claydon Estate		Strutt & Parker LLP				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>We write on behalf of our client, the Trustees of the Claydon Estate, who own land in and around Steeple Claydon, East Claydon and Botolph Claydon, in response to the current consultation on the Aylesbury Plan.</p> <p>We note the Council's proposed range of between 4,500 and 13,500 homes for the District during the plan period and the pros and cons of the different levels of new jobs and homes contemplated. Whilst Range A might meet the District's projected demographic need for housing, it would not provide a sufficient level of affordable housing and would only provide limited opportunities for future economic growth. Similarly, Range B would only provide limited economic growth and would not provide a sufficient level of affordable housing. Range C would see sufficient economic growth, however there is likely to still be a significant shortage of affordable homes. Whilst Range D would not meet the affordable housing need for the District, it would make a significant contribution to it when compared with the alternative ranges. We consider affordable housing to be a key issue that should be addressed in the emerging plan. If insufficient economic growth or affordable housing is planned for, the prosperity of the rural economy will be threatened. To ensure that a substantial amount of affordable housing is provided, we recommend that the Council adopts Range D.</p> <p>The location of new homes is also an important issue for the rural economy. It is imperative that the rural areas benefit from an appropriate proportion of housing development so that existing rural businesses can flourish and so that new jobs are created. This would help to make rural settlements more sustainable in the long term. An urban-centric approach to the distribution of new jobs and homes would inevitably result in the decline of the rural economy. As such, we do not support Distribution Scenario 3 'New settlement(s)' or Distribution Scenario 7 'Urban concentration'. Instead, we propose that the Council adopts a scenario that would result in the distribution of new homes throughout the District based on a settlement hierarchy, where all settlements capable of growth (including villages) would receive a proportion of housing through site-specific allocations.</p>
295	James Mcconnell	Bellway Homes						Best	Continue past trends		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Buckingham has a broad range of services and infrastructure to enable the town to accommodate significant additional growth. The majority of the town and its immediate hinterland is not subject to any environmental designations that would prevent planned future expansion of the urban area. The Council's 2009 SHLAA confirms this. Bellway and Bellcross Homes have recently completed a development of 200 houses at Moreton Road which has proved very popular and highlights the strong demand for new housing at Buckingham.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
5673	Charles Routh	Natural England									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>On Page 12, a new settlement is described as “Likely to have negative impacts on landscape, heritage and biodiversity”. Natural England advises that with appropriate on or offsite measures, a new settlement would not have negative impacts on these factors, and should in fact aim to have positive impacts. Indeed, we advise that such measures would need to be part of the essential infrastructure requirements of the local plan for a new settlement to be sustainable. Similarly we question why a high level of development is “Unlikely to provide enhancements to landscape, heritage or biodiversity”. There is no reason why with appropriate levels of contribution, measures cannot be put in place to deliver enhancements to landscape, heritage or biodiversity. Indeed, we advise that such measures need to be part of the essential infrastructure requirements of the local plan for it to be sustainable. Natural England’s principal concern with respect to the total numbers and broad distribution of development is that the special qualities for which the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was designated are not affected. Any distribution, particularly within the Aylesbury Sub-Market (the edge of which is 3km from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) will need to be assessed to ensure that it can be delivered without affecting the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p>
00108	Peter Marsden	Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Detailed policies for the protection and enhancement of the natural and historic environment should be included in the Plan. The Buckinghamshire Archaeological Society is fully supportive of the goals of providing proper housing and jobs for all the citizens of the Vale, and we consider that this can be concordant with protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment. Such protection and enhancement, indeed, bring benefits to the quality of life of residents in the Vale, as well as benefits to the local economy in terms of education, visitors and tourism. Within these general principles BAS does not have a detailed view on the specific number of jobs and houses and jobs. As to the location of new homes, however, we would strongly urge that their siting should take fully into account: - the desirability of preserving not only sites that are of national importance, but also those of local interest within the Vale; - the desirability of avoiding such developments within historic settlements as would damage their character and grain, and those on the edge of settlements that would damage their relationship to the surrounding countryside; - the desirability of avoiding major developments in areas of high historic landscape value, such as identified in the Bucks County Council’s landscape characterisation project.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6085		Weston Turville Golf Club Limited		Welbeck Strategic Land LLP				Best			<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>There are sound economic and housing reasons why Range D should be adopted by the Council. Discounting the higher rate of economic growth implied by the Experian forecast is unsound because no cogent evidence has been adduced to indicate that the pre-recession growth levels for the district implied by the Experian forecast could not be achieved, the Council has a positive stance on economic development and this is highlighted in the Cabinet report and the adoption of a higher jobs forecast with the associated provision of employment land provides the opportunity for the district to become more self-contained with a lower level of out-commuting. The current ranges do not include any consideration of the potential for growth being accommodated from neighbouring authorities such as from Milton Keynes and the Chilterns AONB. Accordingly, Welbeck and WTGC consider that the number of jobs and new homes should be based on the Experian forecast to both promote and foster economic growth and to ensure an adequate provision of dwellings to meet the housing needs of the population. The approach advocated by Welbeck and WTGC, suggests distribution of new homes, and related jobs, should be a combination of Distributions Scenarios 1, 4 and 5, providing 60% at Aylesbury, particularly to the south and south east of the town; Buckingham Area 10%; Southern Vale 17% and Northern Vale 13%.</p>
104	Diane Clarke	Network Rail									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The Vale of Aylesbury Plan should set a strategic context requiring developer contributions towards rail infrastructure whereby new development will create a significant change in the usage of a part of the transport network and thus generate requirement for new or improved infrastructure and/or station facilities. A policy should be included which requires developers to fund any qualitative improvements required in relation to existing facilities and infrastructure as a direct result of increased patronage resulting from new development. Network Rail would request that the potential impacts from development effecting Network Rail's level crossings is specifically addressed through planning policy, and specific suggestions are set out in their full comments.</p>
6139		Land Improvements		Savills	Worst			Best	Economic led		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>In conclusion, the evidence is clear that growth in jobs and homes over the plan period would rule out Ranges A and B. As a minimum Range C is supported, however, Range D is seen to best reflect the anticipated economic expansion in the District and increased demand for housing from in-migration as the economy recovers. Of the seven distribution scenarios, it is considered inappropriate to consider either a New Settlement (scenario 3) or an urban concentration (scenario 7), whilst these may be sustainable, they would have by far the greatest environmental impact and also require the most infrastructure to be required in order to deliver the options. In addition, they fail to respond to the need for jobs and homes in certain geographical locations in the district. Scenario 1 of maintaining past trends is very similar to scenario 7, following the trend of an urban concentration. However, it fails to take</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											account of the economic needs of the northern and southern submarket areas. For this reason it is rejected. Scenarios 4 and 5 relate to demographic projections and set out very similar distributions across the four market areas. Whilst these scenarios respond to the demand for housing they fail to consider the economic side of the equation, as set out in the first part of this consultation. In addition, scenario 4 is considered to be unreliable being based on the 10 year population trend, especially given the dramatic changes in trends over the last five years. The variation in need and demand for housing across the District is identified in scenario 5, but the scenario does not take account of the potential for job creation especially in the Southern Vale area (as compared to either scenario 2 and 6). For this reason, this scenario is likely to stifle economic growth and recovery in the key locations in the district over the plan period. These scenarios (4 and 5) should be rejected. The only two scenarios that effectively respond to the need for job creation and demand for housing are scenarios 2 and 6. On the whole comments are concerned with the ability to maximise employment growth.
6086		Westcott Venture Park		RPS Planning							Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Range B for housing growth (6,750-9,000) and Range D for Job growth (9,100-12,000). In terms of the consultation document, as a whole the landowner would like to see more encouragement, investment and planning flexibility in attracting/boosting economic development within the District in order to create more jobs and opportunities. AVD should by virtue of its geographical location to London and major road links be at the forefront of attracting economic growth to the District. Investment in the local economy should be the catalyst for developing more homes within the District and not the other way round. Without such economic investment people will not be attracted to the area for work purposes and the District will remain a significant dormitory town for commuter to London. An assessment of previously developed/used land capacity/availability should also be undertaken to inform the Council's emerging Development Plan Document. The existing infrastructure will need to be upgraded over the next 20 years in order to accommodate any planned economic and housing growth in the District.
6087		Stirling Property Management Ltd		Pagusas Planning				Best	Housing need		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Supports findings of Housing and Economic Growth Assessment. 60% of growth should be located at Aylesbury. 'Circus Fields' development site has been promoted. Supports highest levels of growth as considered the SEP to be 'based on thorough research and very considerable debates through public consultations'. The highest range falls below SEP targets of approximately 27,000 new homes between 2006 and 2026.
4173		Redrow Homes (South Midlands)						Best	Housing need		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Redrow Homes consider that Aylesbury should accommodate at least 60% of the District's housing requirements as it would enable provision of housing and associated

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											infrastructure/facilities, contribute to growth in the workforce, enable the creation of new communities, contribute to the delivery of affordable homes, provide opportunities for improved access to and the provision of new green infrastructure, protect the most sensitive landscape/heritage assets in and around Aylesbury (dependent upon the specific location chosen) and assist in the management of flood risk or provide sustainable urban drainage in or around the town. It is also the economic centre for the district. Redrow Homes believe delivery rates are likely to be higher in the coming years compared to recent past delivery rates as economy recovers from an economic recession. Redrow homes endorse the approach of the Housing and Economic Growth assessment and support the removal of the zero net migration option for possible housing ranges.
6088	Mr Iain Stevenson	Carter Jonas			Worst			Best	Population & demographic change	Urban Concentration	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>For Question 5 on the Number of Jobs and Homes, Option D is the best option on the basis that a higher level of growth is needed to meet existing and future need for new homes, particularly affordable. Even with the higher figure of 13,500 homes, this is well below the South East Plan figure (26,900) and historical growth figure (15,000). Any lower figure must be based on robust evidence and defended at Examination. Regarding Q.9 Distribution Scenarios, we believe 'Urban Concentration' to be the worst option because this would result in around 3/4 of the growth in one area i.e. urban extensions to Aylesbury -something previously resisted by the Council and local community. As well as supporting Scenario 4 we would also support Scenarios 2 and 6. We act on behalf of the landowner on the edge of Aston Clinton, so clearly we are seeking to promote the best strategy for this site. Larger settlements, such as Aylesbury should clearly accommodate a substantial amount of growth. There would be benefits of distributing growth to places like Aston Clinton - meeting local housing needs, quicker delivery of smaller sites, sustaining local services, locating at sustainable villages.</p>
1071	Steven Barker	Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd		Various developers and landowners	Worst			Best		Urban Concentration	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>On the matter of housing figures, the ranges offer appear, on the basis of the GL Hearn Executive Summary, to be residual figures having accounted for completions, approvals and allocations. This is a novel and confusing approach and the wisdom of assuming that existing Local Plan allocations should automatically be carried forward and deleted from the 'to find' figure' is questioned if this is to be a clean sheet, ground up approach to settlement planning. That being the case, the range of residuals put forward, even including all 'commitments' barely meet some of the various projections. For example, the net figure in the Experian Growth calculation is just within the upper limit of Range D. The emerging plan needs to set out with more clarity whether figures are gross or net and be more transparent about assumption concerning 'carried forward' sites. As it stands, Range D is the least that should be being considered, to meet likely housing requirements. On the matter of distribution, it is difficult to choose a 'best' option. Of the information available a hybrid of past trends and urban concentration is probably favoured but 'trends' did not yield the 'present policy' of urban concentration and the concentration at Aylesbury proposed in the erstwhile LDF Core Strategy</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											did not reach fruition. Creating a new settlement or settlements in the Vale, which already has to compete with Milton Keynes, is not the answer to solve the problems of dormitory status and lack of infrastructure which affects existing settlements.
770	Charles Firth	The Chiltern Society	Geoffrey Legge	The Chiltern Society							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>The Chiltern Society is only commenting in regard to the villages and parishes in the south of the south of the Southern Vale which are in, or immediately adjacent to, the Chiltern Hills. We do not feel qualified to put general comments on the Vale of Aylesbury Plan where it affects other areas of the Vale. Our comments are set out on the attached (ed. letter summarised by AVDC officer below). We hope they will be helpful to your consultation. AVDC officer summary of cover letter follows:- Please note the Chiltern Society did not choose to tick any boxes in the consultation response form. 1. We feel both houses and jobs should be mainly in towns and areas where good infrastructure exists or has been newly installed or improved. 2. There is no mention of the need to upgrade infrastructure such as water, gas, electricity and sewerage systems. 3. Improvements in infrastructure and especially public transport need to be a high priority in attracting new jobs. The roads along and through the Chilterns are getting overloaded. But we would welcome more job opportunities in the Vale. 4. There is a need to prioritise affordable housing provision and there needs to be a proportion in all new housing developments. Such housing should be located accessible by public transport. 5. Providing more homes will not bring down the cost of them. The market will determine the prices of new housing and funding and economic growth will be important. 6. Development of greenfield sites should be kept to a minimum along with no loss of the best quality agricultural land. The setting of the Chilterns must be preserved. 7. The creation of an Enterprise Zone for Aylesbury might be another way of encouraging more new employment opportunities rather than providing a 'new settlement'.</p>
4469	Mr John Horne					Best		Worst	Continue past trends	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Very little information regarding any new infrastructure. What happened to a Stocklake Link Road, which has been talked about for 20 or more years? Any new development in this area (i.e. Barratts and Circus Field) will result in massive traffic congestion onto an already overcrowded apology for a ring road/bypass for that area (i.e. only single track). No mention of Transport for Bucks plans for this area.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
451		Thornborough				Best		Worst		New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Concerns of the impact particular planning applications might have if permission is granted- Aylesbury east, Hamden Fields. Affordable homes should be for local needs only. A significant proportion of new homes bonus should go back to the community. A particular distribution scenario is not favoured, the best option needs to be balanced economic gain against the rural environment. Brownfield sites should be given priority to be developed before greenfield. When considering new settlements, this should be considered as part of an extension to an existing community, not necessarily a self-contained settlement. Development should have regard to the impacts of HS2 and EW rail.</p>
451		Thornborough Parish Council									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Concerned that the outstanding planning applications (e.g. 2000+ at Bierton) and expected applications could potentially determine the VAP on their own and might not be the most sustainable option. At our meeting of 10th January, NBPPC members were consistent in their reports that their residents had stated a preference for low numbers of new homes in their respective communities, and that any new affordable homes (see 5 below) should be for people with strong local connections. In this respect, Options A or B are more consistent with these preferences than Options C or D. All options appear to polarise advantages and disadvantages: for example, maximum economic gain results in maximum environmental pain. The most acceptable scenario is therefore to strike a balance and to compromise on economic gain in order to protect the rural environment, i.e. the principle of sustainable development¹. After all, it is the rural environment that defines the Vale and is the reason many people choose to live here. Options B and C are therefore more acceptable than Options A or D. In the current prolonged difficult economic climate, and with the demise of the top-down pressure of housing allocation, and with the significant land banks with planning permission as mentioned above, it is difficult to see how the building rates would realistically exceed that of the previous 'boom' years. Options A and B are therefore more realistic than Options C or D. Because of the need for sufficient jobs and affordable homes, there was some support at NBPPC for Option C. Please therefore note: NBPPC fully supports the objective of building more affordable homes, the priority being for families with strong local connections. Therefore, the persistent shortfall in affordable housing, whichever option is considered, is cause for concern. This issue requires additional and more sophisticated attention at strategic and policy level. One way forward is to negotiate with local communities to redirect part of the New Homes Bonus or Community Infrastructure Levy to the provision of affordable housing. Another tool is a more determined use of the Rural Housing Exception Scheme. The causal link between the volume of new development and economic progress is also questionable, given the significant housing growth experienced by Aylesbury and Buckingham in recent years that failed to account for the persistent pressure on employment opportunities. The link between housing and economic progress also depends on the quality of the homes, not just their quantity. The VoA Plan should therefore be one of iteration, imagination, flexibility and quality, not quantity and finger-crossing. The causal link between the supply of homes and</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											<p>their cost is simplistic and misleading. The cost of homes is determined by many other factors, including the demand for homes, mortgage availability and interest rates, salaries, and the attractiveness of the area and the homes themselves. Our policy is not to 'favour' one community over another. In this regard, it is consistent for us not to favour one Distribution Scenario over another. Having said that, there were strong representations against a new settlement in open countryside, and also for the disproportionate expansion of an established community. We therefore request that the following principles be adhered to during the decision making process: a. The responses to this and the previous consultation that ended in December 2011, i.e. the wishes of the local communities and their first-tier councils, should be respected whenever and as far as possible, and meaningful mitigation, in consultation with the communities, be provided when appropriate. b. The principle of sustainable development¹ and not local politics should determine the best Distribution Scenario for the Vale c. Brownfield sites should be developed rather than greenfield sites, and sites should be considered as brownfield or greenfield depending on their current / recent use and aesthetic qualities. d. Community coalescence as a concept or consequence is not discussed in this consultation so cannot be introduced at a later stage of the Plan's development without overwhelming support for such a concept during this consultation. e. The concept of social cohesion should be factored into the decision-making process at this stage. The needs of, for example, households without transport, teens and the elderly should all be accommodated. f. When considering new settlements, the Plan must consider this concept as not only "settlements as self-contained entities," but also "settlements as community extensions" depending on where they may be sited and their impact on other communities. For example, a settlement that is calculated to be sustainable on its own and is touted as bringing some benefits to other communities, may overall adversely impact the sustainability and desirability of one or more of those communities, so should be deemed as unacceptable. g. One concern regarding new settlements is that strategic and service investment would be directed to the new settlement(s), to the detriment of those communities who have needed additional investment for many years. h. A reasonable view must be taken of whether other future developments might proceed, e.g. HS2 and East-West rail, and how these might impact the emerging Plan. However, even the most reasonable views may turn out to be incorrect, in which case the emerging Plan should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the alternative scenarios. i. A significant portion of the New Homes Bonus should be paid directly to those communities who will be affected by new developments, as intended by central Government: we attach our email to AVDC for reference.</p>
426		Marsh Gibbon			Worst		Best		Economic led	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
466		Winslow Town Council			Worst	Best			Economic led	Continue past trends	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Main comments refer to the need to improve the provision of employment and affordable housing in the Vale. Whilst we should also acknowledge the economic recession at the present time.</p>

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
422		Little Horwood Parish Council				Best					No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
411		Great Horwood Parish Council				Best		Worst	Housing need		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Concerns of HS2 and East - West rail, therefore larger scale development is unacceptable. However recognises the shortfall in affordable housing.
460		Westcott Parish Council					Best		Maintaining working age population		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
53	Phil Cummings	Beacon Villages Society									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Beacon Villages Society does not feel able to respond to questions 5 to 11 because we do not have any basis for selecting any particular option of the number of homes/jobs or their geographical distribution. The total number of additional homes that can be accommodated in the area will depend upon so many factors such as the level of infrastructure, services etc. as well as the availability of suitable sites, that it is not possible to judge options in isolation from these factors. At this strategic level it is difficult to do more than make general comments such as that any future housing development should be as sustainable as possible. For instance, be located where there is good access to public transport, either bus or rail, or within walking/cycling distance from employment, shops etc. Whereas we welcome the opportunity to be consulted in the development of the VAP, we feel that we will be better able to contribute once the plan begins to consider options at a more local i.e. village level.
1857	Margaret Robertson	Bucks Badger Group and Personnel			Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. 1. With an ageing population, the ratio of jobs to houses will change. 2. Older residents living in four bedroom houses, whilst wishing to downsize are unlikely to move to 3 bedroom houses. Currently they choose bungalows (no stairs to climb) but these take up more land. In future we will need more apartments in good locations. Shops, buses etc. with a communal garden.
436		Padbury parish council					Best		Urban Concentration		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Whilst we welcome the opportunity to be engaged in this consultation process, and indeed consider it an essential component of localism, we retain some concerns about the validity of the consultation at this stage. Fundamentally, we are not confident that the currently proposed planning policy framework will survive for the next 30 years, and are therefore concerned that our current comments (and any resulting plan) may be used out of context in the longer term. We also note that uncertainties and concerns have been raised against the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which is driving this public consultation

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											<p>process. The Buckinghamshire County Council resolution on this subject (dated 22nd September 2011) highlighted the following concerns (which we concur with):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The vague and conditional language used in the NPPF, especially with regards to the phrase ‘sustainable development’. •The lack of essential detail relating to ‘strategic’ issues such as schools, roads, health support and other infrastructure improvements which would be vital for new development. Housing on its own does not (we would suggest) equal true ‘development’. •The particular concern associated with the presumption for any development to be granted in favour of ‘sustainable development’ in the absence of a Local Development Framework. •In short, the NPPF seems ‘loaded’ in favour of development at any cost, in the hope that this will stimulate economic/wealth growth. This approach seems to be diametrically opposed to the NPPF state aspiration to protect greenbelts and other environmentally protected areas. Similarly, we note the AVDC response to the NPPF consultation dated 11th October 2011. Again, we largely concur with the concerns raised (which again have eroded our confidence in the ultimate value of the current consultation process), especially; •The lack of an inherent ‘Localism narrative’. •The lack of balance between the underlying planning ‘roles’ (prosperity, people and environment), especially with the NPPF emphasis on improving short-term prosperity. •The lack of recognition of the potential gulf between ‘permission’ to build new housing and obtaining funding to do so, especially in the short-term. •The ‘duty to cooperate’ (now enshrined under the Localism Act 2011) could result in the ability of some Local Authorities to ‘pass the buck’ of development burden to neighbouring authorities, because there is no overall direction on planning methodologies or strategies to be taken. We have seen no responses to either of the submissions described above, so can only assume that no amendment to the NPPF has been published. It is our view that, whilst localism is to be largely welcomed as a concept, in practice there is much to be further explained in detail. Planning and development is by its nature a complex issue, and decisions are being asked to be made in isolation, in a strategic vacuum. Long-term (30 year) success is (we would suggest) therefore unlikely. Nevertheless, we regard that the GL Hearn assessment methodology and its results are both reasonable and useful for long-term planning purposes. Padbury Parish Council will raise a Survey Monkey questionnaire on both the Housing and Economic Growth Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, consistent with this narrative response, but would be grateful if they could be read in conjunction with this letter. Whilst we have concerns about the overall utility of this consultation process, we nevertheless welcome the opportunity to be involved both now and in the future development of a viable Vale of Aylesbury Plan.
2504	Mr M. Walker				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Any future development should be restricted to 'brownfield sites'.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
5917		Ivinghoe Parish Council			Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>As a parish council we believe that this survey is very difficult to complete due to the fact that we believe that there should be a jobs/economy survey and a separate one for housing development. This is because although the two are related, they are not directly correlated, not least of all because people live here but don't work here, or work here and don't live here. Also, there is not enough background information on house building completions over the last 20 years. We have found it difficult to consider what is appropriate for the future when we don't have the information to compare to past trends of development. With reference to the question regarding the best and worst of the seven distribution scenarios, we have answered 'urban concentration'. We would like to state that we believe that 'urban concentration' should include development in existing settlements and villages and not contained solely within town settings. 'Urban concentration' should also be taken to mean infilling and not simply adding a block of housing at the outskirts of a town or village as this doesn't create a good chance of new and existing communities integrating. Finally, the survey monkey tool doesn't allow participants to skip a question even if they feel that they cannot answer a particular question or read through the survey in its entirety prior to completion. In addition the construct of the survey does not allow enough room for participants to qualify their answers. This factor is a serious flaw when seeking wider community engagement and likely to put people off from completing the survey.</p>
476	Drayton Beachamp Parish Council					Best		Worst	Urban Concentration		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Concerns about the impacts of HS2, proposed development should have regard to HS2.</p>
423	Mike Le Brun	Long Crendon Parish Council				Best		Worst	New settlement	Maintaining working age population	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Your overall strategy is flawed rather than just building new houses you should:- - Account should be taken of empty/underused property - There are around 12 empty housing association properties in Long Crendon - There is no evidence that you've considered brownfield sites - In Long Crendon we need affordable starter homes and homes suitable for older people, not more executive homes. - No account is being taken of neighbouring development - the significant growth in Thame will have a high impact on Long Crendon - providing much of the housing for this area - Infrastructure in Long Crendon is already overloaded (e.g. schools and sewerage) will be more cost effective to invest in new infrastructure in one new urban concentration rather than spread in many villages.</p>
2371	Mrs C Thompson					Best		Worst	Housing need	New settlement	<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Please bear in mind the huge issue in traffic that will be caused by the Arla Dairy. The roads can barely cope with that, without the extra traffic from new houses. Please keep the majority of the building well away from the Arla area.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
333		National Trust - London & South East Region									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Policies should a) promote and enhance the contributions to heritage and a local sense of place, b) protect the countryside for its intrinsic benefits and the settings of National Trust properties, and c) enhance countryside access and connections for the benefit of recreation and biodiversity and habitat creation. More detailed DM policies should include a 'settings policy' for Stowe Landscape Gardens, and a 'local level landscape' policy to protect the high quality countryside around Aylesbury to the north and north west (Winchenden Hills Area of Attractive Landscape AAL), and a 'green infrastructure' policy to engender connections and public benefits (see attached annex for examples). Key interest of National Trust is to maintain the open and high quality landscape of the North and North-West of Aylesbury (designated as the Brill-Winchendon Hills AAL and the Waddesdon-Hartwell Registered landscape). Considerable weight should be attached to the previously established and comprehensive evidence base of the landscape character assessment, in determining the spatial allocation of new development.</p>
59		Chilterns Conservation Board									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>No preference for any particular growth scenario. Key concern is broad distribution of dwellings and jobs so as not to affect the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and its setting. Any growth in both the Aylesbury Sub-Market and the Southern Vale (both of which are either within the AONB or its setting) will need to be fully considered, properly designed (both built form and any green infrastructure) to ensure it conserves or enhances the natural beauty of the AONB and its setting.</p>
1318		Thames Valley Police		WYG Planning							<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>TVP has no view on the amount and distribution of housing or the amount and distribution of employment land that may be appropriate within the District. However TVP's future infrastructure requirements will ultimately be determined by the level of growth that is planned. Any additional development will impact on services provided by TVP. New developments may create new or altered communities with impacts on policing so additional staff, equipment and facilities will be required by TVP to respond to increased demands on it. Once the quantum and distribution of housing and employment has been determined, TVP will be able to comment on the level of additional infrastructure needed to maintain police services. As the Council is aware, TVP will require funding contributions from future development in accordance with CIL Regulation 122.</p>

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
1390						Best			New settlement		<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Would be interested to learn more about the public interest in the consultation and drop-in sessions, and compared to the number of responses by email and post. Also the total responses compared with the total population of each area. The Plan should not be based on such a relatively low proportion of the general public's views. Instead AVDC should decide the future of the Vale based on our past history and standards of living.</p>
60	Roy Buttery	Roy Buttery Housing Development Consultant			Worst			Best	Continue past trends	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request..
636		Highways Agency									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>Overall amounts of jobs and homes are not something the HA has a view on. PPG13 and related policies ought to mean that few of the housing and jobs will be located near the HA's road network so would cause little effect on our roads. Welcome the aspiration of planning homes and jobs together so that commuting is minimised, although it should be recognised that people cannot be required or assumed to all live close to their jobs. Follow the wider PPG13 policy of locating land uses which are major generators of demand in city, town and district centres and near to major public transport interchanges. Should also try to minimise the increase in congestion on BCC and HA roads and address related effects such as air quality and other SA/SEA issues, particularly with the current Silverstone proposals. Note that the majority of distribution options concentrate new development in and around Aylesbury and the Southern Vale. Broadly support these locations in that they minimise impact on roads needed for strategic use. For the option of a new settlement, cannot make comments until a location is specified. The recent confirmation of funding for East-West rail should now be an influence on the choice of location for new development given likely future road congestion and lack of funds for road building. The scheme will provide new rail services between Aylesbury and Oxford, and Bedford/MK and Oxford and will thus enhance the accessibility of both Aylesbury and Winslow. New housing development could now be planned to capitalise on this and thus reduce the impact on the highway network.</p>
5030		The Coal Authority									<p>Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.</p> <p>As your administrative area lies wholly outside of the current defined coalfield then the Coal Authority has no observations and you do not need to specifically consult the Coal Authority on your emerging planning policy documents.</p>

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
6016		The National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups									Original copy of responses available on request. It is unclear how the Core Strategy will address accommodation provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show people. This is contrary to government policy and evidenced housing need is being neglected or, at the very least delayed, without explanation.
5450	Mrs S Hederson				Best		Worst				Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. I've made comments rather than tick boxes as the UK's economic situation has changes since this was published. Plus the new Winslow station now confirmed moves the whole argument. Good agricultural land will again be needed to produce food not bricks and mortar. The Localism Bill/Act allowing Parish Councils to have a big say must guard against decisions made on petitions as people will sign anything to get rid of the thing without even understanding properly - there must be a fair referendum. 'County Life' commentary on the often petty disagreements at local/village level so wrong decisions could be made. We are more or less in the Midlands and the Chancellors latest decision to have Regional not National Pay levels will lessen the north-south divide and the new Winslow station line will lead people further north putting less pressure on Bucks for houses/obs. So figures should be revised downwards. Listed Buildings must be protected from the creative cycle tracks as must agricultural an floodplains.
3057		Buckinghamshire County Council									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Service by service response given. No specific comment on growth level or apportionment option. Transport : General concentration on existing settlements is supported. Higher levels of development likely to lead to more congestion, however also bring more infrastructure. Careful distribution of growth can however help delivery of other objectives and reduce some congestion levels. Children & Young People : Provides useful pupil yield figures for each housing range and apportionment being considered. General concentration in existing developed areas will help with primary provision, as would new settlement. Upper and Grammar not particularly impacted upon by location. Adults & Family Wellbeing: Useful analysis of service impacts for elderly and specialist care across the range of options being considered. Natural environment team: Preference for a low growth dispersed option, or a high growth concentrated option, driven by environmental impacts and opportunities for mitigation or new green infrastructure.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
65		South Northamptonshire District Council									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Awareness of past joint working between authorities. AVDC needs to consider the planned growth at Brackley and Towcester and not put forward an approach that would undermine this. Supports the consolidation and strengthening of Buckingham's role, and need for awareness of growth at Bicester and A43 corridor. No comment on growth level or apportionment scenario, save role of employment at Silverstone in overall Plan making.
6089		Dacorum Council									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. No growth level selection, apart from that the district should consider potential to accommodate a small portion of additional growth due to the past role of MKSM and low Green Belt coverage. No apportionment option response.
05485		Milton Keynes Council							Urban Concentration		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Some concern regarding imbalance between potential jobs and home numbers, especially if this would mean additional pressure for employment provision in Milton Keynes. Support use of Cambridgeshire Econometric as a realistic assessment of economic forecast. Comment regarding the planned level of growth that the plan can influence versus overall level of growth from existing commitments. Confirmation of no need for planned development from Milton Keynes within Aylesbury Vale according to Core Strategy at Examination, although following this plan period there may be. Should new settlements move forward or significant growth adjacent to MK boundary be required joint working would need to be further considered. Support the urban concentration apportionment option.
03104		West Northamptonshire JPU								New settlement	Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Awareness of past joint working between authorities. Would not support a new settlement around northern Vale edges as this may undermine planned growth at Brackley and Towcester. Supports the consolidation and strengthening of Buckingham's role, and need for awareness of growth at Bicester and A43 corridor. No comment on growth level or apportionment scenario, save role of employment at Silverstone in overall Plan making.
06090		Oxfordshire County Council							Housing need		Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. No comments on level of jobs or homes. Concentration should be on Buckingham and Aylesbury. Concern at some apportionment options if they generated transport impacts on Oxfordshire. Preference for Scenario 5 apportionment option. Support for EW Rail is given, and consideration as to how development can support delivery.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
02110		Wycombe District Council									Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. No specific comment on growth level or apportionment option. As a minimum AVDC should meet own needs, and considers scope of meeting more than this. Impacts on the A4010 in terms of Aylesbury growth and impact upon vehicle movements in Wycombe District should be carefully considered.
06091	Tanveer Mohammed						Best		Housing need		Original copy of responses available on request. Many people are not in favour of the development because it means less green fields. We if we look at historical maps of an town of major cities. The Maps show that in the past most towns/cities only had a small amount of development and as time past, the housing and infrastructure had expanded by building on fields that were close to the existing development. I think the expansion of will create more jobs as there will be more demand by the increase in the number of people living in Aylesbury. Some state apparently show that at the moment there are 4000 people looking for home put that aside for time being as the development will happen, them people not necessarily currently living in Aylesbury may choose to move to Aylesbury. In short Hamden Fields development is good Aylesbury, It is time for expansion.
00461	Hugh Gwilliams	Weston Turville Parish Council			Best			Worst	Economic led	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. The Vale of Aylesbury is fast becoming a building site causing the loss of village life and that sustainability within the villages, and the wholesale destruction of the Chilterns which is already under threat from HS2. Further growth should also be included within Milton Keynes so as to in fill rather than expanding towards Newton Longville/Layton Linlade area.
06141	Rob Taylor				Worst			Best	Housing need	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. . Original copy of responses available on request.
06142	Margaret Beach				Best			Worst	Continue past trends	Economic led	Original copy of responses available on request. This is a very broad brush and rather simplistic consultation which didn't really allow for a great range of understanding and feedback.
06143	Mr Carslake	C/O Agent: Origin3	Harry Sedman	Origin3					Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Origin3 do not believe that the growth scenarios take proper account of the associated evidence base nor adopted and emerging policy and guidance. Origin3 suggest higher growth options are identified which relate more appropriately to the projected population and household growth and housing need. None of the 4 growth options represent a proper interpretation of the evidence base, PPS3 'Housing' or the levels of growth previously proposed in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East (The South East Plan) accepting

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											that a reasonable adjustment could be made for more recent household projections from CLG/ONS. Even the highest growth option available will not provide an adequate amount of new housing to meet Aylesbury Vale's projected population increases or affordable housing. The South East Plan went through an extensive plan making process utilizing a robust evidence base and determined the housing provision in the district should be double the highest growth options proposed in this public consultation. Origin3 consider that the distribution of housing growth should be planned for in conjunction with employment provision. Therefore Distribution Scenario 2 'Economic Led' and Scenario 6 'Maintain working age population' comprise the most sustainable and balanced option. Origin3 support the provision of significant levels of housing and employment at Haddenham within the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Plan. Haddenham represents a sustainable location for growth due to its existing and growing role as an employment centre in the district given its strategic employment allocation at Haddenham Business Park, excellent road links to the M40 and west London and mainline rail services to Birmingham and London. None of the alternative Distribution Scenario's suggested in the Consultation Document place enough weight on the Southern Sub area and specifically Haddenham as a settlement that can accommodate future growth.
00079	Jane Hennell	British Waterways									*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Important waterways assets in the District. 33km of canals in the District, particularly relevant to Aylesbury submarket and southern vale due to the presence of the canal network. Cannot comment at this stage in detail on the impact that proposals may have but will do so as the plan progresses.
05083	Mr D Fowler	L7 Enterprises Limited			Worst			Best	Continue past trends	Economic led	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06147	Stuart Scott-Ely	En-Site Developments			Worst			Best	Continue past trends	Economic led	Original copy of responses available on request. The Priority over the life of the next plan should be to increase employment opportunities close to where people live and to make provision for additional housing close to existing services, utilities and infrastructure. I would prefer the council to adopt a policy of "plan for the worst but hope for the best" when it comes to identifying and allocation land for future development. It must not be forgotten that the plan will not have powers to make development happen and so the allocation of any particular area or site is no guarantee that it will be developed during the life of the plan. Far better to have more potential sites than too few to start with. This will promote competition amongst developers which will ultimately control the rate of price increases caused primarily by supply demand imbalances.
06151	James Griffiths	Kier Homes			Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06118	Ian Orton	Buckingham Society				Best		Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. There seems to be an implicit bias to more rather than less development given the way the various options are presented. There also seems to be an implicit assumption that if housing allocations are made economic activity will automatically follow. Not sure if this follows. Also not sure if this takes account of all the recent approvals in the Buckingham and potential developments at the University
01103	Dave Oxley				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. We need to focus on jobs and maintaining town centres. Just building houses is not the solution, though it does give short term boost to building sector. Flood plains are there for a reason, and building on them is not it. Unless the road infrastructure is upgraded building lots of houses is just going to increase congestion and pollution. With the cost of train fares going ever upwards at way above inflation and the poor links from Aylesbury we're not building a sustainable town.
00447	David Starr	Stoke Mandeville Parish Council			Worst		Best		Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Comments summarised by AVDC. Copy of full comments available on request Comments refer to HS2 which is likely to result in loss of potential development land for the parish.
02999	Frank Donlon					Best		Worst	Housing need	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request.
06156	Messrs Koopman		Richard Tilley	CGMS Ltd	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. The Consultation Document does not indicate whether the Duty of Co-operation in meeting needs likely to be deflected from districts subject to widespread Green Belt controls, has been considered in formulating any of the options, even those incorporating higher levels of growth. The evidence included in the Consultation Document and its supporting documents, shows that the current urban concentration strategy is failing to provide sufficient jobs and housing to meet the need within the rural areas of the District, most particularly in the Southern Vale. There is no evidence that there are any over-riding environmental concerns which would inhibit the Southern Vale from accommodating the higher rates of development required to address its needs for additional housing and jobs. This weakness in the current policy-framework should be addressed in the new local plan by concentrating a higher proportion of new development in the Southern Vale.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06157	Sally Fletcher	Januaries	Sisters of St Louis		Worst			Best	Urban Concentration		Original copy of responses available on request. Even though the highest growth scenario of the options presented has been selected in the questionnaire answers, it is considered that this is too low for the District. The level of growth represents an average level of provision which equates to less than half that of the CLG 2008 based projections for Aylesbury Vale 2006- 2026 (1440 dwellings per annum) and half that of the current RSS9 requirements (1345 dwellings per annum). As a consequence, it is considered that the growth predictions will fail to meet the required demand in the District. The shortage of the existing land supply was identified in the recent Appeal decision (APP/J0405/A/2152198) when it was agreed between all parties including the Council that there was only 3.15 years of deliverable supply in and around Aylesbury Town Centre. The level of growth suggested for Aylesbury therefore fails to acknowledge the current inadequacy of supply of land in and around the sustainable Aylesbury Town Centre and is considered to be contrary to guidance in PPS3 and the emerging NPPF.
05514	T Backus				Best			Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Both the employment and housing endeavours appear to be being driven forward without sufficient impetus being placed on supporting and enabling infrastructure. A prime example is the roads, as Aylesbury has 6 main access/egress routes but only one of these is a dual carriageway; this lack of forethought creates significant bottlenecks especially at peak times and should be a serious limiting factor to any further development in either employment or housing. Power and communications systems also appear to be at capacity as the area continues to suffer from power black outs and has limitations on bandwidth and capacity. There needs to be a marked increase in investment in these areas before any further housing is created, this of course should not preclude the necessary investment in other infrastructure of education, medical, environmental and social support; however, most worryingly is the apparent lack of employment increase at an equitable rate to that of housing.
05513	Helen Backus				Best			Worst	Continue past trends	Housing need	Original copy of responses available on request. Our roads are full to capacity now, unless the developers agree to build an Aylesbury by-pass first, no more development should happen.
06158	Jonathan Harbottle	land & partners limited			Worst			Best	Population & demographic change	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. please let us avoid NIMBY local protectionist - it is too important we get it right - the development industry needs to step up to the challenge with higher quality more sustainable design (one of the main reasons no local wants development is that it is generally poor quality and ugly - it does not have to be this way and AVDC is rightly proud of its progress on design) and to engage more with communities - one example of localism is to use sites and linked developments to bring forward privately funded flood alleviation solutions

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
00757	Brian Robson					Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. This is a very complex consultation document and is therefore likely to result in a low level of response from members of the public. As provision of, or ensuring the most cost-effective use of both existing and new, infrastructure is fundamental to the sustainability of any substantial development, why is there not a distribution scenario "Infrastructure led"?
01031	A Tomblin					Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00019	Lesley Tims	Environment Agency									*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Online survey was too restrictive. At this high level stage of consultation, we do not have a preference on the level of growth or the broad locations. Our role within the LDF process is to work with your Authority to ensure that the decided level of growth is delivered in an environmentally sustainable way, delivering environmental enhancements where ever possible. In order to deliver this it is essential that decisions are made on a robust evidence base. We are working closely with your Authority on key evidence base documents, including an update to the District wide Water Cycle Study and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, which will inform decisions on growth levels and potential locations. We are confident that these studies are progressing in a detailed and timely manner in order to fully inform The Vale of Aylesbury Plan. Once these studies are complete, it is important that the conclusions are used to inform future decisions on acceptable levels and location of growth in relation to environmental impacts. They should also be used to inform policy to be included within The Vale of Aylesbury Plan to ensure environmental protection and enhancement over the plan period and beyond. Specifically, the WCS study will identify potential constraints in terms of growth levels and locations in respect of water quality and water resource and will identify where improvements/upgrades are required in order to deliver spatial growth decisions. The update of the District wide SFRA (along with the WCS) will allow a Sequential approach to growth locations to be taken and will help identify further investigation and mitigation as required in order to ensure flood risk is not increased, and is decreased where ever possible.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
05485	Diane Webber	Milton Keynes Council									*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Some concern regarding imbalance between potential jobs and home numbers, especially if this would mean additional pressure for employment provision in Milton Keynes. Support use of Cambridgeshire Econometric as a realistic assessment of economic forecast. Comment regarding the planned level of growth that the plan can influence versus overall level of growth from existing commitments. Confirmation of no need for planned development from Milton Keynes within Aylesbury Vale according to MK Core Strategy at Examination, although following this plan period there may be. Should new settlements move forward or significant growth adjacent to MK boundary be required joint working would need to be further considered. Support the urban concentration apportionment option.
01226	James Holmes MRTPI	Brian Barber Associates		AZURIE OS LTD	Worst			Best	Urban Concentration	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. Southern Road Aylesbury Site Reference 001/054 It is important that sufficient new homes are built in the Aylesbury Sub Region to meet existing and future housing needs. My clients land at Southern Road, Aylesbury (comprising of part of site reference 001/054) is suitable for such development. The land was accepted as suitable for residential development in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for Aylesbury. The site has been linked with the TRW Systems site to the east which is currently been marketed as suitable for residential development on the Instructions of Aylesbury Vale District Council. The SHLAA assumed that only 50% of the site would be developed for housing because the Council has stated that it should retain some employment uses. The Council states that an element of employment is necessary as South East Plan policy seeks to "maintain a one to one relationship between jobs and new dwellings". Subject to further discussions with the council, if the eastern part of my clients land is rezoned for housing, he would be prepared to enter into agreement that the remaining land to the west will be developed for employment use as per the consent already granted. Planning permission was granted on 16 August 2006 for the development of the western part of the site to provide eight industrial/warehouse units for Class B1 (c) and B8 use with alterations to the existing access and associated parking. Detailed layout/design work has not been undertaken at this early stage, however, it is envisaged that the site could contain a relatively high density residential development in view of its central accessible location.
06159	Mr M Woodford		David Hignell	Jeffrey Charles Emmett	Worst	Best			Housing need	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
00917	Dean Gill	Vale of Aylesbury Housing Trust			Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. None of the options outlined deal with the key issue of affordable housing. All options state that the numbers will not meet affordable housing targets. The Council need to define the targets, communicate these and explain how they will be met. The Council should lead on enforcing local management of new affordable housing to overcome the problems whereby affordable housing is stigmatised and not seen as integral to the sustainable future of the local area. Guidance on tenure mix needs to be provided i.e. what will be the policy for new homes with regard shared ownership, or for older persons, or rural housing etc. What is the policy on property sizes to meet current and future needs i.e. 1/2/3/4 beds.
00426	Cllr Ian Metherell	Chairman, Marsh Gibbon Parish Council			Worst						Original copy of responses available on request. Small village communities are dying due to lack of small scale housing development opportunities. We need to ensure that the small communities survive by allowing limited housing development where appropriate and in keeping with the area.
06194	Carolyn Cumming					Best		Worst	Urban Concentration	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06160	Rebecca Carveth					Best		Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06161	Alan				Worst		Best		New settlement	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06162	Cliff Hide					Best		Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. The east-west Oxford to Milton Keynes railway provides a once in a generation opportunity to rebalance the district away from just being about Aylesbury. Expansion to the south of Aylesbury would merely continue to feed workers into London despite all the empty promises from developers about local jobs. Most journeys would also be by car and contribute to an already chronic peak-time congestion problem to the south of Aylesbury (due to be made worse when the Arla diary opens and HS2 construction work begins). London commuters spend little in the local economy as the high (and increasing) number of empty retail units in Aylesbury testify. In contrast development to the north, in particular around the new station at Winslow, which would be connected to Oxford, Milton Keynes and Aylesbury by train, is a significantly greener option. Additional infrastructure could be easily (and cheaply) built. Economically more money is likely to remain in the district rather than being sucked into London.
05549	Ian Whipp					Best		Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. Letter submitted separately.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06163	Roger Landells					Best		Worst	Population & demographic change	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. Whilst it might be considered good that a consultation has taken place it seems to me to be "going through the motions". On-line surveys are all very well but clearly exclude a huge proportion of the population who either do not use public places or have not had the good fortune to stumble over the item on your web site, which, it may surprise you to learn is not the first place that many of us visit. This has to be one of the most important issues for Aylesbury Vale, I am a Parish Councillor, our District Councillor has not once mentioned this consultation at meetings or elsewhere. It is therefore difficult to believe that decisions have been made, questions have been written to sustain the decisions and hopefully there will not be too great a response.
05800	Kate Ward				Worst	Best			Population & demographic change	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. I realise a need for balanced growth in our district is essential. However I question the changing whims of Government and the way we have to tow the line in this direction or that! I do feel appropriate infrastructure for our villages needs to be addressed before any change of building patterns and job need analysis takes place; as in most villages our infrastructure is outdated (i.e., roads not fit for purpose and rural shopping spaces being run down) and budget should be spent on this prior to developments. As I don't know the resources available (you can't possibly just build or sell land without awareness of a cap!) I worry about heavy handed developers grabbing land in rural areas and think infill and small clusters of 'fit for village purpose' housing is best. I hope(!) Neighbourhood Plans will succeed in protecting communities from the big money developers and inappropriate housing. I believe the need for local jobs will emerge further along the line when the Village Plans and Neighbourhood Plans amalgamate and local people take more control and become empowered to work for their communities.
06164	MacLennan		Andrew Wright	Kirkby & Diamond	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. The vibrancy of towns and villages is paramount and defines the role of community that is typically neglected in developing a strategic plan. To follow the trend of urban concentration will ultimately become exponential with all new development focused on a single conurbation. The effect on community and well-being, demographic distribution and, social infrastructure would be very negative. The role of the rural areas and, the towns and villages within the rural areas, is integral and vital to developing a strategic plan that will provide homes and employment, distributed through the district as a whole. In the absence of a plan that will create economic activity throughout the district, provide new homes for all - across all sectors - social cohesion will become weaker and communities will become degraded.
06165	Mr and Mrs Harvey		Jennifer Lambert	Jennifer Lambert	Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. The focus of this new plan should be to provide additional homes and jobs in villages such as Padbury so that the villages are not left to stagnate. There is a need to encourage growth that

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											brings with it homes of a variety of sizes and tenure and jobs for those living in the community and surrounding rural area. This will allow additional social and community facilities to be provided and a more sustainable environment to develop.
	Anonymous							Best	Maintaining working age population		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00436	Cllr Ken Roberts	Padbury Parish Council					Best	Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Whilst we welcome the opportunity to be engaged in this consultation process, we are not confident that the currently proposed planning policy framework will survive for the next 30 years. We also note that uncertainties and concerns have been raised against the draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Buckinghamshire County Council resolution on this subject highlighted concerns (which we concur with) relating to vague and conditional language; lack of essential detail relating to 'strategic' issues and particular concern associated with the presumption for any development to be granted in favour of 'sustainable development' in the absence of a Local Development Framework. Similarly, we note the AVDC response to the NPPF consultation which again have eroded our confidence in the ultimate value of the current consultation process including the lack of an inherent 'Localism narrative' and 'duty to cooperate' which could result in the ability of some Local Authorities to 'pass the buck' of development burden to neighbouring authorities. In short, the NPPF seems 'loaded' in favour of development at any cost, in the hope that this will stimulate economic/wealth growth. This approach seems to be diametrically opposed to the NPPF state aspiration to protect greenbelts and other environmentally protected areas.
01156	John Gilbey					Best		Worst	Housing need	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. It is vital that the rural environment of the Vale is protected whatever the development options chosen. Also none of the options seem to fully address the lack of affordable housing and so new initiatives are required to try to address this problem. With the advent of HS2 and East-West rail it is of concern that with large numbers of homes to be built in addition that the Vale will become just a major building site for the next 20years.
00431	Mrs M S Hedges	Nash Parish Council				Best		Worst	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. Nash Parish Council has already submitted a response as parish council. Small rural communities can absorb infill housing but, without shops, schools, pubs etc., are not suitable for significant expansion and would not want the scale of expansion that would justify those developments. Hence NPC's belief that the concentration of the development should be concentrated in urban areas, where there already are facilities that can be expanded. Nash Parish Council believes in the preservation of the Green Belt and so supports more moderate expansion, having decided to express a preference for Range B.

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
	Robert				Best		Worst		Continue past trends	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous				Worst			Best			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00392	MARGRET SMITH, CLERK	BIERTON WITH BROUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL				Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. PARISH COUNCILLORS CONSIDERED THAT THE COMPLEXITY OF THE ISSUES/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WILL DETER MANY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC FROM COMPLETING THE RETURN. PLEASE NOTE WE HAVE ALSO SUBMITTED A PAPER COPY OF THIS RETURN
01226	Nigel Ozier	Brian Barber Associates	Mr T. Brown		Worst			Best	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Question the validity of the consultation process. Questions were heavily weighted towards positive responses and prevent a proper objective assessment of the options. Simply ticking boxes of leading and positive statements is not an objective way of achieving informed responses to the issue of growth. Indeed, it is noticeable that there is no option for anyone to agree with the levels of growth which were approved as part of the South East Plan (SEP). The consultation process is not considered to be fair or balanced and fails to allow a proper response to the issues in question. It clearly seeks to restrict comments to within a certain range and through the choice of statements to choose from, obtain a positive bias in any responses. The process does not follow best practice and the overall is of concern. The approach adopted by the consultation process fails to take an objective look at the issue of growth. It seeks to restrict comments to scales of growth desired by the Council and ignore previous evidence on housing requirements which have been tested at independent examination. The questions have been designed to be restrictive and obtain positive answers. The consultation process is therefore not fair or transparent. In terms of the key issues, it is considered that even the higher levels of growth are too low and will not provide the quantity of development necessary for the area. The growth levels of the SEP were adopted following examination and are, therefore, sound. There is no evidence to justify the relaxation of these. Indeed, a reduction in growth levels conflicts with the Government's clear policy of encouraging sustainable growth in support of the economy and to address the deepening housing crisis in the country. The range of growth options set out fails to address these issues and, in particular, on the matter of affordable housing. The majority of new growth should be directed towards Aylesbury as the major town in order to achieve the most sustainable option for growth. In terms of locations for growth around the town, the option to the north-east represents a viable scheme to deliver around 1700 dwellings. The development would deliver 1700 houses including affordable properties, social infrastructure as well as a link road. The link road will connect with existing projects and provide an important element of infrastructure for the town, clearly necessary to be delivered before other sites to the east can come forward. The land was included in the draft Core Strategy and was proposed following consideration of its suitability. Therefore, notwithstanding the arguments over the level of growth required, in terms of locating the land identified represents an appropriate,

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											sustainable location.
05791	Mrs J Pickup				Best			Worst	Population & demographic change	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. One of my major concerns with any development is the problems associated with traffic and the 'rat running' through villages, particular as at present in Newton Longville with traffic coming off the A421 to the bypass at Stoke Hammond A4146. The infrastructure must be in place prior to any developments, whatever the numbers.
00432	Mrs Sylvie Eames	Newton Longville Parish Council			Best			Worst	Population & demographic change	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. Localism - about what the communities 'reasonably' want/need. Give and take approach may be required but the big concern in Northern Buckinghamshire is I before E - no further housing without first providing required infrastructure. (Roads at grinding halt!), hospitals full etc. Creating more homes than jobs - add to welfare state at time of economic crisis! Major 'employment' centres Aylesbury/High Wycombe/Milton Keynes are already beyond capacity.
00405	GRAHAM WYLIE	EAST CLAYDON PARISH COUNCIL			Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Housing need	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
05621	Andrew McQuiggin				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. I have lived in London, Aylesbury and now the village of Newton Longville. If there is genuine growth in demand for housing in Aylesbury Vale, arising from within the area rather than migration from the rest of the UK or elsewhere, then the most sustainable way forward is to allow villages to grow 'organically' at the level to their community decides, and have the bulk of the growth at the existing urban centres.
06166	Josh Davis				Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06167	Nick Canham				Worst			Best	Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06168	Chris Glenn				Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
05828	Mr T Welch					Best		Worst	Housing need	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. I remain very concerned that additional infrastructure funding will be insufficient whatever scenario is chosen, particularly since the banks have broken the UK's public finances. Health, Social and Transport infrastructures, in particular, are highly pressured now, in our area, and that is a very significant concern for me. Augmenting existing communities appears a far more sustainable way of accommodating e.g. older and younger people's housing needs whilst retaining community cohesion. Establishing brand new communities does not, based on my life experience to date, simply because with an existing community there is something already there for new people to integrate into. To me the villages seem sensible for active consideration to enable accommodation of older people, particularly given the demographic changes of an ageing population that we are now seeing forecast. Looking forward: As the plan develops I would certainly wish to see policies developed that protect the character and identity of the vale as well as accommodating needed housing. This must include retaining those policies and contexts that are still appropriate from the existing district local plan. I also wish to see forward looking policies that provide solutions to the many climate change challenges that we face, such as proactive support e.g. for local solar energy generation schemes. I definitely wish to see policies developed to protect ingress, into the district, from neighbouring local authority areas, especially those that threaten the character and identity of existing settlements and civil parishes within the rural vale.
02996	Elizabeth Bryson				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
02997	John Bryson				Best			Worst	Continue past trends	Economic led	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06169	Steven Mitchell				Worst			Best	Population & demographic change	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous					Worst		Best	Economic led	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
04569	Barbara Watson				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06170	c/o agent	Bloor Homes Ltd South Midlands Division	Max Whitehead	JS Bloor (Services) Ltd	Worst		Best		Economic led	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. A minimum number of homes which should be planned for are 16,200 or 5,144 taking into account existing commitments between 2006 and 2031 based on the GLHearn report. However we do not believe it is consistent with national guidance and the Councils SA which indicates very clearly the negative effects this would have on the SA objectives. Not providing enough homes to match potential employment growth my encourage unsustainable commuting patterns. We believe the distribution of housing numbers should be based on how to best match housing delivery to employment growth, whilst ensuring housing need is met where it arises. Distribution scenario 'new settlement' and 'urban concentration' are inappropriate and should be discounted. A combination of 'economic led', 'housing need' and 'maintaining the working age population' would be a suitable basis to move forward.
03269	Tony Strevens				Best			Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06171	Claudia Philips				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06172	Andrew Lock	GRE Land Limited	Nigel Moor	Planning Pilots Ltd	Worst			Best	Urban Concentration	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. The UK economy is struggling to recover from the global economic downturn. The Government wishes the planning system to facilitate employment growth. Previous planning strategies for the district have been strongly housing led but both in terms of meeting the employment needs of those occupiers in the housing areas already committed and the employment needs of future population growth, there needs to be a clear focus on the adequate provision of employment land. We support the target figure of 12,000 jobs in Range D of the consultation exercise, and in terms of distribution, support the urban concentration option. This number of jobs will require approximately 120 Ha of employment land at a density of 100 jobs/Ha. This density figure may appear low but it is a guide commonly used to estimate employment land needs. Much of the district's employment park development has been built at a ratio of about 40% coverage. This is typical of developments elsewhere. Where employment development is found acceptable outside built-up areas, it is often accompanied by landscaping to protect the visual amenities of the area, and the site coverage will be less than on more urban sites. In addition many employment parks now contain shopping , social and recreational facilities for those working on the parks. On the basis of the urban concentration option much of the additional land will need to be found in the Aylesbury area.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											GRE Land Ltd are assembling a strategic employment area to the south of the Aston Clinton by-pass of 25Ha. An access appraisal report has been carried out by RPS which indicates that adequate vehicular access can be provided to the area from the local and sub-regional highway network. There are no over-riding constraints to the employment development of the land on grounds of agriculture, ecology, landscape, flooding, noise or archaeology. The area is accessible to the village of Aston Clinton in terms of local services, and there is public transport to Aylesbury. In terms of a strategic employment area this is sustainable site, and in land -use planning terms relates well to the Arla Dairy site currently under construction north of the Aston Clinton by-pass. GRE Land Ltd wish to bring this site to the attention of the Local Planning Authority at this early stage so that it can be evaluated during the consultation stage of the Vale of Aylesbury Plan, and would wish to discuss with the Local Planning Authority what additional information they would require in order to assess the suitability of the land as a strategic employment area.
03353	Mrs Greta A Gibson					Best		Worst	Economic led	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00445	Alison Kennedy	Stewkley Parish Council		STEWKLEY PARISH COUNCIL		Best		Worst	Continue past trends	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. The development plan should be based on actual gross housing estimated increases rather than the current plan which excludes approved, but unfinished, building developments. The preference is for low numbers of new affordable properties in communities rather than large developments. The most acceptable scenario is to strike a balance between economic gain and protecting the rural environment, i.e. sustainable development. The new homes bonus scheme should be shared between communities with new development and AVDC in line with the stated intent of central government.
	Anonymous				Worst			Best	Urban Concentration	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00394	Mr. C. Wayman	Buckingham Town Council					Best		Housing need		Original copy of responses available on request. 1. No. of houses should be independent of jobs provided; Buckingham can act as an employment hub for its hinterland, but villages can have houses they want without providing employment space 2. The Northern Vale should be linked with Buckingham. The ability to access the questions before filling in the questionnaire would have led to a fuller discussion and response.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
03595	Rachel Webb							Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. It is refreshing to be consulted at such an early stage. Thank you. The reasons provided in this survey are incomplete and often poorly worded. Some of the pros/cons of the various options are misleading: e.g., the cost of buying homes is not solely related to the number of homes built. The decision to divide the Vale into North and South and the actual division is arbitrary and puzzling. What about an Eastern and a Western Vale? The previous draft Core Strategy identified some key villages, e.g. Wing, Haddenham; this concept should be incorporated into the development of the VoA Plan for consultation at an early stage.
06173	Lee Scott	Smiths Gore	All Soul's College	c/o Smiths Gore		Best		Worst	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. The college consider it important to maintain the quality of life and economic vibrancy of the rural area. The college is concerned that the rural areas strategy will focus on conservation of the countryside rather than maintaining vitality and vibrancy of the rural environment.
06174	Nigel bates	Bluemark projects limited			Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. A policy of limited development of a sufficient scale to help support existing schools / pubs / shopping in existing settlements spread around the district would be more sustainable than single urban concentrations. This would help retain existing facilities rather than continue the trend of erosion of facilities as the existing population becomes older. It is possible to integrate new population and housing into towns / villages without "swamping" the existing character.
	Anonymous				Best				Economic led	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06175	Andrew Wright	Kirkby & Diamond			Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. The vibrancy of towns and villages is paramount and defines the role of community that is typically neglected in developing a strategic plan. To follow the trend of urban concentration will ultimately become exponential with all new development focussed on a single conurbation. The effect on community and well-being, demographic distribution and, social infrastructure would be very negative. The role of the rural areas and, the towns and villages within the rural areas, is integral and vital to developing a strategic plan that will provide homes and employment, distributed through the district as a whole. In the absence of a plan that will create economic activity throughout the district, provide new homes for all - across all sectors - social cohesion will become weaker and communities will become degraded.
03346	Mr R H Stansfield					Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06140	Faisal Bin Feroze	NSN			Worst			Best			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
05991	Dwight Coughlan						Best				No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous				Best					New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
01054	Mr Ian Gibson					Best		Worst	Maintaining working age population	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
03846	Patrick White				Best			Worst	Housing need	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Nobody has explained the need to expand Aylesbury. Communities can evolve without the need to expand. The decline of printing in Aylesbury did not mean the death of the town. Better by far to improve what we have, particularly infrastructure and maybe once this has been achieved take stock, since for sure there is plenty of room for improvement in what exists. Not so glamorous but better for the inhabitants of AVD.
06001	Llew Monger				Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. By far the most sustainable area for further development is Haddenham. There is ample land available where development would not impact adversely on the existing community. Haddenham already has an effective by-pass (A418), a rail service linking the community with both London and Birmingham, a bus service linking it with Aylesbury and Oxford, a state of the art Health Centre, two local schools and local shopping. Within three miles lies the market town of Thame which is the prime shopping centre for Haddenham residents and Aylesbury is just eight miles away. The employment site has land available for extension and for some time has had an 'anchor' employer of international status. Despite all this AVDC appear to have been unwilling to focus significant development in this area. Why?
3734	Andrew Muir	CPRE Vale of Aylesbury			Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	*Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request. Conclude from the evidence published that it is appropriate to base the growth of new housing on the growth of new jobs across the District; it is likely that few, if any, new jobs will be created within the District over the next 20 years; therefore it is appropriate to base the growth of new housing on the assumption that there will be zero net jobs growth across the District over the next 20 years; there will be no need for any new major housing developments anywhere in the District (such as those proposed for Fleet Marston, near Stoke Mandeville, east of Broughton or west of Linslade); there will be no need for any new housing allocations in Aylesbury, given the lack of progress to date at Berryfields and Weedon Hill; and there will be a need for a modest number of new housing allocations distributed across the remainder of the District to accommodate demand from the existing population, such as retired and

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											elderly people. The overall numbers of net new jobs and homes which should be planned for the District are zero and 4,500 respectively. The pressure for new houses will be particularly strong in the towns and villages of the rural areas of the District. Given the failure to complete the Berryfields and Weedon Hill sites there is clearly no need for any new major housing developments anywhere in the District (such as those proposed at Fleet Marston, Berryfields north, near Stoke Mandeville, east of Bierton, west of Linslade and at Great Horwood airfield).
	Anonymous				Best					Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous				Best			Worst			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06195	c/o RPS		Sav Patel	RPS		Best		Worst	Continue past trends	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. yes, see letter submitted under separate cover
00957	J.R. Stevens					Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Having been involved in the support of our local Parish on planning issues for the past 12 years. It is time that local opinion is allowed to dictate the future environment in which we live.. AVDC must not be steam-rolled by their own aspirations or by developers into any more grandiose projects which are contrary to the local population's wishes.
02633	KEITH W MILLER					Best		Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06140	Faraz bin Feroze	Nokia			Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. Development should be on the roads and rail link to big cities
06144	Saima Qamar				Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. All areas in the district should be provided with equal opportunities for jobs, economic and resources development. Thanks Saima

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06145	Qamar Khan				Worst		Best		Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. For sustainable growth and providing equal opportunities to all areas it is suggested to plan jobs and homes in areas that are close to road networks. In this way, there will be less resources required to develop infrastructure facilities. More jobs will be created locally to benefit local people and young generation. Thanks for providing this opportunity for contributing in Aylesbury local development. Qamar Khan
01835	Roy Johnson				Best			Worst	Economic led	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. I am not a believer in big is beautiful hence I have selected the low build and most spread out options as I think the pain should be shared. Obviously if there is a need for more housing then a more intensive option would be required; however even the low build option is going to add to the gridlock and pollution on the roads in and around Aylesbury which is already a problem. Therefore it must be said that whilst we might live with it for the lower build option, any more building would necessitate a properly constructed bypass and I believe that this should be a prerequisite before additional building is taken on.
02780	Mr M.A.Knight				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. This area cannot sustain any more than the minimum number of new housing that must be proposed. Unemployment has never been an issue here so more than a minor increase in jobs is unnecessary. Anything more would feed the need for housing on an upward unsustainable spiral changing this area irrevocably for the worse. Throw in HS2 and nobody would want to live or work here! All of the quality of life issues for the existing population would be compromised otherwise. This includes transport, air quality landscape, heritage, biodiversity, water and climate change.
02357	Linda Ward				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. This consultation now needs to factor in the impact of HS2 disruption and changes to services and infrastructure that will be affected by this major project
	Anonymous							Best	Urban Concentration		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
04603	Ian Draper	Syresham Parish Council, Northants				Best		Worst			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
					A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06146	Gerry Gallagher				Best				Population & demographic change		Original copy of responses available on request. The format of tying a range of additional homes to a range of new jobs is too rigid, you should be thinking more along the lines of more local jobs to reduce the effect on infrastructure and commuting. As well any particular scenario may be the best for homes but worst for jobs but your electronic questionnaire does not allow that facility but your paper one does. Equally, is it jobs or homes that are driving the answers, your questionnaire doesn't allow you the facility to identify the respondents primary objective.
01045	Chris Webbley			Chris Webbley Associates Ltd		Best		Worst	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Thank you for the clear way you have set forth these options and questions. CW
	Anonymous				Best	Worst			Continue past trends	Economic led	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous							Best	Population & demographic change		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
00409	Victoria Firth	Granborough Parish Council				Best		Worst	Continue past trends	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. Felt there could have been more information in this survey - no information regarding air quality and climate change, but questions in which it was relevant.....
	Anonymous				Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
	Anonymous				Worst			Best	Urban Concentration		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
05896	Neil Davis	Davis Planning		London and Slough Properties Ltd	Worst			Best	Urban Concentration	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06148	Dean Bunyan					Best		Worst	Economic led	Maintaining working age population	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
05917	Christabel Boersma				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06149	Garry McWhirter				Worst			Best	Housing need	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. Small village communities are dying due to lack of small scale housing development opportunities. We need to ensure that the small communities survive by allowing limited housing development where appropriate and in keeping with the area.
	Anonymous							Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06150	David Ball				Best			Worst	New settlement	Maintaining working age population	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06152		Commercial Land Ltd	Sarah Round	Savills	Worst			Best	Urban Concentration		Original copy of responses available on request. With on going changes in national planning guidance, development policies must be worded to allow any site to be assessed against policies which support sustainable development, and if it is considered to be sustainable and meeting a need then it should be viewed in a positive light. Any unnecessary or arbitrary restrictions on the location of development should be avoided where at all possible. Levels of development should be based on specific housing need at the relevant point in time and not be based on a historical decision. Dividing the District's overall housing and employment targets into specific areas at the time of the VAP's adoption has the potential to create an unnecessary and arbitrary restriction or limitation on development. The sub-areas create broad site allocations, which creates boundaries for development with specified limits to development in each area. In light of national planning guidance and the expectation of all sites being considered in terms of sustainable development, these are unnecessary and should not form part of the VAP. VAP should place the responsibility for bringing forward sites for development at the local level in order to meet local need. Neighbourhood Plans or similar would allow for localised decision making. Where there is an identified need for new housing or employment then these should be supported by the VAP and assessed in terms of sustainability to ensure that development occurs in the locations where it is specifically required and without restriction by sub-areas. Also essential that communities are not able to arbitrarily block developments or there is a risk that suitable proposals could be derailed for non-planning reasons. Also the VAP should include a rural exception policy to help ensure provision of affordable housing in locations where larger developments may not otherwise be suitable. *Comments summarised by AVDC. Original copy of responses available on request.
	Anonymous				Best				Continue past trends		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06153	Anna Baker				Best			Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. I think it is important for villages to keep their identity. Extending housing in and around Weston Turville runs the risk of this area becoming a suburb of the main Aylesbury Town which is not good for the residents or the surrounding countryside.
02020	Jackie Brown					Best		Worst	Population & demographic change	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06155	Sara Cannon				Best			Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. There is a glut of new build property in the area, especially in the 'affordable' homes category. I have a two-bed flat that's been on the market for nearly FIVE years. The price is right, the area right, but I can't offer the deals that the developers do, so I can't buy a different house. This leads to market stagnation. It's all very well helping first time buyers, but what about first time sellers. There are many others I know of in this situation in Aylesbury too.
06176	John White			None	Worst			Best	Housing need	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. The plan needs to take every opportunity to allow development and growth in the area consistent with providing aesthetically attractive development that we all would be proud to be associated with.
06177	Michelle Parsons							Worst			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
02937	Neil Edwards				Best			Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. The need for more house building at all should be questioned. The reasons given of providing homes for more people just doesn't seem to add up when there are already plenty of houses on the market. All this building does is suck in demand from others, which then leads to pressures for more job creation, which in turns leads to demand for more housing and so on. No thought seems to have been given to where the increased water supplies, for example, will come from when the existing supply is under acute strain. There seems to be blind mantra towards build, build, build without care or thought for the consequences.

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06178	Camilla Andrews				Best			Worst	Housing need	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. We have had a lot of homes built in the area over the last few years, many of which have been built on floodplains, admittedly efforts have been made in some instances to raise the level of the land to compensate but this merely pushes the problem elsewhere, so new houses increases flood problems rather than alleviating them. You can build homes but you cannot guarantee jobs will magically arrive even if you provide the opportunities for new businesses, so you will end up with more people in the area, fewer jobs in relation to the people in the population, and consequently more disgruntled people in the population. New homes are supposed to be more sustainable but developers will always build to a minimum standard to keep costs down for those buying the houses and to increase their profits. Self-builders, on the other hand will build up to the best specification they can afford, and their biggest efforts are often directed towards sustainability.
06179	Peter Hooper				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Economic led	Original copy of responses available on request. Wendover has recently had two very large housing developments. Princes Mary Gate illustrates the strains and pressures this can put upon a community, particularly on its resources. It is overcrowded and lacks usable green space. I would ask that AVDC protects the open area off Lambe Road by designating it as undevelopable land.
	Anonymous				Worst			Best	Maintaining working age population	Urban Concentration	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06180	Ms G O'Dell				Best			Worst	Economic led	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. I feel that our green spaces need to be protected, not only in Aylesbury but also surrounding villages. Jobs need to be developed in the area to provide employment for any number of additional houses. Also, any money the developers 'give' to Bucks County Council or AVDC towards extra education, sports or leisure facilities MUST be ring-fenced for what it is intended to be spent on - not swallowed up in budget deficits. Some of the questions within this consultation are really quite confusing for individuals. People living in the community are not Planning Officers. I work for a District Council and deal with planning to some extent, but I struggled to answer some of the questions (didn't understand them). Did you first 'test' it out on a community sample to ensure each question is understood and therefore you are getting valid results? If not, your results may not be valid I am afraid.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06181	Webber				Worst			Best			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06182	Peter Rose				Best			Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. No one wishes for these massive developments in the area when there is large amounts of brown field sites, which if developed would 1 enhance the region and 2 allow the green spaces between villages and most especially between Aylesbury and the villages to be maintained. By saying new jobs will be created, this does not actually mean new jobs will be created, look at how much un-used office space there is already in the local area. More houses will just mean more commuters. The hospitals, roads, health centres will not cope with 1000's more commuters.
02548	Alan Thomas					Best		Worst	New settlement	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. Aylesbury needs a ring road. The town is jammed throughout the day with traffic from the A41 and A418
00427	Robert Kennedy	Marsworth Parish Council			Worst			Best	Economic led	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. WE SHOULD PLAN TO INCREASE THE NO. OF JOBS BY MORE THAN THE WORKFORCE, AND THEREBY REDUCE COMMUTING OUTSIDE THE AREA. HOMEWORKING, OR COTTAGE-WORKING SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED MORE TO CUT TRAFFIC.
06183	N Lock				Best			Worst	New settlement	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. Expanding existing villages and towns always leads to objections and compromise. Why not bite the bullet and put in a new town or village on a new railway link and make a show piece, environmentally sound and carbon neutral development
03959	Trevor Lewis				Worst		Best		Continue past trends	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. We all need the ELR. No homes, no road, and Aylesbury will stagnate and die
06184	John Wilkinson				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. Option A is the preferred option with regard to the number of new homes. It will meet the housing need necessary to accommodate the demographic changes without over supplying. An oversupply of new homes would simply lead to even more out-commuting for employment. The Urban Concentration option is the most sustainable one because it puts new homes and jobs where most of the existing services and infrastructure are currently located. It is not feasible to attempt to duplicate those existing services and infrastructure elsewhere in the district. Improved services in the main centres of population rather than

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
											enhanced but still very limited services elsewhere, has to be the most cost effective way forward. None of the scenarios appear to consider the recently announced confirmation of the East/West rail link which must result in more growth in the Northern Vale. All the options considered assume a very low ratio of new jobs to new homes. A ratio of between 1 and 2 will be necessary if the current situation of more outward than inward commuting from the district for employment is to be reversed.
00407	Mrs Lin Sargeant	Edlesborough Parish Council			Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	Original copy of responses available on request. The lowest number of new homes is the favoured option (Option A), because it would meet the housing need resulting from demographic changes, without over supplying. An oversupply of new homes would simply lead to even more out commuting for employment. The Urban Concentration option has to be the most sustainable option because it puts the largest proportion of new homes and jobs in Aylesbury where most of the existing services and infrastructure are already located. It is not feasible to attempt to duplicate those services and infrastructure elsewhere in the district. None of the scenarios appear to have considered the recently announced confirmation of the East/West rail link which must result in more growth in the Northern Vale. All the options assume a very low ratio of new jobs to new homes. A ratio of between 1 and 2 will be necessary if the current situation of more outward than inward commuting for employment is to be reversed.
01147	Richard Wise				Best			Worst	New settlement	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06185	Rick Avory				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	Original copy of responses available on request. Please leave Wendover alone. It already has 400 dwellings on the PM Gate site, along with associated trouble-makers in the "social housing". The infrastructure and schools can't cope. Please keep new developments to the urban brownfield sites.
06186	A D Fanthorpe				Best			Worst	Continue past trends	Housing need	Original copy of responses available on request. Not sure that I understood the scenarios in the previous section to be detain I have made the preferred choice.
03269	Tony Strevens	Bierton with Broughton Community Plan Steering Group			Best			Worst	Housing need	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. Bierton with Broughton Community Plan Steering Group object to the intention that the Strategic Development Control Committee will determine the application by Barratt Homes for outline planning permission for land east of Aylesbury BEFORE the results of this consultation have been analysed and reported to AVDC cabinet and BEFORE alternative sites have been subject to public consultation. There is no need to rush through consideration of one site other than to avoid an inspector because it has been rejected twice before.

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
01045	Ann Webbley					Best		Worst	Maintaining working age population	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06187	Michael Brimicombe	retired			Best			Worst	Population & demographic change	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. It is important for our grandchildren that any expansion is sustainable - so no expansion at all is probably the best solution.
Anonymous	Anonymous						Best	Worst	Continue past trends	Population & demographic change	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06188	Mr C Narrainen				Worst		Best		Urban Concentration	Population & demographic change	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
03665	Wendy Illsley				Best			Worst	Population & demographic change	Urban Concentration	Original copy of responses available on request. You have provided very little information about how you will provide the infrastructure in Aylesbury Vale to meet any of the proposed development scenarios. Without a huge investment in a road structure, especially in Aylesbury and through routes to the rest of the transport network you will not attract business to this area. Aylesbury already grinds to a halt if there is even a minor traffic incident and the proposed increases are not sustainable. The town centre is dying and shops are pulling out of town. The proposed shopping development is only proceeding with massive council investment. The only decent public transport links are into London. Everyone shops out of area unless they want discount stores. All this needs to be sorted out as part of the development plan, funding identified and roads built at the same time as the housing.
00041	Mrs V Lynch	British Horse Society			Best			Worst			No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06189	Nathan				Worst			Best	Economic led	Housing need	Original copy of responses available on request. I would like to see an infrastructure plan for Aylesbury before answering these questions

AVDC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Stage 1 Public Consultation Summary of Responses

Reference Number (where contact details are known)	Individual/ Client Contact information		Agent contact information		Housing and Employment Options				Distribution scenarios		Further additional comments
	Name:	Organisation:	Name:	Organisation:	A (0-3,000 jobs & 4,500 - 6,750 homes)	B (3,000 - 6,100 jobs & 6,750 - 9,000 homes)	C (6,100 - 9,100 jobs & 9,000 - 11,250 homes)	D (9,100 - 12,00 jobs & 11,250 - 13,500 homes)	Best Distribution scenarios	Worst Distribution scenarios	
06190	Rosie Mobsby				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	New settlement	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
03474	G Armstrong						Best		New settlement		No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06191	Alan Sherwell				Worst		Best		Housing need	New settlement	Original copy of responses available on request. Whilst I would expect development to concentrate near Aylesbury, it is important that villages get more homes for the sons and daughters of village residents. Winslow cannot take more now but, if it gets its new rail link and station, then it should be expected to take more houses and jobs too
	Mrs Smith				Best			Worst	Urban Concentration	Maintaining working age population	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.
06192	John Day				Best			Worst	Maintaining working age population	Continue past trends	No further comments received. Original copy of responses available on request.