

VALE OF AYLESBURY LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Inspector: Paul Clark BA MA MRTPI

Inspector's Questions to the Council:

Q29-30

Q29 I've now finished looking at the representations made on chapter one of the submitted plan. These cover wider areas of the plan than just chapter one and so I have begun to get a feel for what might constitute matters and issues for discussion at the hearing sessions.

No doubt this understanding will be widened as I read more of the representations but, based on what I have read so far, I would appreciate the Council's response to the following points raised in some of the submissions related to housing targets, the spatial distribution strategy, housing mix and affordable housing.

(1131 Ainscough Strategic Land, 1199 Mike Galloway for Newton Longville PC, 1096 Laura Humphries and David Hutchinson of Pegasus Group on behalf of Cala Homes, 1917 Renshaw Watts and Rob Riding of Pegasus Group for Revera Ltd, 292 Neil Salisbury for CPRE, 1128 Neil Tiley of Pegasus Group on behalf of Waldridge Garden Village Consortium, 1909 Mark Behrendt of HBF, 1020 Judith Onuh of Thakeham, 1525 and 1724 Christopher Roberts of Turley Associates on behalf of Bellway Homes, Persimmon Homes and Cala Homes, 2274 Brian Flynn of Carter Jonas on behalf of the South West Milton Keynes Consortium, 1082, Hannah Bowler of Turley Associates on behalf of I M Land, Ed Norris of DLP planning Ltd on behalf of September Properties, Geoff Culverhouse of North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium, 1041 Portia Banwell of Alder King on behalf of Minton Health Care (Bucks), 1873 Myles Smith of Lichfields on behalf of GRE Assets, 2651 Joanna Berlyn of Sirius Yorkshore on behalf of FCC Environment, 1089 John Gately of Savills on behalf of Crest Strategic Projects (particularly his Appendices 5 and 6), Dr Sean Carolan of Winslow Town Council, Michael Knott of Barton Willmore on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd)

I appreciate that the points may be answered simply by my looking at the evidence base, in which case it will be enough for the Council to point me to the relevant part of the evidence base but, where the evidence base does not provide the answer to the point, the Council may wish to take this opportunity to provide me with more information, rather than wait for the hearing sessions themselves. The papers submitted by Neil Tiley of Pegasus Group, by Christopher Roberts of Turley Associates, by Brian Flynn of Carter Jonas, by Geoff Culverhouse of North Bucks Parishes Planning Consortium, by Myles Smith of Lichfields and by Michel Knott of Barton Willmore are particularly strongly argued.

- i. Whether it is justified to base the housing requirement for VALP solely on an analysis of the "best fit" HMA for the four Buckinghamshire authorities, bearing in mind that Aylesbury Vale itself is fairly evenly split three ways between the Oxford, Milton Keynes and South Bucks HMAs, has a significant relationship with the Luton HMA and directly borders the developed area of Milton Keynes.
- ii. Whether it is justified for VALP to make provision for a defined quantity of housing demand displaced from Wycombe, Chiltern and South Bucks in advance of adopted Local Plans for those areas defining the quantity of unmet need to make no provision for unmet need displaced from Luton when there is an adopted plan for that area which defines the quantity of displacement which Aylesbury Vale is likely to experience.
- iii. Whether it is justified to adjust the demographic base on which the housing demand is predicated to such an extent that population growth and housing demand counterintuitively projects a downward trend both in opposition to DCLG's upward trend and in contrast to the levels of housing delivery recently achieved in AVDC. (points made concern migration rates, UPC rates, household formation rates and commuting ratios)
- iv. Whether the market uplift for affordability should be 10% or higher.
- v. Whether likely delivery rates overall and the delivery rates achievable by a concentration on large allocations around Aylesbury represents a deliverable and therefore effective strategy
- vi. Whether and how the strategy of allocation to smaller settlements by capacity is justified
- vii. Whether the requirement for affordable housing should be varied between different parts of Aylesbury Vale
- viii. Whether policy H6 requirements for special needs housing take adequate account of the critical mass required for such provision.

Q30 My earlier Q6 raised the question of the soundness of delegating substantial provisions of the plan to Supplementary Planning Documents. In addition to the examples listed in that question, representations made have brought me to the realisation that policies T1 and T3 may effectively delegate the formulation of transport policies and proposals to the Buckinghamshire Local Transport Plan and impose a planning requirement for development proposals to comply with that plan and so, in effect by-pass the statutory requirements for affording the opportunity to make representations on the policies and proposals concerned. I would therefore appreciate receiving the Council's observations on the soundness of this approach.

4th April 2018