

**Q62**

**Inspectors Question:**

I would welcome the Council's response to representations 2289-99 from Brian Flynn of Carter Jonas on behalf of the South West Milton Keynes Consortium, 449 from Iain Stewart MP, 723 from Cllr Ben Everitt, 889 from Mr Christopher Wayman and 2637 from Cllr Robin Stutchbury both of Buckingham Town Council, 1198 from Mike Galloway of Newton Longville Parish Council, 1454 from Tim Welch, 2468 from Jackson Planning, 2472 from Jon Wellstead of Milton Keynes Council in respect of allocation D-NLV001

**Representation:**

Bryan Flynn Carter Jonas 2289-2299

Paragraphs 4.110 to 4.119 and Policy D-NLV001 provide the policy and supporting text for an urban extension on land at South West Milton Keynes; the site is incorrectly referred to as Salden Chase and we request that it is changed. We support the proposed allocation identified in Policy D-NLV001. The allocation reflects the fact that in June 2017 a resolution was made to grant permission subject to a S106 Agreement for a mixed use residential development for up to 1,855 dwellings (Application Ref. 15/00314/AOP) – see report to Strategic Development Management Committee on 7th June 2017. The S016 Agreement is at an advanced stage and the decision notice should be issued shortly.

The decision to grant permission for a mixed used residential development at South West Milton Keynes reflects the quality of the proposed development, the mitigation measures and package of enhancements provided; and the sustainability credentials of the site, both in terms of location and overall mix of development. In summary, the proposed development will provide for up to 1,855 dwellings, an employment area, a neighbourhood centre, land for a primary school with early years provision, land for a secondary school, substantial green infrastructure; and associated SuDS, highway and transport infrastructure.

The proposed development is adjacent to Milton Keynes and reflects characteristic features of the City, such as self-contained residential neighbourhoods surrounded by substantial areas of open space and strategic landscaping; it will connect to the existing grid road network and with the existing walking, cycling and public transport network. The site is a sustainable location for development and the proposed development has all the attributes of sustainable development, by including landscape and biodiversity features, providing a mix of uses, additional housing, including affordable housing; and being accessible by walking, cycling and public transport.

**Policy D NLV001 & Paragraph 4.110 to 4.119**

During the planning application process, all of the potential significant impacts on the site were identified and assessed, including the impact on the highway network and on the landscape. It was concluded overall that the proposed development should be supported because the adverse impacts are significantly outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. The SWMK Consortium comprises both developers and housebuilders, all of whom are experienced at delivering large scale mixed use developments of the type proposed in Allocation Ref. D-NLV001; and the site is either owned by members of the Consortium or is

controlled under option. The proposed development is viable and deliverable, and will make a contribution towards the five year housing land supply. In these circumstances, it is entirely appropriate to propose the allocation of Site Ref. D-NLV001 and we request that this proposal is retained. We support the proposed allocation, but suggest some minor amendments to the draft policy to reflect the approved development and for clarity and consistency with other strategic allocations.

Pg.114 of PSVALP includes the Concept Masterplan for the proposed development. We note that no masterplan is provided for any other strategic allocation and we request that it is deleted for Policy DNLV001. Paragraph 4.118 refers to a requirement for a masterplan supplementary planning document to be prepared for the site. The requirement for a masterplan is unnecessary and misleading in the circumstances where a resolution to grant planning permission has already been made. An Illustrative Masterplan and Parameters Plans were submitted with the planning application (Application Ref. 15/00314/AOP) and both plans were used to assess the impact of the proposed development and were referred to in the determination of the application.

We request that all references to Salden Chase in Paragraphs 4.110 to 4.119 and Policy D-NLV001 are deleted and that the site is referenced as South West Milton Keynes which is consistent with the application nomenclature; it also more accurately reflects the location and is consistent with the proposed urban extension to the east of the City (SEMK) in emerging Plan:MK. The name 'Salden Chase' was referred to in former development plan documentation for a considerably larger urban extension that included the site (Draft Salden Chase Masterplan & Delivery SPD) and was used for the planning application for a proposed development of up to 5,390 dwellings. It is unhelpful to continue to refer to the site as Salden Chase, it is incorrect and confusing.

Changes requested:

- We request that the Concept Masterplan for Policy D-NLV001 on pg.114 of PSVALP is deleted.
- We request that the requirement for a masterplan to be prepared for Allocation Ref. D-NLV001 at Paragraph 4.118 is deleted.
- We request that all references to Salden Chase in Paragraphs 4.110 to 4.119 and Policy D-NLV001 are deleted, and that the site is renamed South West Milton Keynes.

#### **Responses:**

The request suggesting the site is renamed to South West Milton Keynes is acknowledged and will be changed in any references to the site in question. The name used in the plan after all relates to an earlier much larger development area so the change will eradicate any potential for confusion

The request suggesting the deletion of the concept plan is however considered to be unjustified. The rationale of retaining the concept plan in the policy is that it is an approved plan and forms part of the submission for the outline application 15/00314/AOP. Other proposed strategic site allocations do not include concept plans as these sites are not at an advanced stages in the development management process as D-NLV001.

The rationale behind the masterplan is clearly explained within the site allocation explanatory text. The flexibility of the policy wording under the 'Implementation Approach' can make provision to allow the illustrative masterplan and parameters plan to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document at a later stage subject to the finalisation of the s106 agreement and determination.

#### Iain Stewart MP 449

As the Member of Parliament for Milton Keynes South, I object to this and any other development that extends the urban footprint of Milton Keynes in the absence of strategic plans being developed for the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge corridor. I do not oppose such a development in perpetuity but this development is premature.

As they stand, developments such as Salden Chase will place unacceptable demands on Milton Keynes infrastructure and public services, most notably local roads in Bletchley.

We also do not yet know the route of the new Oxford-Cambridge expressway nor the final scope of East-West Rail. It may be the case that such projects will enable a sustainable development such as Salden Chase in the long-run but common-sense dictates that such a decision cannot be made now.

At the very least, a decision on Salden Chase should be deferred until the scope of the Corridor is known.

#### **Responses:**

Regarding the suggestion of the proposed allocation placing unacceptable demands on Milton Keynes infrastructure. Milton Keynes Council have been fully involved in the consultation and have set out a number of s106 requests for contributions towards: early years school places, library facilities, health facilities, waste management, emergency services and voluntary sector projects.

Regarding highway impacts on local roads in Bletchley. The proposed policy is supported by an agreed Mitigation Package on the A421 corridor will mitigate local impacts on the highway network. This will maintain the position that traffic impacts would not be considered 'severe' in the context of NPPF paragraph 32.

Recognising that the route for the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway has yet to be agreed the site allocation proposals have identified highway measures to accommodate its growth on existing and improved networks including link improvements. The intention is whichever expressway route is agreed both it and the proposed site allocation should not be comprised on access or capacity grounds. The current concept plan was devised with this in mind.

#### Cllr Ben Everitt 723

The placement of this site on the boundary of Milton Keynes means the net economic impact will not benefit Aylesbury Vale. In fact, the location of the site is out of kilter with the main economic centre of gravity within the rest of this Plan. The two enterprise zones near Aylesbury are supported by existing and potential future infrastructure, while this proposed site relies on already-overstretched infrastructure and services of a neighbouring authority.

This Plan is sound. It would be even more effective if this allocation were better suited to serving the major points of economic growth in the Vale.

This allocation should be redeployed to other sites more appropriate to supporting economic growth beneficial to the Vale and to the areas identified in the emerging Newton Longville Neighbourhood Plan.

Suggestions:

850 to D-AGT3 to further meet the demand generated by employment and economic growth stimulated by enterprise zone

850 to D-AGT4 as 155 to Newton Longville, as the emerging Neighbourhood Plan has made allocation for a similar figure

**Responses:**

Regarding the suggestion of the proposed allocation relying on over-stretched infrastructure and services from Milton Keynes. We reiterate that Milton Keynes Council have been fully involved in the consultation and have set out a number of s106 requests for contributions towards: early years school places, library facilities, health facilities, waste management, emergency services and voluntary sector projects.

The proposed site allocation conforms with the principles of the settlement hierarchy in terms of a sustainable location for growth. The settlement hierarchy is based on an assessment of population size, settlement connectivity, and the availability of employment and other services and facilities within Aylesbury Vale however the location adjacent to Milton Keynes ensures that like sites on the edge of Aylesbury the availability of facilities and the size of the population ensure that the allocated site is in a sustainable location..

The proposed development would also include small scale retail/ community uses within the neighbourhood centre to provide a further element of Local employment. 0.67Ha of land is allocated for a neighbourhood centre which will comprise a mixed use space for local retail and other services to include retail (A1), financial and professional services (A2), a family public house (A4) and takeaways (AS) and community and recreation uses (DI and D2). Retail provision on the site would be modest and limited to only providing convenience needs for the residents of the new development, ensuring no impact upon existing services and facilities in the area in line with NPPF advice.

Further the proposed allocation will create in excess of 150 construction jobs on site, for the majority of the duration of the development of the project. It is also estimated that once fully constructed, the new development will create approximately 1,880 new permanent jobs, 621 fte arising from the proposed employment land and 1,261 fte from the neighbourhood centre, schools and supporting on site community facilities / services, depending on the exact types of businesses that occupy the new units. It is also predicted that the completed development will generate a figure of £48,230,000 arising as support for the local economy, this being a reflection of gross median household incomes derived from the Council's monitoring data. The Retail Assessment concluded that the turnover of the proposed food store will be £4,380,000 whilst the housing will generate £10,160,000 of convenience retail expenditure to the local economy.

The proposed site allocation will not only provide additional employment land and the direct creation of jobs which weighs in its favour, it is acknowledged that the construction of the development in itself would contribute to the economy of the area and so too would the resultant population growth in supporting local businesses, facilities and services with increases in expenditure estimated in the ES as well as the new services the development includes. It is therefore considered that the proposal would give rise to a number of economic benefits, which should be afforded significant weight in the overall planning balance.

Christopher Wayman Buckingham Town Council 889

A secondary school is mentioned in the box pertaining to key development and land use requirements but the site specific requirements as to Education only make mention of provision of land for new schools and pre-school facilities. As part of Buckingham County Council area, residents will be eligible for Grammar School places under the 11+ scheme. Given the attraction and reputation of the local Grammar schools, and the land falls within the catchment area of the Royal Latin School in Buckingham, some provision should be made for a contribution to this school in addition to the new secondary school as it might be assumed that as 11+ exam results in the selection of around 25-30% of primary school children [even allowing for those individuals who elect for the new secondary school; faith schools in Milton Keynes; private education or home schooling] a significant number of secondary school pupils may well attend the Royal Latin School. The school itself believes that it is one of the most underfunded schools in England & Wales at the current time.

There is in fact a potential answer given in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan [part of the Supporting Evidence to VALP, at p.23] which suggests that it would be better to redraw the boundary of Milton Keynes to include this expansion from a point of view of schools, thus making it a catchment area for Milton Keynes schools as opposed to Buckinghamshire County Council's selective grammar school system.

However, this policy is not set out in VALP, and if in fact Milton Keynes Council is not prepared to accept this proposal [there is no indication in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan of any consultation on this or the likelihood of it being delivered/agreed] then VALP remains ill-equipped to deliver on education for the District.

### **Responses:**

Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) have raised no objections to the application in its current form on sustainability grounds. In terms of educational facilities, the application makes provision for a 3 form entry primary school, with Early Years Pre-school facilities on 3.0 Ha of land and a secondary school on 5.2 Ha of land. Provision is also made for accessible recreation and community uses to serve the new residents, designed and located with the intention to be complementary to the delivery of the new schools. An Education Statement has been provided in the planning statement to support the proposal. proposition. The proposed allocation will fund the provision of an appropriate number of additional grammar school places and secondary school places in accordance with the County Council Planning Obligations Policy. Whether secondary school place provision, if decided to be within the proposed allocation will be an annex extension to an existing grammar school, an extension to an existing secondary school or a standalone secondary school is a decision that must be left to the Decision Maker, which depending upon circumstances would be the County Council

In summary BCC have advised that primary, secondary and special schools including Children's Centre provision within the planning area of the proposed allocation are all currently or projected to be at capacity. The lack of long term housing plans causes significant difficulties for the Local Authority with regard to its ability to effectively plan for additional secondary and special school provision. The proposed allocation proposal borders Milton Keynes so may well impact on schools across the border. Both local authorities will need to work together to ensure that the effects of the proposed allocation are most effectively mitigated. Notwithstanding these issues, should the application be approved the County Council would require the developer to make contributions based on the indicative mix of homes provided in accordance with the policies set out in its "Guidance on Planning Obligations for Education Provision":

Cllr Robin Stutchbury Buckingham Town Council 2637

a. Salden Chase – NLV0001 – Provision as to education – a secondary school is mentioned in the box pertaining to key development and land use requirements but the site specific requirements as to Education only make mention of provision of land for new schools and pre-school facilities. As part of Buckingham County Council area, residents will be eligible for Grammar School places under the 11+ scheme. Given the attraction and reputation of the local Grammar schools, and that the land falls within the catchment area of the Royal Latin School in Buckingham, some provision should be made for a contribution to this school in addition to the new secondary school as it might be assumed that as 11+ exam results in the selection of around 25-30% of primary school children [even allowing for those individuals who elect for the new secondary school; faith schools in Milton Keynes; private education or home schooling] a significant number of secondary school pupils may well attend the Royal Latin School. The school itself believes that it is one of the most underfunded schools in England & Wales at the current time. 5.2.1 There is in fact a potential answer given in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan [part of the Supporting Evidence to VALP, at p.23] which suggests that it would be better to redraw the boundary of Milton Keynes to include this expansion from a point of view of schools, thus making it a catchment area for Milton Keynes schools as opposed to Buckinghamshire County Council's selective grammar school system.

**Responses:**

Please see response to Christopher Wayman Buckingham Town Council 889 above

Mike Galloway Newton Longville Parish Council 1198

15. Salden Chase – Sites adjacent to Milton Keynes 15.1. It is important to bear in mind the history behind the promotion of this site on the edge of Newton Longville parish and immediately adjacent to Far Bletchley. It did not arise through any demonstration of local need but as a result of an arbitrary reallocation of potential housing need from elsewhere in the South East.

15.2. With no choice but to comply with the South East Plan, AVDC included development around Milton Keynes within its then draft Core Strategy in 2009. The site had for some time been promoted by those with a development interest in the land, but never with any demonstration there was a specific need for the development, other than to meet a general need for growth in the South East.

15.3. Following the election of the coalition government in 2010, AVDC decided to withdraw their draft plan and the then current planning application for Salden Chase was withdrawn after AVDC withdrew its support for the application.

15.4. A new application for a reduced site reappeared in January 2013 with a request to AVDC for a scoping opinion. It seems some developers did not understand the message from the government that top-down planning was no longer government policy.

15.5. The decision letter from AVDC27 in September 2013 on a scoping application made nine months earlier reveals the extent of the disregard by public bodies to the duty to cooperate, with AVDC having to say “Regretfully, despite subsequent reminders, I have not received any comments ...” confirming the draft scoping report proposed was therefore acceptable. There is no indication any view was sought from Milton Keynes Council despite the duty to cooperate or any consideration of development of a joint policy between the two planning authorities.

15.6. Meanwhile, earlier, in early 2010 the Milton Keynes Core Strategy was subject to statutory consultation prior to submission. After the announcement by the new government that Regional Plans were to be abolished, the submission was put on hold.

15.7. Given the significance of this site to Newton Longville and Bletchley the most relevant parts of that version of the Core Strategy are reproduced in full below. Note how even though none of the development was within the boundary of Milton Keynes Council, they were nevertheless very clear on policy requirements for development of the site.

15.8. It is clear from this that the development of the area which had become known as “Salden Chase” was not something that had been promoted by Milton Keynes Council but was a classic example of top-down regional development which was very clearly abolished by the new Government in 2010 to be replaced by localism.

15.9. It is also of note that whilst Milton Keynes Council took action to revise its Core Strategy and protect communities, AVDC chose instead to withdraw its draft Core Strategy and have no policy on strategic development.

15.10. At some point in the future it may well be that Milton Keynes Council can demonstrate it has unmet housing need that it cannot find land for within its own boundary but that is not currently the situation and as is clear from the diagram below there are significant areas of Milton Keynes to the north and east that are largely undeveloped and do not have any fundamentally unsurmountable constraints which would prevent land being brought forward for development – apart from being primarily rural in nature at present. Any need for growth of Milton Keynes should first be dealt with inside the boundary Milton Keynes borough.

15.11. Whilst the site which is now proposed to be allocated is only the eastern half of the original “Salden Chase” or “South West Milton Keynes Strategic Development Area” this is the part closest to Milton Keynes.

15.12. From the February 2010 draft Milton Keynes Core Strategy (see extract in Appendix 3) it is clear that even though Milton Keynes Council did not support the concept of the South West Milton Keynes Strategic Development Area they had to accept it was being forced on

the area by the government's regional strategy. They therefore put in place very detailed policies that would apply to the site.

15.13. Things changed dramatically following the election of the coalition government in May 2010. The new Secretary of State wrote to local authorities on 27th May 2010 saying he would be abolishing Regional Spatial Strategies including the South East Plan.

15.14. Milton Keynes Council decided to put things on hold awaiting clarity. Once clarified they modified their Core Strategy and removed the policy and text above referring to a South West Milton Keynes Strategic Development Area.

15.15. Aylesbury Vale District Council however chose to withdraw its Core Strategy so leaving a vacuum, so starting "planning by appeal" within Aylesbury Vale until a new plan is adopted.

15.16. Milton Keynes Council revised their Core Strategy and published it in October 2010. Ultimately, with modifications, it was found sound and adopted in July 2013. (Note there was a delay until the formal revocation of the South East Plan which took effect in February 2013.)

15.17. In describing the process leading to the now adopted Milton Keynes Core Strategy, they said on page vi: "Following the advice of the Government's Chief Planning Officer, Milton Keynes Council took the opportunity to review its plans for the future of the Borough without the housing targets imposed at a regional level. This led to the preparation of a Revised Proposed Submission version of the Core Strategy, which included lower housing targets to reflect a 'realistic' forecast of housing completion rates, the removal of the South East and South West Strategic Development Areas that had been a requirement from the South East Plan, and the formal allocation of four Local Plan Strategic Reserve Areas in the South East of the city to deliver some 2,500 homes." "The revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (South East Plan) removed the requirement for the South West Strategic Development Area in Aylesbury Vale. However, if any new development sites are promoted and allocated on sites adjoining the city but in the area of a neighbouring local authority, they will require proper planning as sustainable urban extensions to the city. This would be considered through joint working with neighbouring local authorities and should be addressed (if necessary) through the replacement of this Core Strategy with Plan:MK."

15.18. In the revised Core Strategy, what had been policy CS5 "South East Milton Keynes Strategic Development Area" became "Strategic Land Allocation" covering sites within the Milton Keynes boundary.

15.19. Policy CS6 which had been "South West Milton Keynes Strategic Development Area" became a more generic rather than location specific "Place-shaping Principles for Sustainable Urban Extensions in Adjacent Local Authorities". Comparison with the policy above shows the wording is largely based on the content of the previous policies CS5 and CS6. "Policy CS6" "Place-shaping Principles for Sustainable Urban Extensions in Adjacent Local Authorities" "When and if development comes forward for an area on the edge of Milton Keynes which is wholly or partly within the administrative boundary of a neighbouring authority this Council will put forward the following principles of development during the joint working on planning, design and implementation:" "1. The local authorities will work jointly, and with infrastructure and services providers, to achieve a coordinated and well designed

development. "2. A sustainable, safe and high quality urban extension should be created which is well integrated with, and accessible from, the existing city. Its structure and layout should be based on the principles that have shaped the existing city, especially the grid road system, redways and the linear parks and strategic, integrated flood management." "3. A strategic, integrated and sustainable approach to water resource management (including SUDS and flood risk mitigation) should be taken. "4. The design of development should respect its context as well as the character of the adjoining areas of the city "5. Linear parks should be extended into the development where possible to provide recreational, walking and cycling links within the development area and to the city's extensive green infrastructure and redway network. "6. Technical work to be undertaken to fully assess the traffic impacts of the development on the road network within the city and nearby town and district centres and adjoining rural areas, and to identify necessary improvements to public transport and to the road network, including parking." "7. A route for the future construction of a strategic link road(s) and/or rail link should be protected where necessary." "8. New social and commercial facilities and services should be provided, and existing facilities improved where possible, to meet the day to day needs of new and existing residents." "9. The opportunity for new 'Park and Ride' sites for the city should be fully explored and where possible provided and efficiently and effectively linked to the city road system." "10. The local authorities and their partner organisations should produce an agreement on appropriate mechanisms to secure developer contributions towards improvement and provision of infrastructure to support the development, including facilities in the city that will be used by residents of the development area."

15.20. The allocation of Salden Chase should be removed. Inclusion of the site renders the draft plan unsound. It is contrary to other policies in the plan, is not justified or positively prepared. Allocation of what is to all intents and purposes a strategic new settlement that did not even score in the independent New Settlement study is clearly perverse. The details of the site within the policy do not even indicate it is cross boundary application subject to an EIA which amongst other things means that consent is required from Milton Keynes Council as well as Aylesbury Vale. The continuing delay in bringing forward the development shows how unlikely it is to be able to make any contribution to the 5 year housing land supply any time soon.

#### **Responses:**

- Whilst informative it is not considered that the long history overrides its suitability as a development site as concluded by the HELAA and the site has been considered afresh in the light of a sustainability appraisal. Also the site did not have the necessary capacity to be regarded as a new settlement in the study referred to had an envisaged capacity of 4,500 dwellings
- It is not clear from this response as to when Mr Galloway felt that there was no communication between AVDC and MKC. There has been consultation and meetings between the two organisation leading up to the application submission and in relation to the councils respective local plans involving both members and officers. The dates and attendances at these meeting can be supplied. Further Peter Williams of AVDC attended the presentation by MK officers about the MK plan in Waddesdon to ensure that questions could be asked of AVDC about the MK plan. MK officers also attend the Bucks Planning Policy Officers Group to discuss the local plans and policy

matters in Bucks. There is also a signed MoU between the two councils  
CD/DTC/008

- The point relating to the need for growth of Milton Keynes should first be dealt with inside the boundary Milton Keynes borough is irrelevant as this proposed site allocation is not meeting Milton Keynes unmet need it is meeting housing need within AVDC as demonstrated in the HEDNA although it does fall within the Milton Keynes HMA and meets need arising in that part of the HMA from within Aylesbury Vale.
- The point relating to 'any new development sites that are promoted and allocated on sites adjoining the city but in the area of a neighbouring local authority, will require proper planning as sustainable urban extensions to the city. This would be considered through joint working with neighbouring local authorities. AVDC believe that the site allocation policy identifies criteria that will ensure the sustainability of the site. Moreover, the infrastructure contribution requests from MKC demonstrate that joint working has been undertaken.
- Criteria identified in Policy C6 have been addressed in the proposed site allocation policy and subsequent planning application. The site has also been included in the county-wide modelling work and meetings between the 2 authorities regarding the MKC model have taken place discussing Salden Chase.
- The proposal to remove the allocation of Salden Chase because its inclusion renders the draft plan unsound and is contrary to other policies in the plan is flawed. The proposed site allocation has been fully tested through the Sustainability Assessment process, complies with all strategic policies contained within the proposed VALP with the settlement hierarchy proposed within VALP, assists with AVDC's overall housing and employment needs, complies with the sustainable transport vision and will not prejudice any decision over the agreed Oxford-Cambridge expressway, mitigates landscape and ecological impacts and provides the necessary infrastructure to ensure its sustainability.

Tim Welch 1454

Policy D-NLV005.

I regard this allocation as unsound for environmental reasons. This land was identified as having ecological value (see the ecological impact assessment under planning application 15/00195/APP) but was subsequently ploughed. I cannot find the reason why this land was ploughed within the public domain. The land should not undergo development and should be given time to recover.

If development were to take place here, a much more suitable compromise may be to mirror the existing development on the north side of Whaddon Road and not extend past the western edge of the existing building line just east of the entrance to Hammond Park. This would probably reduce the number of dwellings but should make it possible to preserve an amount of the ploughed land. This should also enable restoration of much of the floral species that were compromised at the times the land was ploughed - when it clearly shouldn't have been.

**Responses:**

- It is considered that the response to Inspector's Question 74 covers the answer to this question

#### Policy D-NLV001.

I consider this allocation to be unsound as the bulk of district housing need is the south of Aylesbury. Therefore an allocation of this size at the furthest point in the district does not make sense.

Also Milton Keynes Council objects to planning application 15/00314/AOP for a number of sound reasons including the pressure the development would bring on infrastructure in the area.

I ask that consideration be given to reallocating this site nearer to the districts' major points of housing need.

#### **Responses:**

- Housing need arises across Aylesbury even in the northern part of the district. The allocations are nevertheless already skewed to southern locations with a very large proportion of development around Aylesbury, at Haddenham and at RAF Halton. If the allocation was not located next to Milton Keynes it is considered that it would need to be spread out across the north of the Vale and this would have unsustainable implications for access to facilities and the growth of traffic on less suitable rural roads. The strategic settlements in the north of Aylesbury have also already been allocated a significant amount of new development through their own neighbourhood plans which has been added to by VALP.
- It is not a matter for the hearings to discuss the merits of a planning application.

#### Jackson Planning 2468

The plan completely fails to recognise the on-going work by the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) to accommodate over a million new homes in the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford arc. There needs to be greater acknowledgement about the role Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) must play in shaping the future of the city as part of the 2050 spatial vision and the plan needs a specific policy that deals with how this will be accommodated until 2033 which is the time period for the plan. See also response to Section 1 of the plan. The plan is not effective as it does not consider the longer-term potential of the allocation at Salden Chase to become part of wider planned growth as part of the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford arc. The policy as drafted has the potential to infringe on this important national priority for growth and needs to be revised to make it an effective policy for significant growth within the plan period.

Add additional text after paragraph 4.111 as follows:

Land adjacent to Milton Keynes within AVDC has significant long term potential for development to support the step change in delivery of housing to support the aspirations of the Growth Arc by exploiting major development opportunities, from smaller scale garden

towns of around 10,000 homes through to new city-scale developments of up to 150,000 homes. The plan must consider opportunities that may exist to:

- Enable new settlements and major urban extensions – for example between Oxford and Milton Keynes which may have the potential to grow city-scale and:
- Support the on-going growth of existing towns and cities, for example re-establishing Milton Keynes as a growth location of national significance.

4.118 A masterplan supplementary planning document (SPD) for the site will establish the site layout and disposition of land uses. The development will adhere to the following place shaping principles: Remove first bullet point, add additional new bullet points • Although entirely within AVDC the proposed development at Salden Chase is an extension of Milton Keynes grid and as such the main vehicular access is within Milton Keynes. 4.119 Revised last bullet • The development at Salden Chase will take account of potential for further expansion of the city as part of the NIC growth arc proposals.

**Responses:**

- The purpose of the site allocation is to ensure it delivers The proposed growth within the Local Plan period. It is not for the VALP to plan to 2050 albeit it is recognised that a review will need to take place to consider external influences and proposed government changes to the NPPF/NPPG and housing need methodology as well as the implications of the corridor as those implications cannot yet be quantified or located.. A review will identify new sites if need arises as a result of any decisions made through the NIC and its direction of growth including any revisions to the OAN figures.
- The purpose of the hearings is not to hear debate on additional sites including those sites that may or may not be proposed for delivery to meet up to 2050. Rather to discuss sites that have been put forward for allocation therefore, we have not made any comments in relation to additional site NLV020.

Jon Wellstead MKC 2472

We would, however, request that one minor modification is made to the Salden Chase policy (pages 110-114) in the proposed submission VALP:

\* To insert in the Salden Chase policy a requirement for a green buffer to be included on the eastern edge of the site to protect the adjacent community of West Bletchley.

**Response:**

- Noted and the insertion of a 'Green Buffer' to mitigate potential visual impacts to the existing communities of Far Bletchley will be provided – into the community Facilities and Green Infrastructure criteria of the proposed site allocation policy on page 112.