

VALE OF AYLESBURY LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**Inspector: Paul Clark BA MA MRTPI****Inspector's replies to AVDC responses to his questions
Q110, Q115, Q117**

Q110: The Inspector thanks the council for their response to his Q 110 and he has no further questions arising.

Q115: The point the inspector intended to make was not so much concerned with placing planning obligations on particular sites but rather to ask whether the references in the IDP required VALP to have a site allocation for the Haddenham School expansion or for the Anglian Water treatment works or a policy requirement for the provision of bin storage capacity. It looks as though the first two might be intended to be carried out within existing sites; in which case no allocation of land would be needed but, he could not be sure without asking. From the Council's response, it looks as though the Council may have misunderstood the purpose of the question.

Q117: The Inspector is not content with the Council's response to this question, in particular the explanations firstly, that the areas identified as "not built development" on the proposals map are at a low resolution and so do not coincide exactly with the SFRA flood maps and secondly, that the proposals map is purely indicative in relation to this matter. Both explanations are inconsistent with the role of a proposals map (technically, a "policies map" in the terms of the T&CP(local Planning)(England) regulations 2012). Regulation 9 requires that the adopted policies map must be comprised of, or contain, a map of the local planning authority's area which must – (a) be prepared from, or be based on, an Ordnance Survey map; and (c) illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. The fourth bullet point in NPPF(2012) paragraph 157 differentiates between broad locations shown on a key diagram and land-use designations on a proposals map. Its seventh bullet makes it clear that areas where development would be inappropriate should be identified. The purpose is to enable any landowner to be clear about what can or cannot be done with any particular parcel of land. The Inspector accepts that sometimes it is not possible to be precise and that further work needs to be done. Where this is the case, that should be made clear in the key to the proposals map and in the text of the relevant policy, so he welcomes in general terms the suggested modification to the plan which the Council puts forward in this response to his question. However, even at its low resolution, the policies map can clearly be seen to diverge from the SFRA flood maps which is not acceptable without a substantive reason other than the

mere technicalities of map production, so he invites the Council to revisit the depiction shown on the policies map.

One particularly noticeable discrepancy lies in the area to the north of Weston Mead Farm where an area, apparently not at risk of flooding has been designated as an area of "not built development". Paragraph 1.23 of the plan explains that areas marked as "not built development" are so designated either because of the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment or because of the recommendations of the Strategic Landscape and Visual Impact Capacity Study. The former does not indicate that this piece of land should not be developed. The latter identifies that the entire site is developable other than a small strip along the Bear Brook. The Council's response during the examination introduces a third consideration, namely the requirement for 50% of a site to be green infrastructure and the concept of the Aylesbury Linear Park shown diagrammatically in paragraph 4.21 of the plan but not included in the policies map. But this additional consideration should apply equally to both halves of the Weston Mead Farm site; it does not explain why the northern part has been indicated as "not built development". In the Inspector's view, this part of the plan is not justified and so, is unsound. A modification is required, amending the "not built development" designation but indicating the requirement for the Aylesbury Linear Park.

12.8.19