

## Question 70

I would welcome the Council's observations on representations which object to allocation D-WIN001; 127, 129 Mr Victor Otter for self and on behalf of Yes 4 Winslow, 192 Tamara Butterworth, 657 Mrs Mary Saunders of Great Horwood Parish Council, 1006 Jonathan Harbottle of Land and Partners Ltd, 1162 B Wells, 1164 John Mather, 1165 Samantha Harris, 1166 Gillian Mather, 1168 (name censored), 1416 Dr Sean Carolan of Winslow Town Council and 2461 Samuel White

### **AVDC's response:**

There are a variety of issues raised by these representations including:

- Relationship with the neighbourhood plan
- Whether growth would be better at Milton Keynes than Winslow
- Infrastructure capacity, namely roads, GP services, recreational facilities and bus service
- Allocation is premature before east to west rail line dates being confirmed
- Criteria amendment

Winslow's neighbourhood plan was prepared at a time when the previous Local Plan was being produced and used the housing numbers for Winslow contained in that. The Local Plan was then withdrawn following its examination partly because of concerns about the amount of housing that the draft plan proposed. At this point the Winslow Neighbourhood Plan had been submitted for examination and continued through to being made. Following the withdrawal of the Local Plan the district wide level of housing growth needed was not known, but it was advised that Winslow was likely to get an increase in housing growth through the local plan process given the local plan inspector's comments and the relative sustainability of Winslow.

Previously in the draft VALP stage we identified a specific number of houses required at each settlement, based on a percentage increase in stock. This would have allowed settlements to base a neighbourhood plan on this number. We did however have many negative comments on this prescriptive approach and were advised it might not be considered sound. Therefore in the submission version of VALP we have identified sites to meet the total housing need for the district up until 2033. This approach demonstrates that the plan is deliverable and allows us to have a 5 year housing land supply, both of which are needed for VALP to be found sound. The allocations have been made at the most sustainable settlements, looking firstly at Aylesbury with 60% of development going here as well as over 2,000 dwellings being proposed at the edge of Milton Keynes. Whilst ideally we would respect all neighbourhood plans and not allocate any further development, the strategic settlements are the next most sustainable places in Aylesbury Vale to allocate housing to meet the remaining housing need. As such, we have decided to allocate further housing at the strategic settlements. For the larger and medium villages it has been possible to match the level of growth in neighbourhood plans that have allocated housing. In the case of smaller villages there have not been any allocations or housing requirements set out,

although an allowance has been made for windfall to come forward at these locations. This distribution is set out in the table below.

Settlement	Was there a neighbourhood plan past submission when the plan was finalised	Comparison of numbers in NP and VALP
<b>Garden Town</b>		
Aylesbury	No	
<b>Strategic settlements</b>		
Buckingham	Yes	Reserve site allocated, two additional sites totalling 550
Haddenham	Yes	One additional site of 315
Wendover	No	
Winslow	Yes	One additional site of 585
<b>Large villages</b>		
Aston Clinton	No	
Edlesborough	Yes	Same as NP
Ivinghoe	No	
Long Crendon	Yes	Same as NP
Pitstone	Yes	Same as NP
Steeple Claydon	Yes	Same as NP
Stoke Mandeville	No	
Stone (including Hartwell)	No	
Waddesdon (inc Fleet Marston)	Yes	Same as NP
Whitchurch	No	
Wing	Yes	Same as NP
Wingrave	Yes	Same as NP
<b>Medium Villages</b>		
Bierton (including Broughton)	No	
Brill	No	
Cheddington	Yes	Same as NP
Cuddington	No	
Gawcott (*part of the parish is in the Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan area)	No	
Great Horwood	Yes	Same as NP
Grendon Underwood	No	
Ickford	No	
Maids Moreton	No	
Marsh Gibbon	Yes	NP didn't allocate, allocating 1 site of 9
Marsworth	No	
Newton Longville	No	
North Marston	No	
Padbury	No	

Quainton	Yes	NP didn't allocate, allocating 2 sites totalling 37
Stewkley	No	
Stoke Hammond	No	
Tingewick	No	
Weston Turville	No	

In the HELAA there is a second large site at the edge of Milton Keynes that was identified as suitable for development (WHA001) for potentially around 2,000 dwellings, as well as NLV001 which is a proposed allocation in the Plan for 1,855 dwellings. The SA considered both these options for growth at the edge of Milton Keynes, as well as two further options at pages 20 – 30 of the Technical Annex (CD.SUB.005). In the HELAA only the one site at Winslow was considered suitable, on top of existing commitments. The SA Technical Annex considers the options of growth at Winslow at pages 58-64. Options which include higher growth at Milton Keynes and lower growth at Winslow are included in the reasonable alternatives, set out in table 6.8 of the main SA report (CD.SUB.004). These options are appraised in chapter 7 and appendix III. Paragraph 8.2.2. then sets out the Councils response and selection of the preferred option which includes just the one large site allocation on the edge of Milton Keynes and growth at the Strategic Settlements.

The Settlement Hierarchy (CD.MIS.003) assesses the sustainability of settlements throughout the district looking at facilities and services as well as existing population numbers. Winslow was concluded to be one of the more sustainable settlements within the district and classified as one of the five Strategic Settlements.

Three forecast scenarios were developed during the first and second phases of the transport modelling work, in cooperation with BCC and the districts. These comprised a 2033 DM (Do Minimum) scenario which included the projected planning completions to 2033 across Buckinghamshire, as well as committed development (some of which may form part of the local plan proposals), and two DS (Do Something) scenarios which included DM development plus additional non-committed local plan developments across the county. For phase three, the DM development scenario remained unchanged, but the DS scenario will be updated to reflect the revised local plan development scenario, comprising the revised local plan growth for the four districts. Further details of the forecast scenarios are provided in Table 3-A of this technical note. The revised DS scenario will then be used to develop the DS with mitigation scenarios. Paragraph 5.2.1.3 of the latest countywide-modelling work (CD.TRA.003) sets out that a comparison of the travel time changes between the DS and DM scenario at Winslow indicates that the town experiences relatively slight increases in travel time across both the AM and PM peak with the local plan development in place. As a result it was not necessary to test any mitigation in the local area for either scenario.

In the preparation of this plan discussions have been had with Aylesbury Vale and Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG). Paragraph 6.18 of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) (CD.INF.001) sets out the position in respect of the GP services in Winslow.

Paragraphs 10.16 and 10.17 of the IDP set out the position in Winslow regarding additional swimming and sports halls provision which is what the representation was concerned about.

Information about the Government's commitment to delivering the East to West rail link is given in the IDP at paragraphs 4.2-4.6. In the November 2017 Budget the Chancellor stated that funding will be made available for phase two of the western section from Bicester to Bedford and Milton Keynes to Princes Risborough with the aim of having passenger services running from 2023 and the project complete by 2024. Funding was also announced to build the western section of this project and the Chancellor promised accelerated progress on the link between Bedford and Cambridge.

Question 39 deals with the criteria amendments requested.

On the basis of the above it is not considered that a modification of VALP is required to address these representations.