



Proposed Submission Draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (Regulation 19)

Transport Topic Paper

November 2017

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-------------|--|--------------|
| 1.0 | Introduction | 3-4 |
| 2.0 | National Context | 4-6 |
| 3.0 | Local Context and Planned Growth | 6-11 |
| 4.0 | Neighbourhood Plans | 11 |
| 5.0 | Accessibility | 11-12 |
| 6.0 | Public Transport | 12-13 |
| 7.0 | Rail | 13-15 |
| 8.0 | Walking and Cycling | 15-17 |
| 9.0 | Highways | 17-18 |
| 10.0 | National Infrastructure | 18-19 |
| 11.0 | Issues Raised In Consultation Responses | 19-21 |
| 12.0 | Changes Made at Proposed Submission Stage | 21-29 |
| 13.0 | Appendix | 29-33 |
| | Glossary Term Definition..... | 29-32 |
| | Growth Delivery Partners..... | 33 |

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This topic paper summarises the background, context and evidence which has informed the drafting of the Proposed Submission Draft Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) (Regulation 19) transport policies. The topic paper outlines the overall strategy for all modes of transportation to accommodate the proposed housing and employment growth in the VALP, the allocation of strategic sites and the approach to planning applications.

1.2 This topic paper relates to the following VALP policies set out in the Proposed Submission Plan:

- S1 Sustainable development for Aylesbury Vale
- S5 Infrastructure
- S8 Neighbourhood plans
- D1 Delivering Aylesbury Garden Town
- T1 Delivering the sustainable transport vision
- T2 Protected Transport Schemes
- T3 Supporting transport schemes
- T4 Delivering transport in new development
- T5 Vehicle parking
- T6 Footpaths and cycle routes
- T7 Electric vehicle infrastructure
- Strategic site allocations policies - various

1.3 The paper should be read with the following documents:

- Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan -- Proposed Submission VALP -- 2013 -- 2033, September 2017
- Cumulative Growth Impact -- Aylesbury -- Final Report - AECOM, June 2017
- Aylesbury Transport Strategy -- AECOM, January 2017
- Buckingham Transport Strategy -- AECOM, January 2017
- Countywide Local Plan Modelling -- Phase 3 Technical Note -- JACOBS, August 2017
- Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan 4 -- March 2016 -- 2036, March 2016

1.4 This topic paper is one in a series, which sets out how we have developed the proposed submission Local Plan. Each topic paper will look at relevant national and local policy and guidance that informs the VALP. Topic papers explain how the strategy has developed and the data, evidence and feedback that has informed choices made in formulating policies. The topic papers aim is to provide background information; they do not contain policies, proposals or site allocations. All topic papers will be finalised to accompany the submission of the VALP to the Secretary of State for examination.

2.0 National Context

2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places great emphasis on the delivery and promotion of sustainable transport. The following paragraphs of the NPPF identify the Government's commitment to achieving this:

2.2 Paragraph 29, states:

'Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. The transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel. However, the Government recognises that different polices and measures will be required indifferent communities and opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary from urban to rural areas'.

2.3 Paragraph 32, states:

'All developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether':

- the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;
- safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and
- improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.

2.4 Paragraph 34, states:

Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.

2.5 Paragraph 35, states:

Plans should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Therefore, developments should be located and designed where practical to;

- accommodate the efficient delivery of goods and supplies
- give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities
- create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate establishing home zones
- incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles, and
- consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.

2.6 Paragraph 36 states:

A key tool to facilitate this will be a travel plan. All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan.

2.7 Paragraph 37 states:

Planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.

2.8 Paragraph 38 states:

For larger scale residential developments in particular, planning policies should promote a mix of uses in order to provide opportunities to undertake day-to-day activities including work on site. Where practical, particularly within large-scale developments, key facilities such as primary schools and local shops should be located within walking distance of most properties.

2.9 Paragraph 39 states:

If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, Local Planning authorities should take into account:

- the accessibility of the development
- the type, mix and use of development
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport
- local car ownership levels, and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

2.10 Paragraph 41 states:

Local Planning authorities should identify and protect, where there is robust evidence, sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice.

3.0 Local Context and Planned Growth

- 3.1 Aylesbury Vale is a large district, with a resident population of 174,100 people at the time of the 2011 Census, and an estimated 78,591 homes in March 2016. Around 40% of the population live in the main town of Aylesbury. The other largest settlements are Buckingham, followed by Haddenham, Wendover, and Winslow. There are a large number of smaller settlements dispersed across the rural parts of the district.
- 3.2 The district continues to grow in terms of population and houses. The rates of house building over recent years have remained high with an average of 1,127 dwellings built each year over the past five years. Out of this total, an average of 349 were affordable dwellings.
- 3.3 Over the past five years, an average of 29% of new homes have been built on brownfield sites. This percentage has decreased in the past five years and is expected to continue to decrease in the future as the supply of available brownfield sites decreases and greenfield urban fringe sites are built.
- 3.4 In the district 69,406 households have access to one or more cars which equates to an average 1.5 car per household and approximately 88% of total households. This is higher than the average for the South East (82%) and significantly higher than the national average of 74%. Since the 2001 Census, there has been an increase in the ownership of vehicles with more households owning four or more cars and a decrease in those owning only one car. In the district 12% of households don't have access to a car compared with around 27% nationally, reflecting the economic affluence and rural nature of much of the district.
- 3.5 The majority of journeys to work in the district are made by car. Approximately 61% of people travel to work by car and 5% as a car passenger, with 10% by foot and 5% by train. 48% of travel-to-work journeys are also made within the same district.
- 3.6 Currently, the South East region has a higher percentage of people travelling to work by sustainable transport than Buckinghamshire at 18% and 14% respectively. Buckinghamshire has the third lowest rates of cycling in the South East, with only 12.5% of people cycling at least once a week (compared to an average of 16.9% across the south-east of England). The rates in Aylesbury Vale at 15% are the joint highest in the county with Chiltern.
- 3.7 According to the latest travel-to-work data (2011), the majority of residents in the district commute to other parts of the South East (74%) and London (17%) for work. Within the South-east, the most popular commuting destinations for residents living the district include Wycombe (22%), Aylesbury Vale (20%), Chiltern (9%), South Bucks (5%) and Westminster (5%).

- 3.8 Due to the districts relatively high level of affluence and rural nature the car is, and will remain, the mode of choice for many people for the foreseeable future.
- 3.9 The county overall is relatively well connected by road and railway to London, to the national motorway network and to London Heathrow and London Luton International Airports. However, there is a clear disparity between the north and south of the Strategycounty3.10 Large parts of Aylesbury Vale are relatively isolated from regional transport networks. While High Wycombe benefits from railway journey times of less than 40 minutes to London, the equivalent journey from Aylesbury takes over 50 minutes. Say also isolated from Strategic Highway network??

Buckinghamshire County-wide Traffic Model Phase 3

- 3.11 Jacobs were commissioned to assess the transport impact of the emerging Local Plan proposals for the districts within Buckinghamshire, comprising the District Councils of Aylesbury Vale (AVDC), Chiltern (CDC), South Bucks (SBDC) and Wycombe (WDC). It should be noted that Chiltern and South Bucks are currently in the process of producing a joint Local Plan.
- 3.12 Jacobs completed work on the first phase of the Countywide Local Plan modelling support; further details of the first phase of work can be found in the Phase One Forecast Modelling Report 1.
- 3.13 The Phase 3 report documents the interim model refinements that have been made between phase one and two in response to comments received from BCC, as well as the second phase of modelling work.
- 3.14 Phase one of the modelling support work sets out the impacts of the proposed Local Plan developments on the highway network in Buckinghamshire and identified a number of areas in which the model impacts were considered to be significant, in terms of increased travel time and congestion as a result of the Local Plan development proposals. As part of this work, a 'do minimum' (DM) scenario, with only committed development (some of which may form part of the Local Plan), and two 'do something' (DS) scenarios, with additional non-committed Local Plan development, were assessed with a forecast year of 2033. Further details of the forecast scenarios are provided in section 1.3 of this report. For future reference in this report, "Local Plan development" refers only to the Local Plan development which is not yet considered to be committed.
- 3.16 Compared with phase one, there is a reduction of 6,299 houses and an increase of 5,531 jobs in the DS forecast scenarios, across the county. The significant reductions in housing in South Bucks and Wycombe (compared with the phase one work) offsets the increase observed in Aylesbury Vale.
- 3.17 In conclusion the overall highway network operates within capacity. In the Milton Keynes A421 corridor of the district here are some significant reductions in delays on the A421 due to dualling, the new grid road and the Bletchley bypass although there are some additional queuing on minor roads as a result of increased demand flows on the A421.

- 3.18 For Winslow the new development spine road and relief road lead to reductions in journey times, but still significant congestion on routes to A421, and at the A421/ Spine Road Roundabout.
- 3.19 There are reductions in journey times on most corridors approaching Aylesbury as well as in the town centre due to reassignment onto orbital routes, with the exception of A418 Oxford Road where the roundabout with the new western link roads is operating over capacity.
- 3.20 There is significant additional congestion on A418 to Thame compared with DM, but reduced in the DS with mitigation as a result of improvements at the Thame Roundabout and around Aylesbury.
- 3.21 Lastly there are overall reductions in travel time and congestion on the B4009 through Wendover in the DS+mitigation scenario.

Aylesbury Transport Study and Buckingham Transport Study

- 3.22 To support the development of the Proposed VALP Strategy, AVDC and Transport for Buckinghamshire commissioned Jacobs to undertake separate traffic assessment studies for the towns of Aylesbury and Buckingham.
- 3.23 The studies provide an assessment of current and forecast traffic demand in order to identify opportunities and constraints in the towns, taking into consideration findings from previous studies and relevant policy and strategy documents. Outputs from these studies, which were based on traffic models of the towns included the following:
- An assessment of the level of additional housing and employment-related development that Aylesbury and Buckingham could support;
 - A comparative assessment of the traffic and transportation implications of locating new land use development in particular areas.
 - The impact and performance of additional road infrastructure provision and its potential to fulfil a strategic role were also considered as part of these studies.
- 3.24 The traffic modelling studies support and inform the development of the VALP. Relevant outcomes and conclusions from the studies are considered below. It is important to note that the locations assessed for potential additional development in Aylesbury and Buckingham reflected theoretical areas for growth and were intended as a tool to assist in the development of the proposed VALP. They were not related to any specific planning applications or proposed developments.

Aylesbury Garden Town

- 3.25 In January 2017 the Council was successful in its Garden Town Bid for Aylesbury as part of the Government's Garden Town programme. The bid recognises Aylesbury's unique role in delivering 50% of the districts housing needs and the opportunity that developing new housing allocations (combined with existing committed and sites already built) in delivering around of 15,800 new dwellings between 2013 and 2033.

The success of this bid has provided the opportunity to develop Aylesbury and the surrounding area in a visionary and sustainable way. The Council will now be in a position to apply for funding from the Government to support those new communities with the roads and facilities they will need, and ensure everyone can travel around the Vale more easily.

- 3.26 A masterplan will be produced for the Garden Town which will set out all the required key strategic physical and social infrastructure and how it will be funded. The Masterplan will also set out specific design guidance which will further define the character of the Garden Town and provide design guidance for key components such as transport and movement routes, parks and green space and built development, and focus on delivery and implementation of this
- 3.27 To continue to grow the town successfully, key transport issues need addressing including tackling congestion, managing demand, enhancing access, increasing active travel and enhancing public transport in Aylesbury. The district and county councils have developed a transport strategy for the Garden Town, the principles of which are seen as part of a balanced and integrated package of measures contained within the study below. Transport schemes that will be integral to supporting the growth of Aylesbury Vale will be secured under Policy T2 Protected Transport Schemes.

Aylesbury Transport Strategy

- 3.28 In early 2016 Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) commissioned AECOM to develop a transport strategy for Aylesbury in order to support and accommodate future planned growth and the upcoming release of the Plan. This is known as the Aylesbury Transport Strategy (ATS), which is a plan for transport in Aylesbury, setting out the improvements needed to support the planned growth of the town between 2016 and 2033. The Aylesbury Transport Strategy supports Aylesbury Garden Town by assessing the existing and future transportation network conditions based on future housing and employment growth and demographic change and identifying transport improvements across various modes.
- 3.29 The VALP identifies Aylesbury as playing a substantial and critical role in delivering growth for the district and the rest of Buckinghamshire. The focus of the strategy is Aylesbury town centre and its immediate urban area, however the growth and travel patterns were considered in a much wider context, including most of the Aylesbury Vale area. A list of mitigation schemes can be found in the Aylesbury Transport Strategy which is on the Council's website. The six overarching strategic objectives to guide the growth are:
- Improve transport access and movement to the town centre
 - Minimise the impact of future growth on traffic levels, congestion and air quality
 - Make it easier and more accessible through provision of walking and cycling connections and the use of public transport
 - Improve journey time reliability

- Improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas, and
 - Reduce the risk of death or injury on the transport network.
- 3.30 The Aylesbury Transport Strategy builds on previous and currently planned improvements to transport infrastructure. The initial work has identified a list of potential transport interventions for Aylesbury which will enable growth, influence travel behaviour and meet the strategic objectives identified above. These will be based on:
- completing a series of outer link roads that will take traffic away from the town centre and allow public transport priority improvements to take place on the main radial roads closer to the town centre, improving public transport journey time reliability;
 - implementing an overarching strategy to connect new developments, with each other, to key destinations and to the town centre by active travel and public transport considering new ways to redesign roads within the central area of Aylesbury to ensure access for all;
 - undertaking a parking study to understand current supply and demand in order to reassess parking provisions and controls;
 - completing gaps in the cycling/walking network, particularly connections within the Aylesbury Gemstone cycle network improving pedestrian crossing options where safety is an issue or where major roads act as a barrier to pedestrian movements, including the inner relief road around the town centre; and
 - ensuring a strategic approach is in place for providing sustainable transport access to all new development and ensuring good transport links are in place to all three rail stations around the town centre.

Buckingham Transport Strategy

- 3.31 AECOM was commissioned by Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) to develop a transport strategy for Buckingham that supports future planned growth in the town up to 2033.
- 3.32 The focus of this strategy is the town of Buckingham, but also recognises that the town will be affected in coming years by proposed growth in a wider area around the town.
- 3.33 The growth aspirations in the Plan are likely to have an impact on transport requirements in Buckingham; any may therefore necessitate a number of improvements in/around the town. The aim of the Buckingham Transport Strategy (BTS) is to consider these growth aspirations holistically and propose measures that address their impacts as a whole, rather than the impact of each individual development.
- 3.34 In addition to accommodating these future growth aspirations, the BTS should also address existing known transport issues in the town.

- 3.35 The BTS is expected to provide a guiding transport policy for Buckingham, to prioritise transport schemes for the area, and to promote a coordinated approach towards transport investment. A list of mitigation schemes can be found in the Buckingham Transport Strategy which is on the Council's website.

Overall conclusions

- 3.19 Overall, the results of the various transport modelling studies have supported and underpinned the growth proposals and distribution of development at Aylesbury and Buckingham as proposed within the Proposed VALP Strategy.

4.0 Neighbourhood Plans

- 4.1 The policies in proposed VALP are strategic in nature to allow for some of the detail to be shaped by communities through neighbourhood planning where applicable. This may be through a Neighbourhood Development Plan, Neighbourhood Development Order, or the Community Right to Build. There are a number of parishes which have expressed an interest in developing neighbourhood plans to supplement the Proposed VALP Strategy and provide greater detail on what the strategic policies will mean for the settlement.
- 4.2 Within Aylesbury Vale, 14 Neighbourhood Plans have been 'made' at Buckingham, Buckland, Cheddington, Edlesborough, Great Horwood, Haddenham, Long Crendon, Marsh Gibbon, Pitstone, Quainton, Waddesdon, Wing, Wingrave with Rowsham, Winslow. These Neighbourhood Plans are now integral part of the local planning system. The following list of 'made' Neighbourhood Plans contain land within the Green Belt:
- Edlesborough (passed referendum) - no specific policies on the Green Belt
 - Pitstone- no specific policies on the Green Belt
 - Buckland – Policy BP2 resists any significant development in the Green Belt except in very exceptional circumstances
 - The following neighbourhood plans that are emerging contain land within the Green Belt:
 - Ivinghoe (Pre Submission) - Policy HSG1 states that inappropriate development in the Green Belt will be resisted unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated
 - Aston Clinton (Pre Submission) – no specific policies on the Green Belt
 - Halton (early stages)
 - Wendover (early stages)

5.0 Accessibility

- 5.1 The VALP places a great deal of emphasis on accessibility in relation to site allocations and strategic policy including Aylesbury Garden Town.

- 5.2 Policy S1 Sustainable development for Aylesbury Vale makes provision for high-quality accessibility through the implementation of sustainable modes of travel including public transport, walking and cycling.
- 5.3 Policy D6 which relates to town, village and local centres supporting new and existing communities, places emphasis on sustainable growth and regeneration at Aylesbury, Buckingham, Haddenham, Wendover and Winslow which will be supported where the proposed scheme is readily accessible by public transport, walking and cycling.
- 5.4 Specific site allocation policies in Aylesbury that relate to Waterside South (from Walton Street junction to Upper Hundreds including Exchange Street and lower High Street) make provisions to break down the concrete barrier of the inner ring road and improve links and accessibility from the rest of the town centre to Aylesbury Waterside Theatre, Aqua Vale Leisure Centre, Vale Park and the retail parks.
- 5.5 Policy T4 which relates to delivering transport in new development concerns itself with issues over accessibility particularly important for those without access to a car. At the local level this should include encouraging walking for trips under two miles, and encouraging cycling for trips within a five-mile radius
- 5.6 Policy T5 relates to vehicle parking and setting equitable levels of parking in new development based on the accessibility of the site and Policy BE4 which concerns itself with accessibility and public transport in determining new development densities
- 5.7 The Aylesbury Transport Strategy identifies the importance of town and key destination accessibility for pedestrian and cycle users. It further identifies the importance of accessibility in new developments, connectivity and accessibility within Aylesbury town centre and the requirements to improve accessibility to other urban centres and new growth areas outside Aylesbury town.
- 5.8 Integral to this is the proposed upgrade of the existing bus station in Aylesbury town which aims to increase the number of bus passengers by increasing the capacity, comfort and accessibility of Aylesbury bus station. The accessibility improvements would create a comprehensive interchange with Aylesbury railway station, and improve links with the cycle and the pedestrian networks.
- 5.9 The Buckingham Transport Strategy places emphasis on improving accessibility into Buckingham and to other urban centres and new growth areas including employment areas. It also raises concerns that bus accessibility needs to be considered on the back of the town's proposed growth.

6.0 Public Transport

- 6.1 For Aylesbury Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) is the designated highways authority and has responsibility for the provision of transport infrastructure, including public transport within the district.
- 6.2 Aylesbury is served by a number of different bus networks operated by the Rainbow Route Quality Bus Partnership; a collaboration between a number of operators including Arriva, Red Line and Red Rose. The services can be classified as follows:

- 6.3 Regional buses: Long distance bus routes connecting Aylesbury town centre to surrounding urban centres, such as Milton Keynes, Watford, Oxford, High Wycombe, and Hemel Hempstead, although there are no direct services to Luton.
- 6.4 Local buses: Serve major destinations within Aylesbury such as Stoke Mandeville, the town centre (served by frequent bus routes along most corridors), the railway stations, and residential areas.
- 6.5 Community buses: Bus routes that effectively act as community buses running infrequently and timetabled. The frequency of these services varies by route, with school routes operating as single trips to and from schools, to those serving nearby villages on particular days.
- 6.6 The town centre is served by frequent bus routes along most corridors. Most of these services access the town centre at the main bus station, located on the southern border of the town centre within Friars Square Shopping Centre, which is well connected for walking and cycling access to the Aylesbury rail station (approximately a five minute walk). However the central bus station has been identified as already being at capacity and in need of improvements to capacity to allow for potential increased services in future.
- 6.7 The Transport Strategy for Aylesbury considers future needs of the Highway Network and Public Transport and identifies the need to make it easier and more attractive to travel by active and public transport modes.
- 6.8 One of the aims of the Strategy is to look at the delivery of key strategic links which will need to be delivered together with complementary public transport. Once the series of outer link roads are completed traffic will be taken away from the town centre and allow public transport priority improvements to take place on the main radial roads closer to the town centre.
- 6.9 The Aylesbury transport strategy also identifies the need to improve public transport journey time reliability. Buckinghamshire County Council is looking to develop a series of Primary Public Transport Corridors (PPTCs). These PPTCs will include measures to improve and enhance bus operation and access. These are currently proposed for the A413 Buckingham Road (partially implemented), A41 Bicester Road and A41 Tring Road. The transport improvements needed for the growth arc will require:
- the creation of a further PPTC along the A418 Bierton Road into Aylesbury
 - extension of the proposed A41 Tring Road PPTC
 - Smarter choices promotions

7.0 Rail

- 7.1 Day-to-day delivery of railway services across the county rests with Network Rail and the Rail Franchise Operators. Aylesbury Vale is served by the Chiltern railway line between London and Birmingham (stations at Aylesbury, Aylesbury Vale Parkway, Stoke Mandeville, Wendover and Haddenham), and the West Coast Main Line between London and the North (station Cheddington).

East West Rail

- 7.2 For many years the District Council has been a member of the consortium of local authorities promoting East West Rail as a strategic infrastructure project that links a number of major towns and cities across central, eastern and southern England. Within Aylesbury Vale District the project includes re opening the disused/mothballed railway between Bicester and Bletchley, improvements to the spur to Aylesbury to facilitate passenger traffic on new rail services to London and a proposed new station at Winslow.
- 7.3 It was announced on 16 July 2012, that the western section of East West Rail (EWR) will form part of the Government's strategy for rail transport (Railways Act 2005 Statement for Control Period 5). The western section will link Aylesbury, Bicester, Oxford and Reading with Bedford and Milton Keynes.
- 7.4 The western section route is on existing lines between Bedford and Oxford, Milton Keynes and Aylesbury Vale.
- 7.5 Oxford to Bicester Village has been significantly upgraded by Chiltern Railways and Network Rail as part of the scheme to introduce a new service between Oxford, Bicester and London Marylebone. This project was delivered as phase one of the overall East West Rail project and includes the additional infrastructure required for East West Rail train services. Chiltern Railways began services from Oxford to London Marylebone via Bicester on 12 December 2016.
- 7.6 Phase 2 of the western section covers the route from Bicester Village to Bedford (due open in 2022), and Milton Keynes to Aylesbury (due open in 2024).
- 7.7 The line east of Bicester to Claydon Junction that is currently only used by freight trains will be upgraded for fast passenger services.
- 7.8 The section of rail track between Claydon Junction and Bletchley has been out of use and 'mothballed' since the early-1990s and will be rebuilt. A new station will be provided at Winslow.
- 7.9 Train services on the East West Rail line will then follow the existing Marston Vale Line from Bletchley to Bedford. New high-level platforms will be provided at Bletchley, which connects with West Coast Main Line, allowing East West Rail trains to run to Milton Keynes.
- 7.10 The East West Rail project will include upgrading of the route between Oxford and Bedford to a two-track railway. It is further anticipated that train services will extend to Reading, using existing operational lines.
- 7.11 The western section will also provide train services between Milton Keynes and London Marylebone, via Aylesbury. The line between Aylesbury and Claydon Junction will be upgraded initially as a single track with room to allow for a future double track for fast passenger services as part of the East West Rail scheme.

Winslow Station

- 7.12 The station at Winslow has the potential to significantly improve sustainable transport options and choice in the mid and north of the District. These include:

- Much improved access to fast local, regional and national railway services that provides an attractive and accessible alternative to travel by road in support of the economic vitality of the local area and the wider catchment area
- Promoting more sustainable travel options and help to constrain the upward pressure on traffic congestion on the hard pressed north-south roads serving Buckinghamshire by improving the travel choice by rail and generating mode shift away from the private car including commuter traffic to growth towns such as Milton Keynes.
- Improve access to employment, education and training via rail for residents in the Winslow/Buckingham local transport area

7.13 The confirmation of the project and the potential benefits are acknowledged in the proposed VALP and were instrumental in linking growth at Winslow (Policy VS2) to the development of the railway.

Aylesbury Station

7.14 The main aim at Aylesbury Station is to encourage improved interchange between modes including the provision of a public transport interchange for Winslow and the wider catchment area including Buckingham including the provision of priority place for car sharing, and perhaps electric car charging point(s). LTP4 Policy 4 - Maximising our rail network states the importance of continuing to work as an active member of the East West Rail Consortium And supporting the earliest possible delivery of East West Rail services.

Station Accessibility

7.15 Station accessibility is seen as a high priority in order to promote the use of sustainable travel including cycling and walking. Security, under-cover cycle storage, well lit walkways to and into the station, safe cycle routes to the station including making progress towards an aspiration for an attractive/safe cycleway route from Buckingham to Winslow station.

8.0 Walking and Cycling

8.1 The 3,300 km network of public rights of way in Buckinghamshire is a valuable transport asset for the county. It can help encourage active travel, including walking and cycling.

8.2 Based on the journey to work information from the Census data, movements by cycling or on foot are not particularly significant in the Aylesbury area. Based on all journeys to work that have Aylesbury as their residence or workplace, only 2% of the journeys are made by bicycle and 8% on foot, from a total of approximately 84,900 commuting journeys.

8.3 These proportions are higher when only the journeys within Aylesbury area are considered, which involve shorter distances. In this case, journeys on bicycle and on foot represent 4% and 23% of the journeys to work respectively.

- 8.4 Many public footpaths located in the Aylesbury area, primarily outside the town centre. These provide a wide pedestrian (and occasionally cycle) network across the area, which links to improved pedestrian conditions in urban areas. An example of this is the canal basin footpath from Aylesbury to Tring which also enjoys cycling access. In recent years, there have been a number of improvements to the pedestrian network, most of which have been concentrated in the town centre as part of its regeneration.
- 8.5 The 'Round Aylesbury Walk' promoted route, which uses public footpaths, footways and permissive paths lacks investment in some places and needs improving to promote pedestrian connectivity between housing estates and for recreational use to boost exercise to tackle obesity.
- 8.6 The Aylesbury Transport Strategy and Garden Town Plan identifies potential improvements to the cycling network with possible new routes or improvements to existing routes through detailed feasibility planning, design and implementation. Focus will be on development sites to create continuous safe and attractive walking and cycling networks. This will build on Aylesbury's status as a cycling demonstration town in 2008 and the subsequent development of a network of 'gemstone' cycleways developed across the town increasing walking and cycling facilities.
- 8.7 Most cycle routes on road and shared with traffic and while the majority of these are on quiet roads, those routes which are on busier roads may deter some potential users who are concerned about safety or do not feel confident enough to use the on road segments of the network.
- 8.8 Buckinghamshire County Council is planning to enlarge the cycle network in the study area with a small number of extensions, which are currently in the planning stage. In addition to the existing network, new roads have been built with cycle infrastructure in place. An example of this is the new road between the Berryfields and Buckingham Park development, which has a new shared-use path running alongside the main road. Many public rights of way are shared-use which enables having segregated cycle routes to outer areas of Aylesbury.
- 8.9 All future strategic roads that are built will be expected to provide an associated shared path along a similar alignment. These include cycling routes alongside all the new proposed roads (i.e. Stocklake Link and Eastern Link Road), the Grand Union Triangle, the Aylesbury to Haddenham cycle route and the Aylesbury Vale Parkway station link to Waddesdon.
- 8.10 Other improvements needed include the route between the A418 (Holmans Bridge) and A41 (Stone Bridge) between Watermead and Haydon Hill, which provides cycling and walking access south of the River Thames on AVDC-owned land and is expected to be a busy commuting route to Aylesbury Vale Parkway train station.
- 8.11 The Grand Union Triangle is a cycle route along the towpath of the Aylesbury and Wendover Arms of the Grand Union Canal, linking Aylesbury, Wendover and Tring. This cycle route connects the Aylesbury area to the existing cycling routes in Wendover where there are plans to extend the network. This would link to the

proposed National Cycleway (London to Birmingham; more locally Wendover to Waddesdon) and the suggested corridor through Aylesbury.

- 8.12 The Aylesbury to Haddenham cycle route may be implemented along Aylesbury Road and Oxford Road, this route will improve connectivity to existing and future improvements in Haddenham.
- 8.13 In the Buckingham area, journey to work data from the 2011 Census suggests relatively low levels of commuting by bicycle or on foot. 1% of journeys to work by Buckingham area residents are made by bicycle, and 10% are made on foot. The proportions are the same for those working in the Buckingham area
- 8.14 Outside the town, there is a fairly comprehensive network of public rights of way that provide off-road links from Buckingham to outlying villages.
- 8.15 The existing cycling network in Buckingham is limited, such that most cycle trips to or within the town must be made on-road. With the exception of the on-road NCN route 50, there is currently no cycling route provision on the town's bypass roads, many of which are 60mph single-carriageways.
- 8.16 The issue of inter-urban cycling connectivity will be improved with the opening of the A413 Sustainable Travel Scheme. BTVLEP funding has facilitated the construction of a 9km shared cycle and footway link adjacent to the A413 (from Winslow to the southern edge of Buckingham) and aims to encourage walking and cycling along the corridor.
- 8.17 The Local Transport Plan 4 promotes attractive links to and from stations by sustainable modes of transport, such as walking and cycling. Well maintained roads are encouraged to promote an active lifestyle, by providing well maintained walking and cycling routes.

9.0 Highways

- 9.1 For Aylesbury Vale Buckinghamshire County Council (BCC) is the designated highways authority and has responsibility for the provision of transport infrastructure, including public transport within the district.
- 9.2 The strategic road network comprises the major highways that link cities, areas of population, ports and airports. The network includes all the country's motorways as well as strategically important A classified roads. Through the District the main highway components of the strategic network includes the: A41 M25 to M40 via Aylesbury, A418/A4146 Aylesbury to Leighton Buzzard Milton Keynes; A413 Aylesbury to M40 at Denham; & A4010 (A413) Stoke Mandeville to High Wycombe. Other significant highway routes across the District include the A421 Milton Keynes via Buckingham to A43 Brackley; A422 Buckingham to Milton Keynes; and A413 Aylesbury to Buckingham. A small section of the M40 runs through the western part of the District although the nearest junctions are to the south and north west of the district.
- 9.3 To achieve the aims of the Aylesbury transport strategy key strategic links need to be delivered together with complementary public transport, walking and cycling schemes

to ensure that released highway capacity is not taken up by suppressed demand. The following key strategic links are either in development or planned:

- The Eastern Link and the Stocklake Link Road are the two key links of the transport network that have been recently constructed and link with two other transport infrastructure projects that have been funded and delivered by the Aylesbury East (Kingsbrook) Barratt Homes development—Eastern Link Road (North) and Stocklake Link Road (Rural). Collectively they will provide key infrastructure to enable growth in the east of Aylesbury.
- Northern Link Road (NLR) between the western link road and the A418 close to Hulcott crossroads. While it is an aspiration to complete the North West link (between A418 and A41) around the town there is no planned development in this part of Aylesbury Vale to secure contributions through developer funding. Funding is likely to be dependant on future grant funding (i.e. DfT)
- Southern Link Road (SLR) and South Western Link Road (SWLR) from the A413, crossing the two railway lines to the south to a new junction onto the A418
- South East Link Road (SELR) between the A41 and A413 Wendover Road.

10.0 National Infrastructure

High Speed 2

- 10.1 High Speed 2 (HS2) is a new railway, proposed to run from London to Birmingham and, later, to Leeds and Manchester. The Government is promoting HS2 as a flagship project which it claims will bridge the North-South divide. HS2 plans to use 400m-long trains built to European standards, with each carrying 1,100 passengers. Initially 14 trains will run every hour in each direction rising to 18 trains per hour. The design speed of the line is 400kph (250mph).
- 10.2 In December 2010 the Government announced a preferred route option for the proposed high speed rail link between London and Birmingham, known as High Speed 2 (HS2). The preferred route runs through the western part of the district, entering at Wendover in the south past the western edge of Aylesbury, and proposes a major infrastructure maintenance depot located at Calvert/Steeple Claydon, then continues northwards to exit the district at Turweston. The Council and many other groups petitioned the Government to achieve the best possible mitigation of the significant impacts that HS2 will have on the environment and local communities in the district. Work on cycle route design and how it interacts with the HS2 will be completed to maximise benefits and connectivity between communities and the countryside.
- 10.3 The Secretary of State has issued a safeguarding directive for the route which requires the notification to HS2 of any Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan planning application which affects the safeguarded line. The High Speed Rail (London – West Midlands) Act 2017 received Royal Assent in February 2017 and preparatory work for delivery of the line has commenced.

Oxford-Cambridge Expressway

- 10.4 In the Department for Transport's Road Investment Strategy 2015 a new strategic study was announced to investigate the case for linking existing roads which would create a high quality link between Oxford and Cambridge, via Milton Keynes. Three corridor options have been identified that cross Aylesbury Vale, of which the A421 corridor and potential upgrade is one option. A preferred corridor is not expected to be selected until the end of 2017 with a preferred route selected expected by the end of 2018. This new expressway will then have implications for the wider highway network and the ability to access key residential and employment areas will be maintained or enhanced. However, until the route alignment is selected it is not possible to say what these requirements will be.
- 10.5 The two principal schemes outlined above will be delivered at a higher level and will impact on a wider geographical scale than just Aylesbury. However, they will still have an impact on the residents of Aylesbury and are a key element of the wider policy approach to delivering sustainable development. Enhancements to the regional rail and road infrastructure linking Aylesbury to neighbouring growth areas will open up access to the north, east and west of Aylesbury. As a result, these new links will help to ensure that local communities in Aylesbury and the surrounding rural areas will continue to be developed and grow.

11.0 Issues Raised In Consultation Responses

- 11.1 A summary of key issues raised by respondents to the 2016 Draft VALP relating to transport policies is set out below.

Policy S1 - Sustainable Development for Aylesbury Vale

- 11.2 Some 137 respondents made specific comments regarding Policy S1. Positive responses reflected support for a Sustainable Development approach to the Plan, although many remained concerned that embedding this would require further strengthening throughout the VALP provisions in order to ensure that the concept will be more meaningful in practice, rather than simply an aspiration. Many felt that the definition of 'sustainability' was too vague and did not set out what sustainability means in this context.

Policy S5 - Infrastructure

- 11.3 Policy S5 attracted 144 responses and the majority of respondents considered that this policy is not strong enough in its current form. All agreed on the importance of infrastructure, stating that the currently presented strategy was not sufficient for the stated purpose. Many different aspects of infrastructure were referenced as requiring further consideration in these responses from flood risk management measures to traffic and rail, water and sewerage and community infrastructure.

Policy S8 - Previously Developed Land

- 11.4 This policy received positive endorsement from the majority of respondents, of which there were 28.

Policy D1 - Delivering Aylesbury Garden Town

- 11.5 There were 253 responses in relation to policy D1, the majority of which presented a negative view of the policy. A large proportion of these expressed outright opposition to the proposals, with a template letter circulated by the Hampden Fields Action Group being used by a large number of respondents. Key reasons for opposition include the following:
- 11.6 Opposition to accepting the unmet need of neighbouring district councils, without which there is a perception the housing demand placed upon Aylesbury would be reduced;
- 11.7 Concern over the impact of proposed housing development upon the condition and capacity of traffic, infrastructure, amenities and services in Aylesbury, as nothing in the proposals appears to address the required expansion of infrastructure and services that would be necessitated by the proposed scale of development;
- 11.8 Concern that flood risk management has not been adequately considered, q
- 11.9 Questions over the viability of the 'orbital road' proposal, as well as frustration at the traffic model (which they see as flawed) and the apparent lack of a comprehensive transport strategy; and
- 11.10 Perceived inconsistencies between proposals in policy D1 and the aims of other policies stated in the VALP, such as preventing coalescence of settlements (through development of the Green Belt), improving air quality and protecting landscape and green infrastructure.

Policy T1 - Vehicle Parking

- 11.11 Policy T1 received 97 responses. Of these, over half the respondents raised concerns over a perceived lack of parking provision, both existing and proposed.
- 11.12 These comments specified a need for greater off-road allocation, particularly in rural communities where roads are narrow and congested. Adequate parking at surgeries, schools and Stoke Mandeville Hospital were specifically mentioned. The lack of provision for disabled parking in the policy was also noted.
- 11.13 Traffic congestion, associated with existing parking provisions, was highlighted as a concern. Respondents note a perceived increase in car drivers (as a result of new housing) would place strain on a system already thought to be under considerable pressure. The health and safety of children walking to school, other pedestrians and cyclists was also mentioned in this regard.

Policy T2 - Footpaths and Cycle Routes

- 11.14 Positive comments in support of the policy, citing the creation of a cycle network across the region and, specifically, the benefits for health and the environment and a shift from a reliance on cars. Many of these responses were from residents. The alignment with para. 35 of the NPPF was noted by one parish council.

11.15 The more negative comments cited issues surrounding a perceived lack of local consultation, safety concerns and raised questions surrounding financial responsibilities and implementation. A number of respondents emphasised the need for a 'joined-up' infrastructure approach, to link new routes with existing cycle networks and public transport. Shenley Road, Hampden Fields, Aylesbury, Haddenham, Thame and Milton Keynes were highlighted in this regard, specifically noting the importance of connecting up rural communities to major centres with well-established cycle routes (e.g. Milton Keynes).

Policy T3 - Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

11.16 There were 26 responses received in relation to Policy T3. The majority of comments were favourable, noting AVDC's commitment to sustainable modes of transport and the policy's alignment with the NPPF.

11.17 Respondents queried the viability of electric vehicle charging points and questioned the implications and the robustness of the policy. The responsibility for installing charge points is unclear. Additional details were requested for large developments and a greater pledge to link charge points to renewables was suggested.

11.18 Negative comments questioned the methodology used to prepare the policy conditions. The overall cost of the scheme was also a cause of concern with respondents noting the high price of electricity. Investment in cycle-schemes, electric buses and park and ride schemes were suggested.

12.0 Changes Made at Proposed Submission Stage (Regulation 19)

12.1 Below is a summary of key changes made:

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|--|--|
| Response from Buckinghamshire County Council | | |
| Paragraph 4.15 | Aylesbury Garden Town movement - refers to 'a transport strategy for the Garden Town'. BCC are not aware of such a strategy and assume this should refer to the Aylesbury Transport Strategy. For consistency towards the adopted strategy. | Amended to say Aylesbury Transport Strategy, with an explanation added to reflect how it is being used to reflect the Garden Town principles. |
| Paragraph 2.4d Paragraph 2.4g, 4-5 Paragraph 2.4h, 6 Paragraph 4.17 | <p>There's a general concern that the transport measures included in the draft focus on a limited part of the full transport picture that affects (and/or is affected by) the Plan. In particular:</p> <p>It focuses on a limited number of specific issues (modes, locations, challenges etc.), rather than the quality of the network as a whole. Broader interventions will be required across the network, both inside and outside of developments (to its capacity and scope but also its quality, particularly for walking and cycling). Specific examples of this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Para' 2.4d, which focuses on a small number of public transport served destinations, rather than the broader geography identified in the Aylesbury and Buckingham Transport Strategies. ii. Para' 2.4g, 4-5, which separate the walking and cycling network from other modes rather than looking at a whole connected network. It appears that the intention of this is positive – to give sustainable modes more weight – but there is a danger that this could minimise the effectiveness of these interventions. iii. Para' 2.4h, 6 and elsewhere, which focuses on links between destinations but doesn't consider connectivity within settlements. <p>Para' 4.17, which doesn't reflect the close interaction of the overall urban space and transport behavior.</p> | <p>Developed a new sustainable transport vision section incl policy that identifies the 'broader interventions'</p> <p>Have acknowledged the 'wider geography'</p> <p>Have kept this policy to protect cycle ways and ped facilities against direct impact however, have included the provision and protection of cycle way and pedestrian facilities in a new T4 Delivering Transport in New Development section and policy</p> <p>Policy amended to acknowledge internal movements</p> |
| Transport | Not giving full coverage to all modes of transport. We support the Plan's focus on more sustainable modes; however, even in pursuing sustainable transport it is important that policy considers all of the ways people travel in reality. Whilst a policy will naturally focus on issues it wishes to promote, it must still cover all relevant issues. The transport policies set out relate only to a very small proportion of trips. Additional policies on public transport, alternatives to travel and road infrastructure would seem particularly important for the Plan to consider (as suggested by the Aylesbury and Buckingham Transport Strategies). The Plan could also include an all-encompassing | Have produced a new sustainable transport policy which acknowledges all modes of transport including sustainable modes and identifies how these have been justified through the various traffic models and transport strategies. Make provisions for a more holistic sustainable transport policy |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|---|---|
| | 'Sustainable Travel' policy which sets out the expectations of all new developments across the district to contribute to the enhancement of transport network and to deliver n increasing proportion of journeys being undertaken by sustainable travel modes. | |
| Paragraph 3.36 | 'necessary and critical infrastructure – need confirming | Completed |
| Paragraph 3.39 | A421 Expressway – reference should be to Oxford-Cambridge Expressway and needs to be consistent through document. | Corrected |
| Protected transport schemes | Could proposals in the Aylesbury and Buckingham Transport strategies be regarded as protected transport schemes (or at some other appropriate place in the draft). | These have now been incorporated into sustainable transport vision |
| Transport | BCC has historically used highway improvement lines but these are not appropriate for new road infrastructure such as the link roads or other proposed relief roads. It is not proposing to create any new highway improvement lines and would expect Local Plans to apply appropriate protection to relevant proposals, as is common elsewhere in the country. | Noted |
| Paragraph 3.52 | The Oxford - Cambridge Expressway Study identified one of the corridors as running in the area of the A421. It is only 1 of three possible corridors in Buckinghamshire which is being looked at and so there is uncertainty about which corridor option will be selected. In addition, the Expressway is not funded and implementation would be towards the end of the plan period - making it unlikely to assist in the mitigation of planned growth in this Local Plan. On that basis, we do not see how it can be a protected transport scheme. | Have created a protected scheme policy and a separate supported scheme policy which the Oxford-Cambridge expressway falls into and allows for a review once scheme route is identified. |
| East West Rail Paragraph 3.55 | Insert 'and' before supports 'The EWR project will link between Reading, Didcot, Oxford, Bicester, Aylesbury, Milton Keynes, Bedford, Cambridge, Norwich and Ipswich and supports sustainable growth'. | Corrected |
| Paragraph 3.55 | Should refer to England's Economic Heartland, as part of the consortium of local authorities. | Corrected |
| Paragraph 3.56 | Should include a map of the second phase, as the description is quite confusing. | Completed |
| Paragraph 3.58 | BCC has concerns that it seems unlikely that the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway route will be identified in time for this Local Plan. There may be a route by the end of 2018, but there seems to be some doubt about whether it will really be nailed down by then. | Noted |
| S6 Protected transport | S6a - The difficulty with the reference to 'Transport improvements in accordance with Buckinghamshire County Council's Local Transport Plan and associated movement | The ATS and BTS now are incorporated into the vision and protected schemes for a separate |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|--|---|
| schemes | strategies' is that there are no specific transport schemes identified in the LTP (latest version). Documents such as the Aylesbury Transport Strategy and Buckingham Transport Strategy are supporting documents to the LTP and these do identify specific schemes. Therefore, it is suggested that the wording of this policy needs to be changed to identify that it is schemes in the supporting documents which are supported. These documents and schemes are not mentioned in the supporting text and so this needs to be amended to make it clear what schemes from these documents are protected. | policy |
| S6b – HS2 | There has also been ongoing work with HS2 on the design of cycle routes where they interact with HS2 requiring high quality treatment - it would be good to see this also recognised in the Local Plan. | Acknowledged into new HS2 wording |
| Policy T1 | Aylesbury Garden Town transport strategy, paragraph 4.15 – As suggested previously, there should be a cross reference to Protected Transport schemes policy. | Acknowledged and reference made in Transport Chapter to Protected schemes |
| Policy D1 | Policy D1 Delivering Aylesbury Garden Town – statement 'All development in Aylesbury should contribute to meeting the Aylesbury Transport Strategy' –needs stronger wording. The developments cannot happen without the strategy being implemented as they include key mitigation measures | Statement changed to include the following; All development in Aylesbury should make significant contribution to delivering the Aylesbury Transport Strategy' |
| Policy D1 | Promote and encourage sustainable travel choices – Point F needs to include an element of future proofing. This could be through Electric Vehicles, E-bikes, car and ride sharing enablement etc., as a way of actively trying to reduce single occupancy car use and reduce emissions. | Wording changed to reflect this |
| D-AGT2: South West Aylesbury | Under Key Development and Land Use Requirements, point 'South West Link Road' – it is suggested that this should specify if this is a single carriageway with safeguarding for dualling, as well as upgrades to junction with A413 and A418. | Corrected |
| Paragraph 1.17 and 1.18 | The final sentence of paragraph 1.17 be amended to say '... in relation to national highway and rail networks.' Other than rail travel to work, there is a distinct boundary between Buckinghamshire including Aylesbury Vale and employment locations in the west of London. Including the rail network reference recognises existing rail commuting and provides a starting point to enable connections to be made via East West Rail and other enhancements to opportunities in and near the south of Bucks. | Changed to reflect rail commuting improvements under E-W rail |
| Paragraph | As drafted it recognises the links to international gateways such as Heathrow. | Corrected |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|--|---|
| 1.51 | <p>However following on from the point above it may be useful to add ‘...public transport, which may be addressed by East West Rail connections via Princes Risborough. In the longer term north south rail connectivity via Amersham may be supplemented by an improved rail network which provides for links to west London and the Thames Valley without needing to travel into central London.’</p> <p>This in part recognises that unmet need from the south of the county - which itself is partly a function of wider employment patterns and travel – is now to be proved for in Aylesbury Vale and specifically in locations with existing public transport hubs and corridors.</p> | |
| Paragraph 3.53 and 3.54 | The Plan should state that no station is being provided by HS2 in the district and so it will not provide additional north south connectivity for Buckinghamshire. | Noted |
| Paragraph 3.56 | It is suggested that the paragraph identifies the connectivity to the Thames Valley that EWR will provide via Oxford and Reading and so to Heathrow via Crossrail and potentially Western Rail Link to the Heathrow. | Noted |
| Paragraph 3.86 | Amend to paragraph to say ‘... adoption. Regional, national and internationally connectivity schemes such as the Oxford...’ It is suggested that monitoring should include changes in travel to work areas as these may require consideration of how supporting access to employment within and outside the district through transport investment, education and skills development can achieve the plan’s objectives. | Agreed and Corrected |
| Transport | There is a need for the VALP to give greater consideration towards supporting ‘healthy communities’ by including cross cutting objectives which aim to deliver accessibility, inclusivity and adequate infrastructure which facilitates active and sustainable lifestyles. This could include policies on place making, amenity, health and wellbeing, which look to support opportunities for healthy and active lifestyles through providing access to high quality walking and cycling routes, supporting initiatives for local food growing, avoiding concentrations of hot food takeaways and recognising the need to ensure greater access to open space, sport and recreation facilities for communities of all ages. | Acknowledged however, Sustainable vision identifies the promotion of high quality of life, connected and integrated communities and healthy communities |
| IDP | Within the Plan, there are still only a few references to health and social care, and the | The IDP has and will identify community/health |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|---|---|
| | plan is unclear about what it will specifically deliver in terms of health care and social care infrastructure. The only reference to health care facilities appears to be in relation to Aylesbury and Salden Chase. A policy should include integrating facilities and delivery of services, which includes flexible multiuse buildings in community ownership, co-location of doctors, pharmacy facilities and enhancement and new social care and local healthcare facilities to meet long term health needs. | hubs as a preferred NHS/CCG strategy. The CCG operate outside the LPA's control and hence it would be difficult for AVDC to implement a policy to develop these health/community hubs |
| Transport | The chapter looks to be a more helpful approach to incorporating our joint transport work, covering overarching transport issues more explicitly. | Accepted no action necessary |
| Policy T1 | The role of developers in delivering these measures isn't overly clear. It could be misinterpreted as suggesting that they would all be delivered by us and/or AVDC. | Amend to incorporate the following: 2nd para, start with The Council aims to ensure that appropriate developments will deliver the improvements identified in....? |
| Policy T1 | It is generally better to refer to transport studies (or similar) than to transport models. The model is the tool used but requires a good deal of interpretation to provide evidence to inform a strategy. It is misleading and doesn't reflect the depth of our joint work. | Change T1 to state Transport Studies as opposed to county-wide and local traffic models |
| T4 | New Developments section: it would be good to discuss how this references / interacts with our developing Development Management Policy, which considers a number of similar issues. https://democracy.bucksc.gov.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=3290 | As the County DM policy has yet to be adopted we will continue to set our own DM requirements until such time that they need to comply |
| T5 | Vehicle parking section: In order to support sustainable transport this should cover parking for all modes (bicycles, car share, electric vehicles, blue badge parking, motorcycles, cars and delivery vehicles). Preferably these would be ordered according to your modal hierarchy. Our joint work creating our Countywide Parking Guidance would provide a helpful basis for this. | Amend to incorporate the following: Policy T5 – Delete the word 'Car' from the last sentence and replace with 'Vehicle' |
| Response from Suzanne Ornsby QC | | |
| S5 | Update S5 to be more general - Transport Strategy, and include protected transport schemes as part of that | Transport chapter amended to separate strategic transport policies from DM transport policies such as S5. Protected schemes now has a separate policy |
| T1 | Improve AGT transport section - doesn't currently say what was done, what it concluded and what the result will be – redraft | New Policy T1 identifies the importance the Garden Town makes on the Transport Vision for Aylesbury |
| Response from Keith Holland | | |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|---|--|
| Transport | This latter information is somewhat generalised and it would be helpful if the information and the more important site specific transport initiatives could be brought together in the transport chapter. As it stands, it looks as though the Council is not concerned about the transport implications of the growth being proposed | New Policy T1 identifies the vision and the strategies devised to help achieve it. The IDP identifies the schemes required to develop the strategies and thus the vision. |
| Regulation 18 VALP consultation | | |
| Transportation Infrastructure | This concern went ‘hand-in-glove’ with the concern over housing volume. Respondents noted that the proposed housing allocations will impact the ability of the current infrastructure to handle additional demand and questioned the ability of the existing systems to absorb this increase. Respondents questioned that recent traffic modelling and planning had either allowed for the VALP proposals, or that the VALP had adequately considered this issue in its planning stage. The majority concern was for regional traffic (vehicular) although the upgrading of rail infrastructure and cycle routes were also frequently mentioned. Traffic increase, with its attendant impacts on air quality, noise and community safety (particularly around schools) was of concern to respondents. The impact of traffic volumes and mix on village roads and main feeder routes was seen to be an important issue including the impact on journey times into Aylesbury at peak times. A minority of respondents linked the requirement for transportation infrastructure in the VALP with HS2 development and suggested that cumulative impacts required further investigation. | The county-wide model identifies the mitigation required to support the proposed VALP growth and assess the impact. At a lower level the Aylesbury Transport Strategy and Buckingham Transport Strategy identify less strategic schemes that will mitigate growth impact to the towns at a more local level. |
| Infrastructure/ DP | Respondents were concerned that the proposed housing volumes would create significant strain on the area’s infrastructure in general terms. This includes the built environment, in addition to transportation infrastructure, (transportation infrastructure was often mentioned as a separate concern). Respondents would have greater comfort in the VALP if an infrastructure plan was available which took account of or incorporated the VALP proposals. Respondents were not convinced that the infrastructure, as exists currently, would be able to handle significant increases in capacity and use. | The IDP does take account of the development strategy and this has been tested through the subsequent transport models |
| Transport | The concern of transport provision and capacity was highlighted as a separate concern to the transportation infrastructure per se. The capacity of bus route connectivity to main centres such as Aylesbury was a concern as well as access to the proposed rail developments in the area. | Public Transport improvements have been identified in the Aylesbury Transport Strategy and the IDP |
| Services | With regard to the provision of services, social and structural to support the influx of proposed new household levels, respondents were concerned that the current services | The IDP accounts for these services and service providers have been heavily consulted on the |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|---|---|--|
| | (health, doctors, hospitals, schools, shops and pubs) would be overwhelmed by demand resulting in lower levels of access for current residents and loss of amenity. Access to Doctors and GPs was a key concern along with education provision and availability of school places for the children and young people in the area. | development strategy in order to identify appropriate levels of infrastructure |
| South Oxfordshire District Council | | |
| Strategic Growth | Concern regarding cross-boundary and cumulative impacts on SODC. Request that these (with particular reference to Thame and Princes Risborough) are incorporated into the SAR and VALP. Traffic impacts are highlighted – assessments should consider the SO Core Strategy, Thame Neighbourhood Plans, SODC Local Plan, Princes Risborough Area Action Plan and Wycombe DC Local Plan. | South Oxon – Bucks CC commissioned a County-wide Model using Jacobs who used NTEM – National Trip End Model rates for all of the neighbouring districts outside the study area including the South Oxon highway network. |
| Chiltern, Aylesbury Vale and Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Groups (NHS) | | |
| IDP | Advise consultation with other healthcare providers Need more information on phasing of developments and confirmed location in order to advise further. Note Development Plans should account for Bucks Primary Care Policy Delivery of infrastructure to support local facilities (and growth thereof) subject to developer contributions and funding Particular concern re village infrastructure and the significant healthcare effects that could result from increases in local population / pressure on services | Noted Phasing has been confirmed in proposed VALP and IDP Liaised with CCG about locality provision and demand from new proposed development strategy |
| Sport England | | |
| Infrastructure | Welcome the protection of Green Belt, footpath and cycle routes from inappropriate development. Suggests a number of improvements to policy statements. Concern regarding the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and detailed in an attached report. Objects to the use of “standards” in the last bullet point of Detailed Infrastructure and advises that the Local Authority use a needs/evidence based approach. Considers that the Detailed Infrastructure policies are not compliant with the NPPF, paragraph 73. Consequently objects to the Draft Plan. Recommend tools and guidance produced by Sport England to address issues. | AVDC will be using a Sport England endorsed Playing Pitch Strategy as well as a Built Sports Facility Strategy and the Open Space Strategy to determine the demand and supply of facilities across the district and are compliant with para 73 of the NPPF.. |
| Milton Keynes Council | | |
| Services, Infrastructure | Note the reliance on Milton Keynes for services, infrastructure and facilities and consequently wish to highlight the importance of assessing impacts, and implementing | MK – Bucks CC commissioned a county-wide model using Jacobs who used NTEM – National |

| Page number/ Section/ Paragraph | Original text/Comment (Proposed Submission Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, November 2017) | Suggested changed text/AVDC response |
|--|--|--|
| and Housing: | mitigation, for Milton Keynes. Traffic impacts are mentioned as particularly concerning. The submission attaches a draft Memorandum of Understanding to set out their position in more detail. Key points to note are: an objection to policy wording referring to “a long term defensible edge” for sites; and a point of disagreement (between MK and AVDC) over to which Housing Market Areas allocations should be attributed to. | Trip End Model rates for all of the neighbouring districts outside the study area including the MK highway network. |
| Wycombe District Council | | |
| Sustainable growth and development: | Need to work together to understand potential cross-border transport impacts that could lead to additional pressure on Princes Risborough. | See MOU 5. Transport — The cross boundary impacts of development on transport infrastructure will be assessed on an agreed basis jointly with the County Council. This will be undertaken in conjunction with traffic modelling of the impact of proposed allocations on the road networks within each Council’s area with the assistance of the County Council using an agreed joint assessment methodology. Where appropriate joint commissioning of transport modelling including utilising the county- wide transport model will be undertaken to assess strategic growth proposals or growth proposals straddling or close to district boundaries. |
| Dacorum Borough Council | | |
| Transport | Any traffic/transport implications need to be reviewed with Hertfordshire County Council to ensure no problems arise in Dacorum. | Dacorum – Bucks CC commissioned a county-wide model using Jacobs who used NTEM – National Trip End Model rates for all of the neighbouring districts outside the study area including the Dacorum highway network. |

13.0 Appendix

Glossary Term Definition:

Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP)

The spatial development plan for Aylesbury Vale used to determine planning applications. Adopted by AVDC in February 2004, only some of the policies have been saved for use in planning decisions. The AVDLP will be replaced by the Proposed VALP strategy, other future proposed VALP development plan documents and neighbourhood plans.

Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV) – Aylesbury Vale Advantage (AVA)

Organisations which support local authority partners to implement agreed projects, plans and strategies by helping deliver key infrastructure, prepare bids to secure funding and co-ordinate investment to help develop and deliver projects. The vehicle covering the district is known as Aylesbury Vale Advantage.

Climate Change

The lasting and significant change in weather patterns over periods ranging from decades to hundreds of years, impacting on river and sea levels and the rate of flows on watercourses.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a charge on new buildings and extensions to help pay for supporting infrastructure. This new charge replaces the section 106 tariff, but section 106 agreements (s106) will still be used for the specific impacts of a development (such as a new access road) and for affordable housing. Unlike s106, CIL is non-negotiable and collection is purely an administrative process. The levy and what it covers is set out in a charging schedule that is consulted on prior to submission to Government and public examination prior to adoption by the Council.

Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG)

The Department of Communities and Local Government sets national policy on local government in England, including what it does, how well it works and how it is funded. It is responsible for setting the cycle of local government elections in England and also has responsibility for the legislation that governs the review and updating of electoral arrangements within local authorities, work which is a statutory duty of the Electoral Commission

Department for Transport (DfT)

The Government department responsible for national Transport policy, funding and consideration of transport projects in the national interest

Development Plan Document (DPD)

The statutory development plan for determining planning applications and appeals in the district. This currently comprises the Adopted Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP) 2004 saved policies. The Proposed VALP strategy would replace parts of AVDLP. It is

intended that the remaining development management policies in AVDLP will be replaced by a proposed VALP delivery DPD and/or adopted neighbourhood plans.

Do Minimum Scenario

The base road and traffic network and serves as the benchmark for evaluating all other potential transport improvements.

Duty to Co-operate (DTC)

Duty to co-operate, is a legal requirement in the Local Plan preparation process. The duty concerns the Council and adjoining districts, counties and other identified public bodies. Council is required to provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the duty has been undertaken appropriately for the plan being examined. A topic paper has been prepared to provide evidence for the proposed VALP Strategy examination that the duty has been satisfied.

East-West Rail

A new railway network, partly using existing track that will connect Reading and Oxford across to East Anglia via Milton Keynes, Bedford and Cambridge. In the shorter term, the East West Consortium's priority is to deliver the western section of the route comprising Reading to Milton Keynes and Bedford via Oxford; and also Milton Keynes to Aylesbury. There will be a new station at Winslow due to be built on the line between the Aylesbury spur/Bicester and Bletchley. This is confirmed as part of the government's strategy for rail transport, and is planned to be open by 2017.

East-West Rail Consortium

A group of local authorities and businesses with an interest in improving access to and from East Anglia and the Milton Keynes/ South Midlands area.

Eastern Link Road (ELR)

New road links on eastern side of Aylesbury connecting between A418 at Bierton, A41Tring Road and Stocklake.

High Speed 2 Rail (HS2)

The Government's proposed high speed railway line from London to Birmingham (phase one due to open in 2026) and the north of England (phase two), cutting through the district from the southeast near Wendover to northwest near Turweston. The Council is opposed to the proposals (as part of the 51m group of local authorities) but is working with partner organisations to minimise the impact it will have if it does go ahead.

Local Model Validation Report

A report which demonstrates that a traffic model is an accurate representation of existing traffic conditions and the transport network.

Local Transport Plan (LTP)

Plan that sets out Buckinghamshire County Council's transport policies and strategies for a five-year period that will be delivered by Transport for Buckinghamshire. LTP3 (the current plan) covers 2011/12-2015/16.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is the Government's statement of national planning policy and all Local Plans must be in general conformity with it. This is tested at a Local Plan examination. The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and replaced numerous planning policy guidance documents, statements and circulars. It was accompanied by technical guidance to the NPPF on flood risk, on minerals and waste and a planning policy statement on Travellers sites.

Neighbourhood Plan

A type of planning policy document that after adoption can be used (alongside the Vale of Aylesbury Plan) to determine planning applications. The Plans are prepared by a parish council or neighbourhood forum for a particular neighbourhood area (made under the Localism Act, 2011) and have to be in general conformity with the district plan, undergo examination and a referendum.

Traffic Forecasting and Assumptions

The process of estimating the number of vehicles or people that will use a specific transportation network or particular pieces of infrastructure in the future.

Traffic Models

A mathematical representation of a transport system or network.

Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (proposed VALP)

The new planning policy Development Plan Document for the district covering the period 2011-2031. The first part of the proposed VALP will be a Strategy document due to be adopted in early 2014. It is envisaged a proposed VALP Delivery document will follow afterwards and replace the other development management policies in the Adopted Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan 2004.

51m group of local authorities

51m is a group of 18 local authorities that have joined together in a national campaign to actively challenge the HS2 rail project. The group is known as 51m because that represents how much HS2 will cost each and every parliamentary constituency...£51million. The group wants to emphasise the impact this proposed scheme will have on every taxpayer in the country for years to come. Aylesbury Vale is a member as are adjoining districts on the route, other Buckinghamshire districts and Buckinghamshire County Council.

Growth Delivery Partners

The following are considered to be the key delivery partners with the Council on implementing transport schemes in support of the proposed VALP Strategy:

- Buckinghamshire County Council/Transport for Bucks;
- Aylesbury Vale Advantage;
- Network Rail;
- East West Rail Consortium;
- Buckingham Town Council;
- Winslow Town Council;
- Other neighbourhood plan authorities;
- Development Industry;

References / list of evidence

Proposed Submission Core Strategy (June 2009)

Core Strategy Examination BCC Submissions Matters 3(c) & 3 (d) (February 2010)

Towards 2026 A Transport Strategy for Aylesbury – Draft officer Report (BCC March 2009)

Local Transport Plan 2 (BCC)

Local Transport Plan 3 (BCC)

Railways Act 2005 Statement for Control Period 5 (DfT)

East West Rail - www.eastwestrail.org.uk.

Traffic Assessment and Transport Modelling Reports

- Vale of Aylesbury Plan - Aylesbury Land Use and Traffic Assessment, June 2012
- Vale of Aylesbury Plan - Buckingham Land Use and Traffic Assessment, August