

CORE STRATEGY FOR CHILTERN DISTRICT - EXAMINATION

INSPECTOR'S AGENDA: HEARING, TUESDAY 12 APRIL (1st session)

Main Matter 2

There is a separate agenda for the 2nd session on MM3 Overall Housing Provision and Delivery. There will be a short adjournment (or the lunch break) before the start of the 2nd session for participants involved solely with the 2nd session to take their places.

This agenda draws on the main questions set out in the Main Matters and Questions 21 February. These are indicated thus (Q3.1). The order of some of these questions has been changed. Additional, follow-up questions and comments are shown in *italics*.

The Locational Strategy

(Q3.1) Over-arching issue: is the spatial strategy clearly expressed, does it derive from a proper consideration of reasonable alternatives and is it justified by evidence?

In CDN117, Appendix 2, the Council proposes the deletion of the explanatory text in the submitted CS regarding the Strategy and the substitution of new text.

(Q3.4): Does this text appropriately explain what the chosen strategy is meant to be? Is it consistent with policy CS1?

Is this change necessary for soundness? (If so, it would not be a minor change and would need to be the subject of appropriate consultation after the hearings.)

(Q3.8) Is the Council's evolved choice of urban concentration (as it is now stated to be) as the locational strategy justified by evidence and has it been the subject of Sustainability Appraisal which has informed the development of the strategy?

(Q3.7) In September 2010, did the Council review the chosen strategy including the constraints it was imposing on supply (such as by not contemplating development in the Green Belt)? Where is any such assessment set out? What are the Council's reasons now for not considering any housing sites in the Green Belt?

In the light of the Council's response, is the Council's decision not to consider reviewing the potential of the Green Belt justified?

Policy CS1

(Q3.5) Policy CS1 as submitted refers to the *four main, and most accessible settlements*. The Chiltern Accessibility Plan (B10 in CDN009) shows that Great Missenden has a higher accessibility index at its centre than Little Chalfont. How has *most accessible* been assessed in choosing the main settlements in CS1/CS2? Is the description of the selected settlements justified?

The Council's response interprets this question as a suggestion that more development should be in Great Missenden. My intention was to explore whether the wording of the policy reflected the evidence regarding accessibility. Does it? If not, does the Council's proposed change to CS1 in CDN117, Appendix 2 make the position clearer? Is it consistent with the new explanation of the strategy? Is this change necessary for soundness?

Policy CS2

(The soundness of the overall housing number in this policy will be the subject of discussion under MM3)

Q3.9 Has there been a change in locational strategy (or in the practical consequences flowing from how the strategy is expressed) between the Consultation Document March – April 2010 (CDN084) and the publication/submission version, now that housing numbers are not given for individual settlements?

Q3.10 Does policy CS2 provide a sufficient strategic spatial steer for the scale of housing in different settlements? Would figures for individual settlements make any difference to the scale of development that occurs, bearing in mind the strategic allocations made and reliance on SHLAA sites within the urban areas?

The Council accepts that policy CS2 does not clearly express what it intends and has proposed a change to include reference to housing delivery from sites in Policy CS7 (the residential MDS). Is a change necessary for soundness? Is the proposed change effective in supporting the chosen strategy? Should the contribution from policy CS7 sites be shown separately from the main settlements?

Table 2 in the submitted CS (p34) is based on policy CS2 (as submitted). CND117 notes that it will need to be updated, but no change is put forward by the Council. Could the Council prepare (by Monday 11th) a revised table 2 with CS7 sites as a separate category and with the data updated to 31 March 2011 in accordance with Council's revised evidence in the SHLAA (ie showing the range of anticipated delivery from the SHLAA sites etc).

Does the updated table demonstrate that the housing split between the different locations can still be delivered? Is inclusion of an amended table in the CS necessary for effectiveness?

Q3.12 Is the balance between the urban areas and the rest of the district appropriate? What has informed this split?

The Council's statement (CDC4, p 5) says that 75% or more of new dwellings will be built in the 4 settlements of Amersham, Chesham, Chalfont St Peter and Little Chalfont. Is this correct given the scale of development planned outside these settlements at the MDS sites and provision in the smaller villages? Revised Table 2 should be able to show the true position.

Q3.13 Would any settlement or parish, particularly Chalfont St Peter or Little Chalfont, have a disproportionate amount of new housing over the plan period or be affected by disproportionate impacts from developments?

**Simon Emerson
INSPECTOR
30 March 2011**