

## **CORE STRATEGY FOR CHILTERN DISTRICT - EXAMINATION**

### **INSPECTOR'S AGENDA: HEARING, WEDNESDAY 13 APRIL (1<sup>st</sup> session)**

#### **Main Matter 4**

There is a separate agenda for the 2<sup>nd</sup> session on MM5. That session will not start until 1pm or later.

This agenda draws on the main questions set out in the Main Matters and Questions 21 February. These are indicated thus (Q5.1). Additional, follow-up questions and comments are shown in *italics*. Not all the questions may require much further discussion.

**Sub matter: Policy CS6 Strategic Housing Allocations** (Land east of Lincoln Park, Amersham-on-the-Hill; Donkey Field, Little Chalfont; Holy Cross Convent, Chalfont St Peter.)

*I confirm that as planning permission has been granted for residential development at the Holy Cross Convent site I do not intend to consider further the principle of redeveloping that site as the allocation reflects current circumstances.*

Q5.1 Why did the Council select these 3 sites from other sites in the SHLAA as strategic sites? Are there any other sites which could or should be considered as strategic allocations which accord with the stated strategy?

*What is the size/scale of site which makes a site a candidate for a strategic allocation?*

*Applegarth Holdings contend that the Saxeway Business Centre (Chartridge Business Centre) should be a strategic residential allocation. Is its size and the potential scale of housing that could be delivered large enough to be strategic? (The issue of whether any employment land should be released for other uses will be addressed under MM7 and not here.)*

Q5.2 What contribution does the undeveloped state of the Donkey Field make to the character of Little Chalfont? How does the significance of any such contribution compare with its suitability for housing and the need for housing?

*In justifying development of this site, does the Council place any reliance on the Chiltern Townscape Character Assessment (CDN112) which includes the Donkey Field within Townscape Character Area 6 (Little Chalfont Village Centre)? If so, is this aspect of the Assessment credible?*

Q5.3 There are figures in the Housing Trajectory (CDN089) for what the Council expects from these sites. Are these figures appropriate and justified by evidence?

*Council to clarify what is the expected density of development expected from each of these sites. Does the figure for Lincoln Park take into account any trees on site that should be retained?*

Q5.4 What is the evidence for the anticipated delivery from these sites as set out in the Trajectory (CDN089)? Is delivery realistic?

Q5.5 Are there any specific infrastructure requirements which the development of these sites requires or should contribute to? If so, should these be identified in the Core Strategy?

*(None appear to have been identified in any evidence.)*

Q5.6 How will the Core Strategy be effective in securing the appropriate delivery of what the Council intends/expects from these sites?

*In relation to the Donkey Field the Council's statement (CDC6, p2) says: By allocating the site... the Council can ensure that future development proposals on the site are of high quality of design, respect local character and retain important features such as some boundary screening and some open space within the site. Is this approach necessary and appropriate and, if so, how will it be achieved when the CS is silent on all these matters?*

*For effectiveness, should policy CS6 say any more about the scale/type of development envisaged or other desired outcomes? Is supporting explanatory text required?*

*(Q5.7. Should the allocation for the Holy Cross site include the land shown in the approved planning application as a relocated playing field? Given the Council's response and in the absence of any other arguments, I am not pursuing this matter.)*

### **Short Adjournment**

**Sub Matter: Policy CS7 Major Developed Sites (MDS) in the Green Belt allocated for residential development** (Amersham and Wycombe College, Lycrome Road, Chesham; and Newlands Park.)

Q5.9 Do these 2 sites come within the type of sites referred to in PPG2, Annex C as potential MDS?

*In the absence of any specific guidance in PPG2 there would seem wide scope for the Council to decide whether to allocate sites as MDS. There is no evidence that the Council has been inconsistent or arbitrary in doing so. Any further discussion?*

Q5.10 Is the allocation for housing of these 2 MDS consistent with the stated strategy in policy CS1? If not, are there factors which justify development here?

*Are they consistent with the strategy in the submitted CS? Are they consistent with re-stated strategy and possible changes to CS2 in CND117?*

Q5.11 Bearing in mind the sites' low scores on the Chiltern Accessibility Plan (B10 in CDN009), how is the proposed residential development consistent with the sustainability objectives of the Strategy or, if not, what are the factors which justify development here?

Q5.12 Given the low scores on the Chiltern Accessibility Plan (B10 in CDN009) are these appropriate locations for seeking a high proportion of affordable housing in accordance with policy CS8?

Q5.13 Is there any evidence of a continuing need for the site or premises at Amersham & Wycombe College for educational or other community purposes?

*Although some representors consider that the site should be retained for educational/community purposes, I have seen no evidence of any specific need to do so.*

Q5.14 Has the impact of residential development at the Amersham & Wycombe College site on traffic congestion and air quality in Chesham been assessed? What were the conclusions and should any mitigation be specified in the Core Strategy?

*Although concern is expressed by some representors, I have seen no specific evidence to undermine the Council's position summarised in CDC6/A, p4)*

Q5.15 There are figures in the Housing Trajectory (CDN089) for what the Council expects from these sites. Are these figures appropriate and justified by evidence?

Q5.16 What is the evidence for the anticipated delivery from these sites as set out in the Trajectory (CDN089)? Is delivery realistic?

*In particular, Council to clarify the prospects of Amersham and Wycombe College being able to pursue its reorganisation plans and release its Chesham side for redevelopment within the timescale indicated in the Trajectory.*

Q5.17 Policy CS7 lists some requirements of development at these sites. Are these requirements justified and sufficiently comprehensive?

**Simon Emerson**  
**INSPECTOR**  
**30 March 2011**