

SOUTH BUCKS DISTRICT COUNCIL

Decisions

BILL LIDGATE

Cabinet Member – PLANNING POLICY

Having considered reports sent to the Policy Advisory Group (PAG) on 9 October 2003 and the views expressed by the PAG, the Cabinet Member has made the following decisions.

1. **Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy**

The Cabinet Member has agreed a response to the consultation in respect of the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy, making the following points:

- There is concern about development going south from Milton Keynes in to Buckinghamshire and on to grade 2 agricultural land, rather than to the east of the M1 on less constrained land.
- With growth at Aylesbury there is need for better transport links to the Thames Valley, which should be via a western transport system link from the A404 down to the M4.
- It is essential that additional infrastructure (e.g. schools) is provided to meet the needs of new residents in the growth areas, including Aylesbury, since otherwise that growth will impact adversely on services (including schools) in southern Buckinghamshire.
- Some of the housing growth at Aylesbury is likely to be occupied by people working in the Thames Valley (given the differentials in property prices). It could thus help to meet some of the needs for affordable housing associated with people working in the Thames Valley. It is thus considered that authorities in the Thames Valley (including South Bucks) should be provided with a mechanism where they would have nomination rights to some of the affordable housing to be provided in the Aylesbury area.

2. **Consultation Paper on a Proposed Change to PPG3 Housing: “Supporting the Delivery of New Housing”**

The Cabinet Member has agreed a response to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on the consultation in respect of the Proposed Change to PPG3 Housing: “Supporting the Delivery of New Housing”, to include the following:

- The increased flexibility was welcomed but there were some reservations about the details, which appear to relax planning controls too much.
- Concern was expressed about the potential for loss of small “incubator” units including any future potential;
- Land which was no longer “suitable” for continued employment purposes was different from “redundant” or “vacant land”, and the word “suitable” would be preferred to be included in the proposed change.

Date published: 10 October 2003

Date to be implemented: 20 October 2003.