

**LOCAL PLAN ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION DOCUMENT**

**1 Purpose**

- 1.1 To ask for input from the Committee on the content of the Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document prior to its consideration by Cabinet and Council.

**2 Recommendation**

- |  |
|--|
| 2.1 To consider the content of the attached Local Plan Issues and Options consultation document and make recommendations to Cabinet. |
|--|

**3 Supporting information**

- 3.1 Since the withdrawal of the Vale of Aylesbury Plan (VAP) Core Strategy in 2014, due to insufficient housing and Duty to Cooperate issues, work has been progressing on the preparation of the new Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan. This commenced with a Scoping Consultation, a Call for Sites and the commissioning of a Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). Initial results of the Aylesbury Vale HEDNA were published in October and following a delay to take account of the most recent DCLG Household Projections a final draft of the report was published. However ensure compatibility with Government guidance and the Duty to Cooperate a Central Bucks HEDNA has been commissioned in conjunction with the Wycombe and Chiltern councils and draft report is about to be published.
- 3.2 At the same time as the Aylesbury Vale HEDNA preparation work commenced on the preparation of a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to ascertain which of the sites suggested through the Call for Sites were achievable and deliverable against a range of criteria. A joint methodology was agreed with the other Buckinghamshire Councils as the basis for the assessment and the initial assessment has now been completed.
- 3.3 Other evidence to support the Local Plan has also been sourced including a Retail Needs Assessment, an assessment of evidence supporting Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) and Areas of Sensitive Landscape (ASLs), an update to the 2013 Buckinghamshire Gypsy and Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Needs Assessment and the definition of a Central Bucks Housing Market Area (HMA) and Functional Economic Market Area (FEMA).
- 3.4 Currently work is progressing on a joint Buckinghamshire Green Belt Review, and a joint Sustainability Appraisal and Habitat Regulation Assessment Scoping study. Further joint evidence is being considered in discussions with the other Buckinghamshire Councils to meet Government Guidance such as the preparation of a Water Cycle Study and flood risk assessments.
- 3.5 As reported previously preparation of a consultation document commenced in July and August to inform the Issues and Options Consultation in October. The consultation document is now ready for consideration by this Committee. It does not allocate sites for development as proposed allocations will be included at the Draft Plan stage which is timetabled for Spring 2016 which will precede the submission stage in late 2016 and adoption by mid 2017.

#### **4 Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document**

- 4.1 The Issues and Option Consultation Document attached as an Appendix to this report sets out the capacity which can be derived from the HELAA of 22,523 dwellings, the housing need of 21,300 dwellings from the HEDNA, an estimated need for 10,000 dwellings to meet unmet need and the spatial options for meeting the need. As can be seen in the attached document with the shortfall between the need and the potential supply other options need to be considered to meet need. These include combining the HELAA supply and other aspects of supply with either a new settlement or substantial extensions at Milton Keynes which presents capacity close to the housing need figure or utilising both the new settlement and the Milton Keynes extensions to exceed the projected need. A short presentation will be made to the Scrutiny Committee to set out the results of the HEDNA.
- 4.2 Both of the HELAA and the HEDNA reports will be placed on the Council's website and be available for comment as well as the consultation document. The consultation document also invites comments on the revised settlement hierarchy, a list of proposed development management policies and work to support local landscape designations.
- 4.3 The six week consultation period will commence on Friday 23<sup>rd</sup> October following consideration of the consultation document at Council on the 21<sup>st</sup> of October. It will involve a number of consultation events but will primarily be web based. All of those on the Local Plan consultation database will be invited to comment and the consultation will be publicised via a press release and on social media. All comments received will be taken into account in the production of the draft Local Plan for Spring 2016

#### **5 Resource implications**

- 5.1 Funding of the Local Plan's preparation is being derived from existing budgets.

Contact Officer Peter Williams (01296) 585208

Background Documents None

**Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013 to 2033**

**Issues and Options Consultation Document**

**October 2015**



# Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation Document

## Contents

1. Introduction and Context
2. Implications of Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and Traveller Needs Assessment
3. Output from the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment
4. Settlement Hierarchy
5. Spatial Options for meeting HEDNA conclusions
6. Development Management Policies
7. Landscape
8. Glossary



# 1. Introduction and Context

## Introduction

When adopted the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) will form the major part of the development plan for Aylesbury Vale covering the period from 2013 to 2033. As set out in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Local plan will therefore have a pivotal role in determining how Aylesbury Vale will develop in the future by determining where development should or should not happen, how much development there will be and what that development will look like. It is therefore vitally important that we get as many inputs as possible from local residents and businesses to help us define the content of the new plan.

## Previous work

Following the withdrawal of the previous Vale of Aylesbury Plan Core Strategy in February 2014, on the advice of an Inspector, the Council has been working towards preparing a full replacement Local Plan. This commenced with a 'Regulation 18' consultation which took place over an 8-week period from 2<sup>nd</sup> April to 28<sup>th</sup> May 2014. That consultation focused on what the scope and content of the new Local Plan should be in terms of the topic areas the plan should cover and its general content. The consultation was accompanied by a Call for Sites in which we asked developers and landowners to promote sites for any use so the Council would know where land was available. The sites suggested have since been publicised on the Council's website but this does not imply that these sites will be allocated for development.

The Council has also published an ambitious timetable for the delivery of the Local Plan entitled the Local Development Scheme. This envisages this Issues and Option consultation stage to be followed by consultation on a draft Local Plan by Spring next year, then the preparation of a final 'submission' Local Plan by the end of 2015 which will be followed by an Examination in early 2017 and adoption by mid 2017.

Then in October 2014 the Council undertook a series of forums involving town/parish councils and other stakeholders to set out the early results of work to establish the numbers of houses and amount of employment land that the Local Plan will have to accommodate. Since then the Council has been working on securing the evidence to support the new local Plan and that evidence forms the majority of this consultation.

## Context for the Local Plan

The principal guide for the production of a Local Plan is the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This sets out the broad policy approach to be taken across a range of planning issues. Further detail is then provided in the Planning Practice Guidance which is regularly updated to ensure guidance remains current. The job of a local planning

authority is then to interpret and amplify the content of the NPPF into local planning policies and allocate sufficient land to meet the areas needs whilst protecting selected areas from development where it can be justified. A key principle in the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development which means that development proposals that accord with the development plan should be approved without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The District Council is not however the only organisation that draws up planning policy documents. The County Council has the responsibility for producing plans on minerals and waste as well as determining applications for such matters. Then town and parish councils can draw up neighbourhood plans which can allocate land for development and contain policies which are taken into account in planning decisions. A settlement may therefore have up to four plans which relate to its area.

The process of producing Local Plans is also determined by the Local Plan Regulations 2012 which contain specific stipulations about how the process must be undertaken. This includes the need to carry out consultations at certain stages in the preparation of the plan, for at least 6 weeks for each consultation, and take the results of the consultation into account before submitting the plan for Examination by an independent Inspector who will then determine whether the plan is 'sound' on the basis of tests set out in the NPPF. Should a plan be found 'sound' it can then be adopted and become the basis for planning decisions until it is replaced by a revised Local Plan. Such revisions usually take place every five years or so.

A very important part of the process of producing a Local Plan is to cooperate with other Councils and other statutory bodies to ensure that the plan works with their plans. This is the Duty to Cooperate which is set out in the Localism Act. If this duty has not been met a plan cannot be found sound. Aylesbury Vale District Council has therefore put in place arrangements to ensure that the duty is met through continuous engagement with Duty to Cooperate organisations. In relation to the Wycombe and Chiltern Councils which evidence shows AVDC most closely relates to in planning terms, this has led to joint working on a range of evidence so that the respective Council's plans use the same evidence.

Another very important part of the process of producing a Local Plan is the undertaking of a Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan. This involves the creation of a methodology for testing the sustainability of the Local Plan which is then applied throughout the process of preparing the Local Plan which leads to the production of an environmental report which is submitted alongside the Local Plan. The Council has to take into account the findings of the sustainability appraisal in its plan and mitigate or remove any negative impacts as far as it is able to. The Government's definition of sustainability is paragraphs 8 to 219 of the NPPF which encompasses 46 pages of policy guidance. This means that sustainability assessments must encompass economic and social impacts as well as environmental ones. This can mean that negative environmental effects are outweighed by beneficial social and economic effects.

The Council has commissioned consultants to carry out a scoping appraisal so that the methodology for assessing the Local Plan can be agreed. The proposed methodology for assessing the Local plan will be published alongside the issues and options consultation. A commentary will also be produced to indicate what the broad sustainability ramifications of

the content of this document may be. A Sustainability Appraisal report of the draft Local Plan will be published alongside the draft Plan when it is published next year.

## **Evidence to Support the Local Plan**

As set out in the NPPF “each local planning authority should ensure that the Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area”. The Council has therefore been commissioning or producing in house supporting evidence to accord with the provisions of the NPPF.

The first type of evidence referred to in the NPPF is the need for housing in an area. The PPG says that the Council should prepare a Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) to determine the need for both housing and economic development in an area. The Council commissioned the preparation of a HEDNA for Aylesbury Vale in mid 2014 and a draft final report was issued recently. This HEDNA was commissioned at a time when other councils were not wishing to prepare Local Plans but subsequently other councils have determined that they need to prepare new Local Plans. The NPPF requires that any assessment of housing need should be based on a Housing Market Area (HMA) and consultants were commissioned to carry out a study to determine what area the HMA should cover. It determined that the Aylesbury Vale, Wycombe and Chiltern Council areas form a ‘best fit’ HMA which should be the basis for determining housing need. A Central Bucks HEDNA was therefore commissioned and the draft findings of that HEDNA form a major part of this Issues and Options Consultation.

The HEDNA also determines the need for affordable housing in an area and what amount of housing is needed to meet specific needs such as housing for the elderly. The Council will use this information to formulate its policies so that these needs are met through appropriate development. However such requirements cannot force developments to meet the policies if it would render developments unviable.

Councils are also required to produce a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment to find out what the supply of deliverable or developable housing and employment land is within the plan area. To initiate this process the Council carried out the Call for Sites referred to above to ask anyone to suggest areas of land that the Council should consider for allocation in the Local Plan. The sites suggested have subject to a checking process to determine the impacts that they would have and whether the site could be allocated in the Local Plan or not. The draft HELAA report will be published alongside the Issues and Options consultation document so that comments can be made on its content. It must be emphasized that the sites will only have been determined to be deliverable or developable on the basis of a technical assessment of their potential for development. Even where an area has been determined to be suitable for development it does not mean that it will be allocated in the Local Plan.

To determine what the need for site allocations is to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers Government guidance also requires Councils to undertake a Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment (GTNA). A joint report with other Councils has therefore been prepared and is available on the Council’s website. The Council will use the information in the report to

determine the amount of land to be allocated for Gypsies and Travellers on specific sites in the draft Local Plan which will be produced early next year.

The Local Plan area includes land around Wendover which is designated as Green Belt where there is a presumption against development which would harm the openness of the Green Belt. The areas which are designated as Green Belt can only be reviewed as part of the preparation of a Local Plan. The aim of such a review is to determine whether there are areas within the current Green Belt which no longer meet the purposes of the Green Belt or whether there are new areas which should be included in the Green Belt. Areas which do need to be retained can then be considered for allocation in the Local Plan. A Green Belt Review has been commissioned and is currently underway. The methodology for the review can be seen on the Council's website. Any sites which are proposed for removal or additional to the Green Belt will be consulted on as part of the draft Local Plan to be published next year.

Another significant piece of evidence is a Retail Needs Assessment which determines what the need is for retail development over the plan period. Consultants have been commissioned to prepare a report and it is available on the Council's website. The report concludes that there is no need to allocate more land to meet need for supermarket or 'convenience' retailing and there is only a small amount of land needed for white goods or 'comparison' retailing.

A profoundly important area of evidence is in relation to the built and natural environment. Information about the environment will be taken into account in the sustainability appraisal referred to above and the site selection process including the HELAA will take into account environmental impacts. Specific matters such as impacts on important wildlife sites have to be considered via a Habitat Regulations Assessment and the potential for flooding will be taken into account through a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Another important area of evidence on the environment relates to landscapes. The Local Plan area includes land which falls within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the current Local Plan identifies Areas of Attractive Landscape and Local Landscape Areas. Local designations carry less weight in planning decisions than national designations like the AONB but still allow important local landscapes to be taken into account in planning decisions. The Council wishes to retain local landscape designations in the new Local Plan and has produced reports relating to their suitability which are being consulted on as part of this consultation via the Council's website.

Also important is that the Local Plan's provisions for each of its settlements should take into account the role of each settlement in the hierarchy of settlements. Generally the larger the settlement the more facilities it has and the larger the amount of development that can be accommodated. Previously the Council has published a settlement hierarchy which ranked settlement according to a range of criteria including the size of the population and the community facilities which are available. As part of preparing the Local Plan the Council has updated the survey work behind the hierarchy and amended the hierarchy where justified. The resultant hierarchy is being consulted on as part of this Issues and Options consultation so that it can be included in the draft plan to be published next year once comments have been taken into account.

## **Community Infrastructure Levy**

As well as preparing the Local Plan the Council is also engaged in the production of other documents and strategies which will have an impact on planning decisions. One particular area of work is in relation to the production of a Community Infrastructure Levy which will allow the Council to charge developers for costs of the infrastructure which is required to support their development. This entails the Council preparing a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule together with an Infrastructure Plan and information on impacts on development viability. The Council intends to introduce CIL and will be preparing the relevant documentation at the appropriate time. However it is not possible to determine what infrastructure is required until allocations are proposed and policies are defined, such as those in relation to affordable housing, which will determine the viability of development. A draft Charging Schedule will be produced in association with the draft Local Plan next year which will be consulted prior to finalisation alongside the submission Local Plan. The Charging Schedule will then be subject to a separate Examination process which will probably follow close on behind the Examination of the Local Plan.

## **Neighbourhood Plans**

Another very important area of work allied to the production of the Local Plan is assisting communities within Aylesbury Vale with the production of Neighbourhood Plans. Such plans have to take into account the strategic content of the Local Plan but can set their own policies on matters of a non-strategic nature. Other policies in the Local Plan which are non-strategic will apply in those areas where there is no neighbourhood plan or where the neighbourhood plan does not contain a policy on the matter concerned. It should not be assumed therefore that the policies outlined in this Issues and Options consultation document will apply in all of the Local Plan area.

## **Development Management Policies**

As mentioned above the new Local Plan will also contain a range of development management policies based on the NPPF and related to the circumstances in Aylesbury Vale. Such policies will cover detailed matters such as design and car parking standards. At this stage the Council wishes to know whether all of the topics which should be covered by a policy are included and the general aim of the policy is appropriate. Comments will then be used to determine what the specific content of the policy should be. It will be possible to draw up and implement policies which differ from the NPPF if local circumstances warrant it but in some areas such as in relation to sustainable building design the Government has stipulated that local policies cannot be brought into force. The specific wording of the development management policies will be set out in the draft Local Plan to be prepared next year.

## **2. Implications of the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment and Gypsy and Traveller needs Assessments**

As explained above the Council has to undertake a Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) to determine the amount of housing and employment land that should be allocated in the Local Plan. A Central Bucks HEDNA has been commissioned and its draft findings form an important component of this consultation. Essentially the HEDNA has to commence by considering the Government's projections for population growth in an area and determine whether they need to be varied to reflect local circumstance to arrive at figures for housing and economic development that the Council can use to formulate its Local Plan.

In relation to Aylesbury Vale the consultants have determined that the Government's projections do not adequately take into account local circumstances so have concluded that the basic level of growth will be at a lower rate than that forecast by the Government. They have then considered other local factors that may mean that the level of growth predicted should be increased to take into account such factors as affordability and the need to support economic development. On that basis they have concluded that growth will need to be at a higher level than suggested by the revised projections. Based on the CLG 2012 based household projections growth would have amounted to 34,300 households across the HMA . Before any uplifts the HEDNA concludes that growth will be 35,970 households with 18,720 in Aylesbury Vale from 2013 to 2033. Following uplifts the number of new houses required across the HMA is 43,000 with 21,300 required in Aylesbury Vale.

Related to this forecast level of growth is the proportion of affordable housing that should be required by the Council in new housing developments. The latest guidance indicates that only those households who cannot afford to obtain housing at all will be counted as being in need. This is very different from the approach taken previously where it was the proportion of households who devoted more than a set percentage of income towards meeting housing costs, such as 30%, that were counted as being in need. Based on information on those households that fit the new definition the proposed affordable housing requirement is between 24% and 22% dependant on the level of uplift to be included for market signals. To account for the fact that a large number of small sites are likely to be excluded by whatever threshold is adopted in relation to the requirement for affordable housing the Local Plan policy on affordable housing is likely to require a higher figure than this to ensure that the affordable housing need is met.

The HEDNA has also considered what the need might be for housing to meet the needs of the elderly. The effect of healthier lifestyles and better healthcare is that the proportion of elderly within the population is increasing nationally. The conclusion is that the population over 75 years old across the HMA will increase almost by 30,000 people and this will lead to an increase of 5,700 dwellings or 13.3% needed as various types of housing for older people. The Local Plan will also need to address the growth in the institutional population across the HMA which is forecast to 2,200 extra persons above the objectively assessed need for the HMA. This will mean that the Local Plan will have to show how these populations are to be housed. One approach may be to require a percentage of adaptable

housing within large developments for independent elderly of around 15%, with possible site allocations for care of the dependant elderly.

Because of constraints like Green Belt or AONB designation some areas cannot accommodate all of their need within their areas. The Government has stated that such unmet need should be met in less constrained parts of the HMA or outside the HMA if capacity cannot be found within it. In relation to the HMA for Aylesbury Vale it is unlikely that the other areas included of Wycombe and Chiltern will be able to accommodate all their housing and or employment need so their unmet need will have to be accommodated in Aylesbury Vale. As the other councils have not yet completed their capacity assessments it is not possible to determine what their level of unmet need will be. Other adjacent councils which may have unmet need have also not determined whether they would have any need for their unmet need to be determined in Aylesbury Vale. This document has therefore attempted to take into account the possible level of unmet need by generating an estimated figure of 10,000 houses. The real figure may be lower or higher than this but at this early stage that figure is felt to be a reasonable estimate on which to consider the options for meeting growth In Aylesbury Vale.

The HEDNA has considered the level of employment land for offices, manufacturing and warehousing that should be allocated in the plan. This has involved evaluating three employment forecasts and determining which of them is the most appropriate for the economic area. Based on the chosen forecast the conclusion has been that there is a need for an allocation of 22ha of employment land in Aylesbury Vale. There is already 77ha of employment land available for development in the Council's area so there will need to be a careful consideration of employment sites to determine whether they can be out to other uses. If the Council decides to retain a surplus above the forecast need the housing requirement for Aylesbury Vale will need to be increased. Until that detailed assessment has taken place it will not be possible to determine the amount of land to be allocated and whether housing figures should be increased as a result.

In conjunction with other councils an assessment of traveller needs has been undertaken. This has concluded that there is a net requirement for 57 traveller pitches and 3 travelling showpeople pitches in Aylesbury Vale between 2013 and 2028. There a large number of temporary consent for traveller pitches in Aylesbury Vale. One way to address the shortfall would be to allocate such sites if they suitable for long term occupation. Alternatively the Local Plan could allocate other sites or could require the provision of traveller pitches as part of any large housing allocations.

The full reports are available on the Council's website but the questions that the Council would like respondents to take into account are as follows

1. Has the HEDNA come to the correct conclusion on potential growth and if not what should the correct figure be?
2. Has the HEDNA made the correct adjustments to the Government's projections and if not what should the adjustments be?

3. Is the HEDNA's conclusion on affordable requirements a valid one or should the requirement be higher or lower?
4. What should be the Council's approach for meeting the housing needs of the elderly?
5. Do the HEDNAs conclusions on employment growth reflect your expectations and if not what should it take into account?
6. How should the Local Plan address the need for traveller pitches?

In all answers the evidence which justifies any proposed revision should be included.

### **3. Output from the Housing Economic Land Availability Assessment**

As explained in the Introduction and Context local planning authorities are required by the PPG to produce a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) to find out what the supply of deliverable or developable housing and employment land is within the Local Plan's area. This replaces the requirement in the NPPF to produce Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment but it largely follows the same process whilst including land for economic development.

The first step in the process was to carry out a Call for Sites to ask anyone to suggest areas of land that the Council should consider for allocation in the Local Plan. The sites suggested have since been subject to a broad checking process to determine the impacts that they would have and whether a site would be deliverable in the short term or developable in the longer term. Aspects assessed in the HELAA include flood risk, accessibility, landscape, proximity to existing development, expected density and impact on heritage assets. The methodology for carrying out the assessment was agreed with other Councils as part of the Duty to Cooperate process and broadly reflects the methodology utilised to produce the previous SHLAA reports.

The draft HELAA report will be published alongside this Local Plan Issues and Options consultation document so that comments can be made on its content. It must be emphasized that the sites will only have been determined to be deliverable or developable on the basis of a limited technical assessment of their potential for development. This means that even where an area has been determined to be suitable for development it does not mean that it will be allocated in the draft Local Plan in Spring 2016. It also means that comments should be restricted to the suitability of a site on the basis of the criteria used to make the assessment. Comments on other matters will not result in a change to the conclusion of the HELAA.

The methodology for carrying out the HELAA was agreed with a Steering Group representing balanced interests. The Steering Group will be asked for their opinion on the draft HELAA as part of this consultation. Their views will then be taken into account alongside any other views expressed about the HELAA during the consultation period before the HELAA is finalised. It should be noted that Government guidance indicates that the HELAA will need to be updated annually. The Council will therefore be considering further sites as part of the HELAA process and will be producing further HELAA reports prior to the adoption of the Local Plan. The conclusions of those reports will be fed into the Local Plan preparation process so that the supply of deliverable and developable sites is kept up to date.

Following the completion of the assessment process the HELAA has concluded that from the large amount of land put forward in response to last year's Call for Sites the capacity of the developable and deliverable housing sites in Aylesbury Vale is 22,523 dwellings and that figure has been fed into the spatial options considered later in this consultation document. In relation to employment land the HELAA has concluded that there is potential for the delivery of 666,404 sq m of employment floorspace. Should there be a need to allocate new

employment land this provide the reservoir of sites to choose from, however current supply exceeds the need defined through the HEDNA so the need for new sites may be non-existent.

The Council would like to know whether you agree with the conclusions of the HELAA and if not what it should say instead and why?

## 4. Settlement Hierarchy

To determine the amount of development which a settlement can accommodate it is necessary to review the relative sustainability of settlements. This has been done previously through the production of a settlement hierarchy. As part of the preparation for this Issues and Option Consultation the settlement hierarchy has been reviewed on the basis of the range of factors which underlie the previous version of the hierarchy produced in 2012. These include such aspects as settlement connectivity, employment, facilities and services. The facts which underlie the assessment have been checked with parish and town councils to ensure their accuracy. This has led to the revised settlement hierarchy set out below.

Settlement	Settlement Hierarchy Outcome
Aylesbury (including Parishes of Coldharbour, Watermead, Buckingham Park and Berryfields)	Strategic Settlement
Buckingham	Strategic Settlement
Haddenham	Strategic Settlement
Wendover	Strategic Settlement
Winslow	Strategic Settlement
Aston Clinton	Larger Village
Bierton	Larger Village
Brill	Larger Village
Gawcott	Larger Village
Great Horwood	Larger Village
Grendon Underwood	Larger Village
Ickford	Larger Village
Ivinghoe	Larger Village
Long Crendon	Larger Village
Maids Moreton	Larger Village
Marsh Gibbon	Larger Village

Marsworth	Larger Village
Newton Longville	Larger Village
North Marston	Larger Village
Padbury	Larger Village
Pitstone	Larger Village
Quainton	Larger Village
Stewkley	Larger Village
Stoke Hammond	Larger Village
Stoke Mandeville	Larger Village
Stone	Larger Village
Thornborough	Larger Village
Weston Turville	Larger Village
Cheddington	Larger Village
Edlesborough	Larger Village
Steeple Claydon	Larger Village
Tingewick	Larger Village
Waddesdon	Larger Village
Whitchurch	Larger Village
Wing	Larger Village
Wingrave	Larger Village
Adstock	Smaller Village
Akeley	Smaller Village
Ashendon	Smaller Village
Aston Abbots	Smaller Village
Beachampton	Smaller Village
Bishopstone	Smaller Village
Buckland	Smaller Village

Calvert Green	Smaller Village
Chackmore	Smaller Village
Charndon	Smaller Village
Chearsley	Smaller Village
Chilton	Smaller Village
Cuddington	Smaller Village
Dinton	Smaller Village
Drayton Parslow	Smaller Village
East Claydon	Smaller Village
Edgcott	Smaller Village
Granborough	Smaller Village
Great Brickhill	Smaller Village
Halton	Smaller Village
Hardwick	Smaller Village
Little Horwood	Smaller Village
Ludgershall	Smaller Village
Mentmore & Ledburn	Smaller Village
Mursley	Smaller Village
Nash	Smaller Village
Northall	Smaller Village
Oving	Smaller Village
Preston Bissett	Smaller Village
Shabbington	Smaller Village
Slapton	Smaller Village
Soulbury	Smaller Village
Swanbourne	Smaller Village
Turweston	Smaller Village

Twyford	Smaller Village
Weedon	Smaller Village
Westbury	Smaller Village
Westcott	Smaller Village
Whaddon	Smaller Village
Worminghall	Smaller Village
Cublington	Smaller Village
Dagnall	Smaller Village
Oakley	Smaller Village
Addington	Other Settlement
Barton Hartshorn	Other Settlement
Biddlesden	Other Settlement
Boarstall	Other Settlement
Broughton	Other Settlement
Burcott	Other Settlement
Chetwode	Other Settlement
Creslow	Other Settlement
Dorton	Other Settlement
Drayton Beauchamp	Other Settlement
Dunton	Other Settlement
Ford	Other Settlement
Hillesden	Other Settlement
Hoggeston	Other Settlement
Ivinghoe Aston	Other Settlement
Kingsey	Other Settlement
Kingswood	Other Settlement
Leckhampstead	Other Settlement

Lillingstone Dayrell	Other Settlement
Lillingstone Lovell	Other Settlement
Luffield Abbey	Other Settlement
Middle Claydon	Other Settlement
Nether (Lower) Winchendon	Other Settlement
Poundon	Other Settlement
Quarrendon (Excluding Berryfields development)	Other Settlement
Radclive	Other Settlement
Rowsham	Other Settlement
Shalstone	Other Settlement
Singleborough	Other Settlement
Stowe & Dadford	Other Settlement
Thornton	Other Settlement
Upper Winchendon	Other Settlement
Upton	Other Settlement
Water Stratford	Other Settlement
Woodham	Other Settlement
Wotton Underwood	Other Settlement

A detailed report setting out the basis for this list can be seen on the Council's website. The content of the hierarchy will play an important part in defining the capacity for development in Aylesbury Vale and will play a part in determining the level of allocations to be proposed in the draft Local Plan next Spring. It will also have a role in determining what the appropriate level of growth is for any village where a neighbourhood plan is being prepared. The Council would like to know whether this settlement hierarchy is correct and if not why it is not correct.

## 5. Spatial Options for meeting HEDNA conclusions

### Where should the new housing go?

Beyond determining the housing figure for Aylesbury Vale, a crucial aspect of the Aylesbury Vale Local Plan will be the strategy which will determine the broad locations where development should take place. A number of factors will inform the selection of the strategy. These include the amount of housing required, land availability, policy aspirations, environment and landscape considerations, infrastructure and potential impact on communities affected. The strategy should ensure we can provide homes to meet the needs of current and future generations while maintaining the distinctiveness of the District's villages and towns. The process involves the Council considering a range of potential strategies for meeting development need, assessing the evidence and consulting on a preferred option together with reasonable alternatives.

This part of the consultation paper sets out different options for distributing housing growth around the district together with underlying assumptions. After first considering these, we would like you to tell us what you believe to be the right option for Aylesbury Vale.

### Underlying assumptions

The main assumptions we have made in drawing up potential options are described below.

- **To be considered suitable** an option should have the potential to deliver the District's housing need, commonly referred to as Objectively Assessed Need (OAN), and make some provision to assist neighbouring districts who are unable to meet their need as follows:
  - **Aylesbury Vale's housing need:** A Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA, 2015) for Central Buckinghamshire local authorities suggests the district has an OAN for 21,000 dwellings (net) over the plan period (1,050 per annum). This figure is less than in the Aylesbury Vale HEDNA, (July 2015) due to a different methodology which follows more recent advice and takes into account other factors, such as unattributable change.
  - **Unmet need:** where a district does not have enough housing land to meet their OAN, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires local planning authorities within the same housing market area and other adjacent areas to work together to accommodate any shortfall. Aylesbury Vale is less environmentally constrained than other Buckinghamshire authorities who are therefore looking to Aylesbury to meet some, or all, of the housing land shortfall arising in their districts.
- **A provisional Local Plan housing figure of 31,000 dwellings over the plan period.** This comprises 21,000 dwellings to meet Aylesbury Vale's OAN and an estimated 10,000 dwellings for unmet need. The estimate for unmet need is subject to confirmation once respective authorities have completed their evidence studies.

Only options that appear capable of accommodating this level– or approaching this level – of growth are considered suitable. The housing figure may need revising **following** finalisation of Central Buckinghamshire HEDNA or should our OAN figure change, for example due to a significant change in the household or population projections.

- The main source of potentially suitable land is **the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA)**. This assesses the suitability of available sites in a transparent, consistent way according to an established methodology.
- **The Settlement Hierarchy (2012)**. This assesses settlements within the district against factors such as population size, facilities and transport and groups them according to a broad hierarchy. The hierarchy has been used as a rough guide to inform the level of growth that might be right for a particular place. The hierarchy is currently being reviewed and consulted on. Should there be any change as a result of this review, then this will need to be reflected in the final spatial option / strategy.

For illustrative purposes, we have divided the district into four broad geographic areas: Buckingham Area, Aylesbury Area, Northern Vale and Southern Vale. A list of settlements and parishes within these areas is given at the end of this document.

Potential capacity for providing homes over the plan period, unless otherwise stated, draws on sites assessed as suitable in the HELAA; a windfall estimate (sites which come forward unexpectedly which were not previously or identified as suitable); commitments (planning consents and site allocations in Neighbourhood Plans and the Local Plan); completions (net additions to the housing stock since the start of the plan period, i.e. 2013); windfalls; and some proposals in the pipeline (applications expected to come forward). The total from these sources would provide 28,200 dwellings – enough to meet the District’s OAN for 21,000 dwellings and provide 7,200 dwellings towards unmet need.

The HELAA assesses whether a site may be suitable in principle: it does not consider what level of growth is right for a particular place or whether an individual site should be allocated. In some places, the amount of potentially suitable development land may exceed what they could sustainably accommodate and in other places it may be less. The HELAA is a snapshot in time and, therefore, the potential in practice could be more, or less, than that assessed.

### **Some background to the options**

Not all options we have looked at are able to deliver 31,000 dwellings. Based on our present understanding of land available and potentially suitable, options which would achieve significantly less than this are viewed as ‘not viable’ and discounted at this stage. They are included here for purposes of comparison and information and because some provide a starting point for options which could meet the housing requirement.

Among options we are considering, some include the possibility of a new settlement. While this has been looked at and rejected in the past, we are consulting on this again since a new settlement could contribute significantly towards meeting the district housing requirement, which has increased, and provide flexibility on where to develop new housing. A new settlement can mean enlarging an existing settlement by more than 50% of the

population/dwellings or developing a freestanding new community. A study is currently being carried out for us to assess the potential for a new settlement within the district. The study will also see how this would compare with other ways of providing new homes in Aylesbury Vale. The findings of the study will inform the Local Plan at the next stage of preparation.

Options A to E would focus housing growth on the district's more sustainable settlements. These are places which provide some level of facilities drawing on the Settlement Hierarchy and HELAA. Variations on the Sustainable Settlements theme are considered, such as developing an urban extension at Milton Keynes/Bletchley; 'intensification', which means using land more efficiently by raising the average density of development and developing more homes on a given area of land; creating a new settlement; and a combination of these.

Options F to I would distribute new housing more evenly across the district under a 'dispersed' approach to development. To take these options further would require additional detailed work to identify potentially suitable land.

Following a description of each option below we summarise some of the advantages and disadvantages of these, based on our present understanding of the key issues. Transport issues would apply all the options so we have not raised these separately.

<p><b>Sustainable Settlements – Options A, B, C</b></p>	<p><b>Option A Sustainable Settlements with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b></p>	<p><b>Option B Sustainable Settlements with one or more new settlements</b></p>	<p><b>Option C Sustainable Settlements with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and new settlement</b></p>
<p>Growth at strategic settlements, large villages and some smaller villages.</p> <p>All potential capacity for strategic settlements is included. This comprises HELAA suitable sites, commitments (site allocations in the local plan and neighbourhood plans), permissions, pipeline and an allowance for windfalls.</p> <p>Commitments, completions, windfalls and pipeline are included.</p> <p>Outside strategic settlements growth over the plan period would take place broadly as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large villages 100 dwellings*</li> <li>• Small villages 20 dwellings+</li> <li>• Parish with no designated settlement (in the Settlement Hierarchy) average 10 dwellings across all parishes</li> </ul> <p>Some villages are capable of accommodating more housing than others and others less, even though the Settlement Hierarchy may place them in the same category, on the basis of having similar characteristics and facilities. Some flexibility would be needed. The practical implications can be explored at the next stage of plan preparation when site allocations are to be considered.</p>	<p>In addition to the key elements set out in the left hand column, this option includes an urban extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley to deliver 3,900 homes.</p> <p>This option could deliver around 29,000 homes - less than estimated requirements of 31,000. More land would need to be found to make up the shortfall.</p>	<p>In addition to the key elements set out in the left hand column, this option includes one or more new settlements at an unspecified location(s).</p> <p>A new settlement is assumed capable of delivering 4,000 new dwellings over the plan period and more beyond. The figure of 4,000 is based on what reasonably might be expected to be delivered within the plan period and takes into account long lead times typical of development at this scale.</p> <p>This option could deliver up to 29,100 homes - less than estimated requirements of 31,000. More land would need to be found to make up the shortfall.</p>	<p>In addition to the key elements set out in the left hand column, this option includes an urban extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley to deliver 3,900 home and a new settlement at an unspecified location.</p> <p>This option could deliver up to 33,000 homes. This is above estimated requirements of 31,000 and would offer scope for flexibility.</p>

<b>Sustainable Settlements – Intensification – Options D and E</b>	<b>Option D Sustainable Settlements: intensification with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	<b>Option E Sustainable Settlements - Intensification with one or more new settlements</b>
<p>Growth in strategic settlements, large villages and some smaller villages. In addition, Raise the average density of development by 20%. Developing land more efficiently could provide 20% more homes on a given area of land than under Options A, B &amp; C.</p> <p>All potential capacity for strategic settlements is included. This comprises HELAA suitable sites, commitments (site allocations in the local plan and neighbourhood plans), permissions, pipeline and an allowance for windfalls.</p> <p>Commitments, completions, windfalls and pipeline are included. Outside strategic settlements growth over the plan period would take place broadly as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large villages 100 dwellings*</li> <li>• Small villages 20 dwellings+</li> <li>• Parish with no designated settlement (in the Settlement Hierarchy) average 10 dwellings across all parishes</li> </ul> <p>A 20 % increase in the density of development would mean that a 1 hectare site assessed as suitable for 30 homes would accommodate 36 homes, or a 1 hectare town centre site assessed for 50 homes would accommodate 60 homes. The increase would apply only to uncommitted sites (a site that is not an allocation, windfall or consent).</p>	<p>In addition to the key elements set out in the left hand column, this option includes an urban extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley to deliver 4,700 homes.</p> <p>This option could deliver up to 31,900 homes – more than estimated requirements. This would give some flexibility to enable growth to align more closely with Neighbourhood Plans or to vary densities depending on location and site characteristics.</p>	<p>In addition to the key elements set out in the left hand column, this option also includes one or more new settlements at an unspecified location.</p> <p>This option could deliver up to 31,600 homes, more than estimated requirements. This option would offer flexibility for example, to enable growth to align more closely with Neighbourhood Plan allocations or to vary densities depending on location and site characteristics.</p>

<b>Option F Dispersed approach: growth at all settlements and other suitable locations</b>	<b>Option G – Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	<b>Option H – Dispersed approach with one or more new settlement(s)</b>	<b>Option I – Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and new settlement</b>
<p>Under Options F, G, H and I, Aylesbury would continue to take the largest amount of development in the district. However, there would be less housing growth in the Aylesbury and Buckingham areas compared with other options and more in Northern and Southern Vale. These options would distribute development more evenly around the district and offer the possibility of reviewing sites in Aylesbury Vale near settlements outside the district and assessing their suitability.</p> <p>To find out whether this option could meet our housing requirement further work would need to be done to assess whether some small and large villages could accommodate more development, and whether more remote sites and smaller settlements – sites HELAA currently considers unsuitable due to their location – could accommodate development.</p> <p>A caveat should apply to Options F, G, H and I since these options are predicated on meeting the housing requirement of 31,000 dwellings. They assume we would be able to find more suitable, available land, over and above what has already been identified.</p>	<p>This is the same as Option F but with a new settlement contributing 4,000 new homes. The option would more evenly distribute development throughout the district and enable a lower proportion of development in the Aylesbury and Buckingham areas compared with Option F and other options.</p> <p>To find out whether this option could meet our housing requirement we would need to assess land at smaller villages and other potential locations (which the HELAA considers unsuitable).</p>	<p>This is the same as Option F but with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley. It would enable a lower proportion of development in the Aylesbury and Buckingham areas compared with Option F and other options.</p> <p>To find out whether this option could meet our housing requirement we would need to assess land at smaller villages and other potential locations (which the HELAA considers unsuitable).</p>	<p>This is the same as Option F but with a new settlement and an extension to Milton Keynes. It would enable a lower proportion of development in the Aylesbury and Buckingham areas compared with all other options considered.</p> <p>To find out whether this option could meet our housing requirement we would need to assess land at smaller villages and other potential locations (which the HELAA considers unsuitable).</p>

\*Based on current information, commitments and completions at five larger villages exceed 100. Villages affected are Aston Clinton, Cheddington, Pitstone, Stoke Hammond and Wing. Growth at these villages would therefore exceed 100 dwellings over the plan period.

+ Based on current information, commitments and /or completions at four smaller villages exceed 20. Villages affected are Bierton, Westbury, Oakley and Calvert Green. Growth at these villages would therefore exceed 20 dwellings over the plan period.

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Option A Sustainable Settlements with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing new homes near existing facilities and infrastructure would minimise the need for or cost of providing additional facilities to serve new development.</li> <li>• Most new homes would be in places where there is reasonably good access to jobs, transport, services and facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise the need to travel.</li> <li>• Support rural communities by making provision for small scale growth at smaller settlements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option falls short of the housing requirement. Further suitable land would need to be found.</li> <li>• Unless further suitable sites are identified, this approach would require us to allocate all suitable HELAA sites at strategic settlements or make provision for growth to take place at an equivalent level.</li> <li>• Aylesbury would continue to take a significant proportion of the district's development - there may be limits to how much growth the town can sustainably accommodate over the long term.</li> <li>• Overreliance on large sites may make it harder to deliver the number of homes needed should these not come forward as planned.</li> <li>• Under the Duty to Co-operate we would have to take into account Milton Keynes' views on our strategy.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>
<b>Option B Sustainable Settlements with one or more new settlements</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing new homes near existing facilities and infrastructure would minimise the need for or cost of providing additional facilities to serve new development.</li> <li>• Most new homes would be in places where there is reasonably good access to jobs, transport, services and facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise the need to travel (this would depend in part on the location of the new settlement).</li> <li>• Support rural communities by making provision for small scale growth at smaller settlements.</li> <li>• A new settlement may assist in the longer term planning and development needs of the district and take development pressure away from Aylesbury town.</li> <li>• Surrounding communities may benefit from the services and facilities which a new settlement is likely to provide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option falls short of the housing requirement. Further suitable land would need to be found.</li> <li>• Unless further suitable sites are identified, this approach would require us to allocate all suitable HELAA sites at strategic settlements or make provision for growth to take place at an equivalent level.</li> <li>• Aylesbury would continue to take a significant proportion of the district's development - there may be limits to how much growth the town can sustainably accommodate over the long term - a new settlement could help offset this.</li> <li>• Uncertainty: some disadvantages are unknown as these would depend where a new settlement were to be located.</li> <li>• Long lead in times: planning a new settlement and the infrastructure needed to support it is a long, complex, costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver at most 4,000 dwellings towards the end of the plan period - possibly more with more than one new settlement.</li> </ul>

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Option C Sustainable Settlements with a new settlement and extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach could deliver the housing requirement and provide some flexibility about how growth is distributed.</li> <li>• Developing near existing facilities and infrastructure helps minimise the need for, or cost of providing, additional facilities to serve new development.</li> <li>• Most new homes would be in places where there is reasonably good access to jobs, transport, services and facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise the need to travel (this would depend in part on the location of the new settlement).</li> <li>• Support rural communities by making provision for small scale growth at smaller settlements.</li> <li>• A new settlement may assist in the longer term planning and development needs of the district and take some development pressure away from Aylesbury town and elsewhere in the district.</li> <li>• Surrounding communities may benefit from services and facilities which a new settlement is likely to provide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty: some disadvantages are unknown as these would depend where a new settlement were to be located.</li> <li>• Long lead in times – planning a new settlement and the infrastructure necessary to support it, is a long, complex, costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver at most 4,000 dwellings during the plan period – possibly more with more than one new settlement.</li> <li>• Overreliance on large sites may make it harder to deliver the number of homes needed should these not come forward as planned.</li> <li>• Under the Duty to Co-operate we would need to agree our approach with Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• Aylesbury would continue to take a significant proportion of the district's development though less than under Options A and B.</li> </ul>
<b>Option D Sustainable Settlements: Intensification with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option could deliver the housing requirement and offer some flexibility for distributing growth across the district.</li> <li>• Developing near existing facilities and infrastructure helps minimise the need for or the cost of providing additional facilities to serve new development.</li> <li>• Most new homes would be in places where there is reasonably good access to jobs, transport, services and facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise the need to travel.</li> <li>• Support rural communities by providing for small scale growth at smaller settlements.</li> <li>• Optimise the use of land and minimise the amount of greenfield land needed for new development.</li> <li>• Increasing the density of development helps make services, including schools, shops and transport, more viable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places greater demands on the housebuilders. Careful planning and design and attention to the local context are needed to ensure an increase in density can successfully be accommodated and the benefits of this approach realised.</li> <li>• Aylesbury would continue to take a significant proportion of the district's development - there may be limits to how much growth the town can sustainably accommodate over the long term.</li> <li>• Overreliance on large sites may make it harder to deliver the number of homes needed should these not come forward as planned.</li> <li>• Under the Duty to Co-operate we would have to take into account Milton Keynes' views on our strategy.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> </ul>

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Option E Sustainable Settlements - Intensification with one or more new settlements</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This option could deliver the housing requirement and offer some flexibility for distributing growth across the district.</li> <li>• Developing near existing facilities and infrastructure helps minimise the need for or the cost of providing additional facilities to serve new development.</li> <li>• Most new homes would be in places where there is reasonably good access to jobs, transport, services and facilities.</li> <li>• Minimise the need to travel.</li> <li>• Support rural communities by making provision for small scale growth at smaller settlements.</li> <li>• Optimise the use of land and minimise the amount of greenfield land needed for new development.</li> <li>• Increasing the density of development can help make services, including schools, shops and transport, more viable.</li> <li>• Surrounding communities may benefit from services and facilities which a new settlement is likely to provide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Places greater demands on the housebuilders. Careful planning and design and attention to the local context are needed to ensure an increase in density can be successfully accommodated and the benefits of this approach realised.</li> <li>• Uncertainty: some disadvantages are unknown as these would depend where a new settlement were to be located.</li> <li>• Long lead in times – planning a new settlement and the infrastructure necessary to support it is a long, complex, costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver at most 4,000 dwellings during the plan period – possibly more with more than one new settlement.</li> <li>• Aylesbury would continue to take a significant proportion of the district's development - there may be limits to how much growth the town can sustainably accommodate over the long term - a new settlement could help offset this.</li> </ul>
<b>Option F Dispersed approach: growth at all settlements and other suitable locations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach would more evenly distribute development across the district. It offers scope to take some development pressure away from Aylesbury.</li> <li>• Smaller villages and rural communities could benefit from the provision of additional services and homes to a greater extent than they would under Options A to E</li> <li>• Offers flexibility to consider the potential for housing growth away from existing settlements.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may not be enough suitable sites to deliver the number of homes required.</li> <li>• Provision of infrastructure and services needed to support new development is likely to be more difficult and expensive under an approach that disperses development around the district.</li> <li>• Potential landscape impact.</li> <li>• May encourage more journeys to be made by car should the new homes be provided in areas with poor services and public transport.</li> <li>• Depending on the location of the new homes, may increase isolation and result lack of access to services and jobs for those without access to a car.</li> </ul>

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Option G Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach would more evenly distribute development across the district. It offers scope to take some development pressure away from Aylesbury.</li> <li>• Smaller villages and rural communities could benefit from the provision of additional services and homes to a greater extent than they would under Options A to E.</li> <li>• Offers flexibility to consider the potential for housing growth away from existing settlements and at sites in Aylesbury Vale near settlements outside the district.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may not be enough suitable sites to deliver the number of homes required.</li> <li>• Provision of infrastructure and services needed to support new development is likely to be more difficult and expensive under an approach that disperses development around the district.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• May encourage more journeys to be made by car should the new homes be provided in areas with poor services and public transport and result lack of access to services and jobs for those without a car.</li> <li>• Overreliance on large sites may make it harder to deliver the number of homes needed should these not come forward as planned.</li> </ul>
<b>Option H Dispersed approach with one or more new settlement(s)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach would more evenly distribute development across the district. It offers scope to take some development pressure away from Aylesbury and other strategic settlements.</li> <li>• Smaller villages and rural communities could benefit from the provision of additional services and homes to a greater extent than they would under Options A to E</li> <li>• Offers flexibility to consider the potential for housing growth away from existing settlements.</li> <li>• Surrounding communities may benefit from the services and facilities which a new settlement is likely to provide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may not be enough suitable sites to deliver the number of homes required.</li> <li>• Provision of infrastructure and services needed to support new development is likely to be more difficult and expensive under an approach that disperses development around the district.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• May encourage more journeys to be made by car should the new homes be provided in areas with poor services and public transport and result in lack of access to services and jobs for those without a car.</li> <li>• Some disadvantages are unknown as these would depend on where a new settlement, and other suitable sites that would be needed, were located.</li> <li>• Long lead in times – planning a new settlement and the infrastructure necessary to support it is a long, complex, costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver at most 4,000 dwellings during the plan period – possibly more with more than one new settlement.</li> </ul>

Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Option I Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and a new settlement</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This approach would more evenly distribute development across the district. It offers scope to take development pressure away from Aylesbury, Buckingham and other strategic settlements.</li> <li>• Smaller villages and rural communities could benefit from the provision of additional services and homes to a greater extent than they would under Options A to E</li> <li>• Offers flexibility to consider the potential for housing growth away from existing settlements and at sites in Aylesbury Vale near settlements outside the district.</li> <li>• Surrounding communities may benefit from the services and facilities which a new settlement is likely to provide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may not be enough suitable sites to deliver the number of homes required.</li> <li>• Provision of infrastructure and services needed to support new development is likely to be more difficult and expensive under an approach that disperses development around the district.</li> <li>• Landscape impact near Milton Keynes.</li> <li>• May encourage more journeys to be made by car should the new homes go in areas with poor services and public transport and could result in lack of access to services and jobs for those without a car.</li> <li>• Some disadvantages are unknown as these would depend on where a new settlement, and other suitable sites, are located.</li> <li>• Long lead in times – planning a new settlement and the infrastructure necessary to support it is a long, complex, costly process. This would mean that a new settlement could deliver at most 4,000 dwellings during the plan period – possibly more with more than one new settlement.</li> </ul>

### Preferred options

Out of the options considered above, three offer most scope for meeting housing requirements. These are *Option C Sustainable Settlements, with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and a new settlement*; *Option D Sustainable Settlements - intensification with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley*; and *Option E Sustainable Settlements - Intensification with a new settlement*.

### Alternative options

Some options are close to meeting requirements and are therefore considered plausible alternatives. These are *Option A Sustainable Settlements with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley*; and *Option B Sustainable Settlements with one or more new settlements*.

It is unknown whether a dispersed option (Option F to I) could deliver the housing requirement. Assessing these would require further detailed work to identify land with potential in smaller villages and other locations currently considered unsuitable, and consider sustainability aspects, such as transport, access to services and jobs, provision of infrastructure – key considerations which inform where new development should take place.

Dispersed options are included here as potential alternatives. Following this consultation, should these prove popular/there be an appetite for exploring them further, then work will be carried out to address their shortfalls.

### **Next Steps**

The Local Plan will need to provide enough land to deliver our housing requirements and meet our wider aspirations for the kind of homes and places we want to live in, therefore, the Council's preference is for a strategy which is able to do these. On the evidence available at present, this would appear to be Options C, D or E.

Feedback from this consultation along with evidence from the Sustainability Appraisal and other studies, will inform the Council's choice on which option should form the basis for developing the Local Plan strategy and guide future site allocations.

### **Consultation Questions**

**Question 1:** Out of the following options, which do you prefer? Please tick one.

Option A Sustainable Settlements with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley

Option B Sustainable Settlements with one or more new settlements

Option C Sustainable Settlements with a new settlement and extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley

Option D Sustainable Settlements: Intensification with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley

Option E Sustainable Settlements - Intensification with one or more new settlements

Option F Dispersed approach: growth at all settlements and other suitable locations

Option G Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley

Option H Dispersed approach with one or more new settlement(s)

Option I Dispersed approach with an extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and a new settlement

Other – please state

**Question 2** Please explain the reason for your preference. If you do not like any suggested option, please explain why and suggest an alternative.

**Question 3** Is there any option you consider we should not consider further? If so, please state below, giving reasons.

**Question 4** Options A to E propose to allocate growth over the plan period to the district's villages and parishes in the form of an allowance for Larger and Smaller Villages (as defined in the Aylesbury Settlement Hierarchy, 2012) and rural parishes with no settlement categorised 'Larger' or 'Smaller' in the Settlement Hierarchy. At the next stage of preparing the Local Plan we would identify site allocations for Larger Villages broadly in line with this allowance and indicate the level of growth for Smaller Villages and Rural Parishes –the latter could be treated as an average. Do you agree with the suggested approach to allocating housing growth to the villages and parishes? If not, please suggest an alternative.

## Discounted Options

The following options we have considered and discounted. This is because present information on land availability suggests there would not be enough land to meet our housing requirement. We have included these options here for information purposes. Some of them form the basis for the options described above which we are consulting on.

**Past Trends** (60% of growth in the Aylesbury area, 9% in the Buckingham area, 13% in Northern Vale and 18% in Southern Vale).

This option considers the pattern of housing development (net additions to the housing stock) in the district over the past twelve years and whether this pattern could continue for the duration of the plan period, 2013-2033, given a housing requirement of 31,000 dwellings.

Aylesbury is expected to continue to be the main focus for housing growth, however, our current understanding of potentially suitable land suggests there is more scope for housing growth in the north of the district (23% of potential capacity in Northern Vale and 12% in the Buckingham area) and less in the south (52% of potential capacity in Aylesbury; 13% in Southern Vale) compared with previous patterns of development.

Under a past trends approach, potential capacity in the Aylesbury Area (14,400 dwellings) falls below that required to deliver 60% of the housing requirement (18,600 dwellings) or in Southern Vale, 18% (3,800 versus 5,600). Were Northern Vale to accommodate 13% of new development over the plan period, additional suitable land would need to be found elsewhere to make up the shortfall. Raising the average density of development would deliver more housing in Aylesbury and Southern Vale, but is unlikely to deliver 78% of new development, as occurred over the past 12 years.

An option based on distributing new housing around the district according to where development took place in the past would deliver around 21,000, much less than the estimated 31,000 dwellings required over the plan period. To achieve this level of growth we would need to find more land in Aylesbury and Southern Vale. Based on our current knowledge of suitable, available land, an approach based on past trends would not meet our housing requirement.

**Sustainable Settlements** - Growth at strategic settlements, large villages and some smaller villages.

Under this option, all potential capacity for strategic settlements is included. This comprises HELAA suitable sites, commitments (site allocations in the local plan and neighbourhood plans), permissions, pipeline and an allowance for windfalls.

As for all options, commitments, windfalls and pipeline are taken as given. Outside strategic settlements growth over the plan period would take place broadly as follows:

- Large villages 100 dwellings\*
- Small villages 20 dwellings+
- Parish with no designated settlement (in the Settlement Hierarchy) average 10 dwellings across all parishes

\*Based on current information commitments and completions at five larger villages exceed 100. These are Aston Clinton, Cheddington, Pitstone, Stoke Hammond and Wing. Growth at these villages would therefore exceed 100 dwellings over the plan period.

+ Commitments and /or completions at four smaller villages exceed 20. These are Bierton, Westbury, Oakley and Calvert Green. Growth at these villages would therefore exceed 20 dwellings over the plan period.

**Conclusion:** This option could potentially deliver up to 25,000 - less than estimated requirements. The option provides a starting point but further land would be needed to deliver the estimated requirement of 31,000 dwellings. Options which could potentially achieve this are considered above.

**Sustainable Settlements - Intensification** Growth in strategic settlements, large villages and some smaller villages. Raise the average density of development by 20%.

Developing land more efficiently would enable 20% more homes to be built on a given area of land than previously assumed, for example, in the HELAA.

Under this option, all potential capacity for strategic settlements is included. This comprises HELAA suitable sites, commitments (site allocations in the local plan and neighbourhood plans), permissions, pipeline and an allowance for windfalls.

Commitments, windfalls and pipeline are taken as given. Outside strategic settlements growth over the plan period would take place broadly as follows (with the exception of places where existing commitments and completions exceed this):

- Large villages 120 dwellings\*
- Small villages 24 dwellings+
- Parish with no designated settlement (in the Settlement Hierarchy) average 10 dwellings across all parishes

The increase in density would apply just to uncommitted sites, that is, a site that is not an allocation, windfall or consent. Raising the average density by 20% represents a modest increase in density and would not require high rise or high density development.

**Conclusion:** Increasing the average density of development by 20 per cent could deliver up to 27,600 homes, considerably less than the number required. To deliver 31,000 homes would require almost a fifty per cent increase in density. This might work in individual cases but would be impractical in many places. A combination of 20% density increase together , with a new settlement or major urban extension, could potentially deliver the housing requirement. This is the approach that has been taken in developing some of the other options above.

## Annex 1

<b>Aylesbury Area</b>	
<p><u>Strategic settlement:</u> Aylesbury urban area</p> <p><u>Larger villages:</u> Stoke Mandeville, Stone, Weston Turville</p> <p><u>Smaller villages:</u> Berton, Bishopstone</p>	<p><u>Parishes:</u> Aylesbury, Berton with Broughton, Buckingham Park, Coldharbour, Fleet Marston, Quarrendon, Stoke Mandeville, Stone with Bishopstone and Hartwell, Watermead, Weston Turville</p>
<b>Buckingham Area</b>	
<p><u>Strategic settlement:</u> Buckingham</p> <p><u>Larger village:</u>Maids Moreton</p>	<p><u>Parishes:</u> Buckingham, Maids Moreton</p>
<b>Northern Vale</b>	
<p><u>Strategic settlement:</u> Winslow</p> <p><u>Larger villages</u> Gawcott , Great Horwood, Marsh Gibbon, Newton Longville, Padbury, Soulbury, Steeple Claydon, Stewkley, Stoke Hammond, Tingewick;</p> <p><u>Smaller villages:</u>  <u>Adstock, Akeley, Beachampton, Calvert Green, Chackmore, Charndon, Drayton Parslow, East Claydon, Granborough, Great Brickhill, Little Horwood, Mursley, Nash, Preston Bissett, Swanbourne, Thornborough, Turweston, Twyford, Westbury, Whaddon</u></p>	<p>ParishesAddington, Adstock, Akeley, Barton Hartshorn, Beachampton, Biddlesdon, Calvert Green, Charndon, Chetwode, Drayton Parslow,Dunton, East Claydon, Foscott, Gawcott with Lenborough, Granborough, Great Brickhill, Great Horwood, Hillesden, Hoggston, Leckhampstead, Lillingstone Dayrell with Luffield Abbey, Lillingstone Lovell, Little Horwood, Marsh Gibbon, Middle Claydon, Mursley, Nash, Newton Longville, Padbury, Poundon, Preston Bissett, Radclive-cum-Chackmore, Shalstone, Soulbury, Steeple Claydon, Stewkley, Stoke Hammond, Stowe, Swanbourne, Thornborough, Thornton, Tingewick, Turweston, Twyford, Water Stratford, Westbury, Whaddon, Winslow.</p>
<b>Southern Vale</b>	
<p><u>Strategic settlement:</u> Haddenham Wendover</p> <p><u>Larger villages:</u> Aston Clinton, Brill, Cheddington, Edlesborough, Grendon Underwood, Long Crendon, Pitstone, Quainton, Waddesdon,Whitchurch, Wing, Wingrave,</p> <p><u>Smaller villages:</u>  Ashendon, Aston Abbotts, Buckland, Chearsley, Chilton, Cublington, Cuddington, Dagnall, Dinton, Edgcott, Halton,Hardwick, Ickford, Ivinghoe, Ludgershall, Marsworth, Mentmore, Northall, North Marston, Oakley, Oving, Shabbington, Slapton,Weedon, Westcott, Worminghall</p>	<p><u>Parishes</u> Ashendon, Aston Abbotts, Aston Clinton, Aston Sandford, Boarstall, Brill, Buckland, Chearsley, Cheddington, Chilton, Creslow, Cublington, Cuddington, Dinton with-Ford and Upton, Dorton, Drayton Beauchamp, Edgcott, Edlesborough, Grendon Underwood, Haddenham, Halton, Hardwick, Hogshaw, Hulcott, Ickford, Ivinghoe, Kingsey, Kingswood, Long Crendon, Ludgershall, Marsworth, Mentmore, Nether Winchendon, North Marston, Oakley, Oving,Pitchcott, Pitstone, Quainton, Shabbington, Slapton, Upper, Winchendon, Waddesdon, Weedon, Wendover, Westcott, Whitchurch, Wing, Wingrave with Rowsham, Woodham,Worminghall, Wotton Underwood</p>

## Annex 2 Summary of Spatial options considered\*

OPTION	Aylesbury Area		Southern Vale		Buckingham Area		Northern Vale		New Settlement(s) <sup>2</sup>		
Sustainable Settlements	14,400	57.4%	4,000	15.9%	3,300	13.1%	3,300	13.1%			25,100
Sustainable Settlements intensification: raise density 20%	15,600	56.5%	4,600	16.7%	3,800	13.8%	3,600	13.0%			27,600
<b>Option A</b> Sustainable Settlements with Milton Keynes / Bletchley Extension	14,400	49.7%	4,000	13.8%	3,300	11.4%	7,200	24.8%			29,000
<b>Option B</b> Sustainable Settlements with one or more new settlements	14,400	49.5%	4,000	13.7%	3,300	11.3%	3,300	11.3%	4,000	13.7%	29,100
<b>Option C</b> Sustainable Settlements with Milton Keynes / Bletchley Extension and New Settlement	14,400	43.6%	4,000	12.1%	3,300	10.0%	7,200	21.8%	4,000	12.1%	33,000
<b>Option D</b> Sustainable Settlements intensification with Milton Keynes / Bletchley Extension + 20% density increase	15,600	48.9%	4,300	13.5%	3,600	11.3%	8,300	26.0%			31,900
<b>Option E</b> Sustainable Settlements Intensification with new settlement + 20% density increase	15,600	49.4%	4,600	14.6%	3,800	12.0%	3,600	11.4%	4,000	12.7%	31,600
<b>Option F</b> Dispersed approach: growth at all settlements, other than the smallest hamlets	13,000	41.9%	5,600	18.1%	3,100	10.0%	9,300	30.0%			31,000
<b>Option G</b> Dispersed approach with extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley	12,400	40.0%	5,000	16.1%	2,500	8.1%	11,200	36.1%			31,000
<b>Option H</b> Dispersed approach with one or more new settlements	11,800	38.1%	5,000	16.1%	2,200	7.1%	8,100	26.1%	4,000	12.9%	31,000
<b>Option I</b> Dispersed approach with extension to Milton Keynes / Bletchley and new settlement	10,300	33.2%	4,300	13.9%	2,000	6.5%	10,300	33.2%	4,000	12.9%	31,000

### Explanatory note

1. All numbers are rounded to the nearest 100.

2. Options A to E are based on known potentially suitable capacity in the HELAA, consents, completions, windfalls and pipeline.

3. Options A and B fall short of the estimated housing requirement of 31,000 dwellings. Further land would need to be found to address this shortfall.

4. Options F to I are estimated as the capacity is unknown. We would need to identify sufficient suitable, available land to address this shortfall.

## 6. Development Management Policies

As mentioned in the Introduction and Context the new Local Plan will contain a range of development management policies based on the NPPF and related to the circumstances in Aylesbury Vale. Such policies will cover detailed matters such as design and car parking standards. At this stage the Council wishes to know whether all of the topics which should be covered by a policy are included and the general aim of the policy is appropriate. Comments will then be used to determine what the specific content of the policy should be. It will be possible to draw up and implement policies which differ from the NPPF if local circumstances warrant it but in some areas such as in relation to sustainable building design the Government has stipulated that local policies cannot be brought into force. The specific wording of the development management policies will be set out in the draft Local Plan to be prepared next year.

The following list therefore sets out the policy topics that the Council currently intends to include the draft Local Plan when it is published in Spring 2016. The topics have been refined following the initial scoping consultation on the Local Plan an consideration by the Council's VALP Scrutiny Committee. A indication of the scope of the policy has also been included with some further clarification in some cases. The content of the policies must be based on the Government planning policy and guidance but policy wording may be varied according to local circumstances where a strong enough case can be made.

Those policies in the Local Plan which are strategic will apply across the Local Plan area including within Neighbourhood Plan areas. This includes site allocations over and above neighbourhood plan site allocations which have been made to meet the strategic need for housing development in Aylesbury Vale. This will not apply in all locations as a neighbourhood plan may have already allocated sufficient housing land to meet both strategic and local housing needs. Where a non-strategic policy has been replaced by one in a neighbourhood plan then the neighbourhood plan policy will apply. Where a neighbourhood plan has no relevant policy to replace a non strategic policy in the Local Plan the policy in the Local Plan will apply.

### Local Plan Draft Policy List

#### Strategic Policies

<b>S1</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Proposals</b>
	<i>Sets out the overall approach to the management of all forms of development</i>
<b>S2</b>	<b>Sustainable Development Strategy</b>
	<i>Sets out proposed housing, employment and retail growth figures for the Plan period and their spatial distribution. Specific area allocations will deliver the sites.</i>
<b>S3</b>	<b>Cohesive Development</b>
	<i>Aims to protect strategic gaps between settlements to prevent coalescence. The gaps will be defined on a case by case basis. Need to try and maintain gaps that can't be closed by further development. The plan will help to define those gaps. Settlement boundaries could be used but are not essential.</i>
<b>S4</b>	<b>Green Belt</b>

	<i>Implements usual green belt policy. Extensive definition contained in Section 9 of the NPPF. Presumption against development except in exceptional circumstances</i>
<b>S5</b>	<b>Infrastructure</b>
	<i>The spatial strategy will be supported by the provision of suitable infrastructure proportional to the level and type of development proposed. This will need to take into account the degree to which infrastructure is covered by the NPPF e.g. transport impacts need to be severe before they can be taken into account</i>
<b>S6</b>	<b>Affordable Housing</b>
	<i>Above a defined criteria a percentage of affordable housing will be sought on all housing sites. Deviation from the policy will require detailed viability evidence. Policy will need to take into account the findings of the HEDNA</i>
<b>S7</b>	<b>Gypsy/Traveller Provision</b>
	<i>The policy will set out the gypsy and traveller provision which will be met through allocations over the plan period. This will be based on the existing assessment of need and the latest Government policy.</i>
<b>S8</b>	<b>Brownfield Land</b>
	<i>To set out the LPAs overall approach to the development of brownfield sites. Will need to reflect the content of the NPPF and may be affected by forthcoming Government guidance which has been signalled by the Government</i>

## Housing

<b>H1</b>	<b>Housing Design</b>
	<i>To set out specific design principles which will need to be observed in all housing development. The need for good design is highlighted in the NPPF. Will include guidance on extensions and ancillary buildings. This will aim to ensure that local distinctiveness is respected in new development.</i>
<b>H2</b>	<b>Gypsy Traveller Sites</b>
	<i>To set out specific design principles which will need to be observed in all gypsy/traveller developments.</i>
<b>H3</b>	<b>Exception Sites</b>
	<i>To allow development in rural areas to meet proven local housing need on sites where development would not normally be permitted. Will need to consider allowing a proportion of market housing. Use of Community Land Trusts will be investigated.</i>
<b>H4</b>	<b>Rural Workers Dwellings</b>
	<i>To allow housing development where there is a proven need in relation to a specific rural employment activity.</i>
<b>H5</b>	<b>Replacement Dwellings</b>
	<i>To set out the LPAs approach to the demolition of existing dwellings and their replacement. Will need to consider what restrictions should apply to the replacement dwelling e.g. should it be restricted in size to match adjacent dwellings.</i>
<b>H6</b>	<b>Residential Caravans/Mobile Homes</b>
	<i>To control the temporary location of mobile homes to support development e.g. where a</i>

	<i>new house being built or a building being converted to a dwelling</i>
<b>H7</b>	<b>Self Build Housing</b>
	<i>Policy to promote the development of self build housing to reflect the Government's position. Will need to determine whether there should be a proportion required in large new housing developments</i>
<b>H8</b>	<b>Housing Mix</b>
	<i>To ensure that the mix of housing reflects the needs of communities in Aylesbury Vale in terms individual physical requirements and range of sizes/types. The characteristics of the local population will be taken into account and could cover housing for the elderly.</i>
<b>H9</b>	<b>Dwelling Sizes</b>
	<i>Optional policy dependant on viability assessment. As part of the new Government standards an optional Building Regulation relating to dwelling size can be implemented through a Local Plan policy where there is viability evidence to support such a policy.</i>

## Employment

<b>E1</b>	<b>Retention of employment land/buildings</b>
	<i>Will set out in what circumstances employment land or building will be permitted to convert to other uses such as housing The NPPF states that employment land cannot be reserved in perpetuity for employment. The criteria for determining when land should be released will need to be determined</i>
<b>E2</b>	<b>Town Centre Development</b>
	<i>To set out the LPAs approach to retail development including defined town centres and shopping frontage.. Will be the basis for determining the suitability of sites for retail development in town centres</i>
<b>E3</b>	<b>Development outside Town centres</b>
	<i>To control retail development outside town centres by requiring town centre sites to be considered first.</i>
<b>E4</b>	<b>Shops and Business Frontages</b>
	<i>To retain the character of town centres by ensuring that the design of shop frontages reflect their surrounding context</i>
<b>E5</b>	<b>Tourism Development</b>
	<i>Will set out principles for the development of tourism destinations to ensure that they can operate without detrimental impacts on the surrounding area.</i>
<b>E6</b>	<b>Tourist Accommodation</b>
	<i>To cover the provision of tourist accommodation in all forms including hotels, B&amp;Bs and camping/caravanning</i>
<b>E7</b>	<b>Working at Home</b>
	<i>Policy to address the implications of employment becoming the main use of a dwelling. May involve the encouragement of live work dwellings</i>
<b>E8</b>	<b>Agricultural development</b>

	<i>Policy to set out the LPAs approach to permitting agricultural development where planning permission is necessary.</i>
--	---

## Transport

<b>T1</b>	<b>Vehicle Parking</b> <i>To set out design principles and associated standards for car, lorry and cycle parking in relation to development. Different needs between rural and town centre developments. More car journeys in rural areas, therefore more parking space required at rural properties. May exclude garages from being parking spaces</i>
<b>T2</b>	<b>Footpaths and Cycle Routes</b> <i>To ensure that development connects to existing pedestrian and cycle networks and provides new facilities proportional to the level of development. Will encourage provision of routes segregated from traffic</i>
<b>T3</b>	<b>Protected Transport Schemes</b> <i>These are routes for by passes/railways in line with BCC/LEPs recommendations. National schemes such as HS2 and East/West rail will also be covered.</i>
<b>T4</b>	<b>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure</b> <i>Required by the NPPF – more charging points should be encouraged.</i>

## Conservation of the Built Environment

<b>BE1</b>	<b>Heritage Assets</b> <i>To ensure the protection of designated and non-designated heritage assets including listed buildings conservation areas and archaeological sites from harmful development</i>
<b>BE2</b>	<b>Overall Design</b> <i>To set out design principles which all development should adhere to including disabled access requirements</i>

## Conservation of the Natural Environment

<b>NE1</b>	<b>Protected Sites</b> <i>To ensure that development affecting environmental assets protects them e.g. SSSIs. Level of protection will be determined by the importance of the asset.</i>
<b>NE2</b>	<b>Biodiversity</b> <i>To deliver the protection and enhancement of biodiversity required by the NPPF</i>
<b>NE3</b>	<b>Landscape</b> <i>To promote development which avoids inappropriate development in protected landscapes. Protected landscapes will include locally valuable landscapes</i>
<b>NE4</b>	<b>Pollution</b> <i>To ensure that negative effects on the natural environment arising from development</i>

	<i>are mitigated or prevented including air, light, noise and groundwater pollution</i>
<b>NE5</b>	<b>Local Green spaces</b>
	<i>To ensure the protection of designated Local Green Spaces from inappropriate development. Will only apply to a small number of sites with important qualities as per the NPPF</i>
<b>NE6</b>	<b>Best and most Versatile Agricultural Land</b>
	<i>To ensure the protection of Best and most Versatile Agricultural Land from inappropriate development. Level of protection will depend on the need for the development.</i>
<b>NE7</b>	<b>Trees and Hedgerows</b>
	<i>Policy to ensure that important trees and hedgerows are protected and incorporated in new development wherever possible</i>

### The Countryside

<b>C1</b>	<b>Conversion of Rural Buildings</b>
	<i>To ensure the sympathetic conversion of appropriate rural buildings where planning permission is required.</i>
<b>C2</b>	<b>Equestrian Development</b>
	<i>To promote the development of appropriate equestrian businesses and facilities</i>
<b>C3</b>	<b>Renewable Energy</b>
	<i>To ensure that renewable energy developments take place in appropriate locations. Will need to reflect latest Government policy</i>
<b>C4</b>	<b>Protection of Public Rights of Way</b>
	<i>To set out the LPAs approach to public rights of way affected by development</i>

### Infrastructure and Utilities

<b>I1</b>	<b>Green Infrastructure</b>
	<i>To ensure that new development delivers suitable levels of green infrastructure. This will draw on national standards wherever possible. Must recognise though that provision may be limited where existing provision exceeds current needs.</i>
<b>I2</b>	<b>Sport and Recreation</b>
	<i>To ensure the delivery of appropriate levels of sport and recreation provision including children's play areas in association with the provision of new dwellings. This will draw on national standards wherever possible. Must recognise though that provision may be limited where existing provision exceeds current needs.</i>
<b>I3</b>	<b>Community Facilities (Including designated Community Assets)</b>
	<i>To protect communities from the loss of essential community facilities through development such as the loss of community halls, local shops, public open space, allotments and public houses except where an alternative facility is being provided.</i>
<b>I4</b>	<b>Flooding</b>
	<i>To ensure that only development appropriate to the level of flood risk is permitted</i>

<b>I5</b>	<b>Telecommunications</b>
	<i>To promote the development of new telecommunications network in a manner which minimises negative impacts on communities and the environment.</i>

## 7. Landscape

The NPPF states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting valued landscapes. It then goes on to say that local planning authorities should set out criteria based policies against which proposals for on or affecting protected landscape areas will be judged. Great weight has to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty whilst lesser weight can be given to locally defined landscapes.

The Local Plan area includes some land which falls within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the current Local Plan identifies Areas of Attractive Landscape and Local Landscape Areas. Local designations carry less weight in planning decisions than national designations like the AONB but still allow important local landscapes to be taken into account in planning decisions. The Council wishes to retain local landscape designations in the new Local Plan and has commissioned reports relating to their suitability which are being consulted on as part of this consultation via the Council's website.

For completeness, in general terms the previously published evidence on 'Areas of Sensitive Landscapes' (report by Jacobs for AVDC, 2008) was criticised because it did not have stakeholder or public validation. Nevertheless the areas of sensitive landscape conform with the areas designated as AAL and LLA. This evidence has been reviewed by LUC and this review is published as supporting evidence to VALP. The 2008 Landscape Character Assessment which had primary field-based data collection also by Jacobs has also fed into the 2015 Local Landscapes study by LUC.

The options for VALP are considered to be:

- Redesignate all AALs and LLAs as locally valued landscapes and include a policy to enable the assessment of planning applications and appeals,
- Only redesignate the AALs and LLAs recommended as having value in the LUC report for consultation 'Local Landscape Designations (October 2015) and have an assessment policy,
- Have no formally designated locally valued landscapes but have a policy setting out landscape issues to be taken into account in planning applications and appeals, or
- Have no designations or policy and just rely on the NPPF.

The Council would welcome comments on which of the options it should pursue.

## **8. Glossary**

To be included in publication version of the Local Plan.