

Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 examination

Agenda Session 20 17 July 2018 Matter 15q; D-HAD007
Haddenham

Participants: Inspector, Council, 32065 Rosemary Lane Action Group, 32315 Persimmon Homes and Cala Homes, 30086 Alyson Glasspool (all three with hearing statements).

Summary of issues

A query about an apparent inconsistency between the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the allocation in the VALP has been answered by the Council in that it is now proposed to expand existing schools rather than to provide an additional one. My understanding of the thrust of the representations is that

- Persimmon/Cala argue that the site allocation needs to be larger in order to deliver 315 homes and a more logical distribution of public open space and landscaping
- Persimmon/Cala argue that the site can be larger without detriment to landscape impact – they adduce a landscape study
- Richborough Estates (30221) comments that the northern boundary of the allocation doesn't follow field boundaries
- Jake Collinge argues that the "not built development" annotation in pursuit of criteria (f) and (g) is unjustified.
- Local residents argue that the site selection exercise for the Neighbourhood Plan scored the site poorly on accessibility, ranking 11th out of 21, that it is not clear how the Council's site assessment exercise came to select the allocation and that its potential harm to the Haddenham Conservation Area heritage asset was not assessed.
- Local residents argue that the pedestrian and cycle access proposed would be narrow and unsafe
- Local residents argue that requirement (h) for access from Churchway provides an indirect route to local facilities and so would fail to encourage use of sustainable transport to and from the station, making the allocation unsound
- Local residents argue that the allocation represents a loss of good agricultural land without justification
- Local residents argue that the site has unresolved issues relating to water supply and flooding.

Matters for discussion

- 1)** Have I correctly understood the thrust of the representations?
- 2)** Has the evaluation of a current application (17/02280AOP) substantiated the concerns about the capacity of the allocated site?
- 3)** Is the proposed northern boundary of the allocation correctly defined by reference to the published landscape evidence?
- 4)** Would the allocation encourage a sustainable use of transport?
- 5)** Was the agricultural land quality taken into account?
- 6)** Has heritage impact been adequately assessed?
- 7)** Water and flooding issues
- 8)** Any other matters.

P. W. Clark

Inspector

05.07.18