

**CORE STRATEGY FOR CHILTERN DISTRICT - EXAMINATION****INSPECTOR'S AGENDA: HEARING, MONDAY 11 APRIL 2PM (2<sup>nd</sup> session)****Main Matter 1**

There is a separate agenda for the first session on Compliance with Statutory and Regulatory Matters. There will be a short adjournment after that first session for participants involved solely with this 2<sup>nd</sup> session to take their places.

This agenda follows the main questions set out in the Main Matters and Questions 21 February. These are indicated thus (Q2.2). Additional, follow-up questions are shown in *italics*. Some of the original questions appear uncontroversial and I indicate where I have no further questions and/or where no discussion may be needed.

**Identification of Spatial Issues**

(Q2.2) Do the 8 spatial issues at paragraph 4.5 address the main challenges which the Core Strategy needs to address?

(Q2.4) Are cross boundary issues adequately addressed in setting the context? *I have seen no evidence to suggest that they are not.*

**The Vision**

(Q2.5) To what extent should the Visions for individual settlements reflect any local expression of a vision by that community?

*The Council's statement CDC3 (p2) indicates that they should do so. Is the plan unsound if the Visions do not reflect all the points in a local vision?*

Q2.6 How will the Core Strategy help deliver these settlement visions? Is the Core Strategy sufficiently spatial in its engagement of the issues and visions?

Q2.7 Does the Core Strategy seek to advance any measures to address the acknowledged *pockets of localised deprivation* (paragraph 3.3)? Does it have a role to play in addressing such matters?  
*Does the absence of specific measures targeted at this matter make the CS unsound?*

**Strategic objectives**

Q2.8 Are the Strategic Objectives appropriate and are the targets an appropriate measure of how each objective should be met? Objective 1 (amount of housing) and objective 2 (proportion of affordable housing) will be discussed under main matters 3 and 6 and do not need to be separately addressed here.

Q2.9 Is objective 4 (no net loss of employment land or floorspace) appropriate as an objective, since the wording of the objective, the related target and the policy approach (CS16) are essentially the same? Should the objective express an overall aim or outcome, rather than perhaps the means to an end?

*The Council's statement (CDC3 p5) acknowledges that this objective could be reworded (eg Retain a thriving economy.) Is the Council suggesting a change is made? Is a change necessary for soundness? (Discussion of whether policy CS16 is sound and whether the economy is thriving will be under Main Matter 7).*

Q2.10 A number of representations question the appropriateness of the target relating to sustainable locations (SO3). Based on the evidence used to assess the

sustainability of locations for development (eg CDN008 & 009), is this the most appropriate practical measure? Does it provide a reasonable measure of the effectiveness of the Council's chosen spatial strategy (of urban concentration)? Should any change of this indicator also change the identical indicator under policy CS1 Table 1?

*The Council's statement (CDC3 p5) justifies this target in relation to the density assumptions made on p33 of the SHLAA 2008 (CDN041). I do not understand the Council's summary of what it says the SHLAA did. More importantly, the Council's target does not relate to distance from a town centre which was a main consideration in the SHLAA when assessing density. The Council will need to explain more clearly at the hearing the justification for this target. Is this target sound i.e. (justified/effective)? If not, what would be a sound target?*

Q2.11 Should the target for SO6 (AONB/natural assets) refer to National and Local Biodiversity Action Plans or should these be referred to in indicators under policy CS1 Table 1? Council to respond to points made by Bucks, Berks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (414840).

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