

# **Core Strategy for Chiltern District**

## **Chiltern District Council - Response to Inspector's Questions [ID/4]**

### **MAIN MATTER 4: Strategic Housing Allocations and Major Developed Sites (MDS) in the Green Belt allocated for residential development**

#### **SUB MATTER: Policy CS6 Strategic Housing Allocations**

**DATE: 18 March 2011**

#### **Final**

---

The following Paper sets out the Council's response to 'Main Matter 4, Sub matter: Policy CS6 Strategic Housing Allocations' of the document 'Inspector's Main Matters and Questions' ID/4. The Paper has been structured to include the specific questions raised by the Inspector (in bold) and the Council's detailed response to them.

---

**Q5.1) Why did the Council select these 3 sites (ie land east of Lincoln Park, Amersham; Donkey Field, Little Chalfont; Holy Cross Convent, Chalfont St Peter) from other sites in the SHLAA as strategic sites? Are there any other sites which could or should be considered as strategic allocations which accord with the stated strategy?**

#### **CDC Response:**

The Council notes and agrees with the Inspector's comments that the principle of development on the Holy Cross Convent site is established by the recent planning permission.

Strategic Housing Sites (SHSs) were first considered in the Draft Core Strategy for Chiltern District – Stakeholder Dialogue June 2009 (CDN 063). This document included 21 potential SHSs which were all capable of providing a substantial amount of new housing development in the context of

the District. The original SHLAA (CDN041) formed the basis for selecting these SHSs. Many of these proposed SHSs were sites in multiple ownership, for example sites comprising amalgamations of garden land, and / or including residential redevelopment. Following discussions with key stakeholders the Council amended its policies for SHSs to relate only to those large SHSs which were consistent with the CS, in single ownership or owned by a small number of parties and where there was strong evidence of delivery. This action reflected the advice in PPS3 concerning positive evidence of delivery. Whilst the SHLAA will continue to have a positive role in identifying a basket of suitable housing sites, the Council does not consider at this time that there are additional sites, comparable to the three SHSs, which are suitable for allocation as SHSs.

**Q 5.2) What contribution does the undeveloped state of the Donkey Field make to the character of Little Chalfont? How does the significance of any such contribution compare with its suitability for housing and the need for housing?**

**CDC Response:**

The Council considers that this site is a suitable housing site which can make a significant contribution towards the housing allocation and housing needs in the District. The site is currently undeveloped and there are important trees along the boundaries of the site. The site is well screened and the screening limits the contribution its openness makes to the area. It is embedded within a built up area. By allocating the site as a SHS the Council can ensure that future development proposals on the site are of a high quality of design, respect local character and retaining important features such as boundary screening and some open space within the site. These matters are the subject of Policies CS20 (design and environmental quality) and CS 28 (retaining and improving leisure and recreational facilities) in the Core Strategy for Chiltern District Submission Document (CDN 105).

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

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

**CDC Response:**

The Council's Housing Land Supply Trajectory 2006 – 2026 has been revised and a replacement version has been prepared in response to the Inspector's questions in ID1 (CDN113). The dwelling yields anticipated from the SHSs at Land east of Lincoln Park, (SHLAA site 243) and at the Donkey Field, (SHLAA site 101) which are shown in both versions of the Housing Trajectory are the same. The figure for the Convent site has been amended in the revised Housing Trajectory (CDN 113) to reflect the outline permission for the site. This is a small change from 200 to 198 dwellings for the Convent Site.

**Details of Strategic Housing Sites included in the Housing Land Supply Trajectory 2006 - 2026 (CDN089 and CDN113)**

<b>Site details</b>	<b>Anticipated yield in the Housing Trajectory CDN089 and CDN113, with CDN 113 data in italics</b>
Land east of Lincoln Park, Amersham on the Hill (SHLAA site 243)	44
Land at the Donkey Field, Burton's Lane, Little Chalfont (SHLAA site 101)	60
Land at the Holy Cross Convent, (SHLAA site 116 and 391 minus the Policy H4 area)	200 ( <i>198</i> )

The starting point for estimating the housing yields from the SHSs at Land east of Lincoln Park, (SHLAA site 243) and the Donkey Field, (SHLAA site 101) was the original SHLAA (CDN041-042c). The resulting SHSs allocation figures were initially included in the Draft Core Strategy for Chiltern District – Stakeholder Dialogue June 2009 (CDN 063). The Core Strategy (paragraph 7.6 of CDN 063) acknowledged that the yields for the sites were indicative and that detailed proposals might include different yields.

The yield for the Donkey Field site was subsequently reduced following the stakeholder dialogue stage of the Core Strategy. The receipt of information from the agent for the site in relation to delivery matters refers to flexibility in respect of yields for the site. This can be found in CDN097 (letter from PPML Planning dated 16<sup>th</sup> April 2010 on the 8<sup>th</sup> page). Given the size of the site and its accessible location an estimated yield of 60 dwellings is considered consistent with the workings of the SHLAA

The yield for the site east of Lincoln Park was not amended in this way. The information from the contact for this site was broadly supportive of the Core Strategy and did not propose changes to the dwelling allocation. This can be found in CDN097 (email from Peter Marshall dated 25<sup>th</sup> June 2010 on the 18<sup>th</sup> page).

To conclude, there is important evidence supporting the dwelling figures and delivery of the SHSs, including that from a planning permission and from direct contact with relevant agents / contacts for the sites.

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

**CDC Response:**

In view of the planning permission at the Convent site, this paragraph is more relevant to the SHSs at the Donkey Field and on land east of Lincoln Park. Some of the issues discussed below also relate to the Inspector's Main

Matters 8 and 9 (Infrastructure, including transport and Monitoring) in ID4 and to CDC 11 and 12, the Council's response to these Main Matters.

The Council has been in discussion with infrastructure providers about all elements of the CS, including whether specific infrastructure is needed to support the SHSs. From these discussions no abnormal or specific infrastructure needs have been identified to support the delivery of these sites. Accordingly, no site-specific infrastructure requirements for SHSs are included in the Policy CS6.

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

**CDC Response:**

The Council recognises that the housing numbers against the Strategic Housing Sites in the Housing Trajectory (CDN113) (particularly the Donkey Field and the Land east of Lincoln Park), which have not been subject to a planning application or detailed negotiations may change over time. The Council therefore recognises that the formal planning application process will determine the appropriate levels of housing on each of the SHSs. The CS is effective in that it gives a positive steer for development on these sites to assist in their delivery.

**Q5.7) Should the allocation for the Holy Cross site include the land shown in the approved planning application as a relocated playing field?**

**CDC Response:**

Condition no 38 of the outline planning permission for the development on the site (CH/2010/0293/OA) refers to provision for a playing field. The condition provides some flexibility in the location of the playing field because the overall layout of the site might vary as the details of the development are finalised to cover the reserved matters stage for a future planning application. Therefore the Council does not consider it necessary for the boundary of the Strategic

18 March 2011

CDC/Matter 4  
Sub Matter: Policy CS6 Strategic Housing Allocations

CDC/6

Housing Site to be amended to take account of land requirements for a playing field.