

# Core Strategy for Chiltern District

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

### MAIN MATTER 8: Infrastructure, including transport

DATE: 18 March 2011

#### Final

---

The following Paper sets out the Council's response to Section 9 'Main Matter 8: Infrastructure, including transport' 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.

---

**Q9.1) The Key Diagram shows an Improved Rail Link to Chesham, but this does not appear to be addressed in the text or in Appendix 7 Draft Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (DIDS). The notation should be retained on the Key Diagram only if there is a specific proposal to be included in the text with appropriate details, including deliverability, in the DIDS. Council to clarify.**

#### **CDC Response:**

Noted – there is no specific proposal within the text.

**Q9.2) The Key Diagram shows an Improved Traffic Route Through Chesham. Is this the Congestion Management Corridor in the DIDS? Is it significant for placeshaping in Chesham? If so, should it be mentioned in the text of the Core Strategy? Funding is noted as yet to be committed. What are the prospects of this scheme being delivered by 2026? Does the emerging Local Transport Plan 3 include this scheme or is it likely to change the priority given to it?**

**CDC Response:**

The Congestion Management Corridor is mentioned within LTP2 and the emerging LTP3, in which Bucks CC have indicated to the Council that funding for this scheme will be committed over that period.

**Q9.3) Policy CS25 c) refers to identifying and safeguarding improvement lines from development. Are there any?**

**CDC Response:**

The Highway Authority has conformed that there are currently no road improvement lines within Chiltern District.

**Q9.4) The Evaluation of Transport Impacts (July 2009 (CND72b) states that development scenarios 2 and 3 are able to be delivered with suitable mitigation measures and the transport assessment assumed an element of modal shift when concluding that the impact would be acceptable. Is this the main evidence/technical conclusion underpinning the transport aspects of the Core Strategy? Are any specific mitigation measures taken forward in the Core Strategy or will such mitigation be achieved by other means?**

**CDC Response:**

The Chiltern District Council Core Strategy - Evaluation of Transport Impacts Main Report (July 2009) by Atkins Transport Planning (CDN072b), together with the Chiltern District Council Core Strategy - Evaluation of Transport Impacts Report of Evidence (May 2008) by Atkins Transport Planning (CDN072a) and direct input from Transport for Buckinghamshire forms the main evidence underpinning the Core Strategy. In addition, the transport evaluation alongside the County Local Transport Plan (LTP2) (CDN015) and the CDN008 all combine to underpin the transport aspects of the Core Strategy.

Paragraph 5.19 of the CDN072b refers to the need for mitigation measures. It states that many of these mitigation measures will be specific to each development and negotiated as part of planning applications. Others may be implemented through wider Local Transport Plan initiatives, with funding secured by the Highway Authority. CDN072b did not expect mitigation to be met via the Core Strategy but via site specific Section 106 obligations. Therefore no specific mitigation measures are listed in the CS.

**Q9.5) Policy CS25 refers to any necessary mitigation measures and policy CS26 f) refers to all development not materially increasing traffic problems. These policies would only bite as and when development is proposed on specific sites. Will the application of these policies ensure that the necessary modal shift will occur? Does the Core Strategy need to address any mitigation of general traffic growth or the cumulative impact of development?**

**CDC Response:**

In light of the Council's evidence Policies CS25 and 26 seek to offset the impacts of development proposals on the local highway network. To off-set impacts of specific development proposals on the local highway network these policies could conceivably involve measures to encourage modal shift in that locality.

CDN072a/072b evaluated the impacts of the levels of development envisaged within the CS in the context of anticipated 'general traffic growth' to the local highway network. Therefore factoring the general traffic growth to the local highway network, CDN072a/072b did not identify the need for specific mitigation measures to be included within the CS.

**Utility services – Water supply**

Given the technical nature of the Inspector's questions in Q9.7 to Q9.15, the Council has requested that Thames Water, the Environment Agency and

Veolia Water provide a separate response to the questions concerning Utility Services – Water supply and Sewerage and Sewage Treatment.

Therefore reference should be made to the separate responses from these organisations. Please note at the time of completing this response the Council is unaware whether or not the Environment Agency has provided a response.

The Council has made additional comments in this response document only in relation to question numbers (9.9 (a and b) and 9.14) where it is considered that a further comment from the Council would be appropriate.

**Would the Council please clarify with Viola Water and the EA:**

**Q9.7) Whether the additional demands from the planned additional dwellings (both 2,400 and the 2,900 on which they were previously consulted) would require more water to be abstracted from the Chess or Misbourne; whether this would be within the currently licensed maximum abstraction limits; and, even if it is, whether it would have any material effect on low flows? If not obtained from these rivers, where would the water come from?**

**Q9.8) Would any additional water abstraction from these rivers (even if within currently licensed maximum abstraction limits) weaken the EA's ability to move towards restoring sustainable abstraction?**

**Q9.9) If yes to any of the above questions, should the Core Strategy seek to mitigate any adverse impact and, if so, how could this be achieved including:**

**a) Whether local circumstances provide the necessary justification (in the context of the advice in paragraphs 30-33 of the Supplement to PPS1 Planning and Climate Change) for a focussed local standard in relation to water use lower than will be required in the Building Regulations. (I note that the bracketed text in Table 1 after policy CS4 is to be deleted in a minor change).**

**b) Whether there is any action that the Core Strategy can legitimately encourage in relation to water efficiency in existing buildings.**

**CDC Response to Q9.9a-b:**

There is no proposal in the Core Strategy for a local water use standard which would be lower than that in the Building Regulations but the removal of the reference in criterion (h) of Table 1 following Policy CS4 was intended to create flexibility for the issue of water efficiency to be developed further in other DPDs. The Core Strategy has a long time horizon and criterion (h) as amended enables subsequent DPDs to reflect the local pressures in relation to water efficiency. This issue was raised by the Environment Agency in its comments on the CS.

The scope of powers available to the Council would be a limiting factor in relation to the introduction of references in the Core Strategy to water efficiency measures within existing buildings.

**Q9.14) Whether, in the light of all the above [Q9.13], there is need for the Core Strategy to be more explicit about the capacity constraint arising from the CSTW and whether there maybe a point at which housing developments have to be embargoed pending the capacity upgrade? If so, does this have any implications for any of the allocated sites?**

**CDC Response:**

Thames Water has provided a map of the CSTW catchment. One of the proposed housing sites in the Core Strategy falls within the CSTW Catchment. This is the Major Developed Site in the Green Belt at the Chesham Campus of Amersham and Wycombe College in Lycrome Road, Chesham.

Thames Water confirm that they do not consider that an embargo on housing development is required, although they suggest that a more explicit recognition of the issue concerning the capacity of the Chesham STW could be made in the Core Strategy. The Council would be happy to discuss this

further at the hearing and in the light of any comments which the Environment Agency might have on the issue.