

# **Core Strategy for Chiltern District**

## **Chiltern District Council - Response to additional representations made by Chalfont St Peter Parish Council dated 28 April 2011 and Inspector's Post Hearing Note 1 – Holy Cross Site [ID/15]**

**DATE: 17 May 2011**

### **Final Version**

---

The following paper sets out the Council's response to the additional representations submitted by Chalfont St Peter Parish Council dated 28 April 2011 in relation to the Holy Cross Site (Policy CS6) and the 'Inspector's Post Hearing Note (1) – Holy Cross Site (ID/15). This Paper has been structured to firstly respond to the matters raised by Chalfont St Peter Parish Council (PART A) and then to respond to the specific questions raised by the Inspector (PART B).

---

#### **PART A: CDC Response to Additional Representations by Chalfont St Peter Parish Council:**

The Council does not consider that the Parish Council, in its submission of 28 April 2011, has introduced any new issues to those already raised in its previous representations to the Core Strategy or expressed orally at the hearing sessions.

The Council is of the view that the additional information put forward by the Parish Council in its submission would not justify an alteration to the Core Strategy along the lines it has suggested, particularly in light of the comments made on behalf of the site owner about the delivery of such an alternative (refer to additional representation 368293) and the comments of the Education Authority dated 16 May 2011 (Appendix 1 to this Paper). The Council therefore maintains the view that the outstanding planning permission on the site for housing provides appropriate evidence to justify the site as a strategic housing allocation in Policy CS6.

**PART B: Response to Matters Raised within Inspector's Post Hearing Note 1 (ID/15)**

**3.1 As part of the evolution of the Core Strategy, did the Council consider the future land use needs of St Peter Church of England Junior School? I note that there is a general reference to school capacity at 17.4 of the Core Strategy. Appendix 7 states that "no requirement for the provision of new primary schools has been identified in any of the settlement areas". Does this statement remain consistent with evidence now available? Given the constraints on the school accommodation outlined in the letter from the Headmaster (20 April 2011) should the Core Strategy or other DPD be seeking to address the future needs of this school? Is it unsound not to do so?**

**CDC Response:**

CDC has sought input from the Education Authority (Bucks County Council) throughout the production of the Core Strategy. It is on the basis of information provided by the education authority in 2010 that the Core Strategy states that no requirement for the provision of new primary schools exists (even in light of the planned housing growth). The education authority has confirmed that this remains the situation (Appendix 1). The information put forward by Chalfont St Peter Church of England School indicates that this particular school is over-subscribed and that there is a desire for them to move to larger premises. This in itself does not mean that the 'need' for a new school exists. The Council therefore does not consider the Core Strategy to be unsound for not specifically addressing the future aspirations of this school.

**3.2 No change in the proposals in the Core Strategy will undo the extant permission and the owner can implement that proposal if it wishes to do so. Nevertheless, it terms of the appropriate long term use of the site and in the light of the information now provided by the Parish Council,**

**does the District Council remain of the view that the allocation of the site solely and entirely for housing is justified compared with alternatives which include elements other than housing, such as the proposal now suggested? If so, please explain briefly why. Did the Council consider alternatives to the allocation of the whole site for housing (if so please highlight how/when). If not, how is the current allocation justified as the most appropriate use?**

**CDC Response:**

For the reasons set out in the response to the additional representations by Chalfont St Peter (refer to PART A of this Paper), the Council maintains the view that the allocation for the site solely and entirely for housing is justified when compared with the alternatives suggested.

As the Core Strategy developed, the Council did consider alternatives to the allocation of the site for just housing (as set out in CDN063<sup>1</sup> and suggested by representors at various stages). These were not progressed as the strongest evidence justifies the allocation of the site for housing.

**3.3 In my main matters and issues (21 February 2011) I asked (Q5.7): *Should the allocation for the Holy Cross site include the land shown in the approved planning application as a relocated playing field?* The Council was the only party which responded to this question, in summary, concluding that it is not necessary for the boundary of the strategic allocation to be amended to take account of land requirements for playing field. I did not feel that I needed to take this point further, but on reflection could the Council please clarify the following. Why does the permission require retention of a playing field/whose needs is this intended to meet etc? Is such provision now regarded as a requirement of the development of the site and, if so, should it be reflected in the**

---

<sup>1</sup> The June 2009 Stakeholder Dialogue version of the CS (CDN063) referred at paragraph 11.8 to the need for additional retail floorspace in Chalfont St Peter. The Policy CS17 referred to if the Holy cross site were re-developed part of the site would be allocated for retail expansion. (the area proposed was next to the existing Budgens supermarket.) Paragraph 16.3 refers to the Holy Cross site as a potential extra care/nursing home site. This potential use of the site was carried forward into the submission Core strategy a (CDN105) at paragraph 11.2. In relation to the retail allocation the updated retail study, (CDN073) showed less demand for additional retail floorspace in Chalfont St Peter making a strategic site allocation for retail un-necessary.

**allocation proposal? Policy CS28 indicates that this site will be required to provide “open space”, but the context implies that this is to meet the needs of the new development, not existing/wider needs. Please clarify how the retention of the playing field required by the planning permission relates to the requirement of this policy.**

**CDC Response:**

During the planning application process, the applicant offered to retain a playing pitch as part of the development proposal to respond directly to the specific concerns of Sport England. The retention/provision of a playing pitch is secured by condition within the Notice of Planning Permission. The ‘Chiltern District Council Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities Audit and Needs Assessment Final Report’ (June 2005) by Torkildsen Barclay (CDN010) did not identify the need for additional sports facilities in Chalfont St Peter. Accordingly the Council does not consider that the provision of a sport pitch on this site is essential to meet any local need and this is why it is not mentioned within the Core Strategy.

The Council, recognising the potential of the site to provide informal open space to meet both the need arising from the development and for use by the wider community, set the requirement for open space to be provided on the site within Policy CS28. Whilst a playing field is ‘open space’, for the reasons set out in the paragraph above, the Council does not consider that it could insist on a playing pitch being retained on the site at this time.

## **Appendix 1: Statement from the Education Authority on Holy Cross Site 16 May 2011**

---

From: Chainani, Stephen [schainani@buckscc.gov.uk]  
Sent: 16 May 2011 16:19  
To: Phil King  
Cc: Campbell-Balcombe, Paula; Munday, Chris; Bagnall, Stephen; Shaw, David  
Subject: RE: Inspectors Note and Holy X Note

Dear Phil

This note is to clarify the Local Authority's position on education provision associated with the Holy Cross development.

The Local Authority has a statutory duty to ensure the sufficient high quality early years and education places; it is for the District Council to determine planning applications. The Local Authority's position has always been that it would support the relocation of Chalfont St Peter CE School provided it was at no cost to the Authority. While not a necessary requirement, the Local Authority (like the Diocese) can see the benefits of relocating the Chalfont St Peter CE School onto the Holy Cross site:

Ø Address the lack of playing fields on school site although the school does have access to fields nearby. While this existing deficiency is not ideal there are a number of other schools for which this is the case;

Ø Address the lack of a dining room which was converted into teaching accommodation when the school decided to expand its capacity by an additional 120 places in 2004. While this existing deficiency is not ideal, dining rooms are not a necessary requirement. A suitability survey carried out on the school did not identify any deficiencies in teaching space.

Ø As the development site was previously occupied by a school, its layout is likely to still be suitable for relocating Chalfont St Peter CE. There is also the potential to preserve some of the existing historical buildings on the Holy Cross school site – although as most of the existing infrastructure is likely to require refurbishing/rebuilding there is likely to be little cost savings;

Ø While the proposal to relocate Chalfont St Peter CE would not result in an increase in the school's capacity (i.e. it would only provide the school with more suitable accommodation to deliver the curriculum) the site would have the scope to provide additional infant school places although this would require additional accommodation.

Ø Popular with parents and the community.

However, we have had discussions with the agents who are seeking to sell the land regarding possible land swaps and the relocation of existing schools onto the site. Following those discussions we did not express an interest in the land. We were advised that the 1993 Charities Act would not allow for the site to be sold in parts or used as part of a land swap. The Sisters of the Holy Cross (landowners) had a duty to obtain market value for the land and these options were unlikely to give best return and would add risk and uncertainty to the process. The County Council does not have the required level of resources to enable this to happen. It was our view that it would not have been appropriate to express an interest if it was not genuine.

While we currently have sufficient school places in Chalfont St Peter, the housing development in the area is currently projected to result in the requirement for additional places. We have secured the appropriate level of developer contributions from this development and in accordance with our S106 policy would seek contributions for all future development in the area. We are currently reviewing

primary school provision in Chiltern and South Bucks and will be engaging with a range of local stakeholders to plan provision. This review will take into account the impact of proposed housing developments and provision in the wider area as a result of the significant complexities of parental choice. Chalfont St Peter CE School itself is very popular with parents and as a result over 50% of pupils on roll live outside its Local Authority designated catchment area. Therefore, while the school may be oversubscribed, this does not necessarily mean there is a sufficiency problem within the local area, and our data suggests there is currently sufficient capacity within both the local and wider area to meet demand. To meet the cumulative impact of all development proposed in the area, the Local Authority believes there are other more cost effective expansion options on other school sites which (although perhaps not as ideal as the Holy Cross site) would allow it to meet its sufficiency duty.

I hope that this clarifies our position.

Kind Regards

Stephen Chainani