

HEARING STATEMENT

SESSION 1A – LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS
04 OCTOBER 2016 - AM

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN
EXAMINATION

EXAMINATION HEARING SESSIONS

PREPARED ON BEHALF OF

GLEESON DEVELOPMENTS LTD (REPRESENTOR ID REF 19261)
WATES DEVELOPMENTS LTD (REPRESENTOR ID REF 19218)

September 2016

**HEARING STATEMENT
MAIDSTONE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION
EXAMINATION HEARING SESSIONS OCTOBER 2016**

SESSION 1A – LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Prepared on behalf of Gleeson Developments Ltd and Wates Developments Ltd

Project Ref:	24690/26045/A5
Status:	FINAL
Issue/Rev:	04
Date:	14 September 2016
Prepared by:	Emma Wreathall
Checked by:	Andrew Wilford
Authorised by:	Andrew Wilford

Barton Willmore LLP
The Observatory
Southfleet Road
Swanscombe
Kent
DA10 0DF

Tel: 01322 374660
Fax: 01322 374661
Email: andrew.wilford@bartonwillmore.co.uk

Ref: 24690/26045/A5/EW/mg/djg
Date: 14 September 2016

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore LLP.

All Barton Willmore stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

1.0	INTRODUCTION	01
2.0	RESPONSE TO SESSION 1A – LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS	02

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Extract of Aylesbury Vale District Council's Local Plan Letter

Word Count: 1,920 words (excluding Inspector's Questions and title pages)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared on behalf of Gleeson Developments Ltd and Wates Developments Ltd in respect of Session 1A of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions for the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (MBLP) Examination.
- 1.2 Session 1A relates to the legal and procedural matters of the MBLP and its preparation by Maidstone Borough Council (MBC). Barton Willmore has now had an opportunity to review Maidstone Borough Council's Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement [SUB 008]. It is disappointing that this Statement had not been produced for the Regulation 19 Consultation.
- 1.3 We are concerned by the level of information provided in the Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement [SUB 008]. In BW's experience of Local Plan Examinations, a LPA would ordinarily publish a record of each meeting that has taken place, e.g. agendas and minutes of meetings and workshops and which we had expected to be contained in the published Compliance Paper. However, Appendix 1 of SUB 008 contains only a short summary/sentence of each meeting/workshop compiled by MBC and MBC has failed to demonstrate with evidence that the Duty has been complied with.
- 1.4 By way of example, a Local Plan Inspector (letter dated 07 January 2014) found the Aylesbury Vale District Council's Local Plan to be "unsound" due to the lack of record of any substantive engagement with other authorities and outstanding significant issues of potential unmet housing needs from other authorities, despite giving consideration to the benefit of having an adopted Plan in place (Appendix 1 for extract).
- 1.5 MBC is required to demonstrate how consideration of cross-boundary issues has informed the Local Plan's preparation, including working with authorities in the Housing Market Area (HMA), surrounding Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) and London Boroughs. We note that meetings have taken place but question whether the Duty to Co-operate has been 'effective'. This is particularly apparent by in KCC Highways objection to the Local Plan who we understand have a general objection to the level of growth proposed in relation to impacts in South Maidstone and its view that there is a need for greater strategic infrastructure to accommodate growth (i.e. a Leeds-Langley Relief Road).

2.0 RESPONSE TO SESSION 1A – LEGAL & PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Issue (ii) – Whether the Local Planning Authority and other relevant persons has complied with the Duty to Cooperate?

DtC in relation to Housing Needs and Supply

Qn1.2 As part of the DtC engagement have Sevenoaks or Tunbridge Wells Council in west Kent indicated to MBC how they might address a housing needs assessment if they are not capable of being accommodated within their own areas due to Green Belt and other constraints?

- 2.1 In accordance with requirements of the Duty to Co-operate, it is necessary for MBC to demonstrate that it has engaged, and continues to engage, with the West Kent authorities in the preparation of the Local Plan. In this regard, the Maidstone SHMA [HOU 002, para 2.15] identifies that, whilst the relationship between Maidstone and west Kent authorities is defined as weak, there are still migration flows between these and other areas (i.e. South East London authorities).
- 2.2 Both Tunbridge Wells Borough Council (TWBC) and Sevenoaks District Council (SDC) are at an early stage in the preparation of a new Local Plan. As noted by the Inspector, the West Kent authority areas are heavily constrained by extensive Green Belt and national landscape designations, as are those authorities which surround them, including for instance, London Borough of Bromley (LBB). There is therefore limited capacity for those authorities (i.e. TWBC and SDC) to accommodate their own needs, let alone the needs of their adjoining authorities under their own Duty to Co-operate.
- 2.3 At this time, it is difficult to quantify unmet needs from these authorities until their own housing targets have been identified. Table 2.1 seeks to assist by identifying the present situation, and demonstrates that there is potentially significant levels of unmet need arising from the West Kent and other authorities, including by way of example only, LBB (which has direct links to Maidstone through the M20/A20 and train line into London which stops at both Orpington and Bromley).

Table 2.1: Potential unmet need arising from neighbouring authorities

Local Planning Authority	Dwellings per annum			
	OAN starting point ¹	Council's OAN	Council's housing target	Potential unmet need
Ashford ²	776	727	772	45
Bromley ³	1,843	n/a	641	-1,202 ⁴
Medway ⁵	1,323	1,281	1,281	0
Sevenoaks ⁶	505	620	165	-455
Tonbridge & Malling ⁷	616	673	673	0
Tunbridge Wells ⁸	493	648	290	-358

Source: Compiled by BW. See footnotes for sources.

- 2.4 Notwithstanding the potential for unmet need arising from TWBC and SDC, the Duty to Co-operate Compliance Statement [SUB 008] makes limited reference to those authorities. Indeed neither authority is recorded within the Schedule of Duty to Co-operate Engagements [Appendix 1 of SUB 008].
- 2.5 SDC has also been omitted as a relevant LPA in considering whether MBC has met the Duty [para 2.4 of SUB 008]. Whilst Sevenoaks District is not directly adjacent to Maidstone's administrative area, it does have a relationship with the Borough (as does LBB Bromley), as acknowledged in MBC's own evidence base [HOU 002] set out above.
- 2.6 Para 3.1.9 of the Topic Paper [SUB 008] refers to discussions with TWBC and SDC, undertaken between the publication of the Maidstone SHMA in 2014 [HOU 002] and the West Kent SHMA in 2015, however no such discussions are recorded within Appendix 1 of the Compliance Statement [SUB 008]. It is surprising and of considerable concern that there has been no engagement or discussion with SDC and/or TWBC after the publication of the West Kent SHMA (2015) as acknowledged by MBC.
- 2.7 The lack of effective DtC is exacerbated by the situation in South East London, where LBB, Sevenoaks' immediate neighbour, is required by the London Plan (adopted March 2015) to deliver a target of only 641 dwellings per annum (dpa). However, LBB's Objectively Assessed Needs (OAN) starting point (based on 2014 projections) is 1,843 dpa resulting in an annual unmet need of 1,202 dwellings.

¹ Based on CLG 2014-based household projection converted to a dwelling requirement by applying an allowance for vacancy/ 2nd homes using CLG 2015 Council Tax Base data

² OAN taken from SHMA Update, June 2015. Housing target from Ashford Local Plan 2030 - Reg 19 (June 2016)

³ Council's OAN not available. Housing target from The London Plan 2015

⁴ In the absence of Council's OAN, calculated as difference between OAN starting point and Council's housing target

⁵ OAN taken from SHENA, November 2015. Housing target from Issues and Options 2012-2035 (January 2016)

⁶ OAN taken from Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells SHMA, Final Report, September 2015. Housing target from adopted Core Strategy (February 2011)

⁷ OAN and housing target taken from Local Plan - The Way Forward, Reg 18 (September 2016 Draft) as OAN differs to that in SHMA Update (June 2015).

⁸ OAN taken from Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells SHMA, Final Report, September 2015. Housing target from adopted Local Plan (March 2006)

- 2.8 As a result it is likely that unmet need from LBB will inevitably have to be met by other authorities, including MBC. This is a significant potential figure and cannot be ignored by MBC.

Qn1.3 Would under-provision of housing in west Kent be likely to affect the geography of housing market areas? In particular, would those unable to be accommodated locally (including London Commuters) seek to live in other areas (including Maidstone) with knock on consequences for their own residents (such as the possible displacement of unmet demand towards Ashford)?

- 2.9 Yes. There is likely to be a displacement effect from West Kent authorities to Maidstone and beyond if these authorities cannot meet their own needs. Therefore any unmet housing needs in East Kent will affect the geography of the HMA as it will push migration trends to less constrained areas in mid-Kent i.e. Maidstone and Ashford.
- 2.10 Unmet housing needs within London will undoubtedly increase out-migration flows to LPAs surrounding the capital (including Maidstone), which will also need to be considered. Irrespective of potential future unmet needs arising from West Kent, the Maidstone SHMA (2014) [HOU 002] suggested that Maidstone's housing need would need to increase to 973 dpa (from 928 dpa) to address increased migration from London.
- 2.11 It is noted that the Duty to Cooperate Compliance Statement [SUB 008] states in para 3.1.28 that '*To date however, there has been no suggestion that Maidstone will be expected to accommodate any unmet needs from London, and no formalised requests under the DtC have been received*'. This is not unsurprising, as BW is not aware of any formal request made by the GLA to any other LPA to accommodate its unmet needs.
- 2.12 However, the absence of any request from the GLA does not mean that out-migration flows do not exist. MBC cannot ignore this fact simply because no formal request has been made. A prime example of the effect of London's unmet need is the LBB, an area which has direct links to Maidstone – as detailed above.
- 2.13 There is likely to be as strong a relationship between LBB and Maidstone as there is between Sevenoaks and Maidstone and the failure to take account of the out-migration to Maidstone demonstrates that MBC's Duty to Cooperate has not been 'effective'. This is a fundamental shortcoming of the Local Plan and will result in London commuters seeking to live in Maidstone although no provision has been made for them.

Qn1.4 As the west Kent Local Plans remain at an early stage without defined housing targets, should this issue lead to a request to accommodate additional housing can it be left to the first review of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan?

- 2.14 Due to the early stage of the new West Kent Local Plans, it is not possible to quantify unmet need from neighbouring authorities until their own housing targets have been identified. BW has sought to understand the potential likelihood of unmet needs at the present time (Table 2.1 above) and consider that there is potentially significant levels of unmet needs arising. LBB's Local Plan is still to be examined, albeit the housing target is set within the London Plan Alterations.
- 2.15 BW considers that a review or partial review of the MBLP will be necessary when it becomes apparent what the shortfall in housing provision from surrounding LPAs is. At the very minimum, a flexible policy should be introduced into the MBLP in order to ensure the Plan can respond rapidly to change. This approach is supported to deal with the potential failure of the Broad Locations and explained in greater detail in Session 5A – Housing Land Supply.
- 2.16 It is noted that the MBLP states that a review of the Local Plan will commence by 2022 to ensure an up-to-date planning policy framework is maintained (para 1.3). A main modification will therefore be required to the MBLP to ensure that a Local Plan Review is progressed to accommodate additional housing in the Borough under the Duty to Co-operate, if necessary.

Strategic Infrastructure

Qn1.8 Does lack of agreement to date between MBC and KCC (and HE) on some transport issues qualify as a failure in the duty to cooperate given the history of engagement set out in the DtC Compliance Statement?

- 2.17 Yes. It is evident that the Duty to Cooperate has failed in this respect. It is very unusual for the Highway Authority to object to a Local Plan and KCC's position demonstrates that MBC has not effectively undertaken the Duty to Co-operate with this key stakeholder.

APPENDIX 1

Extract of Aylesbury Vale District Council's Local Plan Letter



John Byrne
Head of Planning
Aylesbury Vale District Council

Our Ref:

PINS/J0405/429/8

Date:

7 January 2014

Dear Mr Byrne,

Vale of Aylesbury Plan Strategy Examination:

- **Duty to co-operate**
- **Soundness in terms of the overall provision for housing and jobs**

1. Further to the initial hearing sessions held on 10, 12 and 13 December 2013 I set out below my conclusions in respect of the duty to co-operate (Matter 1) and soundness in terms of overall provision for housing and jobs (Matter 2) and explain the implications for the examination.

Background

2. The Council submitted the Vale of Aylesbury Plan Strategy (the Plan) for examination in August 2013, having previously published the Proposed Submission version of the Plan in May 2013.
3. Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) imposes a duty to co-operate in terms of the preparation of a development plan document as far as it relates to a strategic matter. The duty to co-operate came into effect in November 2011 and the Council does not dispute that it is required to meet it in relation to overall housing provision within the Plan, amongst other strategic matters. The duty requires the Council to have co-operated in maximising the effectiveness of the preparation of the Plan and in particular to have engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis.
4. It is also of relevance that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012, over a year before the Proposed Submission version of the Plan was published and some seventeen months before the Plan was submitted for examination. The NPPF clearly sets out the approach that should be taken in terms of identifying and meeting needs for development including housing and emphasises the need for co-operation and collaboration, particularly where housing markets cross administrative boundaries and where local planning authorities may not be able to accommodate development requirements wholly within their own areas.
5. In the early stages of plan preparation, the Council commissioned work to consider the potential needs for housing and employment growth in the District. The Housing and Economic Growth Assessment (HEGA) was published in September 2011. This set out a number of scenarios for growth and informed the identification of initial

options for the overall scale of housing and employment to be planned for in the District. The HEGA focussed on the scale and distribution of growth within Aylesbury Vale; it did not specifically consider the potential development needs of other authorities or assess wider housing markets.

6. In light of the duty to co-operate and the publication of the NPPF, the Council commissioned the Strategic Housing Market Assessment: Validation Study (the Validation Study) in May 2012. The Validation Study (published in February 2013) undertook a review of the HEGA, defined a sub-regional housing market area (HMA) and identified potential housing requirements across it. The Validation Study considered that Aylesbury Vale is most appropriately regarded as being within the Luton and Milton Keynes HMA which also includes the local authority areas of Milton Keynes, Central Bedfordshire, Bedford and Luton.
7. Further work on demographic projections undertaken on behalf of the Council was published in April and May 2013. A supplementary report to the Validation Study was published in June 2013 to take account of updated information. This sets out the Council's up to date position in terms of potential housing needs and provision for each of the local authorities within the HMA.

Duty to co-operate

8. Whilst there are a number of cross-boundary issues requiring co-operation between the Council, other local authorities and relevant bodies, the overall provision for housing is of particular significance given the pattern of commuting and migration between Aylesbury Vale and other authorities, interrelationships in housing markets and the role that the District has had in accommodating growth on a sub-regional level.
9. The District boundary adjoins the urban area of Milton Keynes, which is likely to continue to be a major focus for housing and economic growth. The relationship between Aylesbury Vale and the growth of Milton Keynes has long been recognised as a key issue, in particular the potential for future growth of the urban area, partly or wholly within Aylesbury Vale. The need for joint working and effective co-operation on this matter is clearly set out in the recent Inspector's Report on the Milton Keynes Core Strategy (May 2013) and in the Core Strategy itself (Policy CS6) adopted in July 2013.
10. Based on the Validation Study, the Council acknowledges that Aylesbury Vale forms part of a wider HMA along with Milton Keynes, Central Bedfordshire, Bedford and Luton. It also accepts that there are interrelationships with other areas and is aware of concerns that due to environmental constraints, a number of authorities may not be able to accommodate all of their identified housing needs and may be looking to Aylesbury Vale to accommodate some additional growth.
11. The duty to co-operate is not a duty to agree. In addition, whilst consideration must be given to joint working and the production of joint local development documents, these are not specific requirements of compliance with the duty. The lack of jointly produced evidence and the fact that a number of other local authorities continue to have concerns in respect of the level of housing provision set out in the Plan are not in themselves reasons to conclude that the Council has failed to comply with the duty. It is the actions of the Council in terms of co-operating to maximise the effectiveness of the preparation of the Plan which are critical to my consideration of the matter.

12. There is no Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) or other assessment of housing needs produced jointly with other authorities. The Validation Study and supplementary report which considered housing needs across the wider HMA were commissioned and produced solely on behalf of the Council. The conclusion that a joint SHMA or equivalent document was not a realistic proposition appears to have been reached on the basis of discussions with officers of the other authorities concerned. Other authorities were not formally approached to undertake joint work on housing needs and provision.
13. Quite correctly, in light of the duty to co-operate and the publication of the NPPF, the Council acknowledged that the housing needs of the wider HMA should be identified and that further work to supplement the HEGA was necessary. Given the context of the strategic issues relating to housing provision, this was clearly a fundamental element of effective plan preparation requiring constructive, active and ongoing engagement with other relevant authorities.
14. The Council point to a number of meetings and discussions with adjoining authorities¹ during the preparation of the Validation Study. However, these authorities were not actively involved in establishing the scope of the Validation Study. Indeed, the Council confirmed at the hearing session that there was no written brief for the Validation Study and it was commissioned on the basis of verbal instructions. Whilst the objectives of the Validation Study are set out in paragraph 1.10, it is not clear what level and form of engagement with other authorities was intended.
15. There are various references to consultation with other authorities within the Validation Study. The adjoining authorities present at the hearing session considered their involvement in the Validation Study to be essentially that of consultees. They did not consider that they had been actively or directly involved in its preparation. Although adjoining authorities were sent the draft of the Validation Study in January 2013, no request for formal endorsement from these other authorities was made.
16. In the case of Bedford Borough Council, there does not appear to have been any direct contact from the Council or its consultants during the preparation of the Validation Study. For Luton Borough Council, consultation consisted of a telephone call on 27 November 2012. Neither Bedford nor Luton Borough Councils were sent the draft of the Validation Study. The two authorities in question do not adjoin Aylesbury Vale and the linkages in terms of commuting, migration and housing markets are less than for adjoining authorities. In neither case has the authority identified a specific unmet housing need that they consider should be met in Aylesbury Vale. However, it may be that the pattern of migration and housing markets could change over time, particularly given the significant issues in terms of the ability of Luton Borough to accommodate its own growth. In any event, they both form part of the Luton and Milton Keynes HMA and the Validation Study draws clear and specific conclusions in relation to their housing needs.
17. Adding to this concern is the fact that neither Bedford nor Luton Borough Councils were consulted on the Proposed Submission version of the Plan in May 2013.
18. The timing of the Validation Study in relation to the Council's decisions on overall housing provision is also of relevance. Following earlier consideration by the Cabinet meeting of 15 May 2012, the level of housing provision of 6,000 houses (in total approximately 13,500 including existing commitments) was agreed by the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 August 2012. At its meeting on 17 October 2012, the Council

¹ Also South Bucks District Council

agreed to the submission of the Plan following necessary publicity, on the basis of providing for a total of 13,500 houses, including existing commitments.

19. Whilst it was agreed that amendments to the Plan could potentially be made by the Head of Planning, these appear to relate to the timing of the revocation of the South East Plan and the potential need for revisions to explanatory text and supporting material along with minor presentational amendments. There is no indication in the Council's decision or the supporting papers that substantive changes to the policies or overall strategy for growth would be contemplated at that stage. Specifically, there is no mention of the potential for overall housing provision to be reconsidered in the light of continuing engagement with other authorities. The Council had already taken significant steps to determine its preferred level of housing provision at or around the time of commissioning the Validation Study. Its position on the matter had been clearly established whilst the Validation Study was still in preparation and the Council's decision to submit the Plan on the basis of overall provision for 13,500 houses was made before adjoining authorities were consulted on the draft Validation Study and before the final report was published. The conclusions of the Validation Study were drawn in the context that the Proposed Submission version of the Plan was making provision for 13,500 houses (Paragraph 7.16).
20. The extent to which engagement, particular of the limited form undertaken, could have genuinely influenced the overall level of housing provision appears to have been minimal. The response of other authorities to the Validation Study needs to be seen in this context along with their understanding of their role in the process. There is no record of any substantive engagement with other authorities in relation to the Updated Demographic Projections Reports of April and May 2013, or the supplementary report to the Validation Study of June 2013.
21. As I have noted above, the duty to co-operate does not place an obligation on the Council to have agreed with other authorities in terms of the overall level of housing to be planned for in Aylesbury Vale or how any unmet needs from other authorities will be met. However, the nature of representations from other authorities is an indication as to what extent engagement has been constructive in resolving strategic issues. Of the four other authorities within the HMA, only two, Milton Keynes and Central Bedfordshire Councils were invited to make representations on the Proposed Submission version of the Plan. Central Bedfordshire Council are supportive of the overall provision for housing. However, Milton Keynes Council expresses concern as to the balance between the provision for houses and jobs. It considers that the relationship between Aylesbury Vale and Milton Keynes, and specifically the potential need for the growth of the urban area of Milton Keynes into Aylesbury Vale has not been adequately addressed. It highlights the need for joint working on this issue and raises concerns as to the extent of engagement earlier in the process and the effectiveness of the consultation process.
22. Luton Borough Council has subsequently raised concerns regarding the potential scale of its housing needs and the inability to accommodate such levels of growth within its own boundaries. It has identified a potential level of housing need well in excess of the figure set out in the supplementary report to the Validation Study. Whilst accepting that links with Aylesbury Vale are less than those with other authorities, Luton Borough Council considers that given the potential scale of unmet housing need, it may be that some of it will need to be accommodated beyond adjoining authorities, including in Aylesbury Vale. Luton Borough Council wrote to the Council in June 2013, setting out these concerns and suggesting a member meeting and a jointly commissioned SHMA. Such a meeting has not taken place and the offer of commissioning a joint SHMA has not been taken up. Although at a late stage in the

process, the Council had the opportunity to reconsider submitting the Plan in the light of this request.

23. A number of other authorities beyond the HMA raise concerns in respect of the overall provision for housing and the implications for their areas². There are particular concerns in the case of Dacorum, Chiltern, Wycombe and South Bucks that the Plan does not give sufficient recognition to the interrelationships with Aylesbury Vale, constraints within these other areas and the potential need for Aylesbury Vale to accommodate some unmet housing needs.
24. The Council points to the practical difficulties in working jointly with numerous other authorities in identifying housing needs across authority boundaries and planning to ensure that these are met, given the different stages of plan preparation and evidence gathering. It also highlights the fact that other authorities were not in a position to demonstrate alternative clear and specific evidence regarding housing needs or quantify the level of potential unmet housing need. The Council emphasises the benefits of progressing the Plan to adoption rather than delaying the process to allow evidence in relation to the housing needs of other authorities to be gathered.
25. I note that discussions have taken place recently with the other authorities in Buckinghamshire and a shared framework relating to the alignment of Local Plan timetables and co-ordination of evidence was produced in November 2013. The Council have also sought to build in a contingency approach to the Plan to enable it to respond should unmet housing needs be identified by other authorities. I deal with the effectiveness of such a contingency approach in relation to soundness below. However, in my view, both of these actions represent a recognition by the Council of the need for co-ordination of evidence gathering and plan preparation and the potential for unmet needs from other authorities to be accommodated in Aylesbury Vale.
26. The key question is that of timing and the choice between having an adopted plan as soon as possible or a plan that at the point of adoption, effectively resolves strategic housing issues following genuine co-operation and collaboration with other authorities based on constructive, active and ongoing engagement.
27. As it stands there are significant issues in terms of potential unmet needs from other authorities and how they will be accommodated. There are particular issues concerning the relationship of Aylesbury Vale to Milton Keynes and its future growth. These issues have been left unresolved. The Council has been aware of these issues from early in the plan preparation process, if not before. There has been a substantial period of time since the duty to co-operate came into force and the NPPF was published. Whilst noting the lack of specific evidence on potential unmet needs from other authorities and accepting that collaboration and joint working is a two way process, it is the Council's duty, as the authority submitting the Plan for examination, to have sought to address these issues through constructive, active and ongoing engagement.
28. On the basis of the above assessment I consider that the Council has not engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis and that this has undermined the effectiveness of plan preparation in dealing with key strategic issues. It is with regret therefore that I must conclude that the Council has not complied with the duty to co-operate.

² Chiltern District Council, Wycombe District Council, South Bucks District Council, Dacorum Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council, South Northamptonshire Council and the West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit.

Soundness in terms of the overall provision for housing and jobs

29. Notwithstanding the above, I consider it appropriate to also set out my findings in respect of soundness, insofar as it relates to the overall provision for housing and jobs given that I held initial hearing sessions on the matter.
30. In order to be considered sound the Plan must be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Paragraph 182 of the NPPF explains that it should be based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure needs, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development. It should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, be deliverable and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities. It should enable the delivery of sustainable development.
31. In terms of housing, local planning authorities should use their evidence base to ensure that the local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as is consistent with the policies in the NPPF (Paragraph 47). The need for joint working and collaboration where there are cross-boundary issues and where development requirements cannot wholly be met within individual local authority areas is emphasised (Paragraphs 178-181).
32. In respect of overall housing provision, the Council initially consulted on options ranging from 12,000 to 21,000 additional houses between 2011 and 2031 (including commitments). These options were based on the scenarios for growth identified in the HEGA. The HEGA itself did not recommend a particular level of growth. As noted above, the Council had already taken significant steps to determine its preferred level of housing provision at or around the time of commissioning the Validation Study and its position on the matter had been clearly established whilst the Validation Study was still in preparation. The Validation Study, demographic projections of April and May 2013 and the supplementary report to the Validation Study were all produced against the background of the Council's decision in respect of housing and jobs growth.
33. The proposed level of housing growth is close to the bottom of the overall range of options initially consulted upon. The Council confirmed that it considered each of the options to be a credible assessment of housing needs and reflected reasonable alternatives. It also confirmed that there are no fundamental environmental or infrastructure constraints to higher levels of growth within the overall range identified.
34. The Plan would provide for an average of 675 houses per year. This compares with past completion rates which have averaged approximately 750 houses per year. I appreciate that past levels of growth were in the context of higher requirements set out in the South East Plan and in recent years a significant proportion of completions have been affordable houses supported by government funding which may not be available in future. However, the District has seen annual completions above the level proposed in the Plan even in the very difficult economic circumstances that have prevailed in recent years. In 2011/12 completions totalled 1,103 houses and in 2012/13 they totalled 934 houses.
35. On the basis of the Council's assessment, the Government's 2011-based interim household projections published in April 2013 indicate an annual need for 961 houses. The 2008-based household projections indicated a need for 765 houses annually. I note the Council's concern in relation to the 2011-based interim

projections, particularly in terms of migration assumptions given data from mid-year population estimates. However, whilst an over estimation of migration may play a significant part in the other (unattributable) component of change in the mid-year estimates, there is insufficient basis to conclude that it accounts for 100% of this figure. Indeed the ONS itself considers that it would be sensible to exclude the unattributable figure from migration trends (see Appendix 1 to M2/17) given the degree of uncertainty. Attributing all of this to migration, as the Council has done, has the effect of substantially reducing the estimates of past net in-migration to the District. The very recent trend suggests an increase in annual net in-migration, to approximately the levels assumed in the 2011-based interim household projections. Whilst the Council has concerns as to the assumptions which underpin the projections, I find insufficient evidence to conclude that they are inaccurate to the extent suggested.

36. The proposed level of housing in the Plan most closely reflects the projection in the HEGA based on a five year migration trend. The May 2013 Demographic Projections Report concludes that this scenario would require approximately 12,900 houses between 2011 and 2031 and see a growth of approximately 5,500 jobs. It also considers four economic led projections (two used in the original HEGA and two based on more up to date forecasts). All of the economic led projections show significantly more houses would be required than provided for in the Plan (approximately 16,600 to 21,500). The figures would be even higher if existing patterns of out-commuting were to remain. Notwithstanding the difficulties associated with economic forecasting, it is clear that the Council is planning for a level of housing well below that indicated by its own evidence in terms of potential economic growth.
37. The Plan seeks to make provision for at least 6,000 new jobs in addition to those on committed sites (approximately 10,000). Despite the doubts expressed by the Council in its statement and at the hearing sessions in relation to the implementation of existing commitments, the Plan is clearly based on a strategy of delivering some 16,000 additional jobs between 2011 and 2031. The Council's evidence indicates that significantly more housing than that planned would be required to support this level of jobs growth. There is no substantive evidence that the jobs density or patterns of out-commuting are likely to change to the extent required to support the planned level of employment growth without the need for significantly more housing. In simple terms there is a clear and substantial mismatch between the level of housing and jobs planned.
38. The Validation Study concluded (Paragraph 7.20) that potential economic growth could lead to a higher requirement for housing than proposed in the Plan and that an objective assessment of housing needs would be for between 6,000 and 9,000 houses in addition to commitments. It raises some doubt as to the realism of reducing out-commuting to the levels required to support housing provision at the lower end of this range and recognises that provision towards the upper end of the range would potentially allow for some unmet needs from other authorities to be met and support higher levels of job growth (Paragraph 7.21). It goes on to recommend a plan, monitor and manage approach to housing and employment growth. It seems to me that the Council's own evidence base raises concerns as to the appropriateness of the level of growth planned.
39. The decision on the level of housing provision was based on the needs of the District following initial consultation. There is no evidence that the potential needs of other authorities was a specific factor taken into account at that stage.
40. As explained above, I do not consider that the overall level of housing provision in the Plan is a result of effective co-operation and collaboration with other relevant

authorities. A number of key strategic issues remain unresolved. The contingency approach included in the Plan is not an effective or appropriate way to deal with the issue of potential unmet housing needs from other authorities. The decision on whether unmet needs had been identified and justified and that these should be met in Aylesbury Vale would be taken by the Council itself. On a practical level, the only effective response to such a situation would be a review of the Plan, given that the issue would be the overall level of housing provision rather than phasing and also that the Plan does not include site allocations. This is likely to take some time, even if the Council agreed to such a course of action. There is considerable uncertainty as to when and indeed whether strategic issues would be addressed.

41. There are significant strategic housing issues which need to be effectively resolved as soon as possible through the plan making process following genuine co-operation and collaboration with other authorities. Putting this off by relying on a potential future review wholly dependent on the Council's own interpretation of the situation would not be appropriate. Whilst there are clearly benefits in having an adopted plan as soon as possible, these would not in themselves outweigh the need for that plan to be effective in respect of housing issues.
42. Taking all of the above into account, I consider that in relation to the overall provision for housing and jobs, the Plan has not been positively prepared, it is not justified or effective and it is not consistent with national policy. It is therefore not sound.

Overall conclusions

43. You will appreciate that there is no mechanism to rectify a failure to comply with the duty to co-operate. Accordingly I must recommend non-adoption of the Plan and give reasons for the recommendation.
44. In terms of soundness, there would be a need for a substantial amount of additional work to rectify the deficiencies I have identified. This would require significant cross boundary co-operation with a number of other authorities and is likely to take some time, particularly given the difficult issues that would need to be addressed. Modifications required to make the Plan sound would make it fundamentally different to that submitted in terms of its overall strategy and the approach to growth. In the light of this, a suspension of the examination would be inappropriate, notwithstanding the failure to comply with the duty to co-operate.
45. Under the circumstances this leaves two options. Firstly the Council could choose to receive my report. Given my findings, I must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. Alternatively the Council may choose to withdraw the Plan under S22 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) I appreciate that you will be disappointed by my conclusions. However, I would be grateful if you could confirm the Council's position via the Programme Officer as soon as possible.
46. In the meantime, it would be inappropriate to proceed with the further hearing sessions scheduled to begin on 18 February 2014. I will be asking the Programme Officer to inform relevant parties that the further hearing sessions will not be taking place and there is no need to submit statements. The Council's website should also be updated to reflect the situation. A copy of this letter should be placed on the website and made available on request.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Ward

INSPECTOR