



South Bucks Local Development Framework

Proposed Submission South Bucks Core Strategy Self Assessment Report Legal Compliance and Soundness

July 2010



South Bucks
District Council

CONTENTS

Introduction	2	
Glossary of Abbreviations Used	3	
Part 1	Legal Compliance	4
	Stage 1 - Inception	4
	Stage 2 - Plan Preparation - Frontloading Phase	8
	Stage 3 - Plan Preparation - Preparation Phase	15
	Stage 4 - Publication	22
	Stage 5 - Submission	26
Part 2	Soundness	38

INTRODUCTION

The Planning Advisory Service's Self Assessment Toolkit is a supportive tool to assist Local Planning Authorities delivering Development Plan Documents that meet the requirements of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended 2008); Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS 12): Creating Strong Safe and Prosperous Communities through Local Spatial Planning and other relevant guidance and legislation.

The Self-Assessment Toolkit contains two parts: -

- Legal Compliance - a Development Plan Document must adhere to all procedural and material aspects set out in the relevant legislation, regulations and national policy. The completed self-assessment in Part 1 of this document serves as a checklist and point of reference which demonstrates that the South Bucks Core Strategy is legally compliant.
- Soundness - In order for a Development Plan Document to be 'sound' it should be demonstrated that it is '*justified*' (founded on a robust and credible evidence base and the most appropriate strategy relative to reasonable alternatives); '*effective*' (deliverable, flexible and able to be monitored) and '*consistent with national policy*'. Evidence to show that each of these criteria is successfully fulfilled by the Proposed Submission South Bucks Core Strategy is set out in Part 2 of this document.

Documents referred to in the tables which are available on the South Bucks District Council website (www.southbucks.gov.uk) are provided with bold type hyperlinks. Clicking on the document name will open the relevant section of the Council's website, where the document is available to download. Due to the large amount of other documentation referred to, and in order to keep this Self Assessment Report a concise and self-contained report, other documents referred to have not been included as attachments to the report, but can be made available upon request.

Glossary of Abbreviations Used in this Document

To help keep the Self Assessment Report as concise as possible, documents referred to, and some other terms, have been abbreviated throughout the report. The abbreviations used and their meaning are listed in the following table.

CS	Core Strategy
DPD	Development Plan Document
LDS	Local Development Scheme
GOSE	Government Office South East
AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
SCI	Statement of Community Involvement
LDF	Local Development Framework
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
LDD	Local Development Document
SBDC	South Bucks District Council
SEP	South East Plan
SEEPB	South East England Partnership Board
BCC	Bucks County Council

Part 1: Legal compliance

Stage 1: Inception

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>1. Is the development plan document identified in the adopted local development scheme and have you recorded the timetable for its production?</p>	<p>The Act section 15(2); section 19(1)</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraphs 4.50; 4.53-4.58</p>	<p>Milestones are set out in PPS12 (box after paragraph 4.55).</p>	<p>i. The adopted local development scheme at the time of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • commencement of the development plan document • the published development plan document • the submitted development plan document <p>ii. The relevant annual monitoring report (if changes need to be explained)</p>	<p>Yes, the CS DPD is identified in the adopted LDS and a timetable for its production is recorded.</p> <p>This is the fourth LDS for South Bucks District. The CS DPD has been identified and timetabled in all adopted LDS since the first was published in March 2005.</p> <p>Commencement of the CS is covered by the March 2005 LDS. Publication and Submission of the CS are covered by the currently adopted LDS (2010).</p> <p>The AMRs for 2006/07, 2007/08 and 2008/09 have all reported on and explained changes to the adopted LDS timetables. These documents are available here.</p> <p>More recently, updates on LDF progress have been provided regularly to GOSE and PINS, so that they have been kept informed of any slippage compared to the adopted LDS, and of the most current work timetable.</p> <p>Information in the adopted LDS and published AMRs have also been supplemented throughout the preparation of the CS by 'real time' information regarding timetabling for production on the Council's website. The latest example of how this information is</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					presented can be viewed here.
2. Have you considered how community engagement will be programmed into the preparation of the development plan document?	1. The Act section 19 (3) 2. Regulation 25	PPS12 paragraphs 4.19-4.29	Unless the statement of community involvement has been amended, you may need to set out any changes to community engagement as a result of changes in legislation.	i. The statement of community involvement ii. The project plan for the development plan document	Yes, community engagement has been considered in the South Bucks SCI , section 4 of which specifically addresses involvement in the LDF. The SCI was adopted in February 2007. The LDS documents have all included programme management tables showing key milestones for the CS DPD, including how consultation periods were programmed into the timetable. More detailed project plans for later stages of CS preparation (2008 onwards) programmed in consultation periods and time to analyse the responses, particularly taking account of an additional consultation in 2009 on the 'Emerging Approach' publication, following revision of the CS timetable in 2007 (refer to LDSs and AMRs above).
3. Have you considered the appropriate bodies you should consult?	Regulation 25	1. PPS12 paragraphs 4.25 - 4.26 2. Plan Making Manual - Consultee list	Regulation 2 defines the general and specific consultation bodies	i. The statement of community involvement ii. Reports and decisions setting out the approach to be taken to specific and general consultation bodies iii. Consultation statement	Yes, the appropriate bodies to be consulted have been considered at the commencement and also throughout the process. The SCI (Feb 2007) includes at Appendices D & E (pages 36 and 37) a listing of specific and general consultation bodies. Since the first formal consultation on the CS in 2006, the Council has created and maintained a consultation database, which records the agencies that are specific and general bodies for DPD

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					<p>consultation purposes.</p> <p>At each consultation stage, the Council re-checked the specific consultation bodies required to be consulted by the regulations (as amended since the SCI) and updated relevant contact details on its consultation database.</p> <p>The Consultation Statement (available here) (March 2010) includes for each consultation stage the list of consultees including specific and general consultation bodies.</p>
<p>4. Is baseline information being collected and evidence being gathered to keep the matters which affect the development of the area under review?</p>	<p>The Act, section13</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraphs 4.36 - 4.47</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Documents dealing with collection of baseline information ii. Relevant technical studies iii. The annual monitoring report 	<p>Yes, there are numerous documents contributing to the collection of baseline information. The SA Scoping Report (2005, available here) presented, at Appendix 3, baseline information at the time of commencing preparation of the CS DPD.</p> <p>AMRs reporting on monitoring of relevant information have been published since 2005.</p> <p>The list of documents contributing to the Evidence Base underpinning the LDF is published on the Council's website, and shows how information has been gathered and developed over several years.</p> <p>Following the decision to delay submission of the CS in 2007, several updates/reviews to technical studies have been undertaken to ensure the</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					evidence base remains relevant and up-to-date.
5. Is baseline information being collected and evidence being gathered to set the framework for the sustainability appraisal?	The Act section 19(5)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPS12 paragraphs 4.50; 4.39-4.43 2. Strategic Environmental Assessment Guide, chapter five 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sustainability report scoping document ii. Sustainability appraisal report 	<p>Yes - As above.</p> <p>In addition, the most recent SA Report for the Proposed Submission Core Strategy (March 2010) summarises the SA process to date, including the baseline information review, evidence gathering and developing the SA framework.</p> <p>The Scoping Report Questionnaire (May 2005) included questions to inform and contribute to the gathering of baseline information for the SA process.</p> <p>All Sustainability Appraisal reports dealing with preparation of the CS DPD are available here.</p>
6. Have you consulted the statutory environment consultation bodies for five weeks on the scope and level of detail of the environmental information to be included in the sustainability appraisal report?	Regulations 9 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633.	PPS12 paragraph 4.40 SEA Guide Ch 3	The Strategic Environmental Assessment consultation bodies are also amongst the 'specific consultation bodies' which are defined in Regulation 2)	Copies of the consultation letters sent to the bodies	<p>Yes, the statutory consultation bodies were consulted on the SA Scoping Report from 6th May to 10th June 2005. The latest SA Report (March 2010) provides a summary of consultation undertaken on the scope of the SA, with signposting to further details in previous SA documents (see in particular page 23 regarding the statutory environmental consultation bodies). All documents referred to, as well as a succinct summary of consultations undertaken on the SA work, are available here.</p>

Stage 2: Plan preparation - frontloading phase

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>1. Have you notified the specific consultation bodies that have an interest in the subject of the development plan document and invited them to make representations about its contents?</p>	<p>Regulation 25(1) and (2)(a)</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraphs 4.24 - 4.29</p>	<p>Specific consultation bodies are defined in Regulation 2 If any bodies are omitted, you should give a clear justification for doing so, including reference to the SCI.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Copies of documents consulting these bodies iii. Record of discussions iv. Copies of representations made v. A brief statement setting out the reasons why any bodies have been omitted from consultation 	<p>Yes, all specific and general consultation bodies were invited to make representations about the content of the CS DPD in response to the Issues and Options Paper (January 2006), the Preferred Options Document (September 2006) and the Emerging Approach Document (March 2009).</p> <p>The Consultation Statement (available here) provides details of the bodies contacted at each stage and includes copies of letters sent to consultees. Representations made are recorded in the Council's consultation database.</p> <p>In addition, many specific and general consultation bodies were invited to, and participated in, a key stakeholder workshop conducted by the Council in April 2009. Copies of the relevant correspondence and outputs from the workshop are included in Appendices B11 and B12 of the Consultation Statement.</p>
<p>2. Have you notified the general consultation bodies that you consider have an interest in the subject of the development plan document and invited them to make representations about its</p>	<p>Regulation 25(1) and (2)(b)</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraphs 4.24 - 4.29</p>	<p>General consultation bodies are defined in Regulation 2. You should be able to give a clear justification for your selection of the bodies, including reference to the statement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Copies of documents consulting these bodies iii. Record of discussions iv. Copies of representations made v. A brief statement setting out the 	<p></p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
contents?			of community involvement.	reasons why any bodies were or were not included	
3. Are you inviting representations from people resident or carrying out business in your area about the content of the development plan document?	Regulation 25(3)	PPS12 paragraphs 4.24 - 4.29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Copies of documents consulting these persons iii. Record of discussions iv. Copies of representations made 	<p>Yes, residents and other interested parties have been invited to make representations on each of the published consultation documents. Various consultation methods were used to engage with these individuals and organisations. Details are provided in the Consultation Statement (available here) (see page 4), and copies of relevant notices, newsletters and other publications used to invite representations are included in the Appendices.</p> <p>The Core Strategy DPD Archive on the website is also a useful summary of when and how residents and interested parties were invited to make representations. Included on this page are a Statement of Public Participation relating to the Issues and Options Paper (2006), as well as several documents reporting on the responses received to the Emerging Approach document in 2009.</p> <p>Contact details of all respondents are entered on the consultation database so that they are automatically contacted (unless requested otherwise) by letter or email during the next consultation, ensuring that they have the opportunity to follow the CS DPD preparation, see how previous representations have been taken account of, and participate at all stages. The database also records all comments</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
4. Are you engaging with stakeholders responsible for delivery of the strategy?	Regulation 25	PPS12 paragraphs 4.4; 4.27 - 4.29; 4.45	PPS12 paragraph 4.29 gives examples of relevant delivery agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Copies of documents consulting these people iii. Record of discussions 	<p>made.</p> <p>Yes - the Consultation Statement (available here) provides details of engagement with important delivery agencies. Many attended the Key Stakeholder Workshop in April 2009 (details of which are included in the Consultation Statement). The Proposed Submission CS identifies at Appendix 8 the Delivery Agencies for each Core Policy. The Council has been in ongoing discussions with all of these agencies. Further engagement with key delivery agencies was achieved via an informal consultation on draft policies in January 2010 (details are provided in the Consultation Statement).</p> <p>Specific efforts have been made by both the County and District Councils to engage with agencies involved in the delivery of services and infrastructure to ensure planned development will be appropriately supported. The Evidence Base includes documents recording results of discussions with these stakeholders under the heading 'Transport, Infrastructure and Accessibility'.</p>
5. Are you taking into account representations made?	Regulation 25(5)	PPS12 paragraphs 4.19-4.29; 4.37	Evidence from participation is part of the justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Any reports on the selection of alternatives and 	<p>Yes, the Consultation Statement (available here) and SA Reports (available here) record how comments received in representations have been taken into account in the identification of issues,</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
				options for the development plan document	<p>development of options and emergence of preferred approaches.</p> <p>Various documents have been published along the way reporting on analysis of comments received (see the Core Strategy DPD Archive).</p> <p>In addition, consultation documents were structured to include boxes showing 'What you have already told us', to show a clear trail of how responses were being incorporated into policy options and emerging approaches.</p>
6. Does the consultation contribute to the development and sustainability appraisal of alternatives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Act section 19(5) Regulations 12 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> PPS12 paragraphs 4.39-4.43 SEA Guide, chapter three 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation statement Any reports on the selection of alternatives and options for the development plan document Sustainability appraisal report 	<p>Yes, the Consultation Statement (available here) and SA Reports (available here) report on how comments received and other consultation initiatives have contributed to the development and appraisal of options for the CS DPD.</p>
7. Is the participation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> following the principles set out in your statement of community involvement 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Act s.19(3) Regulation 25 	PPS12 paragraphs 4.19 - 4.26; 4.42		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Statement The statement of community involvement The relevant sustainable community 	<p>Yes, the Consultation Statement (available here) demonstrates that participation in all stages of CS preparation has been carried out in accordance with the principles set out in the SCI. See in particular the table at page 4 of the Consultation Statement, which sets out the consultation methods that</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • integrating involvement with the sustainable community strategy • proportionate to the scale of issues involved in the development plan document? 				strategies	<p>were used at each stage. When compared to the guiding principles set out in the SCI, as well as the specific consultation procedures for LDD's in section 4, it can be seen that the Council has consistently gone well beyond the minimum requirements for consultation and undertaken additional actions to facilitate engagement.</p> <p>The timetables of the SCS and CS DPD projects did not align in terms of integrating consultation initiatives to inform both. However, consultation events organised for the SCS and CS have been attended by officers from both Planning Policy and Performance Management (the latter are responsible for SCS preparation) ensuring a shared understanding of the issues raised and emerging policy responses. The SCS was adopted in 2009 putting in place an overall vision for the District which directly informed the spatial vision set out in the CS DPD. The SCS was subject to intensive consultation, thus careful alignment of the community and spatial visions for South Bucks ensures participation on the two projects has been integrated.</p> <p>See Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS for more detail on the relationship with the SCS. The SCS document is available on the South Bucks Partnership section of the Council's website.</p> <p>Yes, consultation has been proportionate to the scale of issues involved, with a</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					<p>more focussed approach undertaken where particular issues have arisen e.g. through meetings and informal discussions. This has included discussions with the Environment Agency, Highways Agency and Highways Authority, key infrastructure partners and community groups. Details on these sorts of issues are provided in the relevant technical reports and papers (see the list of Evidence Base studies). The results of these discussions are reflected in the agreed approach set out in the Proposed Submission CS.</p>
<p>8. Are you keeping a record of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the individuals or bodies invited to make representations • How this was done • The main issues raised? 	Regulation 24	PPS12 paragraphs 4.24 - 4.29	<p>You will need to submit a statement of representations under Regulation 30(1)(d): see Submission stage below.</p> <p>Regulation 49 deals with the availability of documents and the time of their removal</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Consultation statement ii. Reports by the council on the consultation iii. Copies of representations and relevant correspondence iv. Technical reports on the engagement process 	<p>Yes - see the Consultation Statement (available here). Further detail is available in several other previously published documents in the Core Strategy DPD Archive, including a Statement of Public Participation relating to the Issues and Options Paper (2006), and documents reporting on the responses received to the Emerging Approach document in 2009.</p> <p>All representations made throughout the CS DPD preparation process are recorded on the consultation database.</p>
<p>9. Are you developing a framework for monitoring the effects of the development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act section 35 2. Regulation 48 <p>Reg 17 of The</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPS12 paragraphs 4.39 - 4.43 and 4.47 2. SEA Guide, 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sustainability appraisal report ii. The annual monitoring report iii. Reports or 	<p>Yes, SA documents (available here) throughout the DPD preparation process have reported on the development of a monitoring framework for significant sustainability effects. Sustainability effects indicators developed through the</p>

Activity	Legal Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
plan document?	Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No1363	Chapter five 3. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister monitoring guide		documents setting out the appraisal and monitoring framework	<p>SA process are incorporated within the Council's Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p>The AMR contains other indicators that will contribute to monitoring the effects of the CS DPD.</p> <p>Further monitoring indicators relating to the effects of the DPD have been progressively developed and included in documents published for consultation (refer to the Core Strategy DPD Archive).</p> <p>The results of this cumulative process are presented in the Delivery and Monitoring Framework set out in Appendix 8 of the Proposed Submission CS.</p>
10. Have you arranged to send copies of documents used in consultation to the Government Office and Planning Inspectorate?	Not statutory, but will assist in identifying issues leading towards a sound development plan document	Plan Making Manual - New Regulation 25		Copies of correspondence with the Government Office and Planning Inspectorate	<p>Yes, GOSE and PINS have been kept informed and closely involved throughout the DPD preparation process. Specifically, each was sent copies of the Emerging Approach consultation document published in March 2009 (to accord with the New Regulation 25).</p> <p>The various documents reporting on consultations and analysis of responses referred to above include (where relevant) records of comments received from GOSE at key stages.</p> <p>The Council also received an advisory visit from an Inspector as part of the PINS LDF Support Programme in July 2009, during which valuable advice on the published Emerging Approach Document was received.</p>

Stage three: Plan preparation - formulation phase

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>1. Are you preparing reasonable alternatives for evaluation during the preparation of the development plan document?</p>	<p>Regulation 12 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No. 1633</p>	<p>1. PPS12 paragraph 4.38 2. SEA Guide, Chapter five</p>	<p>The sustainability appraisal report and supporting documents relevant to the preparation of the development plan document are part of the proposed submission documents (see Regulation 24)</p>	<p>Documents supporting decisions on alternatives and any preferred strategy</p>	<p>Yes, reasonable alternatives were prepared for evaluation during preparation of the CS. Section 5 of the SA Report (March 2010) addresses the development, appraisal, take up and rejection of options for the CS DPD. This document is signposted to relevant sections in previous SA documents, all of which are available here.</p> <p>The trail of published documents (refer to the Core Strategy DPD Archive) also demonstrates the development of alternatives and emergence of preferred strategy approaches. The decision to postpone and revise the CS timetable in 2007 allowed for further work on a wider range of options. The subsequent Emerging Approach Document (2009) presented and appraised four alternative spatial scenarios, and set out the Emerging Spatial Strategy, supported by the combined effect of the evidence base at that point.</p>
<p>2. Have you assessed alternatives against:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consistency with national policy 	<p>The Act section 19(2), section 24</p>	<p>PPS12 4.30 - 33</p>	<p>General conformity with the regional spatial strategy is tested formally later but you need to consider</p>	<p>i. Supporting documents ii. Correspondence with Government Offices and regional planning body (or</p>	<p>Yes. SBDC has worked closely with GOSE and other key government agencies throughout the preparation of the CS to ensure consistency with national policy.</p> <p>Similarly, there has been a close working relationship with SEEPB</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general conformity with the regional spatial strategy? 			it during preparation of the development plan document	Mayor of London)	(formerly known as SEERA) to ensure conformity and a mutually supportive relationship with the South East Plan and its evidence base. SEEPB confirmed in writing that the Proposed Submission CS was in general conformity with the (then in force) SEP (refer to Stage 5 below for more information).
<p>3. Are you having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • adjoining regional spatial strategies, the spatial development strategy for London, or Welsh Spatial Plan (as appropriate) • the National Planning Framework for Scotland? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act section19(2) 2. Regulation 15(1)(g) 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Supporting documents ii. Correspondence with the relevant bodies 	Yes - South Bucks adjoins the London Borough of Hillingdon and thus the area covered by the spatial development strategy for London. Regard has been had to relevant aspects of the London Plan through the Council's liaison with London Borough of Hillingdon on cross-boundary considerations (see Part 2, item 15 for more information).
<p>4. Are you having regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sustainable community strategy of the authority or other authorities whose area comprises part of the area of the council 	The Act section19(2)	PPS12 paragraphs 1.6; 4.22 - 4. 23; 4.34 - 4. 35		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Supporting documents ii. The Sustainable community strategies iii. Relevant local development documents iv. Correspondence with the local strategic 	Yes, the CS DPD has had regard to the SCS , the final version of which was adopted in 2009, allowing the spatial vision developed for the CS to be informed by and closely aligned to the vision set out in the SCS. This linkage in turn ensures that the CS (and wider LDF) will provide the primary means of delivering spatial elements of the SCS.

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> any other local development documents adopted by the council? 				partners	
<p>5. Do you have regard to other matters and strategies relating to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> resources the regional development agencies' regional economic strategy the local transport plan and transport facilities and services waste strategies hazardous substances and accidents? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Act section19(2) Regulation 15 		<p>As well as the matters and strategies listed in the Act and Regulations there are likely to be other matters identified in planning policy statements, regional and local strategies that you will need to have regard to in preparing the development plan document.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting documents Correspondence with the relevant bodies and the Government Office 	<p>Yes, regard has been had to various matters and strategies throughout preparation of the CS.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.20 of the Proposed Submission CS highlights that regard has been had to various strategies in developing the final strategic approach. Reference is made throughout the Proposed Submission CS to specific matters and strategies that have informed development of the relevant strategy and policies. For example, proposed Core Policy 16 - South of Iver (Opportunity Area) explains how the Minerals and Waste LDF has been taken into account.</p> <p>Many of the supporting documents in the Evidence Base address the other matters referred to. For example, a number of Transport Papers prepared by BCC as Highways Authority address the local transport planning process.</p> <p>Records have been kept of correspondence with and representations received from relevant bodies and GOSE regarding other matters and strategies.</p>
6. Are you having		Annex to PPS1 on	This is expected	Supporting documents	Yes, the formulation phase of plan

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
regard to the need to include policies on mitigating and adapting to climate change?		climate change	to be an amendment to section 19(2) of the Act.		preparation involved consideration of and consultation on policies to tackle and adapt to the challenges of climate change. Consultation documents as well as the Proposed Submission Core Strategy have contained proposed policies on this issue, and enabled a policy approach to be developed. The CS also has regard to SBDC's adopted Climate Change Strategy.
7. Have you undertaken the necessary sustainability appraisal of alternatives, including consultation on the sustainability appraisal report?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act section 19(5) 2. Regulation 12 and 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PPS12 paragraphs 4.38 - 4.43 2. SEA Guide, Chapter five 	Regulation 13 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633 sets out the consultation procedures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Reports on the sustainability of alternatives ii. Record of work undertaken on sustainability appraisal iii. Supporting documents 	Yes, SA Reports (available here) throughout the DPD preparation process have appraised and reported on the sustainability of alternative spatial strategies and policies for the CS. The SA Scoping Document was consulted upon in May 2005. All SA Reports since then have been published for consultation alongside the corresponding Core Strategy consultation documents. See section 2, page 23 of the most recent SA Report (March 2010) for a summary of consultation on the SA work.
8. Are you setting out clear reasons for any preferences between alternatives?	Regulation 13(1)	PPS12 paragraphs 4.36 - 4.38	This will include Information from the sustainability appraisal.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any reports setting out alternatives and choices considered ii. Supporting documents 	Yes, clear reasons have been set out in various documents for preferences between alternatives. Section 5 of the SA Report (March 2010) which addresses the development, appraisal, take up and rejection of options for the CS DPD. This document is signposted to relevant sections in previous SA documents, all of which are available here .

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					<p>In addition, the Preferred Options Document (September 2006) included sections for each policy approach explaining 'Rejected Options', with reference to the options that had been put forward in the earlier consultation document, the Issues and Options Paper (March 2006). The subsequent Emerging Approach Document (2009) presented and appraised four alternative spatial scenarios, and set out the Emerging Spatial Strategy, providing a summary of the merits of that emerging approach. All of these documents are available in the Core Strategy DPD Archive.</p> <p>The Evidence Base contains detailed studies and reports which consider alternatives and compare impacts. The conclusions and recommendations in the Evidence Base studies inform the choices considered and the proposed strategy.</p>
<p>9. Have you taken into account any representations made on the content of the development plan document and the sustainability appraisal?</p> <p>10. Are you keeping</p>	<p>1. Regulations 24, 25(5) and 30(1)(d)(iv)</p> <p>2. Regulation 13(4) of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraphs 4.19 - 4.29</p>	<p>Records on the sustainability appraisal should also include recording any assessment made under the Habitats Directive</p>	<p>i. Correspondence from those making representations</p> <p>ii. Any reports on issues raised</p> <p>iii. Consultation statement</p> <p>iv. sustainability appraisal report</p>	<p>Yes - see the Consultation Statement (available here). Further detail is available in several other previously published documents in the Core Strategy DPD Archive, including the consultation documents themselves, a Statement of Public Participation relating to the Issues and Options Paper (2006), and documents reporting on the responses received to the Emerging Approach document in 2009.</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
a record?					All comments received throughout the CS DPD preparation process are recorded on the consultation database.
<p>11. Where sites are to be identified or areas for the application of policy in the development plan document, are you preparing sufficient illustrative material to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enable you to amend the currently adopted proposals map • inform the community about the location of proposals? 	Regulations 9 and 14	PPS12 paragraphs 4.6 - 4.7; 8.1-8.3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regulation 2 defines the terms 'submission' and 'adopted' proposals map. 2. A map showing changes to the adopted proposals map is part of the proposed submission documents defined in Regulation 24. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The adopted proposals map ii. Any reports on proposals to amend the proposals map iii. Illustrative material that shows how the proposals map will be amended or replaced 	Yes, please see the report entitled <i>"Proposed Changes to the Proposals Map Resulting from Adoption of the South Bucks Core Strategy"</i> (available to download here , in four parts).
12. Are the participation arrangements compliant with the statement of community involvement?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act, section 19(3) 2. Regulation 25 	PPS12 paragraphs 4.19-4.29	You should make sure the arrangements remain in line with legislative changes affecting community engagement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. The statement of community involvement ii. Consultation statement 	Yes, the Consultation Statement (available here) demonstrates that participation in all stages of CS preparation have been carried out in accordance with the principles set out in the SCI . See in particular the table at page 4 of the document, which sets out the consultation methods used at each stage. When compared to the

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
					<p>guiding principles set out in the SCI, as well as the specific consultation procedures for LDD's in section 4, it can be seen that the Council has consistently gone well beyond the minimum requirements for consultation and undertaken additional actions to facilitate engagement.</p>
<p>13. Have you remained in close contact with the Government Office and discussed any emerging issues that might affect the soundness of the development plan document?</p>		<p>Plan Making Manual - New Regulation 25</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Copies of correspondence with the Government Office ii. Copies of the relevant documents 	<p>Yes, SBDC has remained in close contact with GOSE throughout the preparation of the CS. GOSE has provided useful comments in response to formal consultation stages, and has also provided much useful assistance in a more informal dialogue. For example, GOSE hosted a meeting recently between the Council and the Highways Agency to resolve concerns raised by the Highways Agency about the transport evidence base.</p>

Stage 4: Publication

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
1. Have you prepared the sustainability appraisal report?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Act section 19(5) Regulation 12 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 No 1633 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> PPS12 paragraphs 4.38 - 4.43 SEA Guide Chapter five 		Sustainability appraisal report	Yes, the SA Report on the Proposed Submission CS was published alongside the CS document on 31 st March 2010.
2. Have you made clear where and within what period representations must be made?	Regulation 28(2) and (3)		The period must be at not less than 6 weeks from when you give notice under Regulation 27(e) (see below)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Report or record of decisions The statement of community interest 	<p>Yes, publication of the Proposed Submission CS document was accompanied by the Statement of Representations Procedure, as well as a response form which set out details of how representations could be made and when the period to receive them ended. The relevant information was also published on the web page directly.</p> <p>Relatedly, the Council undertook informal communication in December 2009, via an update letter and an article in the South Bucks Report, to inform the community and stakeholders about the upcoming publication a few months in advance. Copies of these are provided in the Consultation Statement (available here).</p>
3. Have you made	Regulation 27(a)		Regulation 24	i. Copies of the	Yes, all relevant documents were made

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>copies of the following available for inspection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed submission documents? the statement of the representations procedure? 			gives definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> relevant statements ii. Report on where and when made available iii. Record of where and when made available 	<p>available at a variety of locations (Council's offices, Town and Parish Council offices and libraries) and published on the website on 31st March 2010. The published Proposed Submission CS document was accompanied by the Statement of Representations Procedure and a Statement of the Availability of Documents for Inspection. The latter set out the details of where submission documents were made available for inspection. Copies of the relevant statements and consultation records are included in the Statement of Representations (available here), which provides a full record of publication procedures in accordance with Regulation 27.</p>
<p>4. Have you published on your website the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed submission documents? the statement of the representations procedure? statement and details of where and when documents can be inspected? 	Regulation 27(b)		Regulations 2 and 24 give definitions	Record of publication	<p>(Note: the Statement of Representations Procedure, Statement of Availability of Documents and the Response Form were removed from the website at the end of the consultation period, and the webpage content was edited to make it clear that the representation period had ended.)</p>
<p>5. Have you sent to each of the specific consultation bodies invited to make</p>	Regulation 27(c)		Regulations 2 and 24 give definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Copies of correspondence ii. Record of sending 	<p>Yes, all specific and general consultation bodies (together with other individuals on the consultation database) were contacted directly (by either email or post) to advise of the publication of the Proposed Submission</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>representations under Regulation 25(1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A copy of each of the proposed submission documents - The statement of the representations procedure? 					<p>CS, and were provided with the Statement of Representation Procedure. Specific consultation bodies were also provided with the relevant proposed submission documents, along with advice on how to access other documents they may wish to view. The relevant letters are included in the Statement of Representations (available here).</p>
<p>6. Have you sent to each of the general consultation bodies invited to make representations under Regulation 25(1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the statement of the representations procedure? - where and when the documents can be inspected? 	Regulation 27(d)		Regulations 2 and 24 give definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Copies of correspondence ii. Record of sending 	
<p>7. Have you given notice by local advertisement setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the statement of 	Regulation 27(e)		Regulation 24 gives definitions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Copy of advertisement ii. Where and when placed 	<p>Yes, advertisements were placed in two local papers - The Slough Observer on Friday 26th March 2010, and the Bucks Advertiser on Thursday April 1st 2010. Copies of the advertisement are</p>

Activity	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>the representations procedure</p> <p>- where and when the documents can be inspected?</p>					<p>included in the Statement of Representations (available here).</p> <p>The same notice was also placed on Council notice boards throughout the District.</p>
<p>8. Have you requested the opinion of the regional planning body (or the Mayor in London) on the general conformity of the development plan document with the regional spatial strategy (or sustainable development strategy)?</p>	<p>1. The Act section 24</p> <p>2. Regulation 29</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraph 4.21</p>	<p>The period is six weeks from when you make copies available for inspection under Regulation 27(a)</p>	<p>Copies of correspondence</p>	<p>Yes, the Council wrote to SEEPB on 31st March 2010 requesting their opinion on the general conformity of the CS with the SEP. A copy of the letter is included the Statement of Representations (available here).</p>

Stage five: Submission

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>1. Are you ready to submit the DPD?</p> <p>2. Are there any major issues revealed by the representations on publication?</p> <p>3. Are all the relevant documents in place?</p>	<p>1. The Act section 20(2)(b)</p> <p>2. The Act section 20(1)</p> <p>3. Regulation 30(1)</p>		<p>If you are not ready to submit, you may need to do more work on the development plan document or consider withdrawing and republishing a revised version.</p> <p>Regulation 30(1) sets out the documents which must be submitted in addition to the development plan document.</p>	<p>i. Report on issues resulting from Regulation 28 representations</p> <p>ii. Resolution to carry out more work on part of the development plan document or to withdraw plan</p> <p>iii. The development plan document</p> <p>iv. The documents prescribed at Regulation 30(1)</p>	<p>Yes, the Council is confident that it is ready to submit the DPD.</p> <p>A Statement of Representations (available here) has been prepared and reports on the issues and objections raised in representations. A Schedule of Proposed Changes to the Proposed Submission CS has also been prepared. On the whole, the proposed changes are relatively minor. A potentially major objection was originally submitted by the Highway Agency, however subsequent discussion (including also the Highways Authority and GOSE) has resolved the matters raised. No other major issues were revealed, although some additional background papers have been prepared to make some aspects of the Proposed Submission CS clearer. The Council is confident that an appropriate Evidence Base is documented and in place to support the proposed spatial strategy and policies. As such, the CS DPD is ready to be submitted, along with all the other submission documents.</p>
<p>4. Has the development plan document been prepared in accordance with the local development scheme?</p> <p>5. Does the development plan</p>	<p>The Act, section 19(1)</p>	<p>PPS12 paragraph 4.50; 4.53 - 4.55</p>	<p>The Act section 15(2) and Regulation 8 note the matters specified in the local development scheme</p>	<p>i. The local development scheme</p> <p>ii. Explanation of any changes from the milestones set out in the local</p>	<p>Yes, the CS DPD has been prepared in accordance with the adopted LDS (March 2010), and matches the listing and description set out in that document. This document includes an explanation of the main changes in relation to the superseded LDS (March 2007).</p> <p>Where milestones and timescales in</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>document's listing and description in the local development scheme match the document?</p> <p>6. Have the timescales set out in the local development scheme been met?</p>			The box on local development schemes in PPS12 after paragraph 4.55 sets out milestones	<p>development scheme</p> <p>iii. Relevant annual monitoring reports</p> <p>iv. Correspondence with the Government Office on the local development scheme</p>	<p>previously adopted LDSs were not met during a particular reporting year, the relevant AMR explained the reasons, and reported on progress achieved.</p> <p>Updates on LDF progress have been provided to GOSE in a quarterly basis, so that they have been kept informed of slippage compared to the adopted LDS, and of the most current work timetable.</p>
<p>7. Has the development plan document had regard to any sustainable community strategy for its area (like a county and district)?</p>	The Act section 19(2)	PPS12 paragraph 4.34 - 4.35; 4.50		<p>i. The sustainable community strategy(ies)</p> <p>ii. Reference to sections of the development plan document showing how regard has been had to them</p>	<p>Yes, the CS DPD has had regard to the SCS, the final version of which was adopted in 2009, allowing the spatial vision developed for the CS to be informed by and closely aligned to the vision set out in the SCS. This linkage in turn ensures that the CS (and wider LDF) will provide the primary means of delivering spatial elements of the SCS. See Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS (at page 4) for more detail on the relationship with the SCS.</p>
<p>8. Is the development plan document in compliance with the statement of community involvement (where one exists)?</p> <p>9. Has the council carried out</p>	<p>1. The Act s19(3)</p> <p>2. Regulation 32(1)(c)</p>	PPS12 paragraph 4.50; box after paragraph 4.26	Before the statement of community involvement is formally amended to take into account the changes in the regulations, you	<p>i. The statement of community involvement</p> <p>ii. The Regulation 32(1)(c) statement</p>	<p>Yes, the Consultation Statement (available here) demonstrates that participation in all stages of CS preparation have been carried out in accordance with the principles set out in the SCI. See in particular the table at page 4 of the document, which sets out the consultation methods used at each stage. When compared to the guiding principles set out in the SCI, as well as the specific</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
consultation as described in the statement of community involvement?			may need to set out how the community engagement that you carried out met the regulations (as amended).		consultation procedures for LDD's in section 4, it can be seen that the Council has consistently gone well beyond the minimum requirements for consultation and undertaken additional actions to facilitate engagement.
10. Has the development plan document been subject to sustainability appraisal? 11. Has the council provided a final report of the findings of the appraisal?	1. The Act section19(5) 2. Regulation 32(1)(a)	1. PPS12 paragraph 4.39 - 4.43; 4.50 2. SEA Practical Guide, chapter five		Sustainability appraisal report	Yes, preparation of the DPD has been subject to sustainability appraisal throughout, including an SA Report on the Proposed Submission CS in March 2010, summarising the SA work and reporting on ultimate findings of the appraisal process (reports are available here). This SA Report has been further updated to take account of the Schedule of Proposed Changes to the CS by means of an addendum, which is included in the material submitted for examination.
12. Is the development plan document to be submitted consistent with national policy?	The Act section20(2) and Schedule 8	PPS12 paragraphs 4.30 - 33; 4.50	You need to be sure changes made up to the time of submission are compliant with the requirements	i. Correspondence with Government Offices ii. Representations from Government Offices	Yes, the Council believes that the Proposed Submission CS to be submitted (subject to the proposed changes set out in the schedule) is consistent with, yet not repetitive of, national policy. This is supported by correspondence with GOSE throughout the process, culminating in their formal representation to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy which raised no concerns about consistency with, or unnecessary duplication of, national policy.
13. Does the development plan document contain	1. The Act s 24(1)(a); 24(2) and	PPS12 paragraphs 4.30 - 33;	In London the requirement is for general	i. Correspondence with or representations	The SEP was revoked by the Government on 6 th July 2010. However, the Proposed Submission CS does not contain policies that

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>any policies or proposals that are not in general conformity with the regional spatial strategy?</p> <p>14. If yes, is there local justification?</p> <p>15. Has the council got confirmation from the regional planning body about the general conformity of the plan with the regional spatial strategy?</p>	<p>24(4)</p> <p>2. Regulation 29</p>	4.50	conformity with the spatial development strategy (The London Plan)	<p>from the regional planning body, or Mayor of London</p> <p>ii. Confirmation of conformity from the regional planning body, or Mayor</p>	were not in general conformity with the SEP, which was still in effect when the Proposed Submission CS was published. The former Regional Planning Body, SEEPB, confirmed in writing on 11 th May 2010 that the Proposed Submission CS was in general conformity with the SEP. A copy of this correspondence is included in the Statement of Representations (available here).
<p>16. Does the development plan document comply with the 2004 regulations (as amended)?</p> <p>17. Specifically, has the council published the prescribed documents, and made them available at their principal offices and their website?</p> <p>18. Has the council placed local advertisements?</p>	<p>1. The Act section 20(2), 20(3) and 20(5)(b)</p> <p>2. Regulations 13(1), 13(2), 13(5) and 30(1)</p>	PPS12 paragraphs 4.36; 4.50	Requirements relating to publication of the prescribed documents are listed later in this table.	<p>i. The documents prescribed at Regulation 30(1)</p> <p>ii. Relevant annual monitoring reports</p> <p>iii. Records of the actions undertaken (see below)</p>	<p>Yes, submission of the CS DPD complies with the regulations, including that the proposed DPD document and all other submission documents have been published on the website (available here), and hard copies made available for inspection at a variety of locations (Council's offices, Town and Parish Council offices and libraries) the same day. Advertisements have been placed in two local papers (the Slough Observer and the Bucks Advertiser) setting out all relevant information about accessing the documents.</p> <p>Yes, the Council has notified all DPD bodies (together with other respondents who requested to be notified) of the submission of the DPD.</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>19. Has the council notified the development plan document bodies?</p> <p>20. Does the development plan document contain a list of superseded saved policies?</p>					<p>Yes, Appendix 1 of the Proposed Submission CS contains a list of the saved Local Plan policies that will be replaced by adoption of the CS.</p>
<p>21. Are there any policies applying to sites or areas by reference to an Ordnance Survey map or to amend an adopted proposals map?</p> <p>22. If yes, have you prepared a submission proposals map?</p>	Regulations 13(4) 14 and 30(1)(b)	PPS12 paragraphs 4.6 -4.7; 8.1-8.3		<p>i. Submission proposals map</p> <p>ii. Brief statement if a submission proposals map is not required</p>	<p>Yes, changes to the proposals map resulting from the proposed policies are set out in the document entitled "<i>Proposed Changes to the Proposals Map Resulting from Adoption of the South Bucks Core Strategy</i>" (available to download here, in four parts).</p> <p>Yes, a Submission Proposals Map has been prepared and is included in the material submitted to the Inspectorate, and made available for public inspection.</p>
<p>23. If the development plan document is not a core strategy, is it in conformity with the core strategy?</p>	Regulation 13(6)			<p>i. The core strategy</p> <p>ii. Documents or reports demonstrating conformity</p>	Not applicable.
<p>24. Have you prepared a statement setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which bodies and persons were invited to make 	The Act section 20(3) Regulation 30(1)(d)		This will bring forward material from the Consultation statement (see Stage 2 above)	<p>i. Consultation statement</p> <p>ii. The Statement as required in Regulation 30(1)(d)</p>	<p>Yes, a Consultation Statement (available here) in accordance with Regulation 30(1)(d) has been prepared and is included in the material submitted to the Inspectorate, and made available for public inspection.</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>representations under Regulation 25</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How they were invited • A summary of the main issues raised • How the representations have been taken into account? 					
<p>25. Have you prepared a statement giving:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number of representations made under Regulation 28(2) • a summary of the main issues raised <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that no representations were made? 	<p>The Act section20(3) Regulation 30(1)(e)</p>			<p>The Statement as required in Regulation 30(1)(e)</p>	<p>Yes, a Statement of Representations in accordance with Regulation 30(1)(e) has been prepared and published alongside the Proposed Submission CS. It is available here).</p>
<p>26. Have you collected together all the representations made under Regulation28?</p>	<p>The Act section20(3) Regulation 30(1)(f)</p>			<p>Copies of the representations</p>	<p>Yes, details of all representations made under Regulation 28 have been recorded in a database and a summary report from this database, together with copies of the original representations, have been included in the material submitted to the Inspectorate. The summary report and copies of the representations are also on the Council’s website, and hardcopies have been made available for inspection.</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
27 Have you assembled the relevant supporting documents?	1. The Act section20(3) 2. Regulation 30(1)(g)			All necessary evidence and records of decisions relevant to the development plan document	Yes, all the necessary supporting documents have been assembled and published (see the Core Strategy Submission and Evidence Base Studies and Other Supporting Documents sections of the Council's website), and included in the material submitted to the Inspectorate.
28 Has your council approved the development plan document for submission?	The Act section20		The full council has to approve the development plan document for submission (requirements are set out in Local Authorities Functions Regulations)	Report and resolution of the council	Yes, the Proposed Submission Core Strategy was approved by full Council on 23 rd February 2010, together with delegated authority for the Sustainable Development Portfolio Holder to approve minor changes up to the time of Submission. Agenda and Minutes from the relevant meeting are available to download from the Council's website. More generally, records of decisions taken by members throughout the preparation of the CS can be found on the Council's website, where a searchable archive of meetings, agendas and minutes is available.
29 Have you sent the Secretary of State (the Planning Inspectorate) a paper copy of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the development plan document? the submission 	1. The Act s20(1) and 20(3) 2. Regulations 30(1) and 30(2)(a)		Regulation 49 deals with the availability of documents and the time of their removal.	Record of sending	Yes, paper copies of all the prescribed documents and the Submission Proposals Map were sent to PINS on 21 st July 2010.

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>proposals map (unless there are no site allocation policies)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1)? 					
<p>30 Have you sent the Secretary of State (the Planning Inspectorate) an electronic copy of the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> development plan document? submission proposals map (unless there are no site allocation policies)? documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1)? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Act s20(1) and 20(3) Regulations 30(1) and 30(2)(b) 		<p>Electronic copies of some of the representations and supporting documents may not be practicable. Regulation 49 deals with the availability of documents and the time of their removal.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Record of sending Reasons why documents cannot be sent electronically 	<p>Yes, electronic copies of all the prescribed documents and the Submission Proposals Map were sent to PINS on 21st July 2010.</p>
<p>31. Have you made the following available at the same places where the proposed submission documents were to be seen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The development plan document? The documents prescribed in 	<p>Regulation 30(3)(a)</p>		<p>You should do this as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to the Secretary of State</p>	<p>Record of where and when made available</p>	<p>Yes, the Proposed Submission CS document, Schedule of Proposed Changes, Summary Report of all Representations, and other key submission documents have been made available at the same places where the proposed submission documents were available - refer to items 16-18 above. Whilst the full list of Evidence Base Studies and relevant supporting documents have been made available at the main SBDC offices, it was not practical to place all these documents together with full copies of</p>

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
Regulation 30(1)?					representation originals at all other locations. However, details of how to view the full range of documents have been provided at each location.
32 On your website, have you published the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development plan document • submission proposals map • sustainability appraisal report • Regulation 30(1)(d) statement • Regulation 30(1)(e) statement • supporting documents (where practicable) • representations made under Regulation 28 (where practicable) • statement as to where and when the development plan document and the documents are available? 	Regulation 30(3)(b)		You should do this as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to the Secretary of State	Record of publication	Yes, all the listed documents have been published on the website (available here).
33 For each specific consultation body	Regulation 30(3)(c)		You should do this as soon as	i. Copies of correspondence	Yes, the Council notified and supplied documents as required to all specific and

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>invited to make representations under Regulation 25(1), have you sent the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development plan document • submission proposals map • sustainability appraisal report • adopted statement of community involvement • Regulation 30(1)(d) statement • Regulation 30(1)(e) statement • supporting documents you consider relevant to each body • statement as to where and when the development plan document and the documents are available? 			reasonably practicable after submitting to the Secretary of State	ii. Record of sending	general bodies (together with other respondents who requested to be notified) of the submission of the DPD.
34 For each general consultation body invited to make representations under Regulation	Regulation 30(3)(d)		You should do this as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to the	i. Copies of correspondence ii. Record of sending	Yes - as above.

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>25(1), have you sent:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. notification that the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1) are available for inspection 2. where and when they can be inspected? 			Secretary of State		
<p>35 Have you given notice by local advertisement setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the title of the development plan document? • the subject and area covered by the development plan document? • notification that the documents prescribed in Regulation 30(1) are available for inspection • where and when they can be inspected? 	Regulation 30(3)(e)		You should do this as soon as reasonably practicable after submitting to the Secretary of State	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Copy of advertisement ii. Where and when placed 	Yes, advertisements have been placed in two local papers (The Slough Observer and the Bucks Advertiser) setting out all the required details of the DPD and information about inspecting the documents.
<p>36 Have you given notice to persons</p>	Regulation 30(3)(f)		You should do this as soon as	i. Copies of correspondence	Yes, the Council has notified and supplied documents as required to all specific and

Question	Statutory Requirement	Guidance Reference	Additional Notes	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
<p>who have requested to be notified that submission has taken place?</p>			<p>reasonably practicable after submitting to the Secretary of State</p>	<p>ii. Record of sending</p>	<p>general bodies, as well as other respondents who requested to be notified of the submission of the DPD.</p>
<p>37 If an examination is being held, at least six weeks before its opening has the Programme Officer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • published the time and place of the examination and the name of the person appointed to carry out the examination on your website • notified those who have made representations on the published development plan document which have not been withdrawn of these details • advertised these details? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Act section 20 2. Regulation 34 			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Record of publication of information ii. Record of sending iii. Copies of correspondence iv. Copy of advertisement 	

Part 2: Soundness

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
Justified		
Participation		
1. Has the consultation process allowed for effective engagement of all interested parties?	The consultation statement	The Consultation Statement (available here) clearly demonstrates that SBDC has undertaken extensive consultation over and above minimum statutory requirements in a genuine attempt to facilitate effective engagement with both key stakeholders and members of the community. Various other documents published along the way provide further evidence of engagement on the CS (see the Core Strategy DPD Archive).
Research/ fact finding		
2. Is the content of the development plan document justified by the evidence? 3. What is the source of the evidence? 4. How up to date and convincing is it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which show how the evidence points towards the selected strategy, policies or proposals ii. Sections of the pre-submission proposals documents iii. Sections of the preferred strategy report iv. Sections of the sustainability appraisal report which set out its main conclusions in relation to the policies in the development plan document v. Sections of the consultation statement <p>OR</p> <p>A very brief statement of how the main findings of consultation support the policies, with reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o reports to the council on the 	<p>The Council believes the Evidence Base supports the proposed spatial strategy and policies set out in the Proposed Submission CS. This document itself serves as a concise summary and reasoned justification of the most relevant key evidence and findings pointing towards the selected strategy and policies. The trail of published documents (refer to the Core Strategy DPD Archive) also demonstrates how the evidence base has evolved during the course of preparing the DPD, and informed the development of alternatives and emergence of preferred strategy approaches.</p> <p>The Non-technical Summary to the SA Report contains a summary of the main conclusions on the spatial strategy and policies set out in the Proposed Submission CS. More detail is provided in section 6 and Appendix 7 of the main report.</p> <p>Following the decision to delay the original programme for submission of the Core Strategy in 2007, several updates/reviews to technical studies have been</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
	<p>issues raised during participation, covering both the front-loading and formulation phases</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o any other information on community views and preferences <p>vi. The studies, reports and technical papers that provide the evidence for the policies set out in the development plan document. The date of preparation and who they were produced by should be signposted</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For each policy (or group of policies dealing with the same issue), a very brief statement of the evidence documents relied upon and how they support the policy (where this is not already clear in the reasoned justification in the development plan document)</p>	<p>undertaken leading up to the publication of the Proposed Submission CS in March 2010, to ensure the evidence base remains relevant and up-to-date - refer to the list of Evidence Base Studies and Other Supporting Documents set out in Appendix 2 of the Proposed Submission CS and published on the website. This list includes reference to who produced each study and when, making it clear that the evidence is up to date and credible.</p>
<p>5. What assumptions had to be made in preparing the development plan document?</p> <p>6. Are the assumptions reasonable and justified?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan documents setting out the assumptions ii. Sections of the sustainability appraisal report setting out the assumptions iii. A very brief statement for each assumption as to how the evidence led to the assumption iv. Reference to national or regional policy, correspondence from bodies consulted or technical papers that provide the basis for assumptions 	<p>The nature of the CS as the key overarching and strategic document for the LDF is that there are many and varied assumptions that need to be made in compiling a very detailed and broad-ranging evidence base. Also, the CS deals with a very long time frame, so assumptions must be involved in considerations of longer term needs or impacts. The various technical studies (refer to the list of Evidence Base Studies and Other Supporting Documents available on the website) acknowledge and explain key assumptions underpinning particular topics where relevant. For example, the Evaluation of Transport (Atkins, 2010) uses the best available information to make predictions about</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		<p>traffic conditions over the long-term. The Council has worked closely with consultants preparing technical studies and key stakeholders and agencies throughout the CS process. Careful regard has also been had to national policy and related guidance informing the preparation of aspects of the evidence base (such as the SHLAA practice guidance and SEEPB guidance on Employment and Economic Land Assessments). As a result, the Council is confident that assumptions forming part of the evidence base are reasonable and justified. In particular, given the strong housing land supply in the District, there are no critical assumptions affecting delivery of the proposed housing range - the CS does not assume that all SHLAA potential or Opportunity Sites will come forward, being flexible enough to deal with circumstances in which they do not. Similarly, housing delivery is not dependent on assumptions about windfall sites.</p> <p>Also, evidence on economic viability informing affordable housing requirements takes into account current market conditions. It also assumed that grant funding would not be available on sites. Delivery of the affordable housing target is therefore not dependent on unreasonable assumptions about improved economic conditions or funding availability.</p> <p>As the Evidence Base is constantly evolving, there are some instances where desirable information is not available. In these cases, the CS generally reflects a precautionary approach, rather than relying on assumptions which are, as a starting point, not duly supported by evidence. For example, the latest forecasts in employment growth for the District were not available when preparing the CS, so it takes a precautionary approach to employment land provision, by protecting the current supply to ensure a range of land and premises are available to support economic growth.</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		<p>In common with other Districts in Buckinghamshire, SBDC uses the population projections commissioned by BCC to inform policy and LDF work. BCC projections are used in preference to pure trend-based ONS Sub-national Population Projections and CLG Household Projections because they link population and household change to local capacity and planned development. The latest available when preparing the CS were produced in 2007, but revised projections are being produced to address potential shortcomings in the methodology and take account of the most recent housing monitoring and planned development information. The CS acknowledges that the latest available projections will need to be used to inform implementation of many Core Policies (see paragraph 1.2.12 of the Proposed Submission CS).</p>
Alternatives		
<p>7. Can it be shown that the council's chosen approach is the most appropriate given the reasonable alternatives?</p> <p>8. Have realistic alternatives been considered and is there a clear audit trail showing how and why the preferred strategy/approach was arrived at?</p> <p>9. Where a balance had to be struck in taking decisions between competing alternatives is it clear how and why these decisions were made?</p>	<p>i. Sections of the consultation statement showing how the community was involved in considering issues, alternatives and options</p> <p>ii. Documents used in community involvement with stakeholders and communities encouraging them to identify the issues and options they wished to see considered</p> <p>iii. Any report produced at the end of the front loading phase of plan preparation setting out the issues and options raised</p> <p>iv. Sections of the preferred strategy report explaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how alternatives were developed and evaluated, and • why alternatives were rejected in favour 	<p>Pages 5 to 15 of the Consultation Statement (available here) summarise how the community was involved in the process of identifying issues and considering options for the CS via consultation on three key documents published between 2006 and 2009.</p> <p>The Issues and Options Paper (March 2006) clearly set out the reasonable options for each issue, with an extract from the SA report, and was structured with question boxes accompanying the text to encourage people to indicate their preferences. The responses from this consultation were analysed and recorded in a "Statement of Public Participation" (September 2006).</p> <p>More generally, response forms used in each consultation show that the community was continuously encouraged to indicate whether there was support for preferred and emerging approaches, and given the opportunity to identify alternatives that should be considered throughout the preparation phase.</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
	<p>of the preferred strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> v. Sections of the sustainability appraisal report showing the options and alternatives and explaining how they were objectively assessed vi. Reports prepared during the plan preparation process (including after the preferred strategy participation) contributing to the decisions made on the inclusion of policies in the development plan document vii. Sections of the consultation statement explaining how the main findings of consultation support the decisions viii. Sections of the representations statement <p>OR</p> <p>A brief statement of the influence upon decisions of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the issues raised during stakeholder and community engagement, and how they have been addressed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ix. Any other documentation showing how alternatives were developed and evaluated x. A very brief statement and any other supporting documentation of the way decisions have been taken 	<p>The Preferred Options Document (September 2006) included sections for each policy approach explaining 'Rejected Options', with reference to the options that had been put forward in the earlier consultation document, the Issues and Options Paper (March 2006). The Emerging Approach document (March 2009) further explored and compared alternative spatial scenarios, and set out the benefits for the emerging spatial strategy presented. A summary of responses made from members of the public and stakeholders to the Emerging Approach was then published on the Council's website (these documents are all available in the Core Strategy DPD Archive).</p> <p>The Council received a PINS advisory visit in a later stage of the preparation phase (July 2009). Written advice was provided and assisted in arriving at the preferred strategy. Issues covered by the advice included how the strong housing land supply in the District could mean the CS does not need to identify long-term contingency sites, and could support reducing the status of the Strategic Sites to Opportunity Sites.</p> <p>As the Council drew closer to finalising its preferred approach, it undertook to update stakeholders and the community on progress. Letters and an article in the South Bucks Report in November and December 2009 outlined the Council's latest thinking, including why long-term contingency sites were no longer thought to be needed, why key sites were now thought to be opportunities rather than strategic allocations, and the latest position on how many new dwellings were expected to be built and where.</p> <p>A special Panel of Members was set up to assist in the CS preparation process (the LDF Panel). The LDF Panel has received regular reports on the various inputs from consultations, ongoing development of the Evidence Base and PINS advice. The Panel has considered key issues and competing alternatives, and provided guidance in a process</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		<p>that was key in arriving at the final proposals.</p> <p>Pages 28-29 of the Proposed Submission CS document is a culmination of all of the above inputs, providing an explanation for how the Spatial Strategy was arrived at, and why it is the most appropriate alternative.</p> <p>Section 5 of the SA Report (March 2010) addresses the development, appraisal, take up and rejection of options for the CS DPD. This document is signposted to relevant sections in previous SA documents, all of which are available here.</p> <p>The Evidence Base contains detailed studies and reports which consider alternatives and compare impacts. The conclusions and recommendations in the Evidence Base studies have informed and support the chosen approach as the most appropriate amongst alternatives.</p> <p>In combination, these documents amount to a clear trail revealing how the proposed approach was arrived at.</p>
<p>10. Does the sustainability appraisal show how the different options perform and is it clear that sustainability considerations informed the content of the development plan document from the start?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A structure to the development plan document which reports the sustainability appraisal findings in relation to each policy ii. Sections of the sustainability appraisal report which set out how sustainability appraisal has influenced the development of the preferred strategy and how policies have been revised in the light of sustainability appraisal findings iii. Reports made as part of plan-making which indicate how sustainability appraisal has influenced the choice of strategy and the content of policies 	<p>The SA process (all documents available here) throughout the DPD preparation has involved appraisal and reporting on the performance of alternative spatial strategies and policies for the CS with reference to sustainability objectives and effects. The SA Scoping Document was consulted upon in May 2005. All SA Reports since then have been published for consultation alongside the corresponding Core Strategy consultation documents, with results and relevant comments contributing to the content and further development of the CS and policy approaches. See in particular section 5, page 30 of the most recent SA Report (March 2010) which summarises the process of development, appraisal, take up and rejection of options for the CS DPD, with signposting to relevant sections in previous SA documents. Appendix 7 includes appraisal of the final policies.</p>

Key question	Possible evidence	Evidence provided
		<p>The Emerging Approach document (at section 2.81, page 22) included a table setting out a comparative assessment of the alternative scenarios presented in that document, as informed by the SA process. This is a specific example which demonstrates how sustainability considerations have been used to compare options and inform decisions throughout the process.</p>
<p>11. Does the development plan document adequately expand upon regional guidance rather than simply duplicate it?</p> <p>12. Does the strategy take forward the regional context reflecting the local issues and objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which explain where and how regional guidance has been elaborated upon and the reasons ii. The regional development agency/regional planning body letter confirming that the development plan document is in general conformity with the regional special strategy iii. Representations received from the regional development agency/regional planning body iv. Representations from the Government Office v. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with 	<p>The SEP was revoked by the Government on 6th July 2010. A section of the Proposed Submission CS pertaining to the relevance of regional policy is therefore proposed to be deleted in the Schedule of Proposed Changes. A number of other changes arising from the revocation of the SEP are also proposed.</p> <p>The CS was prepared with a view to avoiding the repetition of regional policy, striving instead to expand upon relevant issues in accordance with local context.</p> <p>The Proposed Submission CS does not contain policies that were not in general conformity with the SEP, which was still in effect when the Proposed Submission CS was published. The former Regional Planning Body, SEEPB, confirmed in writing on 11th May 2010 that the Proposed Submission CS was in general conformity with the SEP. A copy of this correspondence is included in the Statement of Representations (available here).</p>

Effective		
Deliverable		
<p>13. Has the council clearly identified what the issues are that the development plan document is seeking to address?</p> <p>14. Have priorities been set so that it is clear what the development plan document is seeking to achieve?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which refer to the vision and objectives of the sustainable community strategy and the issues identified there ii. A statement prepared following stakeholder and community engagement in the front-loading phase of plan-making setting out the identified issues for the development plan document A spatial portrait based on the advice in 'Policies for spatial plans' presented as part of the core strategy iii. A core strategy vision which is framed to set out the outcomes which are sought for the future iv. Sections of the development plan document which identify the main issues addressed v. Sections of the development plan document which indicate the priority outcomes 	<p>Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS refers to the vision set out in the SCS, describes the plan area and sets out the issues, problems and challenges identified through consultation and the evidence base. It goes on to set out at section 1.4 the spatial vision and strategic objectives developed to contribute to implementation of the SCS and address the identified issues. The strategic objectives are made more meaningful by the specification of critical success factors, so the main outcomes sought by implementation of the CS are clear. Appendix 4 of the document contains a table showing the links between the issues, spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies.</p>
<p>15. Are there any cross-boundary issues that should be addressed and, if so, have they been adequately addressed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the regional special strategy which identify cross-boundary issues. ii. Sections of the development plan document setting out cross-boundary issues and the response to them iii. Reports on relevant studies which cover wider areas than the local authority and how the development plan document addresses their findings or recommendations 	<p>South Bucks has good joint working relationships with all adjoining local authorities. Numerous instances of correspondence and meetings have taken place on cross-boundary issues during preparation of the CS, records of which confirm that policy approaches on key issues applying across boundaries are well-aligned, and that there are no cross-boundary issues of significance affecting the South Bucks CS, although there is a desire to work collaboratively to benefit from opportunities at adjoining boundaries. SBDC has undertaken several joint evidence</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iv. Records of meetings with adjoining authorities or relevant agencies which confirm that there are no cross-boundary issues of significance 	<p>base studies with adjoining authorities, helping to ensure consistent and comprehensive approaches to issues beyond the District boundary. These are available in the Evidence Base Studies and Other Supporting Documents section of the website. Adjoining authorities have also been included in all consultation stages and have provided representations confirming same (details are provided in the Consultation Statement - available here) together with previously published reports on consultation (see the Core Strategy DPD Archive).</p>
<p>16. Does the development plan document contain clear objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A spatial portrait which identifies the key issues facing the area ii. A core strategy vision which is framed to set out the outcomes which are sought for the future iii. The strategic objectives of the development plan document, and the commentary in the development plan document of how they derive from the spatial portrait and vision 	<p>Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS which describes the plan area and sets out the issues, problems and challenges identified through consultation and the evidence base. It goes on to set out at section 1.4 the spatial vision and strategic objectives developed to contribute to implementation of the SCS and address the identified issues. The strategic objectives are made more meaningful by the specification of critical success factors, so the main outcomes sought by implementation of the CS are clear. Appendix 4 of the document contains a table showing the links between the issues, spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies.</p>
<p>17. Are the objectives specific to the place; as opposed to being general and applicable to anywhere?</p> <p>18. Is there a direct relationship between the identified issues and the objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The spatial portrait and the commentary in the development plan document as to how the objectives derive from it ii. Confirmation from the local strategic partnership and partner organisations that they agree the objectives as being specific to the place 	<p>As above - there is a clear flow-through evident from the locally specific issues and challenges identified to the objectives which address them.</p> <p>Members of the South Bucks Partnership have been involved in preparation of the CS since its inception, for example by participating in the key stakeholder workshop and presentations at Partnership meetings. This has ensured that the objectives are locally specific, and that there are strong links between the vision set out in the SCS and the spatial vision and objectives in the CS.</p>
<p>19. Is it clear how the policies will meet the objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Relevant sections of the development plan document which explain how 	<p>Strategic objectives in Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS are supported by critical success factors, which indicate</p>

<p>20. Are there any obvious gaps in the policies, with regard to the objectives of the development plan document?</p>	<p>policies derive from the objectives and are designed to meet them</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Relevant sections of the sustainable community strategy which identify its objectives iii. Confirmation from the local strategic partnership and partner organisations that they believe the policies will achieve the agreed objectives iv. Research reports and studies which address the means to address objectives and conclude that the policies are appropriate and should succeed v. Sections of the development plan document, reports or other documents which discuss the matters which should be addressed in the development plan document. 	<p>the relevant policy or policies that will deliver the objective. These critical success factors form part of the delivery and monitoring framework set out in Appendix 8 of the document.</p> <p>The table at Appendix 4 showing the links between the issues, spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies provides a clear reference point for how the policies will meet the objectives and shows that there are no gaps in addressing them.</p>
<p>21. Are there realistic timescales related to the objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which address delivery and the timescales for key developments and initiatives ii. Confirmation from the local strategic partnership and partner organisations that the timescales are realistic in terms of their contribution to delivery 	<p>The Spatial Strategy in Part 2 of the Proposed Submission CS addresses timescales for the delivery of development. The Delivery and Monitoring Framework in Appendix 8 includes timescales in the targets where appropriate.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 6 provides additional detail where available on timeframes for delivery of infrastructure relating to relevant policies.</p>
<p>22. Are the policies internally consistent?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document, documents used in community involvement, and technical papers which demonstrate that the objectives are consistent ii. A very brief statement explaining how the council considers its objectives are consistent 	<p>Yes, the Council considers that the CS contains a set of Strategic Objectives and corresponding policies that are consistent overall, although inevitable tensions are acknowledged.</p> <p>Also, Section 4.0 of the SA Report (March 2010, available here) reports on testing the plan objectives for potential conflicts with sustainability objectives. The appraisal demonstrates that the plan objectives are largely consistent with and will help to meet sustainability</p>

		objectives. Although a small number of potential conflicts were identified, an appropriate balance between objectives has been struck.
<p>23. Does the development plan document contain material which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is already in another plan • should be logically be in a different plan • should not be in a plan at all? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Information in the local development scheme, or provided separately, about the scope and content (actual and intended) of each development plan document. This should show how they combine to provide a coherent policy structure ii. Representations from the Government Office iii. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with 	<p>The CS DPD has been prepared in accordance with the adopted LDS (March 2010), and matches the listing and description set out in that document. The LDS shows how other LDD's will be prepared that will combine with the CS to provide an overall LDF that is coherent.</p> <p>SBDC has worked closely with GOSE, other government agencies and stakeholders throughout the preparation of the CS to ensure its content is appropriate yet concise. GOSE has provided useful comments in response to formal consultation stages, and has also provided much useful assistance in a more informal dialogue, culminating in their formal representation on the Proposed Submission Core Strategy which raised no significant concerns about the material in the CS, although further suggestions for some minor additional material were made.</p>
<p>24. Does the development plan document explain how its key policy objectives will be achieved?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document that identify the key objectives and how they will be delivered upon ii. Confirmation from the relevant agencies that they support the objectives and the identified means of delivery iii. Other supporting material - for example, commitments in the local area agreement that will support the delivery of the strategy in the development plan document 	<p>Strategic objectives in Part 1 of the Proposed Submission CS are supported by critical success factors, which indicate the relevant policy or policies that help to achieve the objective. These critical success factors form part of the delivery and monitoring framework set out in Appendix 8 of the document.</p>
<p>25. If there are development management policies, are they supportive of the strategy and objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document that show how the development management policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • will help to deliver the strategy <p>37. derive from, and elaborate on, the</p>	<p>The Proposed Submission CS contains a series of policies setting out the strategy on particular issues. These will be used for development management purposes and set the context for more detailed development management policies in the Development Management DPD. As noted</p>

	objectives and policies of the plan	above, the critical success factors make it clear which policies will support which objectives, thus showing that policies derive from the objectives.
26. Have the infrastructure implications of the strategy/policies clearly been identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. A section or sections of the development plan document where infrastructure needs are identified and the proposed solutions put forward ii. Representations in respect of infrastructure iii. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations in relation to infrastructure have been considered and dealt with 	<p>Core Policy 6 and Appendix 6 of the Proposed Submission CS address infrastructure implications of the CS, including an Infrastructure Schedule setting out schemes and delivery arrangements.</p> <p>Specific efforts have been made by both the County and District Councils to engage with agencies involved in the delivery of services and infrastructure to ensure planned development will be appropriately supported. The Evidence Base includes documents recording results of discussions with these stakeholders under the heading 'Transport, Infrastructure and Accessibility'. Some of the particularly key points arising from representations relating to infrastructure and how they have been addressed are also reported on in the Consultation Statement (available here).</p>
27. Are the delivery mechanisms and timescales for implementation of the policies clearly identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document setting out delivery mechanisms and timescale ii. Other development plan documents being prepared that develop the policies of the core strategy further and set out how they will be delivered iii. Research or studies that address matters of delivery and the realistic timescales iv. Documents that set out arrangements made or planned for local delivery vehicles, or other delivery mechanisms v. Very brief statements on how other stakeholders intend to support the delivery of the policies, with any supporting correspondence or reports by 	<p>Part 4 of the Proposed Submission CS addresses delivery mechanisms for the Spatial Strategy and Core Policies. A Delivery and Monitoring Framework is set out in Appendix 8 - timescales form part of the targets defined where appropriate. The Spatial Strategy in Part 2 of the document addresses timescales for the delivery of development. The Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 6 also contains important delivery information.</p> <p>Both Appendix 8 and Appendix 6 identify other stakeholders and agencies who will be involved in delivering the strategy. SBDC has engaged with all the agencies mentioned throughout the process, and representations received indicate their support for the policies and delivery mechanisms.</p>

	<p>the authority or the relevant stakeholder</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Correspondence from stakeholders on delivery mechanisms and timescale vii. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on delivery and implementation have been considered and dealt with 	
<p>28. Is it clear who is going to deliver the required infrastructure and does the timing of the provision complement the timescale of the strategy/policies?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Confirmation from infrastructure providers that they support the solutions proposed and the identified means and timescales for their delivery ii. Representations in respect of infrastructure iii. Reports or copies of correspondence on how representations in relation to infrastructure and its timing have been considered and dealt with 	<p>Specific efforts have been made by both the County and District Councils to engage with agencies involved in the delivery of services and infrastructure to ensure planned development will be appropriately supported. The Evidence Base includes documents recording discussion with these stakeholders under the heading 'Transport, Infrastructure and Accessibility'.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Schedule in Appendix 6 makes it clear who is going to deliver what infrastructure, and SBDC has received representations from many infrastructure providers that they support the proposed policies and identified infrastructure schemes. Some of the particularly key points arising from representations relating to infrastructure and how they have been addressed are also reported on in the Consultation Statement (available here).</p>
<p>29. Is it clear who is intended to implement each part of the strategy/ development plan document?</p> <p>30. Where actions required to implement policy are outside the direct control of the council, is there evidence of commitment from the relevant organisation to implement the policies?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document setting out responsibilities for delivery ii. Correspondence showing how other stakeholders intend to support the delivery of the policies iii. Reports by the council or the relevant stakeholder iv. Representations from stakeholders on implementation v. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how representations on delivery and 	<p>The Delivery and Monitoring Framework in Appendix 8 of the Proposed Submission CS makes it clear who will be involved in implementing the CS. All the agencies mentioned have been included in engagement throughout the process and provided support for the proposed policies and delivery framework.</p>

	implementation have been considered and dealt with	
<p>31. Does the development plan document reflect the concept of spatial planning?</p> <p>32. Does it go beyond traditional land use planning by bringing together - and integrating - policies for development, and the use of land, with other policies and programmes from a variety of organisations that influence the nature of places and how they function?</p>	<p>i. Sections of the development plan document that reflect the plans or strategies of other bodies</p> <p>ii. Expressions of support from bodies responsible for other strategies affecting the area</p> <p>iii. Representations in respect of services provided by other agencies</p> <p>iv. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with. These should either clarify the issues raised in the representation, or include a copy of the substance of the representation</p>	<p>The paragraph 1.1.20 of the Proposed Submission CS highlights that regard has been had to various strategies in developing the final strategic approach. SBDC has worked closely with GOSE and other government and stakeholder agencies throughout the preparation of the CS to ensure its content reflects and supports other plans and strategies. Reference is made throughout the CS to specific matters and strategies that have informed development of the relevant policies. Many of the supporting documents in the Evidence Base provide further detail on how other programmes and policies have been integrated with the CS.</p> <p>Records have been kept of correspondence with and representations received from relevant bodies regarding other plans and strategies, many confirming support for the context and policy approach put forward.</p>
Flexible		
<p>33. Does the development plan document take into account matters which may be imposed by circumstance, notwithstanding the council's views about the matter?</p>	<p>i. Explicit recognition within the development plan document that this may happen, and clear information about how the plan strategy can accommodate them</p> <p>ii. Consideration of the options in relation to such matters as part of the evaluation of alternatives in a report on the preferred strategy</p>	<p>The Proposed Submission CS gives explicit recognition to matters which may be imposed by circumstance. For example, paragraph 3.2.53 acknowledges the major Government transport projects which may occur and would affect South Bucks, namely the Heathrow Hub and High Speed 2.</p> <p>Proposals for a major development adjacent to the Pinewood Studios sites in Iver are currently the subject of an appeal. During the preparation of the CS, the site was included in considerations of potential long-term contingency site locations (refer to the Emerging Approach document, March 2009 - available here). However the option of long-term contingency sites has not been taken forward, nor does the Project Pinewood proposal specifically form part of, or align with, the proposed</p>

		<p>strategy. Despite this, it would have significant impacts if approved on appeal (as it involves 1,400 new dwellings). The Evidence Base work included testing the impacts of this level and location of development on transport and other infrastructure, so that the CS process has taken into account how to deal with this circumstance if it is imposed.</p> <p>It may be argued that it is necessary for the CS to provide some flexibility towards development occurring within the Green Belt, in order to cope with such examples of imposed circumstance. However, national policy in PPG2 already provides the guidance for decisions on proposals within the Green Belt, and incorporates some flexibility with reference to 'very special circumstances'. Proposed Core Policy 17 provides further flexibility, by providing an approach for dealing with significant development sites coming forward unexpectedly.</p>
<p>34. Is the development plan document flexible enough to respond to a variety of, or unexpected changes in, circumstances?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document setting out the assumptions of the plan and identifying the circumstances when policies might need to be reviewed ii. Sections of the annual monitoring report and sustainability appraisal report describing how the council will monitor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effectiveness of policies and what evidence is being collected to undertake this • changes affecting the baseline information and any information on trends on which the development plan document is based iii. Statements or correspondence from stakeholders which commit to providing information to be used in monitoring the progress of the policies and changes in 	<p>The proposed approach to set a range for the housing target in the CS (rather than an absolute minimum), both for overall housing delivery and also for the amount of affordable housing, is inherently flexible, since it accounts for some risks and uncertainties that are acknowledged, whilst still providing a realistic and deliverable scale for development. For example, if one or both of the Wilton Park and Mill Lane Opportunity Site unexpectedly fails to come forward for development during the plan period, this will not undermine delivery of the strategy.</p> <p>The CS DPD also explains when and how additional local development documents will be used to respond to a variety of possible changes in circumstance. For example, the proposed Core Policy 10 states that if the Council's monitoring identifies a significant imbalance between local job opportunities and the size of the resident work force, any employment land to be released for alternative uses or preferred location for new employment generating floor space will be identified through the LDF process.</p>

	<p>the baseline</p> <p>iv. Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances</p>	<p>The CS acknowledges the potential for changes in population projections, an important component of baseline information supporting the CS. At paragraph 1.2.12 it is recognised that the latest available population projections will need to be used to inform implementation of Core Policies.</p>
<p>35. Is the development plan document sufficiently flexible to deal with any changes to, for example, housing figures from an emerging regional special strategy?</p>	<p>i. Sections within the development plan document dealing with possible change areas and how they would be dealt with, including mechanisms for the rate of development to be increased or slowed and how that would impact on other aspects of the strategy and on infrastructure provision</p> <p>ii. Risk analysis of the strategy and policies to demonstrate robustness and how the plan could cope with changing circumstances</p>	<p>As above, the proposed approach based on a housing target range provides inherent flexibility to deal with changes in housing supply and delivery issues.</p> <p>Prior to settling on the final spatial strategy, a number of different development scenarios and housing levels were appraised and tested, including specifically in relation to infrastructure provision. From this process, no critical thresholds or timescales emerged that would necessitate contingency actions relative to development occurring faster or slower than anticipated.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.1.10 of the Proposed Submission Core Strategy commits to a review of the SHLAA, in the very unlikely event that monitoring reveals an undersupply of housing.</p>
<p>36. Does the development plan document include the remedial actions that will be taken if the strategies/policies are failing?</p>	<p>i. A section of the development plan document which expressly addresses flexibility</p> <p>ii. Sections of the development plan document identifying the key indicators of success of the strategy, and the remedial actions which will be taken if they are failing</p>	<p>Part 4 of the Proposed Submission CS addresses flexibility, and acknowledges that monitoring will provide the basis on which contingency arrangements may be triggered.</p> <p>Critical success factors are identified in Part 1 of the document, in relation to the strategic objectives. These form part of the Delivery and Monitoring Framework set out in Appendix 8, which also identifies many other targets that will be used to determine whether the CS and proposed policies are proving effective.</p>
<p>Monitoring</p>		
<p>37. Does the development plan document contain targets and milestones that relate to the</p>	<p>i. Sections of the development plan document setting out indicators, targets and milestones</p>	<p>A Delivery and Monitoring Framework is set out in Appendix 8 of the document.</p> <p>The current AMR, sections 4, 5 and 6, reports on</p>

<p>delivery of the policies, including housing trajectories where the plan contains housing allocations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Sections of the current annual monitoring report which report on indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories iii. Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the delivery of policies 	<p>indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories for housing, business and town centre development and environmental quality. Much of this existing monitoring framework will be relevant for monitoring the effectiveness of the CS. However, the scope and structure of the AMR will be reviewed and updated in light of the indicators and targets identified in the CS, with further indicators likely to be built into it.</p>
<p>38. Is it clear how these are to be measured and are these linked to the production of the annual monitoring report?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document setting out indicators, targets and milestones ii. Sections of the current annual monitoring report and the sustainability appraisal report setting out the framework for monitoring, including monitoring the effects of the development plan document against the sustainability appraisal iii. Reference to any other reports or technical documents which contain information on the collection or measurement of indicators 	<p>As above.</p> <p>In addition, section 7.0 of the SA Report (March 2010, available here) addresses monitoring the significant effects of implementing the CS on sustainability. The significant effects sustainability indicators are already reported on in the AMR.</p>
<p>39. Are suitable targets and indicators present (by when, how and by whom)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document setting out indicators, targets and milestones ii. Sections of the current annual monitoring report that report on indicators, targets, milestones and trajectories 	<p>As above.</p>

<p>National policy</p>		
<p>40. Does the development plan document contain any policies or proposals that are not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which refer to planning policy statements and justify why any policies 	<p>The Council believes that the CS DPD to be submitted (subject to the proposed changes set out in the schedule) is consistent with national policy. This is supported by</p>

<p>consistent with national planning policy?</p> <p>41. If yes, is there a local justification?</p>	<p>are not consistent with national policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Sustainable community strategy, studies forming evidence for the development plan document or other information which provide the stimulus for departing from national planning policy iii. Evidence provided from the sustainability appraisal (including reference to the sustainability report) and/or from the results of community involvement iv. Representations from the Government Office on the preferred strategy or the submitted development plan document v. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how Government Office representations have been considered and dealt with 	<p>correspondence with GOSE throughout the process, culminating in their formal representation which raised no concerns about consistency with national policy.</p>
<p>42. Does the development plan document contain policies that do not add anything to existing national guidance?</p> <p>43. If so, why have they been included?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections of the development plan document which explain where and how national policy has been elaborated upon and the reasons ii. Representations from the Government Office iii. Reports or copies of correspondence as to how the representations have been considered and dealt with 	<p>The Council has sought to avoid repeating national policy, and believes that the Proposed Submission CS to be submitted (subject to the proposed changes set out in the schedule) is consistent with, yet not repetitive of, national policy. This is supported by correspondence with GOSE throughout the process, culminating in their formal representation to the Proposed Submission Core Strategy which raised no concerns about consistency with, or unnecessary duplication of, national policy.</p>



South Bucks
District Council

Capswood, Oxford Road
Denham
Buckinghamshire
UB9 4LH

Tel: 01895 837200

<http://www.southbucks.gov.uk/>