

ANNEX A TO ITEM 3

The following sets out the LPI Inspector's **recommended changes** to the Second Deposit version of the Local Plan in **Section 1** of the **Part 1** Report, and the recommended response of Cabinet.

This part of the Inspector's Report addresses the broad strategy of the Local Plan rather than specific objections. However the general thrust of objectors arguments (and the Council's case in response) are summarised within the Inspector's Report. The relevant paragraphs for each issue / site are cross-referenced in italics and brackets.

Abbreviations used within this annex and the Inspector's report:

BCC:	Buckinghamshire County Council
DV1:	first deposit version of the MK Local Plan (Sept 2000)
DV2:	second deposit version of the MK Local Plan (Oct 2002)
EP:	English Partnerships
GOSE:	Government Office for the South East
LCS:	Landscape Character Study
MK:	Milton Keynes
MKC:	Milton Keynes Council
MK&SM Study:	MK and South Midland Sub Regional Study (2002)
MK&AV GAA:	Mk and Aylesbury Vale Growth Area Assessment
SRS:	Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub Regional Strategy
ODPM:	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
PIC:	Pre Inquiry Change to the MK Local Plan (April 2003)
PPG:	Planning Policy Guidance Note
RPG:	Regional Planning Guidance
SEERA:	South East England Regional Assembly
SPG:	Supplementary Planning Guidance
UCS:	Urban Capacity Study

TOPIC / SITE:	SUB REGIONAL STRATEGY
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Round Table: Regional / Sub Regional Issues (15 July 2003)
Issues / Objection:	Relationship of emerging Local Plan with emerging alterations to Regional Planning Guidance (RPG9).
Inspector's Recommendation(s) (20.2 & paras 2.1-2.11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan period should not be extended to 2016, but Plan should contain an indication of the directions for growth beyond 2011 The level of growth to be planned for should take into account the emerging sub-regional strategy at this stage rather than when the Plan is reviewed.
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept recommendations
Inspector's Reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports MKC position that the plan period should not be extended beyond 2011. Agrees it is too late in the process, could require further consultation and lead to delay but ... The level of growth in the Local Plan should 'take into account' the emerging SRS and the Plan should indicate directions of growth beyond 2011.
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The RPG Panel supported the level of housing development proposed for MK in the Draft Sub Regional Study. This figure, which is higher than the Structure Plan allocation for MK on which the Local Plan is based, is therefore unlikely to change when the ODPM publishes a revised Sub Regional Strategy later this year. This means that there is now a stronger case for increasing the housing allocation in the Local Plan to meet the figures in the Sub Regional Strategy to 2011 (24,100 dws for the whole Borough). The Inspector acknowledged that there are doubts about whether the rate of housing completions required to meet this higher figure can be achieved by 2011 but concludes that the availability of sufficient housing land should not be a constraint on achieving this level of development. Similarly, the RPG Panel conclude that the Strategy should be based on making up the shortfall in housing completions since 2001 as soon as possible - i.e. by 2011 - although they are also realistic about the number of completions in the first 5 years (2001-06: 7,900 dws), compared to the second 5 years (2006-11: 15,000 dws) Although the Draft SRS is currently an 'emerging' policy document, it is likely that it will be adopted before the Local Plan. PPG1 (para 53) advises that emerging policy guidance can be regarded as a material consideration, and that the circumstances that led to the review of policy may need to be taken into account. Therefore, the RPG Panel Report must be regarded as a material consideration at this stage, pending the publication of a revised version of the Sub Regional Strategy by the ODPM.

**Implications for
Local Plan
timetable:**

- The housing allocation for MK to 2011 has been discussed at length at both the LP Inquiry and the RPG Public Examination

TOPIC / SITE:	THE LOCAL PLAN STRATEGY: REST OF THE BOROUGH
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Round Table: Development Strategy – Rest of the Borough (18 July 2003)
Issues / Objection:	Soundness of the rural development strategy and the classification of Key Settlements, Selected Villages and Other Villages.
Inspector's Recommendation(s) (20.6 & para 3.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanslope should be re-classified as a Selected Village rather than a Key Settlement • The settlement should only accommodate about 40 dwellings
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept recommendations
Reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MKC has always acknowledged that Hanslope is smaller than the other Key Settlements, but have argued that Key Settlement status is related to function as well as size. • Hanslope acts as a key rural service centre for its hinterland and has many more facilities than the other villages in the Borough, including a convenience store & post office, newsagents, butcher, off licence, doctors surgery, two public houses and a combined school. Like the other Key Settlements Hanslope was also designated for its comparatively good level of public transport services. • Hanslope was not identified as a Key Settlement because of parish council support for some development (as was the case with Selected Villages), but because of its facilities and accessibility by public transport as identified in our 1999 Sustainability Assessment. • In recommending a change to its classification, the Inspector has said that Hanslope appears to be a large village rather than a small town and thus different from the other Key Settlements. He does mention that it has a range of facilities and a bus service. It is because of those facilities and public transport accessibility that it could be argued that Hanslope should remain as a Key Settlement, with a reduced level of growth. However, if the change to Selected Village status is accepted, it will still be necessary to review the classification of individual settlements when reviewing the Local Plan, so on balance, the Inspector's recommendation can be accepted. • Reducing the level of growth - as recommended by the Inspector - is acceptable and is consistent with the officer recommendation when the LPSC considered which sites to allocate in DV1. At this time around 50 dwellings were recommended. It is suggested that there should be some flexibility in the revised allocation for the village - e.g. about 40-50 dws. • This level of development could be accommodated on fewer sites (5 sites are currently allocated) and therefore have less impact on the existing pattern of development at Hanslope. • Officers have met informally with the parish council to discuss

	<p>matters. The PC agree with the Inspector that the status of the village should be changed, and would prefer no more than 40 new dwellings. However, the final level of development and the specific sites to be allocated should not be determined until cabinet consider the Inspector's recommendations on each of the DV2 allocations and Omission Sites in the village in Part 2 of his report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PC is also concerned that the intention of Key Settlement designation is to make the village into a town, similar to Woburn Sands or Olney. However, as noted above, the designation is intended to reflect the function of the settlement, not its size or the amount of new housing. There is no direct correlation between population size and housing growth - e.g. Olney has a larger population than Hanslope but a lower level of new housing, reflecting local circumstances. • The Inspector does not suggest that the reduction in housing numbers at Hanslope (75-85 dws) should be balanced by housing development elsewhere in the rural area. He will however be making recommendations in Part 2 of his Report on a large number of Omission Sites put forward by objectors in other Key Settlements and villages throughout the Borough. We will need to consider those recommendations before deciding how and where this relatively small shortfall should be made up.
<p>Implications for Local Plan timetable:</p>	<p>Objections to the status of Hanslope as a Key Settlement, the DV2 housing sites and to a number of Omission Sites put forward by objectors were all considered at the inquiry.</p>

TOPIC / SITE:	HOUSING DELIVERY
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Round Table: Regional / Sub Regional Issues (15 July 2003). Round Table: Housing Numbers / Deliverability (09 December 2003).
Issues / Objection:	Whether enough land has been allocated to meet the Structure Plan housing target. Whether the housing target (to 2011) in the SRS should supersede the housing target in the Structure Plan
Inspector's Recommendation(s) (20.8, 20.10 & 20.11 & paras 4.1-4.3))	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce estimate of housing completions in CMK before 2001 by 400 dwellings • Allocate additional land for some 2,500 dwellings to enable the SRS housing figures are to be achieved.
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept recommendations
Inspector's Reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees with objectors who argued that the MKC/EP housing forecasts are over-optimistic given that housing in CMK is largely a new and untested market • Recommends allocating the Strategic Reserve in the EEA and land at Stantonbury Park Farm for development pre -2011 to make up the shortfall against the housing targets in the Draft SRS (see following table) • No support for more small/medium sites to be allocated for housing, given other sites that MKC has identified that may come forward (small sites = less than 50 dws; medium sites = 50-250 dws). Additional provision should be from large sites
Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The net effect of the Inspector's recommendation is to increase the housing allocation in the pre 2011 period by 2,100 dws. • This revised total of 24,100 dws is consistent with the figure for MK in the Draft SRS. Although MKC and SEERA proposed lower housing figures for MK up to 2011, the RPG Panel Report supports the figures in the Draft SRS: they are therefore unlikely to change in the final version of the SRS expected in October. • The Inspector acknowledged that constraints such as the necessary infrastructure and capacity in the construction industry 'may make this level of growth unrealistic' by 2011 but concluded that 'whatever factors may inhibit the provision of housing, the amount of land allocated for housing should not be one of them'. He also attached weight to the need to provide a 10 year supply of housing land from the date of adoption of the Plan (ie for 2005 -2015). • EP submitted some market research evidence to the inquiry in support of the 2,300 dws forecast for CMK / Campbell Park up to 2011. The Inspector regarded this information as 'tentative' given that housing in the City Centre is a relatively new market, and that it may take time for demand to build up. He also noted that the need to complete blocks of development before

	<p>individual units can be sold may affect the delivery rate of new housing in CMK. He did not however justify the specific reduction of 400 dws (which leaves a revised forecast of 1,900 dws by 2011).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the estimated housing capacity of some sites in the City Centre has increased since the inquiry as a result of more detailed work on SPG and planning applications, it is considered prudent to accept the Inspector's recommendation given that housing development is yet to start on major sites in CMK and Campbell Park. • The Inspector's recommendations in relation to the Strategic Reserve and Stantonbury Park Farm are considered elsewhere in this Annex.
<p>Implications for Local Plan timetable:</p>	<p>Objections relating to the housing figures for MK up to 2011 have been considered at both the LP Inquiry and the RPG Public Examination. Both the LPI Inspector and the RPG Panel have endorsed the figures in the Draft SRS.</p> <p>Any further objections to a revised figure in the Local Plan are unlikely to raise significant new matters that would warrant discussion at a further inquiry.</p>

Housing Figures

This table summarises the revised housing provision in the Local Plan if the Council accepts all of the Inspector's recommendations. The table is taken from page 32 of the Part 1 Report.

	Supply	Demand
Demand based on emerging Sub-Regional Strategy		24,100
Estimated completions (MKC, December 2003)	22,000	
Less 400 over-estimate for CMK completions	- 400	
	21,600	
Effect of substituting Area 11 for Area 10.4	Nil	
	21,600	
Allocation in Strategic Reserve Area (in EEA)	2,000	
	23,600	
Allocation of Stantonbury Park Farm	500	
	24,100	

TOPIC / SITE:	STRATEGIC RESERVE AREA (SRA) AND BROUGHTON MANOR FARM IN THE EASTERN EXPANSION AREA (EEA)
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	<p>Third party interests in SRA (03 September 2003)</p> <p>Land interests in SRA (25 September 2003)</p> <p>Land interests in Broughton Manor Farm (09 – 11 March 2004).</p>
Issues / Objection:	<p>Status / proposed uses for SRA.</p> <p>Implications for delivery of Broughton Manor Farm from proposed changes to SRA.</p>
Inspector's Recommendation(s) <i>(20.10 & paras 11.1-11.4)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use allocations should be made in the Strategic Reserve Area. The SRA should be included as an integral part of the EEA for development in the plan period. The allocations should include housing for some 2,000 dwellings and mixed-use development • The Plan should make it clear that development of the Broughton Manor Farm site should not be unduly delayed by master planning for the EEA
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially accept recommendation - except in respect of land at Eagle Farm (north) which should remain as Strategic Reserve
Inspector's reasoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRA is closely related to the EEA and should be planned comprehensively • Development within the SRA would reinforce the proposed east/west mass transit corridor • Additional housing within the SRA should assist the case for improved access to the M1 • Detailed planning of the SRA could also offset the potential loss of employment land at Newton Leys
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SRA was identified in DV1 and DV2 as the 'first area of search' for further development. Officers put forward part of SRA as possible additional allocation to Local Plan Panel in 2002, to achieve a better balance between the EEA and the WEA in terms of housing numbers. • Given that the Inspector and the RPG Panel support the higher housing figure for MK to 2011 in the Draft Sub Regional Strategy, this is a logical location to provide the additional housing required to meet that figure - within a mixed development which includes housing, employment, facilities, open space etc • In relation to Eagle Farm North (north of the A421, adjoining M1), it is recommended that this area should remain as a Strategic Reserve rather than be specifically allocated for development for the following reasons:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through the preparation of the EEA Development Framework, more than sufficient land has been identified within the remainder of the former SRA to meet the Inspector's recommendation of 2,000 dws, plus other uses. The estimated housing capacity within this area in the draft Development Framework is about 2,500 dws. 2. There is insufficient justification for the range of uses put forward by the objector for this location as 'gateway' development. These uses include offices, retail, hotel, restaurants and leisure. Following a sequential approach, in accordance with PPG6, such development is best located in city and town centres. There is no evidence that such development cannot be satisfactorily accommodated within existing centres in the Borough. 3. Such development would conflict with other Local Plan policies and priorities endorsed by the Inspector - e.g. in relation to the roles of CMK as an emergent regional centre, and Bletchley and Wolverton as secondary focal points for development in the City. 4. Uncertainty that this location will remain a 'gateway' to the City in the long term, given the longer term development options outlined in e.g. the MK and South Midlands Study 5. Uncertainty over a possible J13a adjoining the site, which may require land to be used for highway improvements (MKC supports the provision of this new junction)
<p>Implications for Local Plan timetable:</p>	<p>The revised development framework for the EEA will include a proposed pattern of land uses for most of the SRA. Detailed concerns regarding this land use pattern should be resolved through the consultation process on the development framework rather than through the Local Plan.</p>

TOPIC / SITE:	STANTONBURY PARK FARM (OMISSION SITE OM23 [*])
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Land interests in Stantonbury Park Farm (12 February 2004)
Issues / Objection:	Omission of Stantonbury Park Farm as a City Expansion Area.
Inspector's Recommendation(s) (20.11 & paras 13.1-13.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stantonbury Park Farm (excluding Stonepit Field) should be allocated for a development of some 500 dwellings • That the site should be developed post 2009, once the review of secondary school places in the borough has been implemented (13.4)
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept recommendations
Inspectors Reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspector considers the key argument against allocation of this site is the fact that it does not support the east/west strategy. He balances this against several factors which he concludes outweigh the disadvantages of deviating from the east/west approach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site accessible by 2 of the suggested Faber Maunsell diagonal core bus routes, which is more than some of the allocated sites ○ Site does not perform materially worse in MKC's 1999 Sustainability Assessment than several allocated sites ○ Objector will be giving some 60ha of land to extend country park and public access to the open countryside, so forming a clear, long term, open space boundary to north of city. ○ Includes a commitment to upgrade local health facilities ○ Proposals have been devised to minimise harm to character and appearance of this part of the city.
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The broad approach of the Inspector is rational and consistent with how the Council regarded the allocation of the NEA - i.e. as an exception to the east-west strategy, in that case, because it was a partial brownfield site. It is also consistent with officers' recommendation at DV1 stage, which suggested that the site could be allocated as an exception to the east-west strategy, if members felt the benefits arising from development outweighed the disadvantages. • The Inspector has noted the comparability of the site to allocated Local Plan sites on public transport and sustainability factors. Additionally, the potential benefits of the site's allocation now include extensive open space on both sides of the canal with development being restricted to half the site - next to Wolverton Road - to avoid adverse impact of development on the plateau, as viewed from the Ouse Valley to the north (which was the basis of members' original

* All sites put forward by objectors for development (not allocated in the Local Plan) have been given a separate reference number, prefixed by 'OM'.

	<p>concern).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Inspector's recommends that Stonepit Field should not be allocated for development area. This meets previous officer concerns over the principle of this well used area of open space being developed for housing. • The main constraint to the site's development is the lack of secondary school places in local schools to meet the additional demand arising from 500 dws. The Inspector has noted this as a key constraint and has stated that the site should only be developed once the review of secondary education provision has been implemented. This means that the site cannot contribute to housing completions in the short term, but could make a useful contribution late in the plan period and onwards post 2011. • The allocation of this site would effectively balance the Inspector's recommendation to reduce the estimate of CMK housing completions up to 2011. • If the Council accepts the Inspector' recommendation to allocate this site, this would require a new policy to be added to the Plan (in the City Expansion Areas and Key Sites chapter), setting out the Council's requirements for the area - similar to policies for the EEA. WEA and NEA.
<p>Implications for Local Plan timetable:</p>	<p>If this site is allocated for development, objectors may seek another inquiry on the grounds that this is the first time they will have been able to formally object to the site's inclusion in the Local Plan (see also section of this report dealing with the WEA / Area11).</p> <p>However, as the Council's position at the inquiry was to object to the allocation of the site for development, the Inspector will have considered all the arguments against the site's allocation as part of examining the Council's evidence.</p>

TOPIC / SITE:	GLEBE FARM (OM137 part), EAGLE FARM (OM137 part), CHURCH FARM (OM18)
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Land interests (9 – 11 March 2004).
Issues / Objection:	Whether these sites should be allocated for development as part of the Eastern Expansion Area.
Inspector's Recommendation(s) <i>(20.12 & paras 14.1-15.4)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking into account the suggested spatial strategy for Milton Keynes in the Sub Regional Strategy, Glebe Farm, Eagle Farm (south) and Church Farm, Wavendon should be identified as Strategic Reserve Areas for growth beyond 2011.
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accept recommendation
Inspector's reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not accept that these sites should be allocated for development before 2011 (as sought by objectors) but they do have potential post 2011 • Glebe Farm and Eagle Farm (south) not considered capable of development in short term: number of significant transport issues to be resolved • Church Farm relates well to the city but is somewhat removed from the EEA and not consistent 'at this time' with the east/west expansion strategy • Need to plan all 3 sites in a comprehensive way to deal with issues of coalescence in this area
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals for additional 'strategic reserves' are a logical extension of our approach in the EEA • The general location of these areas is consistent with the growth location identified in the draft Sub Regional Strategy south east of the city. This was supported by MKC, subject to a number of provisos. One of the provisos was further work in relation to the boundaries of these areas. • There were other Omission Sites in the general area around Wavendon and Woburn Sands, which were not discussed at the inquiry but were the subject of written objections. We will not have the Inspector's views on these other sites until Part 2 of his Report. • It is possible that the Inspector may recommend further areas of strategic reserve in this area but it should be noted that in his Part 1 Report, he attaches weight to avoiding coalescence between the City and Wavendon / Woburn Sands / Aspley Guise. He also refers to the potential of Lower End Road as a southern boundary to the proposed strategic reserve south of the A421. The new policy that would be required for these new strategic reserves could refer to the need to avoid coalescence with nearby settlements.
Implications for	This is likely to be objection to these proposals even though the

Local Plan timetable:	<p>Inspector is recommending these sites should be identified as strategic reserves rather than as sites suitable for development before 2011 (as sought by the objectors promoting the sites). The wording of a new policy to cover these areas may help to allay concerns about coalescence.</p> <p>The RPG Panel noted the large number of objections to a proposed southern bypass running through this area and has recommended the deletion of this scheme from the Sub Regional Strategy. If confirmed, this may meet one likely area of objection.</p>
------------------------------	--

TOPIC / SITE:	TICKFORD FIELDS FARM (SITE NP3 IN DV1) AND LAND TO THE NORTH (OM136)
Inquiry Appearance / Session:	Land interests (22 July & 16 December 2003).
Issues / Objection:	Whether this site (and land to the north – OM136) should be reinstated as a proposal in the Local Plan.
Inspector's Recommendation(s) <i>(20.12 & paras 19.1-19.7)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to meet the Council's aim of some new housing development in the rest of the Borough outside the City post 2011, Tickford Fields Farm and OM136 should be given strategic reserve status
Recommended Response:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accept recommendation
Inspector's Reasoning:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Inspector does not agree that the site should be allocated for development pre-2011 (as sought by the objector) but thinks that the Plan should indicate directions of growth for 2011-2016, and should have a supply of land for housing covering 10 years from adoption of the plan (likely to be in 2005). He has also taken into account the MKC view that there should be some new housing development outside the city post 2011. Recognises that there was 'strong objection' to the allocation' of Site NP3 at DV1 stage but thinks the site is suitable for reserve status. A large part of OM 136 (north of Site NP3) is floodplain: the Inspector recognises that housing could be restricted to land outside floodplain. Also recognizes that NP and MK city are 'closely related'.
Comments:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In principle, the identification of a strategic reserve in Newport Pagnell is a reasonable response to MKC's position on the Draft Sub Regional Strategy - i.e. that there will be some development in the borough away from the City after 2011 Site NP3 was identified in the 1999 Sustainability Assessment as the best site around the town if there was going to be any significant greenfield development on the edge of Newport Pagnell It is not necessarily the case that all development outside the City post 2011 should be in Newport Pagnell. It is possible that the Inspector may consider that there are other sites in the rest of the Borough that should be allocated for development or given strategic reserve status. This will not be clear until we receive the Part 2 Report. Site NP3 also included some existing employment land (warehouse, lorry park and community recycling centre =

	<p>approx 3 ha), in order to enable a comprehensive approach to development in this area. The policy for Site NP3 required some replacement employment land (2ha) and the relocation of the lorry park and recycling centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the proposed new secondary education campus at Olney is going ahead, there have been further discussions about the future of Ousedale School. Options include the relocation of the school to this area, in turn freeing part of their existing site for redevelopment. The implications of such a proposal require further detailed investigation but they could have implications for the mix of uses on an enlarged Site NP3, if the Inspector's recommendation is accepted. • The potential housing capacity of Site NP3 as defined in DV1 was estimated at 200 dws. At the revised density of 30 dws/ha in DV2 (Policy H8) it would be 225 dws, allowing some land for employment and open space as per DV1, but no land for a relocated secondary school. • OM 136, to the north of Site NP3, has a developable area of about 6 ha, excluding all land within the floodplain of the River Ouse and the Chicheley Brook. This land could accommodate another 180 dws at a net density of 30 dws/ha, although this would be subject to any additional land use requirements arising from a larger development site - e.g. additional open space. • On the issue of flooding, the Inspector concludes that 'it is likely that housing can be restricted to parts of the site that are not subject to flooding'. A revised policy for the site, if identified as a Strategic Reserve, should make clear that the area for development excludes land in the floodplain. • There is also an issue in relation to AAL designation. Site NP3 was removed from the AAL in DV1 but AAL designation when Site NP3 was deleted in DV2. The Inspector recommends the deletion of AALs from the Plan, but this recommendation is one that the cabinet is being advised to reject. This raises the issue of whether the AAL notation should be retained or removed from this site if the principle of AALs is retained in the plan. • It is recommended that the AAL notation is retained across the whole site, pending the outcome of the landscape character study. The Inspector is recommending that the site should be identified as a strategic reserve for the post 2011 period, rather than for development now. The continued application of landscape protection policies is therefore considered appropriate in the current local plan. • Issues concerning the timing, extent and nature of development of the site, together with any change to the AAL boundary (if the landscape character study supports the retention of the AALs in principle) can therefore be dealt with in reviewing the Local Plan. The review (or new Local Development Document) will be prepared in the light of the outcome of the landscape character study.
<p>Implications for Local Plan</p>	<p>Objections to Site NP3 were considered by MKC at DV1 stage, including to the removal of the site from the Ouse Valley AAL. Reports outlining those objections were included in the Council's</p>

timetable:	evidence at the LP Inquiry. The Inspector was therefore aware of the amount and nature of objections to Site NP3 in arriving at his recommendation, which is for a strategic reserve for possible development post 2011, rather than an allocation for development pre 2011.
-------------------	--