

Appendix: AVDC Table of Responses on Revised Pre Submission Buckingham Neighbourhood Development Plan

Pre Submission Neighbourhood Plan (January 2015) - Comments

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
5	Section 1	Insert a plan showing the designated Neighbourhood Area (like Winslow has on p.5 of the made plan)	To make it clear the plan proposals are within a designated area as shown on the plan.	To be included
5	Section 1	Insert a paragraph on VALP (Winslow’s plan has a reference at 2.19 p.13) and how it will affect the plan’s housing target once the objectively assessed housing needs and contribution to meeting proven unmet housing needs of neighbouring authorities is known.	So that the plan covering 2011-31 anticipates VALP coming in and how the two plans will work together from summer 2017.	To be included
5	1.3	The saved policies date from 2007.	To be accurate on the policies from AVDLP in force.	To be included
9	2.6	Need to update the 2010 figure of AVDC affordable housing waiting list. The latest figures are Those with <i>any</i> partner, registered with AVDC = 2460 Of which having a local connection to Buckingham = 135	To be factually up to date on the scale of need to show the plan is based on the most up to date evidence.	Figures will be updated
10	2.11	Suggest referring to paras 8.39-8.41 of the Employment Land Review 2012. Also Figure A/Table 6.4 sets out an additional demand for offices (B1a/b) as opposed to a loss for industrial .The data does also show the greatest demand to 2031 would be more warehousing.	This has reviewed the need for offices as part of B-uses in the town, identifies the limited scope for existing sites to expand so recommends the additional 6.5ha	Reference has been updated, however, it should be noted that the figures within the Employment Land Review document only account for approximately have of the development proposed through the plan
11	2.19-2.23	Adding in references to the X44 express bus/coach coming to Buckingham and East-West Rail at Winslow	To bring the section up to date on schemes that will come in during the plan period.	References added
23	4.12	Need to move the justification for sports provision into Policy CLH3	So it is clear at the relevant policy in the plan where the evidence has come from as part of justification for the standards to be used.	Reference to the evidence is made in the policy; the evidence produced by the Town Council is contained with an appendix.
25	Proposal Map	Change the page size and orientation to A3 landscape - it needs to be a bigger size to clearly show the allocation boundaries and local green space designations.	So the plan to be examined and then used in practice in clear.	The proposals map was already in A3 Landscape
30	Policy HP1	Suggest including the 300 reserve housing in the main	Table 2 (as amended below) and the Evidence Base set out a basis for the	The University rooms will alleviate

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
		housing target i.e. 917 homes plus University Rooms	Housing need of Buckingham (based on the DCLG Household Projections) published 27 February 2015) of 657 homes. Although 617 new dwellings are proposed in the neighbourhood plan, 400 rooms in addition are for the specific needs of the University. It is suggested to add the reserve site into the housing target so the plan is clearly more than meeting the identified need and is anticipating the higher level of growth to be set out in VALP which Buckingham will need to contribute towards.	pressure on the existing housing market freeing up dwellings for non-university occupation. In addition https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms states that “all student accommodation, whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus, can be included towards the housing provision”. Therefore the Plan has a development figure of 1017 dwellings without the reserve site.
30	Table 2	<p>There is some confusion/updating to be done here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The buffer should be deleted. A buffer is only added for calculating 5-year housing land supply not calculating need. So the buffer can be taken off. The vacancy rate needs revising. AVDC has been using a 3.8% vacancy rate since October 2014 see the Interim Position Statement at http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/planning-policy/monitoring-information/housing-land-supply-housing-trajectory/ . Will need to update the latest DCLG 2012 Household Projections as follows: <p style="background-color: #fce4d6; padding: 5px;"> Figure for AVDC (2013-2033)= 18,404 Vacancy Rate 3.8% = 699 Adjusted Total = 19,103 Buckingham 9.5% = 1,815 Completions and Commitments 2011 to Sept 2014 = 1,158 Final Total = 657 </p> The figure on ‘completions’ in Table 1 is actually 	To ensure the plan has accurate evidence in seeking to justify a housing target of 917 homes (including the reserve site) against the latest DCLG household projections deducting completions and commitments.	The comments clarifying the housing numbers are welcomed. The Plan is however going to use 19,000 as the base level for dwellings for the District. This because the prediction for the vale is 89,000 for the Vale while the figure for 2011 was 70,000. The calculations have been updated within the Plan and the Evidence Base.

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
		<p>‘completions and commitments’ since March 2011 and the combined figure up to September 2014 is 1158.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It does seem the neighbourhood plan allocations are going to be considerably short of the ‘housing requirement’ as calculated in an amended Table 2. Suggest putting in the reserve site and quota of 300 homes into Policy HP1’s housing target to make it 917 homes (you could phase Site M to the latter period of the plan). 		<p>The allocations will not fall below the requirements as stated above https://www.gov.uk/definitions-of-general-housing-terms states that “all student accommodation, whether it consists of communal halls of residence or self-contained dwellings, and whether or not it is on campus, can be included towards the housing provision”. Therefore the Plan has a development figure of 1017 dwellings without the reserve site.</p>
31	Policy HP2 – footnote 27	Please in addition refer to more recent evidence such as a letter of the University (which will need to be included in the Evidence Base) confirming the Campus Development Framework and 400 rooms are still the intention	To justify including the University rooms in the Neighbourhood Plan as a contribution to the housing provision.	On behalf of the university Delta Planning have confirmed the requirement
31	Policy HP3	Why is only Site H selected to be suitable for self-build and how many homes would be enough? Justification is needed. Also, the policy needs amending as it cannot state this development on its own meets Buckingham’s need and as a self build element is not necessary to make the site acceptable in planning terms, a Section 106 cannot be required.	To justify the policy and meet the Section 106 tests set out in regulations.	The wording of the policy has been altered to not preclude development on other sites. There is a requirement for the development to show need under HP4
31	Policy HP4	Need to state in paragraph 6.7 a reference to the evidence base (and paragraph) providing justification for housing mix.	So that evidence can be demonstrated clearly to help the plan meet the NPPF and basic conditions at examination.	Now referenced to evidence 1.29.
31-32	Policy HP5	Advice referring to the VAP and Stage 1 CIL Viability study by Dixon Searle to justify the viability of seeking 35% affordable housing. http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/planning-policy/publications-list/withdrawn-vap-strategy-technical-documents/#Vap_Strategy_Evidence_Infrastructure	This evidence was accepted at the Great Horwood Neighbourhood Plan examination to justify seeking 35% affordable housing.	The evidence and policy have been updated incorporating the comments
31-32	Policy HP5	Please provide clarify in the policy as to the percentage of affordable housing sought on sites of less than 1 hectare. If	To justify the policy approach in terms of what would happen in providing affordable	Clarity has been provided within HP5

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
		<p>the intention is to follow published AVDC's position then it would be '30% on sites of 25 or more dwellings and sites of 1 hectare or more' .</p> <p>http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/planning-policy/publications-list/supplementary-planning-document-</p> <p>Also need to amend the part of the policy that starts 'Proposal for smaller sites should provide...' by deleting 'for smaller sites'.</p> <p>Finally, amend the sentence in the policy to read 'Planning applications for residential development of <u>25 or more units</u> and sites of 1 hectare or more must be accompanied by an Affordable Housing Plan'.</p>	Housing on a development proposal for example of 25-30 dwellings but less than 1 hectare (or change it to bring it fully in line with the district position).	
32	6.8	Please state what the specific needs are or where they are identified (if this is should be in the evidence base)	So that evidence can be demonstrated clearly to help the plan meet the NPPF and basic conditions at examination.	This clarified within the Plan
32	Policy HP6	Need to be clear when in 2016 housing on the main sites can come forward, what does 'take place' mean – any construction? Also the evidence base will need to be very clear on Anglian Water's position if sewerage capacity is indeed currently holding back more housing being delivered.	<p>To take account of the lack of 5 year housing land supply and the Great Horwood Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report on not holding back the delivery of housing sites without good reason.</p> <p>It will be difficult to have such a great policy restriction on housing development before 2016 in the current housing land supply position but if there is an infrastructure capacity reason e.g. Anglian Water and sewerage treatment capacity this should be more clearly drawn out in 6.12-6.13 with specific reference to Anglian Water's position regarding the neighbourhood plan.</p>	Evidence within regard to Anglian Water has been provided. In addition clarification has been provided regarding 'before 2016' and 'take place'
33	Policy HP7	The policy may wish to have a clause at the end 'subject to compliance with all other plan policies' to avoid a small site needed for non-residential uses e.g. employment, community service/facility or green infrastructure being developed.	To ensure the policy does not conflict with the other objectives in the plan and the NPPF, i.e. other than delivery of housing.	Previous advice from AVDC was to not include references to other policies within the plan as they are requirements anyway with needing to state.

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
		There is also a paragraph duplication in paragraph 6.13.		Corrected
35	Policy DHE1	<p>Insert reference to the Buckingham Design Guide being produced consultation with AVDC and a justification that it will be in conformity with AVDLP Policy GP35 and the objectives of existing design guidance.</p> <p>Will the drawing up/impact of having a Design guide be subject to a viability assessment? Need to insert a commentary for this after the policy to prove the policy can be effective.</p>	<p>Support a design guide being prepared though without knowing what it would say, there needs to be a commitment to consult AVDC in drafting the document and a reassurance in justifying the policy that it will conform with AVDC's general objectives for good design that takes account of the criteria in Policy GP35 and objectives of design guidance published at http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/planning-policy/publications-list/design-guides/</p> <p>So that evidence can be demonstrated clearly to help the plan meet the NPPF and basic conditions at examination.</p>	Policy has been re-written considering feedback from all sources
35-7	DHE3 and DHE6	Duplication of policies – delete one of them.	To shorten the plan and avoid confusion.	Corrected
36	DHE4	The Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator – the policy could be made more robust by inserting into paragraphs 7.6 and 7.7 evidence of cases where the Calculator is being used in practice.	To demonstrate the policy can be applied in practice and provide justification needed for the examination.	Evidence of use is mentioned with regard to Warwickshire.
35-39	Policies DHE2-9	<p>Policy DHE2 – the final requirement needs a bullet 'Include a plan showing...'</p> <p>Paragraph 7.11 is missing and Policy DH10 should presumably be 'DHE10'.</p> <p>DHE4 should state 'current' before 'Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator'.</p>	<p>Editorial comments to improve reading the plan.</p> <p>So that the latest version of the Calculator is used (it is version 18, Warwickshire County Council)</p>	Changes have been incorporated into the Plan
39	Policy DHE9	In paragraphs 7.19-7.21 please insert a justification for the viability of requiring the 10-metre garden standard.	To make the requirement of a garden standard robust at examination and to users of the plan. It may be the viability justification here and in other areas of the plan needs to come from Dixon Searle Partnership doing a viability check of the plan. To take account of paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework (ensuring viability and deliverability).	It is felt that this is warranted within the plan and that the policy provides enough flexibility to not affect viability.

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
40	Policy DHE10	Please insert a reference in paragraph 7.22 to where the standards have come from and why they are considered appropriate. If this is in the Evidence Base, then insert a specific reference.	To make the requirement of a (and the chosen) standard robust at examination and to users of the plan.	Advised by Tibbalds that this would be appropriate and that it is part of the standard, used across the sector.
42	Policy CLH2 and CLH 4	Need to revise/add to Policy CLH2 and CLH4 to take account of the tests of development in the CIL regulations http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/regulation/122 .	<p>Requiring Site G alone to provide for the new cemetery or allotments would not comply with the CIL regulations. These set out that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting planning permission for the development if the obligation is—</p> <p>(a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;. (b) directly related to the development; and.</p> <p>(c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</p> <p>Suggest AVDC commissions CIL viability consultants DSP to investigate the viability of the neighbourhood plan proposals, including the burdens on the allocated sites to provide off site infrastructure.</p> <p>To take account of paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework (ensuring viability and deliverability).</p>	The Policy has been re-written following the submission by the developers for the land
43	Policy CLH3	Need to revise/add to Policy CLH3 to take account of the tests of development in the CIL regulations http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/regulation/122 . i.e. the amount of designated play space should only be to meet the needs of people that will be living in the housing on the sites.	The play provision requirements need to be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in order to meet the CIL regulations.	Policy has been re-written following submissions
44-45		Check number for ‘footnotes 119 and 138’ and footnote 45 – where is this need from and how does ‘18 plots of 10 poles each result in a need for at least 0.5ha’?	Possible typo’s and need to explain the plan better to the reader.	Foot notes have been corrected.
47	Policy CLH8	Consider this should be part of an integrated comprehensive approach to developing Sites G and J	So that the plan can best provide a holistic approach to meet the overall needs of Buckingham and the main allocation in the plan other than employment land on sites south of the bypass.	Policy has been amended following submissions

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
50	Policy EE1	Need to insert the site size for these employment development allocations in Policy EE1. Please check the site sizes for sites E and Q they add up to approximately 30ha whereas the intention is for 10ha.	If employment weren't to come forward on the sites allocated for development, AVDC may be faced with residential planning applications. This could be a significant amount of housing on 30ha.	All sites have been rechecked using www.magic.gov.uk and updated in the Site Assessment document. The evidence regarding need for employment has been updated.
51	Policy EE2	The plan needs to set out (bring out from the evidence base pp26-30 and site assessment report) the justification for the sites allocated for retail use including confirming the land is available and realistic	To justify the proposed use on the site. Need DSP viability consultants to consider proposals – is it realistic to expect retail to come forward?	The policy states that these sites would only be progressed if they become available.
51	Paragraph 9.4	The final sentence should be amended to state a reason why B8 storage use would not be preferred. Also clarify if it is intended to read 'other B-class uses' rather than 'Uses other than B8'. Also the final sentence extended to say '...and there has been no market interest for other B-class uses'.	To be clear on the intention of the policy approach and justification for it.	Comments have been considered
53	Policy EE5	Please insert commitment to drawing up proposals for car parking expansion with AVDC's Parking Services to ensure a co-ordinated response to increased provision. Also please clarify in paragraph 9.16 that the sites are available and viable.	Fig. 9.8 The site adjacent to the existing Cornwalls Meadow car park would provide a useful location for increasing parking provision in the town centre and could benefit from using the existing access road if necessary. The site at Stratford Fields appears to be an extension of, and would need access through, AVDC's current car park. AVDC have this area earmarked for additional parking if necessary in the future.	Policy has been altered
53	Paragraph 9.14	Final sentence – suggest adding '...and support the vitality and viability of the centre'.	To bring the justification for the policy more into line with the NPPF and the thrust of town centres policy.	Accepted
57	Policies I1 and I2	The policies should be merged as they are seeking the same. After the sentence '...that good connections are maintained' add in Policy I2 '...via pedestrian and cycle links, with the existing town, footpaths, bridleways...' Also in the reasoned justification (paragraphs 10.1, 10.2-10.5 please provide justification that the proposals would be viable.	To make the plan concise and succinct. Need DSP viability consultants to consider the proposals. To take account of paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework (ensuring viability and deliverability).	Accepted and integrated

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
58	Policy I5	Please delete ‘...at least the minimum level required by the Homes and Communities Agency’ and replace with ‘...at least the Optional Housing Standards being introduced by Government in October 2015’.	The policy needs amending to take account of the Government bringing in new standards coming in to replace the Code for Sustainable Homes and other sustainable construction standards. https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/housing-standards-review-technical-consultation page 10 sets out the Optional Housing Standards.	Has been amended accordingly
59	Policy I9	Could delete the policy	It doesn’t say anything more than the NPPF. To make the plan concise and succinct	Although it is in the NPPF it has specific local relevance
59	Policy I10	Need to provide justification to the policy	Suggest summarising from the Evidence Base the ‘evidenced problem with sewerage drainage’.	It is now referenced to the evidence base
61	Policies DC1, DC2, DC3	Need to revise/add to the policies to take account of the tests of development in the CIL regulations http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/regulation/122 .	The infrastructure contribution requirements need to be directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development in order to meet the CIL regulations. As the policies are currently written they are not considered to meet the CIL regulations.	Done according to AVDC subsequent email correspondence.
65-71	Site Specific Requirements	Need to check and amend the site size requirements set out in this section – it appears the overall site size stated in the net site area having already deducted what would be provided for open space	To ensure that the sites allocated can build the amount of development set out in the specific requirements.	All sites have been rechecked using www.magic.gov.uk and updated in the Site Assessment document. Clarification has been provided within the section
65-71	Site Specific Requirements	A reference would be useful to engagement with Buckinghamshire County Council as Local Highway Authority stating that the site proposals can proceed and be realized despite the local highway network constraints (albeit there are some junction improvements being proposed in the neighbourhood plan).	To justify the proposals and impact on the local highway network and take account of paragraph 173 of the National Planning Policy Framework (ensuring viability and deliverability).	Please see the County Council’s reply

Page	Para/policy No.	AVDC Recommended Change – First Pre Submission Plan	Reason	Response
69	Site J	AVDC still has concerns to the development of this site and the ability (in the absence of a comprehensive approach including Site G) to avoid harmful impacts on the biodiversity constraints on the site). However the use of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Calculator (Policy DHE4) gives some reassurance that <u>if</u> the plan cannot demonstrate no net loss on site then the developer will either need to show it can provide offsite compensation or the application will need to be amended to provide less development.	The site's ambition to deliver up to 39 dwellings whilst achieving no net loss of biodiversity (and provide satisfactory vehicular access) will be very difficult to achieve unless the allocation is combined with Site G. Although the sites are indifferent ownership, as long as both owners are promoting development for the plan and confirm delivery of the development then there should be no issue on meeting the basic conditions.	Noted
71	Site M	Suggest a reference in paragraphs 12.31-12.35 being inserted to the Site Assessment report and section which considers the constraints including flooding affecting Site M. A reference would also be useful to engagement with the Environment Agency stating that the site proposals can proceed and be realised despite the flooding constraints.	To justify the Site M proposals in how they are deliverable (paragraph 173 of the NPPF) and have taken account of planning for flood risk (paragraph 99- 104 of the NPPF).	12.34,35&36 now added how it take account of flooding and how it is available.

Sustainability Appraisal (January 2015) – Comments

Page	Paragraph	Recommended Change	Reason	Response
37	Site J	There is an incomplete 3 rd sentence in the Biodiversity, flora and fauna scoring. The final sentence also says that in order to achieve no net loss of biodiversity, some offsetting will needed offsite. If this is Site G, it needs to be clarified and also in the Plan itself.	To understand the accuracy of the overall conclusion on SA objective scoring.	Noted, and rectified

Site Assessment (January 2015)– Comments

Page	Paragraph /Site	Recommended Change	Reason	Response
38	Site 18	Stage B – AVDC consider that 11.4ha could be available for development given topography and overlooking to Gawcott Road properties. Given the plan’s green space proposals for around 4 hectares, it is difficult to see how up to 400 homes can be realistic. It would be better combining Sites G and J and clearly setting out the residential site area and that from both sites which would make up the open space aspirations. Access into Site J and the biodiversity/heritage constraints on Site J will need to be factored in.	To justify the plan’s allocation of Site G for Up to 400 homes	The site area has been recalculated and the developers have indicated that the topography would not be a hindrance on providing the number of dwellings on site G, nor would any other issue.

Appendix 3 – Local Green Spaces Designation

Previous comments at the first Pre Submission stage still stand as follows:

AVDC has no objection in principle to the areas being designated as Local Green Spaces (as per NPPF paras 76-78) subject to points (1) and (2) below. However it considers the designation should be set out through a specific policy in the Neighbourhood Plan itself, with a hook to the detail in the Appendix.

1. AVDC draws the Town Council to the attention of Section 106 Agreements on Stratford Fields and Mount Pleasant that restrict the use of land to only community purposes for leisure, recreational or community activities.
2. Notwithstanding the Local Green Space designation, AVDC may at any time on its property enact Permitted Development Rights to erect or construct ancillary features or structures normally associated with open space amenity and recreational use; or use part of the land for road widening.

BNDP Evidence Base document –Comments to the Revised Pre Submission Evidence Base (January 2015)

Page	Para/policy No.	Issue and Recommended Change	Reason	Response
8-9	1.16	Have coverage of Stage 1 CIL Viability evidence document referred to in AVDC’s comments to Policy HP5.	To provide viability justification for requiring 35% affordable housing on sites of 1ha of more .	Has been incorporated
17-19	1.32-1.35	Redraft this section in accordance with AVDC’s comments to HP1/Table 2.	To bring the evidence into line with amendments needed.	Has been incorporated