

Inspector's Question 73

I would welcome the Council's observations on representations 134 Chris Muldoon, 344 and 345 Ken Trew of Cuddington Parish Council and 225 Mrs Gillian Fisher concerning allocation D-CDN001 and 003.

CDN001

134 Chris Muldoon

Any proposed development of homes on the Aylesbury road site is within the Cuddington Conservation Area (CA). The Aylesbury Road site is situated at the entrance to the village and any development will be the first houses seen on entering Cuddington along Aylesbury Road. The Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document section 4.4.3 states: "Development will not be permitted where it will have an adverse impact on the character or appearance, or views into or out of the CA. The most important views into or out of each CA are identified in the CA Appraisals and Management Plans". The views from Spickett's Lane across the proposed development site are specifically mentioned on page 3 of the Cuddington CA Appraisal Document (Feb 2008) stating....."at the southern entrance are townspace views across a paddock and this is still a pleasant rural access to the village". The paddock and views across it are also specifically mentioned in the 1973 Cuddington Appraisal Plan and application for Conservation Area status. It further states that this is an important area to keep open. Any housing development will not enhance the character and appearance of the area and the loss the open area of land will negatively impact on the Cuddington Conservation Area. Given the above, I cannot understand why this site has been deemed suitable/part suitable for housing development. I am opposed to any housing development on this site.

345 Ken Trew

The site access is close to the existing 30mph sign and development would extend to Spickets Lane. Traffic surveys have shown that vehicle speeds in this area exceed the legal limit and that the bend in the road to the east has poor visibility and is dangerous.

AVDC Response

Regarding Mr Muldoon's representation the Council does not doubt there will be some impact on the Conservation Area, given the site's location within it, and the eastern gateway into the village if this site is developed. However, the suitability of the site for development depends on whether any negative impacts can be minimised to an acceptable degree. Any potential heritage impacts, and other impacts including highways and landscape/visual impact, were investigated in the 2017 Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) version 4 (CD/HOU/007). This study looked at whether the principle of development on the site would be suitable given site constraints. The assessment fully involved colleagues

from AVDC's heritage team covering the important issue of the impact on the conservation area. The heritage team considered the 2008 Cuddington Conservation Area statement

https://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/sites/default/files/page_downloads/CA-Cuddington.pdf

The conclusion in the HELAA assessment agreed with AVDC and BCC colleagues was that in principle a frontage development may be acceptable and would not negatively impact on the Cuddington Conservation Area depending on its design. The site was therefore categorised as part suitable. It was considered though that there would need to be careful guidance in the VALP if the site was to be allocated to have particular regard to the Conservation Area. The specific text in the HELAA is as follows:

Part suitable for housing – The site has historic constraints however being in the Conservation Area and with Listed Building curtilages in proximity. Around 6 units could be achieved on a sensitively designed proposal.

Since completion of the HELAA, leading up to the production of the VALP Proposed Submission, workshops were held with colleagues to look at the sites needed in further detail and draw up policy criteria. Buckinghamshire County Council officers were also consulted. A criterion (f) in policy D-CDN001 was agreed to carefully respect the Conservation Area (d) makes it clear it is only a frontage and other criteria (a) on settlement character and identity and (b) and (c) on landscape considerations were drawn up. The VALP Proposed Submission reflects the outcome of those workshop/consultations.

It is therefore considered that the impact on the Conservation Area has been appropriately considered and the allocation of the site in VALP is appropriate.

CDN003

344 Ken Trew

There is inadequate detail of the site infrastructure in an area known for highway and drainage issues. Further work is needed to address these issues before the site can be genuinely regarded as suitable location for development. The time frame should be extended to allow these studies to be completed. There is also uncertainty about delivery within the 1 to 5 year period.

AVDC Response:

With regard the representations from Mr Ken Trew the highways impact was also a matter considered through the HELAA process and the workshops leading up to the VALP Proposed Submission. Buckinghamshire County Council are satisfied that highways and drainage issues can be tackled through a prospective planning application and are not a barrier to development in principle.

In terms of the second issue raised by Mr Trew of the time frame for development, a Site Delivery Statement has been drafted with Brown & Co. and Mr James Gibson who are promoting the site. The Site Delivery Statement is in draft but is not finalised or agreed. Whilst there is some disagreement on the capacity of the site following a letter from the site promoter to AVDC on 22 January 2018, Brown & Co. and Mr James Gibson are still actively promoting the site for development albeit there is no planning application in yet to AVDC. AVDC considers in line with other sites around the district at a similar settlement size to Cuddington, if the capacity were 15 homes this is deliverable in 1-2 years. However if the site was considered for a larger capacity which Brown & Co and Mr James Gibson seek (50-60 dwellings) then AVDC would assume this would take 3 years from start on site to all dwellings completed. AVDC would also assume it would take approximately 3 years from submission of an outline planning application until the development started completing homes on the site. For the avoidance of doubt, AVDC's opinion is that 15 dwellings is an accurate capacity of the site following its assessment in the VALP and supporting evidence.

225 Gillian Fisher

If 15 houses are built at Dadbrook Farm there will be a minimum of 30 more vehicles in the village. Dadbrook is a narrow, poorly maintained road, not appropriate for more vehicles. The general infrastructure in Cuddington is suitable for a 'small village' so therefore proposed more housing is inappropriate. The access roads in Cuddington are already overused by outside traffic. Access to amenities in Cuddington is very limited and to use a regular bus service residents have to walk up to the A418 along Dadbrook which is narrow and with no footpath.

AVDC Response:

With regards the representations of Mrs Fisher on highway infrastructure in the village, AVDC have considered the cumulative impact of one or both sites allocated in Cuddington in workshops and a consultation with Buckinghamshire County Council leading up to the VALP Proposed Submission. The workshops and consultation agreed that in principle development to the extent outlined in the plan could take place on the two sites although criteria would be needed to satisfy highway impacts. These are criteria (e) and (g) in Policy CDN001 and (g) of CDN003. These are on top of the Council usual requirements on the Local Validation List for planning applications. Policy T4 of VALP would also apply to secure the necessary mitigation should this be needed following consideration of a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment at the planning application stage.

It is therefore considered that the transport implications of this site and the potential for delivery have been appropriately considered and no modification of VALP is necessary.