

**Inspectors Question 74:**

I would welcome the Council's observations on representations 888 Mr Reuben Bellamy of Lone Star on behalf of Corbally Group and 1065 Tim Welch concerning allocation D NLV005.

**Representation:**

NLV005, 888 Mr Reuben Bellamy of Lone Star

An ecological assessment undertaken in 2015 found that the site contained species rich grassland that is very uncommon in Aylesbury Vale. An archaeological assessment undertaken in 2014 found the allocated site contained medieval ridge and furrow. Therefore the allocated site is of ecological value and contains a non-designated heritage asset. It is not the most sustainable site, when all three dimensions of sustainable development are considered. The allocation of the site is not consistent with national policy designed to enhance bio-diversity and will destroy a heritage asset. Alternative sites are available.

**AVDC Response:**

Following the submission of the Biodiversity Impact Assessment and Preliminary Offset Options Report (Environment Bank, 19th April 2018) supporting application 17/01107/AOP for outline permission with access to be considered and all other matters reserved for a residential development of up to 17 dwellings including a new access, it is accepted that off-site mitigation for the loss of priority habitat (lowland meadow) habitats could deliver a net gain for ecology. As a result, there is no ecological objection to delivering this site. Historic England do not deem ridge and furrow features to be uncommon and do not afford any statutory protection to their impact or removal.

Any application that relates to the loss or impact of a ridge and furrow feature can also be addressed through the development management process. With regard to the current application, an assessment has already looked at this issue and no objections raised by the qualifying body.

**Representation:**

NLV005, 1065 Tim Welch

I regard this allocation as unsound for environmental reasons. This land was identified as having ecological value (see the ecological impact assessment under planning application 15/00195/APP) but was subsequently ploughed. I cannot find the reason why this land was ploughed within the public domain. The land should not undergo development and should be given time to recover. If development were to take place here, a much more suitable compromise may be to mirror the existing development on the north side of Whaddon Road and not extend past the western edge of the existing building line just east of the entrance to Hammond Park. This would probably reduce the number of dwellings but should make it possible to preserve an amount of the ploughed land. This should also enable restoration of much of the floral species that were compromised at the times the land was ploughed - when it clearly shouldn't have been.

**AVDC Response:**

The first question on ecological impact has been answered in the response to Mr Reuben Bellamy's question above.

The land has been ploughed as it is currently within active agricultural use.

The proposals are for up to 17 dwellings and the proposed building line is broadly in line with the adjacent development on the north of Whaddon Road.

**Representation:**

D-NLV001, 1065 Tim Welch

I consider this allocation to be unsound as the bulk of district housing need is the south of Aylesbury. Therefore an allocation of this size at the furthest point in the district does not make sense. Also Milton Keynes Council objects to planning application 15/00314/AOP for a number of sound reasons including the pressure the development would bring on infrastructure in the area. I ask that consideration be given to reallocating this site nearer to the districts' major points of housing need.

**AVDC Response:**

The response to this question is contained within the response to question 62.